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Abstract: Human activity recognition has emerged as an active research area in recent years. With the advancement in mobile and wearable devices, various sensors are ubiquitous and widely available gathering data of a broad spectrum of peoples’ daily life activities. Research studies thoroughly assessed lifestyle activities and are increasingly concentrated on a variety of sport exercises. In this paper, we examine nine sport and fitness exercises commonly conducted with sport equipments in gym, such as abdominal exercise and lat pull. We collected sensor data of 23 participants for these activities, for which smartphones and smartwatches were used. Traditional machine learning and deep learning algorithms were applied in these experiments in order to assess their performance on our dataset. Linear SVM and Naive Bayes with Gaussian kernel performs best with an accuracy of 80 %, whereas deep learning models outperform these machine learning techniques with an accuracy of 92 %.

1 INTRODUCTION

It is commonly known that sport activities and regular exercises are the key for preserving people’s physical and mental health. In 2010, the British Association of Sport and Exercise Sciences published a consensus statement pointing out the correlation between no regular physical activity and an increased risk of cardiovascular disease or type 2 diabetes (O’Donovan et al., 2010). Consequently, people regardless of their age seek to take part in exercise programs or join gyms to improve their fitness and strengthen their muscles. It is also recommended to regularly perform sport as this training lowers blood pressure, improves glucose metabolism, and reduces cardiovascular disease risk (O’Donovan et al., 2010).

However, many athletes suffer from the right motivation to constantly practice over a long period of time. According to the study of Scott Robert, this is one of the people’s main reason for hiring a personal trainer: The wish to have someone motivating themselves (Roberts, 1996).

Issues arise from a practical perspective. Hiring a personal trainer is expensive; especially when exercising with a professional trainer. It does not make a difference whether a personal trainer is hired privately or provided by gyms. Professional health clubs usually offer personal trainer as a supplementary service promise. Even in this case, however, sportsmen are not constantly guided and supervised during their exercises in a way, which is really beneficial. Personal trainers are still a large cost factor and thus, there cannot normally be assigned a personal trainer per athletes over their entire training session.

Those problems can be avoided with a system that functions as a personal trainer, which accompanies each and every sportsmen in their training. A digital personal trainer that is able to supervise athletes in their training has great potential to support both professional and amateur athletes. A system integrated into sport equipment can guide exercises through their training not only helping to motivate people. It can also supervise athletes performing sport activities, which increases the safety and efficiency of their training.

While many research studies focused on movement activities (i.e. walking or jogging (Parkka et al., 2006)) or daily life actions (vacuum cleaning or brushing teeth (Kao et al., 2009)), only little work has evaluated sport activities beyond endurance. Consequently, the problem being examined in this paper is how to perform activity recognition with sport equipment of modern gyms. Therefore, the focus lies on common devices (such as chest press) which are well...
known among athletes and a common practice performed by many people in health clubs.

As to the best knowledge of the authors, no sport equipment is currently available, which is automatically sensing their users in gyms. This work utilized the athlete’s smartphone and smartwatch, which are widely available nowadays. Recent studies showed the possibility to integrate such a human activity recognition system in wearable devices (Ravi et al., 2005; Shoaib et al., 2013). Sensor data of 23 participants were collected performing nine common exercises with sport equipment in gyms. We evaluated common state of the art machine learning algorithms as well as latest deep learning models to assess their classification accuracy. In order to enable and support further research with our collected dataset, we made our dataset publicly available.

In particular, this paper made following contributions:

- A novel and publicly available dataset containing smartphone and smartwatch sensor data of 23 male as well as female participants for nine common sport equipments of gyms. For each participants, we collected two sets of each exercise with ten till fifteen repetition in each set. The dataset can be downloaded from http://www.dfki.uni-kl.de/~baumbach/digital_personal_trainer.

- An detailed comparison of traditional machine learning algorithms and state of the art deep learning techniques, i.e. LSTM. Experiments showed that decision tree, linear SVM and Naive Bayes with Gaussian kernel performed best with accuracy of 80%. However, deep learning model outperformed these machine learning models with accuracy of 92%.

- Our results showed a significant increase of 26 percentage points in the performance of all machine learning algorithms when personalized models were used.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Chapter 2 summarizes and assesses the state-of-the-art in sport activity recognition for both machine learning algorithms and deep learning techniques. Section 3 presents the utilized activity recognition process including the preprocessing steps on the data as well as the applied classification algorithms. Section 4 depicts the experimental setup where data for 23 participants were collected in a gym. Section 6 presents our finding where deep learning outperformed traditional machine learning algorithms by twelve percentage points. Finally, the results are summarized and discussed in Section 8.

2 RELATED WORK

Human Activity recognition is a vast area. Research work have studied different kind of activities, ranging from basic (such as walking, running, sleeping, or climbing stairs) to complex (including eating, vacuum cleaning, or swimming) activities. Especially sport activities (e.g., basketball (Perše et al., 2009)), health monitoring system (like sleep tracking (de Zambotti et al., 2015) and patient care (Chen et al., 2014)) recently gained attention in the research community. Promising results for deep learning also stimulated further research in the field of human activity recognition. Studies already conducted using deep neural network outperformed traditional machine learning approaches.

2.1 Recognition of Sports Activities

Although research work in the field of human activity recognition traces back to the 90s (Polana and Nelson, 1994) and assessed many fitness and sport exercises, only little work about sport equipment of gyms were published so far. Numerous studies focused the domain "ambulation" (such as walking or jogging), daily life (like reading or stretching), or upper body activities (e.g., chewing or speaking) (Lara and Labrador, 2013). Interested readers are pointed to the extensive survey on human activity recognition published by Lara et al. (Lara and Labrador, 2013). Prior work focused on placing multiple acceleration sensors on several parts of the participant’s body (Parkka et al., 2006; Subramanya et al., 2012). This setup were capable of identifying a wide range of activities, such as running, walking, or climbing stairs. However, they require users to wear multiple proprietary sensors distributed across his body. To come around these limitations, other studies conducted experiments where only a single accelerometer measures the activities (Lee, 2009; Long et al., 2009).

With the constantly growing availability of mobile and wearable devices over the last years, "ubiquitous sensing" (Lara and Labrador, 2013) comes into focus. Consequently, several investigations assessed the use of these widely available mobile devices for HAR (Ravi et al., 2005; Lester et al., 2006).

Tapia et al. (Tapia et al., 2007) presented a real-time algorithm for automatic recognition of physical activities and partly their intensities. They utilized five triaxial accelerometers and a heart rate monitor to differentiate 30 physical gymnasium activities from 21 participants. For recognizing activity types with their intensity, the authors obtained a recognition accuracy of 94.6 % using subject-dependent and 56.3 % using...
subject-independent training.
Velloso et al. (Velloso et al., 2013) dealt in their work
with the qualitative activity recognition of weight lifting exercises. Their goal was the recognition of correct and false execution as well as providing feedback to the user. For a 10-fold cross validation, their approach scored a precision of 98.03%. For leave-one-subject-out cross validation it scored 78.2%.

2.2 Machine Learning vs. Deep Learning

Deep learning is by no means a new technology, the recent progress in GPU based data processing gave new possibilities to apply deep learning to a wide variety of problems. This section provides an overview over the recent research results and classification accuracy in deep activity recognition.

Yang et al. (Yang et al., 2015) proposed a convolutional neural network (CNN) with 17 layer and rectified linear units (ReLU) as activation function. Alsheikh et al. (Alsheikh et al., 2016) applied the deep learning paradigm to triaxial accelerometers and presented a hybrid approach of deep belief network (DBN) and hidden Markov models (called DL-HMM) for sequential activity recognition. The authors showed that deep models outperform shallow ones, more layers will enhance the recognition accuracy, and overcomplete representations are advantageous. Ordómez et al. (Ordómez and Roggen, 2016) proposed an 8 layer deep architecture based on the combination of convolutional and long short-term memory (LSTM) recurrent layers, called DeepConvLSTM. Once trained in a full-supervised manner, DeepConvLSTM directly works on raw data with only minimal pre-processing required. Wang (Wang, 2016) proposed a continuous autoencoder (CAE) as a novel stochastic neural network as well as a new fast stochastic gradient descent (FSGD) algorithm to update the gradients of the CAE. The FSGD is capable of achieving a 0.3 % error rate after just 180 epochs of training. Wang then applies time and frequency domain feature extract (TFFE) to extract feature vectors, followed by PCA to end up with a 42 dimensional feature vector. This feature vector is then fed into a DBN composed of stacked CAEs. The DBN consist of 6 layers (2 CAEs and a BP layer) and is trained in a semi-supervised manner. Ronaoo and Cho (Ronaoo and Cho, 2015) proposed to utilize CNNs to classify activities. Their experiments showed that increasing the number of convolutional layers increased performance, but the complexity of the derived features decreased with every additional layer. Zeng et al. (Zeng et al., 2014) proposed a method based on Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN), which can capture local dependency and scale invariance of a signal. They use a 6-layer deep CNN (input - convolution - maxpooling - fully connected - fully connected - softmax).

3 METHODOLOGY OF THE SPORT ACTIVITY RECOGNITION PROCESS

The exercises sensed in our experiment consists of rotation, magnetic field and acceleration of different body part. The accelerometer sensor data from phone and watch needs to be preprocessed before the data can be classified by machine learning approaches. Furthermore, sensor data is noisy and passing the raw data to the learning algorithms negatively effect the accuracy of the recognition.

3.1 Preprocessing

The orientation of devices affects the accelerometer sensor data (Thiemjarus, 2010). To standardize the sensor data regarding the underlying coordinate system, a rotation matrix was calculated using gyroscope and magnetometer sensor data. This rotation matrix was then used to transform the acceleration values from device coordinate to fixed word’s coordinate system.

The sensor data from phone and watch contains noise and outliers. The reason are the sensors’ inaccuracy and noise in the sensors’ signals as well as some unexpected behavior of the users during the exercise. Removing these noise element from sensor data proved to produce better recognition results for human activities (Wang et al., 2011). A median filter of order three was applied to the sensor data to remove impulse noise (Thiemjarus, 2010).

3.2 Feature Extraction

Data was collected with sample rate of 30 Hz for all sensors. From this data, a specific set of features is extracted from each segment using a sliding window approach without inter-window gaps for segmentation. Four different window sizes, 1.5, 2, 2.5 and 3 seconds were used here.

A features vector were calculated on each sensor data segment in two domain, namely the time and frequency domain. Mean, Minimum, Maximum, Range, Standard Deviation, and Root-Mean-Square were calculated for time domain features. To calculate features in the frequency domain first we transformed the
signal to frequency domain using Fast Fourier Transform (Cooley et al., 1969). The dominant and the second dominant frequencies were extracted from the transformed signal. For each feature 4 values are calculated, one for each axis $A_x$, $A_y$, $A_z$ and the fourth component as magnitude component calculated by $\sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2}$. These features were extracted for each sensor and for each device. Thus, we used a feature vector of 192 values to define the feature space of exercises (2 device types $\times$ 4 components $\times$ 8 features $\times$ 3 sensors). Each window size in the sliding window corresponds to a feature vector which describes one repetition of the exercise. For deep learning, data from the segmented windows were passed as input without any feature extraction.

## 4 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

The conducted experiments focused on collecting data of activities from sport equipment of Unifit gym located at the Technical University Kaiserslautern. The data was used to build two datasets for evaluation the performance of the system: an impersonal (user-independent) and a hybrid personalized model.

### 4.1 Devices

We used Samsung Galaxy phone along with the Samsung Gear Live smart watch to collect sensor data from participants. A standalone Android application was developed for the wear and a mobile Android application was developed for the phone. The data was collected with the constant frequency of 30Hz. The smartphone was placed on a west band and attached to the participant’s west aligned to the right side. The smartwatch was worn on the left hand. This arrangement facilitates the data with information of hand movements and the lower body movements. Sensors in the devices record different aspects of the movement like acceleration, magnetic field, rate of turn and orientation of sensor frame with respect to earth.

### 4.2 Participants

The data was collected from 23 participants. 20 male and three female participants took part in the experiment. The dataset consists of data from participants with novice, intermediate and expert level of exercise. Each exercise has been performed in two till three sets with 10 till 15 repetitions in each set. Table 1 shows the demographics of exercise participation.

### 4.3 Activities

According to the fitness trainers working in the unifit gym, the most common gym exercises were chosen for this research work. Table 2 shows the details of performed exercises, number of participants for each exercise and total number of sets. These exercises include movement of different combinations of body parts. These exercises were performed with the sport equipment located in unifit gym.

### 5 DATASET

The conducted experiments results in a dataset containing sensor readings of 23 participants with nine common gym exercises. The total recording of 211.57 minutes contains 328 exercise set, each with 10 to 15 reputation. The data was collected in the form of CSV files which contains values in x, y and z axis for each sensor along with the timestamps. For each activity the data was recorded in six CSV files, one for each sensor and three for each device. Each CSV file contains additional information about the participant such as height, weight, age and gender. This personal information about the participant is useful to build a hybrid personalized models. CSV file name is in ‘RandomID_ExerciseName_DateTime_Device_Sensor’ format and gives information about device and sensor type.
6 EVALUATION

To evaluate the classification performance of different machine learning algorithms for our dataset, three different evaluation approaches were used: Participant separation and K-fold cross validation for personal models as well as a hybrid personalized models. The classification performance was evaluated for four most common traditional machine learning algorithms. k-nearest neighbor with k=2 and k=5, Support Vector Machine with linear and polynomial kernels, Naive Bayes algorithm with Gaussian and Bernoulli probabilities and decision tree.

6.1 Participant Separation

For the evaluation of the impersonal model, data of 19 participant for training and data of four participant were used as test data. Table 3 shows the classification results as f-measure score for different machine learning algorithms. Linear SVM, Naive Bayes with Gaussian probability and decision tree algorithms performed best with window size 2.0 and 2.5 seconds. The maximum recognition score of 80% was achieved by decision tree and Naive Bayes classifier. Table 4 shows the confusion matrix for decision tree for window size 2.5 seconds.

Table 3: F-measure for different window sizes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>W=1.5 s</th>
<th>W=2.0 s</th>
<th>W=2.5 s</th>
<th>W=3.0 s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNN (K=2)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNN (K=5)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear SVM</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM Polynomal</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naive Bayes Gaussian</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naive Bayes Bernoulli</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision tree</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Cross Validation

To further evaluate the performance of the impersonal model, leave-one-out cross validation is applied. The value was chosen according to the number of participant and average number of sets for exercises (Baumbach and Dengel, 2017). As the dataset contains data from 23 participants and average sets performed for each exercises are two, we used 46-fold cross validation here. Table 5 shows the performance measure for different machine learning algorithms for cross validation. Same as for participant separation, linear SVM and decision tree performed best with maximum f-measure score of 80%. Table 6 shows the final confusion matrix for linear SVM as the average of the classification results from 26 iterations.

Table 5: F-measure for different window sizes for 46 fold cross validation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>W=1.5 s</th>
<th>W=2.0 s</th>
<th>W=2.5 s</th>
<th>W=3.0 s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNN (K=2)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNN (K=5)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear SVM</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM Polynomial</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naive Bayes Gaussian</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naive Bayes Bernoulli</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision tree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Linear SVM with window size 2.0 seconds (46-Fold cross validation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Abdominal Exercise</th>
<th>Rotary Torso</th>
<th>Rear Delt</th>
<th>Pull Down</th>
<th>Overhead Press</th>
<th>Lat Pull</th>
<th>Rotary Torso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdominal Exercise</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Torso</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Delt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull Down</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat Pull</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Torso</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Personalized Models

In the work of Baumbach and Dengel (Baumbach and Dengel, 2017), the qualitative analysis of pushup exercise showed that personalized models improves the classification accuracy. To assess the performance of a personalized models, we utilize a hybrid personal model with a two phase process. In the first phase, the learning models (M) were trained on data from 22
participants and tested for one test participant (T). In
the second phase, a subset of data of the test partic-
ipant is used to train the models again. The data of
the test participant (T), was divided into two sets T1
and T2. The learning models (M) were again trained
using T1 and these newly trained models were tested
on data set T2. Table 7 shows the result of normal
and personalized models for window size 2.0 and 2.5
seconds. Results shows a significant increase in the
performance of all machine learning algorithms when
personalized models were used. Figure 1 shows the
comparison between normal and personalized model in
the form of bar charts.

Table 7: F-measure for different window sizes for hybrid
personalized model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Personalized</th>
<th>Personalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w=2.0s</td>
<td>w=2.5s</td>
<td>w=2.0s</td>
<td>w=2.5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNN (K=2)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNN (K=5)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear SVM</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM Polynomial</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naive Bayes Gaussian</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naive Bayes Bernoulli</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision tree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 DER - DEEP EXERCISE
RECOGNIZER

(Hammerla et al., 2016) showed a significant im-
provement of the classification accuracy for activity
recognition when deep learning algorithms were ap-
plied. This research work evaluated different deep
learning approaches such as Deep feed-forward net-
works, Convolutional networks and Recurrent net-
works using LSTM on three different datasets (Reiss
and Stricker, 2012; Chavarriaga et al., 2013; Bulling
et al., 2014). Neural networks with LSTM and CNN
outperformed in most of the cases. Our dataset con-
tains data in the form of time series, where the body
movement recorded at previous time stamps effects
the next time series value and thus, contributes to
the overall recognition accuracy. Using LSTM, the
network can exploit these temporal dependencies.
With these circumstances in mind, we developed a
deep neural network architecture using LSTM cells.
The deep neural network for our exercise recognition
(DER) consists of three hidden layers. Each hidden
layer consists of 150 LSTM cells. Dropout regulariza-
tion was used after each layer to prevent overfitting.
This deep neural architecture was again evaluated us-
ing participant separation, k-fold cross validation and

8 CONCLUSION & FUTURE
WORK

In this paper, activity recognition for sport equipment
in modern gyms are assessed by applying different
machine learning algorithms and deep learning mod-

Figure 1: Comparison of Normal and Personalized Models.

(a) w = 2.0 Seconds.

(b) w = 2.5 Seconds.

Table 8: Results for deep neural network for classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Method</th>
<th>W=2.0 s</th>
<th>W=2.5 s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Separation</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-Fold Cross Validation</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized Models</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Deep Exercise Recognizer with LSTM (window size = 2.5 seconds).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Back Extension</th>
<th>Fly</th>
<th>Lat Pull</th>
<th>Rear Delt</th>
<th>Rotary Torso</th>
<th>Shoulder Press</th>
<th>Shoulder press</th>
<th>Shoulder Press</th>
<th>Shoulder Press</th>
<th>Shoulder Press</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results showed that learning approaches can recognize different exercise types like pull down or chest press. Among machine learning models, decision tree, linear SVM and Naive bayes with Gaussian kernel performs best with a maximum accuracy of 80 percent. Furthermore, we proposed a deep neural network for our exercise recognition (DER) consisting of three hidden layers with each hidden layer having of 150 LSTM cells. DER outperformed traditional machine learning techniques with a maximum accuracy of 92 percent. Additionally, we made the collected dataset for our evaluation publicly available in order to support and encourage further research.

The main drawback is the confusion between exercises for the same body part, i.e., fly and rear delt as well as lat pull, overhead press, and pull down. Since mainly exercises for the same body part are affected, other sensors producing more information could help the recognition system differentiating between these exercises.

Most important is conducting of larger experiments in order to perform more robust evaluation. This includes experiments with not only more people, but also more women and different levels of athletic (professional and non-professional participants). This work could be further extended by incorporating more sensors (e.g. heart rate sensor) or by examining the effects of changes to the location of sensors on the exerciser’s body. In the same way, participant specific attributes, such as height, weight, age, or gender, can be fit into the models in order to assess if these kind of physical information per participant leads to an higher recognition accuracy.
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