Boosting the Performance of Deep Approaches through Fusion with Handcrafted Features
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Abstract: Contemporary human activity recognition approaches are heavily based on deep neural network architectures, since the latter do not require neither significant domain knowledge, nor complex algorithms for feature extraction, while they are able to demonstrate strong performance. Therefore, handcrafted features are nowadays rarely used. In this paper we demonstrate that these features are able to learn complementary representations of input data and are able to boost the performance of deep approaches, i.e., when both deep and handcrafted features are fused. To this goal, we choose an existing set of handcrafted features, extracted from 3D skeletal joints. We compare its performance with two approaches. The first one is based on a visual representation of skeletal data, while the second is a rank pooling approach on raw RGB data. We show that when fusing both types of features, the overall performance is significantly increased. We evaluate our approach using a publicly available, challenging dataset of human activities.

1 INTRODUCTION

Human Activity Recognition (HAR) is the problem of identifying actions, activities or events that are performed by humans. Typically, such approaches are based on some sensorial input. Undoubtedly, the most popular approach nowadays is to use video input, captured by one or more cameras. It is typically formulated as a multi-class classification problem, i.e., of outputting the class label of the performed activity. Its areas of application are broad, including surveillance, assisted living, human-machine interaction, affective computing, etc. When approaching a HAR task, using a computer vision approach, one should select the appropriate way to capture, represent, analyze and finally classify visual data to activities.

According to Wang et al. (Wang et al., 2016), HAR may be divided into a) segmented recognition, wherein the input video contains exactly one activity; and b) continuous recognition, wherein the goal is to detect and classify actions within a video, wherein several parts may not contain actions, while starting and ending points of actions should be detected. Moreover, HAR may be further divided into 4 main tasks, namely gesture, action, interaction and group activity recognition. Actions require a significant amount of time, contrary to gestures that are considered to be “instant” and may involve more body parts. Interactions may take part either between a person and some object, or between two persons. Group activities may be combinations of the above.

Earlier HAR approaches were based on the extraction of handcrafted features from raw visual data. These features are algorithmically extracted, capture visual properties of postures and/or motion and are used to train traditional machine learning approaches, such as neural networks or support vector machines (Schuldt et al., 2004). These approaches have been criticized since they exhibit significant drop of performance and lack of generalization when applied to large-scale datasets. Moreover they are not robust to viewpoint changes. Of course, as with every other field of application, they require specific knowledge of the domain of application. During the last few years, they have been replaced by deep neural network architectures. The latter do not require a feature extraction step, since features are learnt within some of their layers. Thus, raw data or simple data representations have been replaced by this feature extraction step. Moreover, deep architectures exhibit higher accuracies, that are typically increasing when they are trained with larger datasets. Therefore, in many cases...
handcrafted features are considered to be obsolete and are rarely used in research works.

The most popular deep approach that is applied in the area of HAR is the one of Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs). Note that since CNNs require still images as their input, while activities are not instant, i.e., may not be captured by a single image, typically an intermediate still representation that transforms (moving) visual data to still images is required (Wang et al., 2018). Visual data commonly comprise of raw RGB and/or depth and/or skeletal sequences. A depth sequence consists of the estimated depth of each pixel within the scene. Skeletal data consist of the 2D/3D positions of a set of skeleton joints, over time. Therefore, the aforementioned intermediate representations are designed to capture both spatial and temporal information regarding postures and motion, reflected to color and/or texture properties of their visual representation. Also, they often do not require a significant amount of domain knowledge.

In this work, our goal is to demonstrate that handcrafted features may assist towards increasing the accuracy of deep approaches, in the field of HAR. More specifically, we evaluate two vision-based approaches: a) an approach that transforms skeletal data into a pseudo-colored visual representation; and b) an approach that is based on rank-pooling of raw RGB data of consecutive video frames, producing “dynamic” images. Then we evaluate a set of handcrafted features, initially proposed for the problem of arm gesture recognition, which are herein applied to the whole skeleton. Using an early fusion approach, we fuse learnt features of both vision-based approaches with the handcrafted ones and we demonstrate that the latter are able to significantly boost their performance.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows: in section 2 we present related work in the field of HAR, focusing on approaches that are based on skeletal data, on RGB data and on handcrafted features. Then, in section 3 we present the skeletal data representation that is used in this work, the three classification approaches and the fusion one. The dataset we use and the experimental results of our approach are presented in section 4. Finally, conclusions are drawn in section 5, wherein plans for future work are also presented.

2 RELATED WORK

In this section we briefly present related work focusing on HAR that is based on deep learning architectures. More specifically, we focus on a) approaches that are based on intermediate visual representations of 3D motion of skeletal joints that are used with a Convolutional Neural Network; b) approaches that are based on the extraction of handcrafted features from skeletal sequences and c) on approaches that are based on fusion of learnt and handcrafted features.

2.1 Skeletal Motion Representations for HAR

Skeletal motion image representations are used as input in CNNs. In all approaches the motivation is to create an artificial image, by mapping features to pixel values. The result is either a grayscale or a pseudo-colored image, whose color and texture properties somehow reflect the spatial and temporal properties of skeleton motion.

In the work of Hyunh-The et al. (Hyunh-The et al., 2020), two geometric features are extracted, namely inter-joint distances and orientations, forming vector representations which are then concatenated to form images. Pham et al. (Pham et al., 2019) proposed a similar representation, enhanced with an image processing approach for contrast stretching, so as to highlight textures and edges of the representation. Wang et al. (Wang et al., 2016) reflected direction of skeletal motion as hue and magnitude as saturation, creating a representation for each body part. Similarly, Li et al. (Li et al., 2017) generated image representations based on inter-joint distances in the three orthogonal planes (xy, yz and xz), and the 3D space (xyz), while Hou et al. (Hou et al., 2016) used only the orthogonal planes, encoding temporal variation of joints into hue values. To preserve not only spatial, but also temporal features, Li et al. (Li et al., 2017), apart from inter-joint features, also used a Long-Short Term Memory network. Liu et al. (Liu et al., 2019a) arranged skeleton joints in a 2D grid, encoded coordinate values and incorporated duration of performed actions. To address view invariance, a 5D representation has been proposed by Liu et al. (Liu et al., 2019b), wherein spatial coordinates are complemented with time and joint labels. In an effort to preserve spatial relations between joints, Yang et al. (Yang and Tian, 2014) incorporated skeleton graph information. Finally, Ke et al. (Ke et al., 2017) split the skeleton into 5 parts and for each one they extracted features which then were transformed into images.

2.2 Handcrafted Features

Handcrafted features are extracted from raw data using a predefined algorithm. Typical approaches in the
field of HAR exploit angles between joints and joint distances or properties of joint trajectories.

A 3D joint location histogram within a modified spherical coordinate system has been proposed by Xia et al. (Xia et al., 2012). Moreover, the authors built posture vocabularies upon clustering of the histogram vectors. Similarly, Keceli and Can (Keceli and Can, 2014) proposed histograms of angles and displacements between a set of predefined joints in the 3D space. Gowayyed et al. (Gowayyed et al., 2013) used a histogram of oriented displacements, extracted under 3 viewpoints, so as to create 3D features. Yang and Tian (Yang and Tian, 2014) combined activity information including static pose, properties of motion and overall dynamics and combined these three representations so as to create a compact description of frames. Finally, Pazhoumand-Dar et al. (Pazhoumand-Dar et al., 2015) first created relative skeleton motion trajectories and then selected a subset of these features using the longest common subsequence algorithm.

2.3 Fusion Approaches

A few approaches for fusion of handcrafted features with features learnt by a deep architecture have been recently proposed in the field of HAR. Typically, these approaches fuse features from the last pooling layer of a CNN with the handcrafted ones by concatenating them into a single vector and then use a traditional machine learning classifier, e.g., a support vector machine for classification.

Khan et al. (Khan et al., 2020a) proposed fusion of learnt features of a pre-trained CNN model, namely the VGG19 architecture (Simonyan and Zisserman, 2014) and multiview handcrafted features that are based on horizontal/vertical gradients and directional features. In another work, Khan et al. (Khan et al., 2020b) extracted motion, geometric and shape features from regions of interest and fused them with features of pre-trained AlexNet architecture (Krizhevsky et al., 2012). Udeen and Lee (Udeen and Lee, 2019) extracted deep spatial features of Inception-Resnet-v2 architecture (Szegedy et al., 2017) and fused them with a novel feature descriptor that captures spatio-temporal and shape features. In previous work (Vernikos et al., 2019b) we trained a CNN using a dataset for action recognition and used it as feature extractor for a gesture recognition task, upon fusing its learnt features with handcrafted interjoint distance and joint angle features.

Figure 1: Extracted human skeleton 3D joints using the Kinect SDK.

3 PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

3.1 Data

As it has already been mentioned in Section 1, our approach is based on skeletal joint motion information. All techniques that are used and will be presented within this section use as their input 3D trajectories of a set of human joints. We assume that these joints have been extracted using the Microsoft Kinect v2 camera, which consists of an RGB and depth camera. More specifically, Kinect SDK is used to extract and track in real time skeletal joint positions based on captured RGB and depth data. For each joint, its $x$, $y$ and $z$ coordinates per frame (i.e., over time) are provided. Using Kinect v2, a set of 25 joints becomes available. Joints follow a graph-based hierarchy; the whole skeleton is represented as a graph, wherein joints correspond to nodes and are connected by edges that follow the body structure. This representation is illustrated in Fig. 1. The “SPINEBASE” is considered as the root of the graph. Parent-child relationship among pairs of joints is implied, e.g., “SPINESHOULDER” is the parent of “SHOULDERLEFT,” while “SHOULDERLEFT” is the parent of “ELBOWLEFT” etc. Note that all approaches that we shall later describe are also compatible to extracted skeletons that follow a hierarchical structure. Moreover, in Fig. 2 we illustrate a sequence of frames depicting the activity kicking something with extracted skeletons imposed on the raw RGB data.

3.2 Extracted Handcrafted Features

In this work we use a set of handcrafted features that have been proposed by Paraskevopoulos et al. (Paraskevopoulos et al., 2019). Although they have...
been initially designed for the problem of hand gesture recognition, upon initial experimental evaluation we ended up that they are appropriate for the problem of HAR. These features assume a set of joints organized in a hierarchical structure, wherein a parent–child relationship is implied. These joints move in a 3D space, over time. Therefore, they may be extracted by the aforementioned set of skeletal sequences. At the following we briefly present these features.

For a given joint $J$, let $I_J$ and $P_J$ be its child and parent joints, respectively. Let $F = \{F_i\}_{i=1}^N$ denote the set of frames of a given video sequence depicting an activity. Moreover, let $v_i^J$ be a vector that corresponds to the 3D coordinates of $J$ within $F_i$. More specifically, $v_i^J = (x_i^J, y_i^J, z_i^J)$ are the aforementioned $x$, $y$ and $z$ coordinates. Also, let $\mathcal{V}_J^i$ be the set of all vectors $v_i^J$. By $B(\mathcal{V}_J^i)$ we denote the 3D bounding box of $\mathcal{V}_J^i$, by $a_{B(\mathcal{V}_J^i)}$ and $b_{B(\mathcal{V}_J^i)}$ the lengths of its horizontal and vertical sides, respectively. We summarize the extracted features in Table 1.

### 3.3 Pseudo-colored Images

Moreover, in order to use the skeletal information as input to a CNN, we use the representation of Vernikos et al. (Vernikos et al., 2019a). This representation aims to capture inter-joint distances during an action and use them to create pseudo-colors within an artificial RGB image. Note that it is based on the 3D trajectories of skeletal joints. From the $x$, $y$ and $z$ coordinates of each of the $M$ available joints, a set of $3 \cdot N$ signals is collected for a given video sequence depicting an activity. To address the problem of temporal variability between actions and between users, a linear interpolation step is imposed, by manually setting the duration of all video sequences equal to $N$ frames. From each sequence, coordinate differences between consecutive frames are calculated, while $x$, $y$, $z$ coordinates correspond to R, G, B color channels of the pseudo-colored image, respectively. More specifically, the latter is created as follows:

Let $x_i(n)$ denote the $x$-position of the $i$-th joint in the $n$-th frame. Let $R$ denote the red channel of the color image. The value of $R(i,n)$ is calculated as:

$$R(i,n) = x_i(n + 1) - x_i(n),$$

where $i = 1, \ldots, N$. Similarly, B and G channels are constructed. As it is exhibited, the way these pseudo-colored images are formed, leads to preserving both the temporal and the spatial properties of the skeleton trajectories. In Fig. 3 we illustrate a pseudo-colored image that corresponds to the activity illustrated in Fig. 2.
3.4 Dynamic Images

The idea for the construction of dynamic images (Bilen et al., 2016) is to represent a video sequence as a ranking function $S(\bullet)$ of its frames $F_1, \ldots, F_N$ (Fernando et al., 2015). This function provides a feature vector $\psi(F_t)$ extracted from each video frame $F_t$. Let us denote by $V_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \psi(F_t)$ the time average of the aforementioned features from the first to the $t-$th frame, wherein $S(\bullet)$ associates to each time $t$ a score $S(t)$, given a set of parameters $d$ that are learned upon solving a convex optimization problem, i.e., later frames obtain larger scores. Although $\psi(\bullet)$ may be any feature extractor, Bilen et al. (Bilen et al., 2016) opted for simply using raw RGB pixel values and reported remarkable results. However, the most important aspects of such an approach are a) $d$ may be interpreted as an RGB image; and b) this image is obtained by rank pooling, thus it may be regarded as a summary of the whole sequence. Note that the pixels in the produced dynamic images tend to focus on salient information rather than the background, which in our opinion makes them appropriate for the problem of HAR. In Fig. 4 we illustrate a dynamic image that corresponds to the activity illustrated in Fig. 2.

3.5 Activity Classification

For classification of both pseudo-colored and dynamic images we use the same Convolutional Neural Network that has been proposed and evaluated in our previous work (Papadakis et al., 2019b), for a similar HAR problem. More specifically, the first convolutional layer filters the $159 \times 75$ input activity image with 32 kernels of size $3 \times 3$. The first pooling layer uses max-pooling to perform $2 \times 2$ subsampling. Then, the second convolutional layer filters the resulting $76 \times 34$ image with 64 kernels of size $3 \times 3$, followed by a second pooling layer, which also uses max-pooling to perform $2 \times 2$ sub-sampling. A third convolutional layer filters the resulting $36 \times 15$ image with 128 kernels of size $3 \times 3$ and a third pooling layer uses max-pooling to perform $2 \times 2$ subsampling. Then, a flatten layer transforms the output of the last pooling to a vector, which is then used as input to a dense layer using dropout. Finally, a second dense layer produces the output of the network. For classification of the handcrafted features we used a Support Vector Machine with linear kernel.

3.6 Fusion

As we have already mentioned, we use two distinct feature extraction steps: a) handcrafted features, extracted by 3D joint motion; and b) deep features extracted using a CNN. The former are extracted using the methodology described in section 3.2. The latter consist of the learnt features, i.e., the dense layers of the CNN are omitted. Both features are concatenated into a single feature vector. For classification, they are normalized and then upon a PCA step they are given as input to an SVM.

4 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

4.1 Datasets

For the experimental evaluation of our approach we used the PKU-MMD dataset (Liu et al., 2017). It is a large-scale benchmark dataset that focuses on human action understanding. It contains approx. 20K action instances from 51 action categories, spanning into 5.4M video frames. For the data collection, 66 human subjects have been involved. Moreover, each action has been recorded by 3 camera views, namely L (left), M (middle) and R (right); fixed angles are used, i.e., $-45^\circ$, $0^\circ$ and $+45^\circ$. Note, that the height of all cameras is the same and remains fixed, while the area, within which users perform actions is pre-determined. The Microsoft Kinect v2 camera was used for all recordings, and for each action instance the following where provided: a) raw RGB video sequences depicting one or more test subjects performing an action; b) depth sequences, i.e., depth information of the aforementioned RGB sequences; c) infrared radiation sequences of the aforementioned sequences; and d) extracted 3D positions of human skeleton joints.

4.2 Setup

Experiments were performed on a personal workstation with an Intel® i7 5820K 12 core processor on 3.30 GHz and 16GB RAM, using NVIDIA® GeForce GTX 2060 GPU with 8 GB RAM and Ubuntu 18.04
(64 bit). The deep architecture has been implemented in Python, using Keras 2.2.4 (Chollet et al., 2018) with the Tensorflow 1.12 (Abadi et al., 2016) backend. All data pre-processing and processing steps have been implemented in Python 3.6 using NumPy, SciPy and OpenCV.

4.3 Results

Our experiments are divided into 3 parts: a) experiments under the same viewpoint (single-view), wherein samples from the same camera viewpoint are used for training and testing; b) experiments under different viewpoints (cross-view), wherein samples from different camera viewpoints are used for training and testing; and c) cross-subject experiments, wherein actors are split into training and testing groups, i.e., none participating in both groups. The goal of cross view experiments is to evaluate the robustness under simple transformations, such as translation and/or rotation which are typical in real-life applications and occur due to viewpoint changes since cameras are still, while subjects move within a space. Cross subject experiments aim to evaluate the robustness of the approach in the case of intra-class variations which in real-life situations may occur e.g., when a system is pre-trained and then used with different subjects and without any fine-tuning.

Experimental results are depicted in Table 2. For each experiment we provide precision (P) and recall (R) for each of the aforementioned parts of experiments. As it may be observed, in almost every case the fusion of the three approaches outperforms any other approach or combination. Notably, handcrafted features are able to boost the performance of every other approach, upon fusion with them.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper we demonstrated how handcrafted features may be fused with learnt ones, in order to boost the performance of classification within a human activity recognition task. We experimentally demonstrated that handcrafted features learn different data representations than those learnt by deep architectures, therefore, their fusion leads to increased performance.

Among our future plans are to enhance the fused approach by incorporating more modalities. Also we would like to apply techniques such as data augmentation (Papadakis et al., 2019a) transfer learning and domain adaptation (Spyrou et al., 2020), which we believe may further increase performance. Finally, we would like to evaluate our approach in larger datasets, such as the NTU RGB+D120 (Liu et al., 2019b) and in other HAR tasks, e.g., in gesture recognition and in other domains such as surveillance.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR M</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM R</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM L</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M L</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M R</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R L</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R M</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L R</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L M</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Subject</td>
<td>LRM</td>
<td>LR M</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L L</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R R</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M M</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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