

# Human Activity Recognition

*by* Mahbuba Tasnim

---

**Submission date:** 05-Jan-2020 11:54AM (UTC+0600)

**Submission ID:** 1239290965

**File name:** uman\_Activity\_Recognition\_from\_Ambient\_Intelligence\_Dataset.docx (3.41M)

**Word count:** 5735

**Character count:** 32998

# Comparative Classifier Model Approach on Human Activity Recognition from Ambient Intelligence Dataset

Mahbuba Tasmin  
ID : 1610064042

Email:  
mahbuba.tasmin@northsouth.edu

Arif-Ur Rahman Chowdhury Suhan  
ID: 1610437642 Email:  
arif.suhan@northsouth.edu

Abdur Raufus Saleheen  
ID: 1610472642  
Email:  
abdurraufus.saleheen@northsouth.edu

Sharif Uddin Ruman  
ID: 1611557642

Email: sharif.ruman@northsouth.edu

Taoseef Ishtiak  
ID: 1612142642  
Email: taoseef.ishtiak@northsouth.edu

N.M. Shihab Islam  
ID: 1420339042 Email:  
shihab.islam@northsouth.edu

Sifat Jahan  
ID: 1611702642 Email:  
sifat.jahan@northsouth.edu

Md. Shahnawaz Zulminan  
ID: 1611708642  
Email:  
shahnawaz.zulminan@northsouth.edu

15

**Abstract**— Human activity Recognition (HAR) is a challenging time series classification task based on neural network modeling to classify the activities of new unseen subjects from the collected sensor data. It involves predicting the movement/activities of a person based on time series data collected from a gyroscope of a smartphone or motion sensors in indoor setup. In this paper, we present a comparative model approach on classification methods from the Ambient Sensor Dataset from UCI machine learning repository to recognize human activities. Before the classifier approach, we have executed extensive data preprocessing and feature selection to produce our selected dataset for the classification. The accuracy of the three classifier models (Decision Tree, Random Forest and Nearest Neighbor) shows different accuracy scores for datasets with and without feature selection. The research output of this paper presents the necessity of data preprocessing and significant feature selection for achieving greater accuracy score for noisy time-series data of HAR activity.

**Keywords**—Human Activity Recognition, Time Series Data, Activity Classification, Feature Engineering

## I. INTRODUCTION

Technology's advancement has blessed mankind with smart world that consists of smart living appliances namely smart home devices, smartphones, wearables and other forms of applications, which has tremendously influenced human lifestyle and is continuing to shape the futuristic lifestyle as well. These technologies have empowered independent lifestyle of an individual, thus significantly reducing dependency on other people [3]. With these smart technologies, the concept of Ambient Assisted Living (AAL) emerged. Ambient Assisted Living [13] presents a system consisting of smart devices, home appliances, wireless networks primarily for healthcare monitoring and smart home living. This concept provides the solution ensuring a safe and quality life for older citizens through preventing, curing and improving wellness and health conditions of older adults by assisting them in living comfortably in their preferred environment. Another sister concept in this regard is Ambient Intelligence (AMI). It presents the ability of a computing system to sense its surrounding and interact with people around.

55

The concept of Ambient Assisted Living (AAL) and Ambient Intelligence (AMI) originates at the first place from the advancement of Human Activity Recognition (HAR) through wireless sensor network and the Internet of Things (IoT) [14]. Data records from different sensor readings has paved the way to identify human activities separately and is leading to smart home systems consequently. Most HAR systems are based on camera or computer vision or wearable sensors [1]. One major feature of activity recognition is change detection via detecting sudden change in statistical metrics (e.g. Mean and Covariance) [2], which represents a change in time series data within an indoor environment. Precise manipulation of the derived metrics using a robust algorithm would decide the class of activity performed within a timeframe. In general, activity recognition is a vital component of context-aware systems [3], which provides the understanding of the smart home applications to understand user requirement and adapt to the various circumstances. Nevertheless, a real-time indoor HAR system in a real environment is often limited by the constraints of indoor environments and makes it difficult to build a robust and scalable system.

Computer vision based HAR systems are useful for large coverage and pedestrian activity recognition. To eliminate the potential privacy issue related to camera based computer vision system in indoor environment setup, HAR solutions at recent years are based on wearable sensors or devices including smartphones [6]. Wearable approach is sometimes rendered restrained and potential limitations since the user need to always equip the sensing device while recording data, which doesn't support seamless activity record process. In addition, the wearable approach requires transition between different positions of the user need to be perceived since the system depends on the target to determine the location of the wearable device with respect to the performed activity [17]. On the other hand, in the indoor environment, intelligent HAR system perceives the state of the physical environment and the interacting resident using sensors, reasons about the recorded data and applies Ambient Intelligence to take actions to achieve specified targets [4, 5]. During recording, embedded sensors in the home collects readings while residents independently perform their usual activities. Sensor-data is collected and stored in a database and later

analyzed to generate target information such as patterns, predictions and transitions [7].

To this end, the present work is motivated to classify five distinct activities (Watch TV, Read, Phone, Cook, and Eat) from the dataset of 12 pre-defined activities including 3 labeled activity namely “other activity”, on the basis of the UCI Machine Learning Repository dataset “*Human Activity Recognition from Continuous Ambient Sensor Data Dataset*” from Washington State University [11]. The motivation is to precisely classify the activities while reducing the computational requirements through exhaustive data preparation. This originates from the idea to allow human activity recognition with less costs involved in computation so that we can incorporate the concept in the perspective of Bangladesh. The dataset is preprocessed, features with statistically significant values have been selected and finally we have applied three different classifier models to present a comparison output of the accuracy level.

The major contributions of the present paper include:

1. Data processing of the selected 5-activities dataset through Principal Component Analysis and Linear Discriminant Analysis
2. Feature Selection based on statistical significance and importance score of columns
3. Classifier models comparison on the pre-processed dataset

The paper follows the following structure: Section II presents the related works on the research objectives. Section III presents Data Source and Section IV presents Methodology where data preprocessing and feature selection approaches are discussed and classifier model approach follows the discussion. Section V, Performance Evaluation consists of the results from three consecutive steps of the research and evaluation metric score of the classifiers. In the following Section VI, Conclusion presents the observation and areas for further improvement, completed by Section VII References.

## II. RELATED WORK

The research field of activity recognition is quite large considering the combination of embedded sensors, different environmental setups and algorithms to detect activity points. Hence, there are number of approaches explored in this field.

Naïve Bayes classifiers have produced satisfactory output [53] offline detection of activities [7]. Decision trees are used to learn logical transition of the activity [9] while Gu et al. [10] utilizes KNN to detect mode sensor values associated with activities which helps in recognition.

Probabilistic graph based Markov models, conditional random field [22] Bayesian network [21] have been used successfully to recognize activities even in complex environments. Studies have found that probabilistic graphs along with neural network approaches [12] are significant at mapping pre-segmented sensor sequence to activity labels. Different types of sensor data are proven to be effective for classifying different types of activities. Ambulatory movements (e.g. Walking, Running, Standing, Sitting, Climbing Stairs and Falling) are classified in [6, 18] using accelerometer placed on the body. Recently smartphones with accelerometer and gyroscope sensors are used as

wearable device to recognize gesture and motion patterns [19].

More complex activities that require more information than body movement, in that case the user's interaction with key objects in the environment is recorded. Shake sensors or RFID tags are tagged with the object and are selected based on the targeted activities [1]. Environment sensors such as motion detector, light sensor, door contact sensors are used to recognize daily activities in other researches [4, 5].

At realistic activity recognition tasks, the recognizing activities are performed with interleaved activities [20, 21], embedded errors [19] and concurrent activities performed by multiple individuals in the setup [6, 20]. Detecting activities in free movement setup, where the residents perform usual daily routines in a smart home environment was the next step of advancement [3, 6]. These recorded datasets have required on manual labelling to segment and analyze the data.

Dedicated HAR architectures [5] use various methods to perceive the complex concerns from recognizing sequential and concurrent human activities. Two key approaches are followed in HAR: data-driven and knowledge-driven technique [23]. Naïve Bayes (NB) classifiers, Decision Trees, Hidden Markov Models, Bayesian Networks [5] and Support Vector Machine (SVM) classifier are the machine learning techniques and probabilistic approaches in Data-driven method. The algorithms work on inductive reasoning to detect human activities in data-driven approach. Existing works including data-driven technique utilizes supervised approach using manually labeled data for training. The approach is restrained by complex method and additional computational cost.

The unsupervised approaches are often restricted by low performance in comparison with the supervised approach in indoor home environment. In the knowledge-based HAR, activities are modeled with their contextual information in the common ground as new activity record is detected via deductive reasoning. The construction of a common ground to present the set of concepts along with their relationships in a machine-interpretable approach is a restraint of knowledge-based HAR. Data-driven techniques are useful for detecting basic distinctive activities, on the other hand unsupervised approach is suitable for creating probabilistic models with expected accuracy score.

A knowledge-based approach utilizing the inter-frame algorithm convolutional neural network is applied in Chen et al. [26], where distinguishing features are collected through cameras and learnt, filters non-target objects and estimate skeleton sequence from RGB images.

## III. DATA SOURCE

The primary dataset of the project is collected from UCI Machine Learning Repository [11], *Human Activity Recognition from Continuous Ambient Sensor Data Dataset*. The dataset is fairly new, published on 20<sup>th</sup> September, 2019.

This dataset represents ambient data collected in homes with volunteer residents with their usual daily activities at home. Ambient PIR motion sensors, door/temperature sensors, and Light Switch sensors are used to record activity data as event stream. The sensors are placed in locations throughout the home that are related to specific target activity of daily living.

3

The classification task is to predict the activity that is occurring in the smart home and being observed by the ambient sensors. The sensors communicate using the ZigBee Pro protocol [5,6].

3

The original format captured from the sensors is provided, as well as the feature vector we generate using a sliding window of 30 sensor events. Each annotated data file (ex: csh101/csh101.ann.txt) has a corresponding feature vector CSV file (ex: csh101/csh101.ann.features.csv).

Most of the sensor data files contain labels for **two months of the collection period**, though some contain labels for extended time periods. The motion sensors determine the time of motion occurrence in the range of the sensor. The motion sensor reports 1/0 depending on record of motion activity. The transition period between on and off status is roughly 1.25 seconds. For continuous activity record beyond the threshold time, the sensor won't record 0 until 1.25 seconds after the activity has ceased. One example smart home layout is attached below:




Figure 1: Sensor Layout of One of the Volunteer Resident House

The original dataset is collected under the lead of Diane J. Cook from School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at Washington State University, and the other creators are Aaron S. Crandall, and Brian L. Thomas.

The key features of the scraped dataset for our purpose is presented in the below table:

Table 1: Key features of the Scrapped Dataset

Data Set Characteristics	Multivariate, Sequential, Time Series	Number of Instances	4475631
Attribute Characteristics	Integer, Real	Number of Attributes	37
Associated Tasks	Classification	Missing Values	Yes
Area	N/A		

#### IV. METHODOLOGY

We have scraped the dataset for this research from the UCI dataset, for the five selected activities (Watch TV, Read, Phone, Cook, and Eat). The dataset attributes is presented in table 1. The whole work is divided into three major segments-

Data Preprocessing, Feature Selection and Classifier Model execution. In this section, we discuss about the working principle of each of the segment. Figure 2 presents the basic workflow of this project.




Figure 2: Flowchart of Work

##### A. Data Preprocessing

The scraped dataset is standardized and divided into test and train set (split = 0.3). The scatter plot with test and train set marked in red and blue dots is presented in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Input Data Distribution of Test and Train Split

##### B. Dimensionality Reduction

We have applied dimensionality reduction through Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) methods to make the data more visually understandable.

###### I) Principal Component Analysis

21

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) applied to this data presents the most variant combination of attributes (principal components, or directions in the feature space).

21

Here we plot the different samples on the 2 first principal components in Figure 4.

The feature of the dataset is standardized first through `StandardScaler()` and reduced to dimension of 2. Here is the visual graph output of the dataset:




Figure 4: PCA Presentation with 70% Accuracy

The PCA variance presents 70% accuracy on the test dataset, which is significantly low since the dimensions are reduced from 37 to principal 2 dimensions.

52

## 2) Linear Discriminant Analysis

Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) identifies attributes with most variance between classes. LDA is a supervised approach that uses known class labels.

The LDA accuracy score outperforms PCA score, with a 77% accuracy score in Figure 5. LDA finds centroid of each data point and projects the cluster of data points.




Figure 5: LDA Presentation with 77% Accuracy

## C. Feature Selection

The primary goal of this research work is to activity detection through recognizing the pattern of data mined in "Human Activity Recognition from Continuous Ambient Sensor Data Dataset" [4, 11]. Primarily 5 distinct activities have been selected to train for pattern recognition purpose. Before fitting the dataset into the explored classifiers for activity recognition several preprocessing techniques have been applied for statistical analysis of the attributes the dataset to reduce those number of features that do not contribute to training. The research team believes the feature selection approach not only reduce the number of training time and computational cost but also will reduce the variance of the model, thus avoiding overfitting. The following section describes the feature selection techniques that the research team has applied for feature selection and the theoretical background of the techniques. Table 2 presents the set of significant column attributes selected by the four feature selection approaches in the following:

### 1) Low Variance Feature Removal:

The low variance feature selection technique removes the features which is found to be constant mostly. The constant value of a feature is not very interesting to find pattern and can be removed from the dataset. For dataset with large attributes the scikit-learn library automatically identifies the features which have the lowest variance. The heuristic approach before running the feature selection techniques is to use a threshold value to use as cut-off. The feature elimination is run when any features comes beneath this threshold value. On the given threshold the library computes the covariance against each tuple of the dataset and generates the result. The research team has kept a threshold of 80% as the threshold.

### 2) L1-based Feature Selection:

In SVM the parameter C controls the sparsity of the vectors. The smaller C is the fewer features elected. L1 model outputs random value when working on large dataset. L1 model feature selection depends on noise level, smallest absolute value of non-zero coefficients, logarithmic number of features and design matrix structure. The design matrix must contain the property of not being too correlated.

39

### 3) Tree-based Feature Selection:

The tree-based estimators are used to compute the importance of features and to discard the irrelevant features.

### 4) Feature Selection with Random Forest:

Random forest classifier uses the tree-based strategies to rank the features for improving purity of the node.

Table 2: Selected Features through Feature Selection Approach

Original Set of Features	Selected Features with Low Variance Feature Removal	Selected Features with L1 Based Feature Selection	Selected Features with Tree-based Feature Selection	Feature Selection with Random Forest
lastSensorEventHours	lastSensorEventHours	lastSensorEventHours	lastSensorEventHours	lastSensorEventHour
lastSensorEventSeconds	lastSensorEventSeconds	lastSensorEventSeconds	lastSensorEventSeconds	lastSensorEventSeconds
lastSensorDayOfWeek	lastSensorDayOfWeek	lastSensorDayOfWeek	lastSensorDayOfWeek	lastSensorDayOfWeek
windowDuration	windowDuration	windowDuration	windowDuration	windowDuration
timeSinceLastSensorEvent	timeSinceLastSensorEvent	timeSinceLastSensorEvent		
preDominantSensor1	preDominantSensor1	preDominantSensor1	preDominantSensor1	
preDominantSensor2	preDominantSensor2	preDominantSensor2		
lastSensorID	lastSensorID	lastSensorID		
lastSensorLocation	lastSensorLocation	lastSensorLocation	lastSensorLocation	lastSensorLocation
lastMotionLocation	lastMotionLocation	lastMotionLocation	lastMotionLocation	lastMotionLocation
complexity	complexity			
activityChange	activityChange	activityChange		
areaTransitions	area transitions	area transitions		
areaDirectSensor				
sensorCount-Bedroom	sensorCount-Bedroom	sensorCount-Bedroom		
sensorCount-Bedroom	sensorCount-Bedroom	sensorCount-Bedroom		
sensorCount-Chair	sensorCount-Chair	sensorCount-Chair		
sensorCount-DiningRoom	sensorCount-DiningRoom	sensorCount-DiningRoom		
sensorCount-Hall	sensorCount-Hall	sensorCount-Hall		
sensorCount-Ignore	sensorCount-Ignore	sensorCount-Ignore		
sensorCount-Kitchen	sensorCount-Kitchen	sensorCount-Kitchen	sensorCount-Kitchen	sensorCount-Kitchen
sensorCount-LivingRoom	sensorCount-LivingRoom	sensorCount-LivingRoom	sensorCount-LivingRoom	sensorCount-LivingRoom
sensorCount-Office	sensorCount-Office	sensorCount-Office		sensorCount-Bedroom
sensorCount-OutsideDoor	sensorCount-OutsideDoor	sensorCount-OutsideDoor		
sensorCount-WorkArea	sensorCount-WorkArea	sensorCount-WorkArea		

Feature	Score
1. feature 20	(0.153283)
2. feature 0	(0.087287)
3. feature 1	(0.085212)
4. feature 9	(0.067567)
5. feature 21	(0.036598)
6. feature 27	(0.036238)
7. feature 31	(0.035192)
8. feature 34	(0.033122)
9. feature 2	(0.033049)

## 2) Random Forest Classifier




Figure 7: Random Forest Classifier Feature Score

## D. Feature Importance

Feature importance calculates the score for each feature in a dataset through use of forests of trees. The red bars present the feature importance of the forest, along with inter-trees variability. Here we have applied the score calculation on 37 column attributes through Extra Tree Classifier and Random Forest Classifier. Figure 6 & 7 presents the significant features with bar charts and the scores are listed in table 3 & 4 respectively.

### 1) Extra Tree Classifier




Figure 6: Extra Tree Classifier Feature Score

Table 3: Top 10 Significant feature score in Extra Tree Classifier

Table 4: Top 10 Significant feature score in Random Forest Classifier

Feature	Score
1. feature 31	(0.149931)
2. feature 1	(0.116110)
3. feature 20	(0.091917)
4. feature 0	(0.080503)
5. feature 3	(0.055434)
6. feature 9	(0.045336)
7. feature 34	(0.041218)
8. feature 25	(0.035567)
9. feature 26	(0.035500)
10. feature 27	(0.031554)

## E. Backward Elimination Output

Using Variance Threshold baseline approach, we have executed Backward Elimination algorithm on the dataset, The two columns that are found most significant through this technique are “lastSensorEventSeconds, sensorEITime-Bedroom.” Figure 8 presents the statistical significance calculation of each of the column attributes with respective to p-value, t-test and standard error.

	coef	std err	t	P> t	[0.025	0.975]
const	6.402e-11	3.55e-12	18.035	0.000	5.71e-11	7.1e-11
x1	0.0515	0.017	3.028	0.002	0.018	0.085
x2	-2.103e-05	4.74e-05	-4.432	0.000	-3.03e-05	-1.17e-05
x3	-0.0165	0.003	-5.931	0.000	-0.022	-0.011
x4	-3.727e-06	1.46e-05	-0.255	0.799	-3.24e-05	2.49e-05
x5	-0.0082	7.95e-05	-2.937	0.003	-0.009	-7.76e-05
x6	0.0177	0.003	7.012	0.000	0.013	0.023
x7	0.0103	0.002	4.486	0.000	0.006	0.015
x8	-0.0238	0.002	-13.595	0.000	-0.027	-0.020
x9	-0.0238	0.002	-13.595	0.000	-0.027	-0.020
x10	-0.0261	0.004	-6.118	0.000	-0.034	-0.018
x11	0.4485	0.016	27.341	0.000	0.416	0.481
x12	0.0458	0.021	2.145	0.032	0.004	0.086
x13	0.0022	0.002	0.899	0.359	-0.003	0.007
x14	6.387e-14	8.49e-15	7.427	0.000	4.64e-14	7.97e-14
x15	-0.0228	0.004	-5.968	0.000	-0.030	-0.015
x16	-0.0272	0.003	-8.212	0.000	-0.034	-0.021
x17	-0.0905	0.003	-34.644	0.000	-0.099	-0.085
x18	0.0667	0.001	66.164	0.000	0.065	0.069
x19	3.908e-17	2.52e-17	15.507	0.000	3.41e-17	4.4e-17
x20	0.0066	0.001	5.181	0.000	0.004	0.009
x21	0.0442	0.001	40.071	0.000	0.042	0.046
x22	0.0027	0.001	2.399	0.016	0.000	0.005
x23	4.959e-17	5.55e-18	8.931	0.000	3.87e-17	6.05e-17
x24	-0.0089	0.005	-0.191	0.849	-0.011	0.009
x25	0.0214	0.001	17.513	0.000	0.019	0.024
x26	-3.61e-05	5.43e-06	-6.754	0.000	-4.74e-05	-2.51e-05
x27	6.864e-06	5.43e-06	1.265	0.286	-3.77e-06	1.75e-05
x28	4.84e-05	1.84e-07	26.352	0.000	4.49e-05	5.2e-06
x29	9.85e-06	1.23e-06	7.345	0.000	6.63e-06	1.15e-05
x30	5.531e-06	3.07e-07	18.035	0.000	4.93e-06	6.13e-06
x31	5.495e-06	1.96e-07	28.003	0.000	5.11e-06	5.88e-06
x32	-9.561e-05	9.05e-05	-10.552	0.000	-8.000	-7.79e-05
x33	7.301e-05	1.06e-05	6.898	0.000	5.23e-05	9.38e-05
x34	5.531e-06	3.07e-07	18.035	0.000	4.93e-06	6.13e-06
x35	-3.97e-06	1.19e-06	-3.322	0.001	-6.31e-06	-1.63e-06
x36	-1.495e-05	8.93e-07	-16.750	0.000	-1.67e-05	-1.32e-05
Omnibus:	1972.542	Durbin-Watson:	0.063			
Prob(Omnibus):	0.000	Jarque-Bera (JB):	8988.587			
Skew:	0.167	Prob(JB):	0.00			
Kurtosis:	5.698	Cond. No.	2.79e+19			

Figure 8: Backward Elimination Output

#### F. Classifier Comparison

The classifier comparison presents a set of classifying methods in scikit-learn on our dataset. The point of this comparison is to illustrate the nature of decision boundaries of different classifiers. After feature selection is done, two datasets<sup>33</sup> are generated based on the Tree-based and Random-forest based feature selection. The L1-based and Low-variance approach don't reduce the dimension significantly and hence we have discarded those results.

We have tested on Nearest Neighbor, Decision Tree and Random Forest Classifiers to run on the two datasets.

#### V. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

49

In this section, three state-of-the-art classifier models for HAR system are applied on the raw dataset and the preprocessed dataset. Three models applied here are Decision Tree, Nearest Neighbor and Random Forest. The results clearly show an increase of 5%-10% on accuracy varying on models when dataset<sup>41</sup> pre-processed and significant features are selected. Later in this section, we present the confusion matrix of each of the classifier models on the dataset and statistical metric score to compare and evaluate the model performance.

##### A. Dataset without Feature Selection

First, we have run the classifier models in the dataset without feature selection approach. The Figures 9-11 represent the model accuracy of Decision Tree, Nearest Neighbor and Random Forest respectively on the dataset.




Figure 9: Decision Tree Accuracy 67%




Figure 10: Nearest Neighbor Accuracy 59%




Figure 11: Random Forest Accuracy 67%

33

##### B. Dataset from Tree-based Classifier Feature Selection

The tree-based classifier feature selection selects top few attributes and produces a new dataset based on the selection. Figures 12-15 represent the new dataset distribution based on the selection and the following classifier models (Decision Tree, Nearest Neighbor and Random Forest respectively) accuracy scores. The distribution pattern in Figure 12 is significantly different and denser compared to the input distribution of the dataset without feature selection in Figure 3.




Figure 12: Input Data Distribution of Tree-based Feature Selection




Figure 13: Decision Tree Accuracy 70%




Figure 14: Nearest Neighbor Accuracy 62%




Figure 15: Random Forest Accuracy 70%

### C. Dataset From Random Forest Selection Classifier Feature Selection

The Random-forest selection classifier feature selection selects top few attributes and produces a new dataset based on the selection. Figures 16-19 represent the new dataset distribution based on the selection and the following classifier models (Decision Tree, Nearest Neighbor and Random Forest respectively) accuracy scores.




Figure 16: Input Distribution of Random-Forest Based Feature Selection




Figure 17: Decision Tree Accuracy 70%




Figure 18: Nearest Neighbor Accuracy 61%




Figure 19: Random Forest Accuracy 70%

Table 5 summarizes the performance of the three different classifier models on the 3 datasets.

Table 5: Accuracy Score of Classifier Models on Three Datasets

Dataset Types	Decision Tree	Nearest Neighbors	Random Forest
Full Dataset	67 %	59 %	67 %
Tree Based Dataset	70 %	61 %	70 %
Random Selection Dataset	70 %	62 %	70 %

#### D. Evaluation Metrics

The performance of the tree classifier model on 3 datasets is evaluated through four key metrics of accuracy: *precision*, *recall*, *f1-score* and *support*. We have applied the classifier models on the raw dataset as well as the feature selected two other datasets. The confusion matrix and evaluation metrics are presented here on the basis of the different datasets and the result of classification models on those datasets. The

activities are coded into numerical values in here, hence the below graphs will show activity id comparisons.

1 Accuracy gives the sum of correct classifications to the total number of instances.

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP+TN}{TP+TN+FP+FN}$$

29 Where TP i.e. true positive is the category of positive attributes correctly classified as positive attributes, TN i.e. true negative is the set of negative samples identified as negative samples. FP i.e. false positive is the category of negative attributes classified as positive attributes. And FN i.e. false negative are the positive samples being classified as negative samples.

$$\text{The formula for Precision} = \frac{TP}{TP+FP}$$

This performance metric presents the proportion of positive attributes those were classified correctly. Recall presents the proportion of actual positive classes those were identified in proportion to all samples in the actual class

$$\text{The formula for Recall} = \frac{TP}{TP+FN}$$

35 score is a performance metric that measures the weighted harmonic mean of precision and recall. It is used to evaluate the classification accuracy of an algorithm.

$$F\text{-Score} = 2 * \frac{\text{Recall} * \text{Precision}}{\text{Recall} + \text{Precision}}$$

#### 1) Full Dataset Metric Scores

In this sub-section, three confusion matrix and respective statistical scores are presented on the basis of the three classifier model applied on the dataset without significant feature selection. Figure 20 presents the PCA clustering of the full dataset.




Figure 20: PCA Clustering of Full Dataset

#### a) Decision Tree

The evaluation metrics show that decision tree worked fairly well for activity 2 and activity 4, with a weighted average accuracy of 67% in figure 21. For activity 0, 1 and 3, values are zero or near to zero. This represents that decision tree didn't work so well on the full dataset.




Figure 21: Decision Tree Confusion Matrix and Evaluation Scores on Full Dataset

### b) Nearest Neighbor

The evaluation metrics show that compared to decision tree, nearest neighbor worked fairly well for all 5 activities as shown in figure 22. The f1-score ranging from 0.76 for activity-4 to the least 0.04 for activity-1 presents a moderate performance of the model on the dataset. The overall accuracy stands to 59% in this case.




Figure 22: Nearest Neighbor Confusion Matrix and Evaluation Scores on Full Dataset

### c) Random Forest

In this case, the evaluation metric showed quite surprising results in terms of zero f1-score for all 4 activities and 81% for activity-4. All the evaluation metrics through Random forest classifier only could classify activity 4 fairly well. The overall accuracy is 67% as presented in figure 23.




Figure 23: Random Forest Confusion Matrix and Evaluation Scores on Full Dataset

### 2) Random Forest Feature Select Dataset

In this sub-section, the dataset in execution consists of the selected statistically significant attributes from Random Forest Feature Select approach on the full dataset. Three classifier models have been executed and evaluation metric scores of each one of those is discussed below. Figure 24 presents the PCA clustering of this feature selected dataset.




Figure 24: PCA Clustering of Feature Selected Dataset

### a) Decision Tree

Unlike the first iteration of Decision Tree on full dataset, the model performs better in the Random Forest Feature Selected Dataset. The overall accuracy here is 70%, while the F1-score goes 81% as maximum for activity 4. Precision, Recall and F1-score- each classifier has 1 pair of zero values for activity 1 & 2. Figure 25 presents the confusion matrix for this classifier model on the feature selected dataset.

Classification Report :				
	precision	recall	f1-score	support
0	0.64	0.15	0.24	21335
1	0.00	0.00	0.00	3721
2	0.00	0.00	0.00	12117
3	0.52	0.31	0.38	21366
4	0.71	0.95	0.81	128473
accuracy			0.78	179012
macro avg	0.37	0.28	0.29	179012
weighted avg	0.62	0.70	0.62	179012




Figure 25: Decision Tree Confusion Matrix and Evaluation Scores on Random Forest Feature Select Dataset

Classification Report :				
	precision	recall	f1-score	support
0	0.65	0.15	0.24	21335
1	0.00	0.00	0.00	3721
2	0.00	0.00	0.00	12117
3	0.55	0.26	0.36	21366
4	0.71	0.96	0.81	128473
accuracy			0.70	179012
macro avg	0.38	0.27	0.28	179012
weighted avg	0.62	0.70	0.62	179012




Figure 27: Random Forest Confusion Matrix and Evaluation Scores on Random Forest Feature Select Dataset

### b) Nearest Neighbor

Nearest Neighbor classifier on Random Forest feature select dataset produces overall accuracy of 61%, while the F1-score, Precision and Recall metrics here produces values more than zero for all the activities. The highest metric score goes to activity-4 in all three metrics, as presented in Figure 26.

Classification Report :				
	precision	recall	f1-score	support
0	0.29	0.34	0.31	21335
1	0.03	0.02	0.02	3721
2	0.11	0.07	0.09	12117
3	0.42	0.27	0.33	21366
4	0.73	0.78	0.76	128473
accuracy			0.61	179012
macro avg	0.32	0.30	0.30	179012
weighted avg	0.58	0.61	0.59	179012




Figure 26: Nearest Neighbor Confusion Matrix and Evaluation Scores on Random Forest Feature Select Dataset

### c) Random Forest

Random forest classifier on this dataset produces an overall accuracy of 70%. The outputs here have a strong similarity with the Decision Tree result on the same dataset, with 1%-2% difference for metric scores recorded at each activity. The findings are presented in figure 27.




Figure 28: PCA Clustering on Tree Based Feature Select Dataset

#### a) Decision Tree

The overall accuracy of Decision Tree on this dataset is 70%, while the F1-score goes 82% as maximum for activity 4. Precision, Recall and F1-score- each metric has 1 pair of zero values for activity 1 & 2, similar to the decision tree result on random forest based feature selected dataset. The confusion matrix is presented in figure 29.

Classification Report :					
	precision	recall	f1-score	support	
0	0.56	0.39	0.46	21335	
1	0.00	0.00	0.00	3721	
2	0.00	0.00	0.00	12117	
3	0.50	0.18	0.17	21366	
4	0.72	0.95	0.82	120473	
accuracy			0.70	179012	
macro avg	0.35	0.29	0.29	179012	
weighted avg	0.61	0.78	0.63	179012	




Figure 29: Decision Tree Confusion Matrix and Evaluation Scores on Tree Based Feature Select Dataset

Classification Report :					
	precision	recall	f1-score	support	
0	0.68	0.33	0.43	21335	
1	0.00	0.00	0.00	3721	
2	0.00	0.00	0.00	12117	
3	0.57	0.03	0.06	21366	
4	0.71	0.97	0.82	120473	
accuracy			0.78	179012	
macro avg	0.38	0.27	0.26	179012	
weighted avg	0.62	0.70	0.61	179012	




Figure 31: Random Forest Confusion Matrix and Evaluation Scores on Tree Based Feature Select Dataset

### b) Nearest Neighbor

Nearest Neighbor Classifier on this dataset achieves 62% overall accuracy. All the metric score are consistently measured for all activities. Nearest neighbor showed the consistent output of being able to classify correctly all the activities across all three datasets. Figure 30 presents the evaluation metric score and confusion matrix here.

Classification Report :					
	precision	recall	f1-score	support	
0	0.37	0.47	0.41	21335	
1	0.04	0.02	0.03	3721	
2	0.12	0.09	0.10	12117	
3	0.35	0.21	0.26	21366	
4	0.74	0.79	0.76	120473	
accuracy			0.62	179012	
macro avg	0.32	0.32	0.31	179012	
weighted avg	0.59	0.62	0.60	179012	




Figure 30: Nearest Neighbor Confusion Matrix and Evaluation Scores on Tree Based Feature Select Dataset

### c) Random Forest

Random forest classifier on this dataset achieves an overall accuracy of 70%, as shown in figure 31. In this dataset too, activities 1 & 2 have achieved zero metric score across all three evaluation metrics on Random Forest.

On the basis of these nine analysis, Nearest Neighbor has proved to be the overall best classifier for these three datasets, on the classifying ability of five listed activities.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we present a comparative model approach to classify five selected activities from the dataset. The classifier models show significant changes after application of precise data preprocessing and feature selection approach. The accuracy score increases by 10% using Decision Tree from the raw dataset [46] in feature selection is applied. From the three classifier state-of-the-art model for human activity recognition, we have utilized here Decision Tree, Random Forest and Nearest Neighbor. Only the Nearest Neighbor classifier has persistently detected all five activities with varying metric score in the three datasets of this research. On the raw dataset without prior feature selection based on feature significance calculation, Nearest Neighbor achieved 59% overall accuracy, which increased to 61% in Tree based feature selected dataset and 62% in Random Forest based dataset. Hence, this research paper presents that for human activity recognition systems, data preprocessing and feature selection greatly affects the classification performance and consequently the AAL and AML structures on the basis of HAR. State-of-the-art classifier models have presented varying accuracy score on the basis of how well the dataset have been preprocessed for running machine learning model on the dataset.

The future work includes preparing neural network approach to classify the activities and on the basis of the model, we aim to produce a robust time-series model to handle adversarial attack.

The end goal of the research work is to inject adversarial attack on the model to confuse the network and identify the actual activity after the injection. To suggest more amicable work based on such data, the research team is exploring variety of fields in health, administration and security issues where such dataset generation and model implementation will be useful for activity recognition.

## VII. REFERENCES

1. G. A. Oguntala et al., "SmartWall: Novel RFID-Enabled Ambient Human Activity Recognition Using Machine Learning for Unobtrusive Health Monitoring," in IEEE Access, vol. 7, pp. 68022-2033, 2019. doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2917125
2. D. Cook, N. Krishnan, and P. Rashidi. Activity discovery and activity recognition: A new partnership. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B*, 43(3):820-828, 2013
3. Reisburg B, Finkel S, Overall J, Schmidt-Gollas N, Kanowski S, Lehfeld H, Hull F, Sclan SG, Wilms HU, Heininger K, Hindmarch I, Stemmler M, Poon L, Kluger A, Cooler C, Bergener M, Hugonot-Diener L, robert PH, Erzigekeit H. The Alzheimer's disease activities of daily living international scale (ADL-IS) International Psogeriatrics. 2001;13(2):163–181
4. S. Aminikhahgahi, T. Wang, and D. Cook. Real-time change point detection with application to smart home time series data. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, to appear
5. S. Aminikhahgahi and D. Cook. Enhancing activity recognition using CPD-based activity segmentation. *Pervasive and Mobile Computing*, 27:75-89, 2019
6. A. Alberdi, A. Weakley, A. Goenaga, M. Schmitter-Edgecombe, and D. Cook. Automatic assessment of functional health decline in older adults based on smart home data. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 24:119-130, 2018
7. Brdiczka O, Crowley JL, Reignier P. Learning situation models in a smart home. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B*. 2009;39(1)
8. B. Minor, J. Doppa, and D. Cook. Learning activity predictors from sensor data: Algorithms, evaluation, and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge Data Engineering*, 29(12):2744-2757, 2017
9. Logan B, Healey J, Philipose M, Tapia EM, Intille S. A long-term evaluation of sensing modalities for activity recognition. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing*; 23
10. Gu T, Chen S, Tao X, Lu J. An unsupervised approach to activity recognition and segmentation based on object-use fingerprints. *Data and Knowledge Engineering*. 2010
11. P. Alinia, C. Cain, R. Fallahzadeh, A. Shahrokni, and H. Ghasemzadeh. How accurate is your activity tracker? A comparative study of step counts in low-intensity physical activities. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 5(8):e102. 2017
12. K. Feuz, and D. Cook. Modeling skewed class distributions by reshaping the concept space. *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2017
13. J.-L. Reyes-Ortiz, L. Oneto, A. Samà, X. Parra, and D. Anguita. "Transition-Aware Human Activity Recognition Using Smartphones." *Neurocomputing*, vol. 171, pp. 754–767, Jan. 2016
14. Q. Ni, A. B. García Hernando, and I. P. de la Cruz. "The Elderly's Independent Living in Smart Homes: A Characterization of Activities and Sensing Infrastructure Survey to Facilitate Services Development." *Sensors*. vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 11312–62, May 2015.
15. "Welcome to CASAS." [Online]. Available: <http://casas.wsu.edu/datasets/>. [Accessed: 24-Apr-2018].
16. Lara, Oscar & Labrador, Miguel. (2013). A Survey on Human Activity Recognition Using Wearable Sensors. *Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, IEEE. 15. 1192-1209. 10.1109/SURV.2012.110112.00192.
17. Davis-Owusu, Kadian & Owusu, Evans & Bastani, Vahid & Marcenaro, Llo & Hu, Jun & Regazzoni, Carlo & Feij, Llo. (2016). Activity recognition based on inertial sensors for Ambient Assisted Living.
18. B. Najafi, K. Aminian, A. Paraschiv-Ionescu, F. Loew, C. J. B'ula, and P. Robert, "Ambulatory system for human motion analysis using a kinematic sensor: monitoring of daily physical activity in the elderly," *Biomedical Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 711–723, 2003.
19. Assessing the quality of activities in a smart environment. Cook DJ, Schmitter-Edgecombe M. *Methods Inf Med*. 2009; 48(5):480-5
20. N. A. Capela, E. D. Lemaire, and N. Baddour, "Feature selection for wearable smartphone-based human activity recognition with able bodied, elderly, and stroke patients," *PloS one*, vol. 10, no. 6 p. e0124414, 2015.
21. K. Davis, E. Owusu, C. Regazzoni, L. Marcenaro, L. Feij, and J. Hu, "Perception of human activities as a means to support connectedness between the elderly and their caregivers," in *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Information and Communication Technologies for Ageing Well and Healthy SCITEPRESS*, 2015, pp. 194–199.
22. Gu T, Wu Z, Tao X, Pung HK, Lu J. epSICAR: an emerging patterns based approach to sequential, interleaved and concurrent activity recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications*; 509. pp. 1–9
23. N. D. Rodríguez, M. P. Cuéllar, J. Lilius, M. D. Calvo-Flores, "A survey on ontologies for human behavior recognition", *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 10 no. 4, pp. 1-43, 2014
24. Nweke, Henry & Wah, Teh & al-garadi, Mohammed & Alo, Uzoma. (2018). Deep Learning Algorithms for Human Activity Recognition using Mobile and Wearable Sensor Networks: State of the Art and Research Challenges. *Expert Systems with Applications*. 105. 10.1016/j.eswa.2018.03.056.
25. Banos, O., Garcia, R., Holgado-Terriza, J. A., Damas, M., Pomares, H., Rojas, I., Saez, A., & Villalonga, C. (2014). mHealthDroid: a novel framework for agile development of mobile health applications. In *International Workshop on Ambient Assisted Living* (pp. 91-98): Springer.

5

26. Y. Chen, L. Yu, K. Ota, M. Dong, "Robust activity recognition for aging society", IEEE J. Biomed. Health Inform., vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 1754-1764, Nov. 26, 8
27. Cornacchia, M., Ozcan, K., Zheng, Y., & Velipasalar, S. (2017). A Survey on Activity Detection and Classification Using Wearable Sensors. IEEE Sensors Journal, 17, 386-403.
28. Ha, S., Yun, J. M., & Choi, S. (2015). Multi-modal Convolutional Neural Networks for Activity Recognition. In 2015 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (pp. 4) 17-3022.
29. B. Chen, Z. Fan, and F. Cao, "Activity Recognition Based on Streaming Sensor Data for Assisted Living in Smart Homes," in 2015 International Conference Intelligent Environments, 2015, pp. 124–127.
30. K. Robertson, C. Rosasco, K. Feuz, M. Schmitter-Edgecombe, and D. Cook, "Prompting technologies: A comparison of time-based and context-aware transition-based prompting..," Technol. Health Care, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 745–56, Jan. 2015.
31. J. Wang, Y. Chen, S. Hao, X. Peng, and L. Hu, "Deep learning for sensor-based activity recognition: A Survey," Pattern Recognit. Lett., 12, 2018.
32. A. Jordao, A. C. Nazare, J. Sena, W. R. Schwartz, "Human activity recognition based on wearable sensor data: A standardization of the state-of-the-art" in arXiv:1806.05226, 2018, [online] Available: 9 <https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.05226>
33. K. Wang, J. He and L. Zhang, "Attention-Based Convolutional Neural Network for Weakly Labeled Human Activities' Recognition With Wearable Sensors," in IEEE Sensors Journal, vol. 19, no. 17, pp. 7598-7604, Sept. 1, 2019. doi: 10.1109/JSEN.2019.2917195
34. Chung, Seungeun et al. "Sensor Data Acquisition and Multimodal Sensor Fusion for Human Activity Recognition Using Deep Learning." Sensors (Basel, Switzerland) vol. 19, 7 1716. 10 Apr. 2019, doi:10.3390/s19071716

# Human Activity Recognition

## ORIGINALITY REPORT

**34%**  
SIMILARITY INDEX

**27%**  
INTERNET SOURCES

**26%**  
PUBLICATIONS

**21%**  
STUDENT PAPERS

## PRIMARY SOURCES

- |   |  |    |
|---|--|----|
| 1 | <a href="http://hdl.handle.net">hdl.handle.net</a><br>Internet Source  | 4% |
| 2 | <a href="http://casas.wsu.edu">casas.wsu.edu</a><br>Internet Source  | 3% |
| 3 | <a href="http://archive.ics.uci.edu">archive.ics.uci.edu</a><br>Internet Source  | 3% |
| 4 | <a href="http://eecs.wsu.edu">eecs.wsu.edu</a><br>Internet Source  | 2% |
| 5 | George A. Oguntala, Raed A. Abd-Alhameed,<br>Nazar T. Ali, Yim-Fun Hu et al. "SmartWall:<br>Novel RFID-Enabled Ambient Human Activity<br>Recognition Using Machine Learning for<br>Unobtrusive Health Monitoring", IEEE Access,<br>2019<br><br>Publication | 2% |
| 6 | <a href="http://www.drhu.eu">www.drhu.eu</a><br>Internet Source  | 2% |
| 7 | V. S. Bramhe, S. K. Ghosh, P. K. Garg.<br>"EXTRACTION OF BUILT-UP AREA BY  | 1% |

COMBINING TEXTURAL FEATURES AND  
SPECTRAL INDICES FROM LANDSAT-8  
MULTISPECTRAL IMAGE", ISPRS -  
International Archives of the Photogrammetry,  
Remote Sensing and Spatial Information  
Sciences, 2018

Publication

---

- |    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 8  | archive.org  | 1 % |
|    | Internet Source  |     |
| 9  | Submitted to Study Group Australia   | 1 % |
|    | Student Paper  |     |
| 10 | hal.archives-ouvertes.fr   | 1 % |
|    | Internet Source  |     |
| 11 | Submitted to Middlesex University  | 1 % |
|    | Student Paper  |     |
| 12 | Kun Wang, Jun He, Lei Zhang. "Attention-Based<br>Convolutional Neural Network for Weakly<br>Labeled Human Activities' Recognition With<br>Wearable Sensors", IEEE Sensors Journal,<br>2019 | 1 % |
|    | Publication  |     |
| 13 | epdf.tips  | 1 % |
|    | Internet Source  |     |
| 14 | Submitted to University of Pretoria  | 1 % |
|    | Student Paper  |     |
-

- |    |   |      |
|----|---|------|
| 15 | machinelearningmastery.com<br>Internet Source   | 1 %  |
| 16 | Cook, Diane. "Scaling Smart Environments",<br>Sensor Networks for Sustainable Development,<br>2014.<br>Publication  | 1 %  |
| 17 | Igi Ardiyanto, Sunu Wibirama, Fajri Nurwanto.<br>"Sliding variance and data range for lightweight<br>sports activity recognition with fusion of<br>modalities", Journal of King Saud University -<br>Computer and Information Sciences, 2018<br>Publication | <1 % |
| 18 | Changhai Wang, Yuwei Xu, Hui Liang, Wanwei<br>Huang, Ling Zhang. "WOODY: A Post-Process<br>Method for Smartphone-Based Activity<br>Recognition", IEEE Access, 2018<br>Publication   | <1 % |
| 19 | Diane Cook, Kyle D. Feuz, Narayanan C.<br>Krishnan. "Transfer learning for activity<br>recognition: a survey", Knowledge and<br>Information Systems, 2013<br>Publication  | <1 % |
| 20 | sites.google.com<br>Internet Source   | <1 % |
| 21 | Submitted to University of Stellenbosch, South<br>Africa  | <1 % |

- 22 Submitted to University of Bristol <1 %  
Student Paper
- 
- 23 pubmedcentralcanada.ca <1 %  
Internet Source
- 
- 24 Submitted to University of Western Sydney <1 %  
Student Paper
- 
- 25 Submitted to SUNY, Binghamton <1 %  
Student Paper
- 
- 26 eprints.bournemouth.ac.uk <1 %  
Internet Source
- 
- 27 www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov <1 %  
Internet Source
- 
- 28 spie.org <1 %  
Internet Source
- 
- 29 Priyanka Ingole, Smita Bhoir, A.V. Vidhate. <1 %  
"Hybrid Model for Text Classification", 2018  
Second International Conference on Electronics,  
Communication and Aerospace Technology  
(ICECA), 2018  
Publication
- 
- 30 link.springer.com <1 %  
Internet Source
- 
- 31 journals.plos.org <1 %  
Internet Source

- 
- 32 Samaneh Aminikhahgahi, Tinghui Wang, Diane J. Cook. "Real-Time Change Point Detection with Application to Smart Home Time Series Data", IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering, 2019  
Publication <1 %
- 33 Submitted to CSU, San Jose State University  
Student Paper <1 %
- 34 docplayer.net  
Internet Source <1 %
- 35 Bushra Ramzan, Imran Sarwar Bajwa, Noreen Jamil, Riaz Ul Amin, Shabana Ramzan, Farhan Mirza, Nadeem Sarwar. "An Intelligent Data Analysis for Recommendation Systems Using Machine Learning", Scientific Programming, 2019  
Publication <1 %
- 36 www.mdpi.com  
Internet Source <1 %
- 37 Haidong Wang, Md. Fawwad Hussain, Himadri Mukherjee, Sk. Md. Obaidullah, Ravindra S. Hegadi, Kaushik Roy, K. C. Santosh. "Chapter 25 An Empirical Study: ELM in Face Matching", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2019  
Publication <1 %
-

- 38 [www.tech.dmu.ac.uk](http://www.tech.dmu.ac.uk) <1 %  
Internet Source
- 
- 39 Submitted to AUT University <1 %  
Student Paper
- 
- 40 Garrett Wilson, Christopher Pereyda, Nisha Raghunath, Gabriel de la Cruz et al. "Robot-enabled support of daily activities in smart home environments", Cognitive Systems Research, 2019 <1 %  
Publication
- 
- 41 Jiahui Wen, Mingyang Zhong, Zhiying Wang. "Activity recognition with weighted frequent patterns mining in smart environments", Expert Systems with Applications, 2015 <1 %  
Publication
- 
- 42 Submitted to University of West London <1 %  
Student Paper
- 
- 43 Issam Abu-Mahfouz, Omar El Ariss, A. H. M. Esfakur Rahman, Amit Banerjee. "Surface roughness prediction as a classification problem using support vector machine", The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology, 2017 <1 %  
Publication
- 
- 44 Submitted to University of Ulster <1 %  
Student Paper

45	www.igd.fraunhofer.de Internet Source	<1 %
46	epsl.eecs.wsu.edu Internet Source	<1 %
47	"Human Activity Sensing", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2019 Publication	<1 %
48	Tao Zhang, Jiachi Chen, Geunseok Yang, Byungjeong Lee, Xiapu Luo. "Towards more accurate severity prediction and fixer recommendation of software bugs", Journal of Systems and Software, 2016 Publication	<1 %
49	Submitted to KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY Student Paper	<1 %
50	Laure Berti-Equille. "Learn2Clean: Optimizing the Sequence of Tasks for Web Data Preparation", The World Wide Web Conference on - WWW '19, 2019 Publication	<1 %
51	Submitted to National Taipei University of Technology Student Paper	<1 %
52	open.uct.ac.za Internet Source	<1 %

53

Diane J. Cook. "Sensor selection to support practical use of health-monitoring smart environments", Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, 07/2011

<1 %

Publication

---

54

Submitted to University of Warwick

<1 %

Student Paper

---

55

"Machine Learning and Knowledge Extraction", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2017

<1 %

Publication

---

56

Submitted to University College London

<1 %

Student Paper

---

57

Ni, Qin, Ana García Hernando, and Iván de la Cruz. "The Elderly's Independent Living in Smart Homes: A Characterization of Activities and Sensing Infrastructure Survey to Facilitate Services Development", Sensors, 2015.

<1 %

Publication

---

Exclude quotes

Off

Exclude matches

Off

Exclude bibliography

Off