

# B-HAR: an open-source baseline framework for in depth study of human activity recognition datasets and workflows

Florenc Demrozi, *Member, IEEE*, Cristian Turetta, and Graziano Pravadelli, *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—Human Activity Recognition (HAR), based on machine and deep learning algorithms is considered one of the most promising technologies to monitor professional and daily life activities for different categories of people (e.g., athletes, elderly, kids, employers) in order to provide a variety of services related, for example to well-being, empowering of technical performances, prevention of risky situation, and educational purposes. However, the analysis of the effectiveness and the efficiency of HAR methodologies suffers from the lack of a standard workflow, which might represent the baseline for the estimation of the quality of the developed pattern recognition models. This makes the comparison among different approaches a challenging task. In addition, researchers can make mistakes that, when not detected, definitely affect the achieved results. To mitigate such issues, this paper proposes an open-source automatic and highly configurable framework, named B-HAR, for the definition, standardization, and development of a baseline framework in order to evaluate and compare HAR methodologies. It implements the most popular data processing methods for data preparation and the most commonly used machine and deep learning pattern recognition models.

**Index Terms**—Human Activity Recognition, Inertial sensors, Machine learning, Deep learning, Open-source library

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, with the advent of the Internet of Things (IoT), embedded sensors have been integrated into personal devices such as smartphones and smartwatches but also into clothes and objects of daily life. This has pushed the definition of research directions and the development of smart applications for Human Activity Recognition (HAR). Meanwhile, HAR has become a popular topic due to its importance in many areas, including health care, well-being, interactive gaming, sports, and monitoring of activities of daily life (ADLs) in general, in both controlled and uncontrolled settings [1]–[3].

Despite its increasing importance, research on HAR encounters multiple difficulties. Among them, the most critical are: i) the variety of daily activities to be recognized, ii)

the intra-subject and inter-subject movement variability, iii) the trade-off between performance and privacy, iv) the need of computational efficiency and their actual availability in embedded and portable devices where HAR algorithms should run, and v) the necessity of learning phases based on time-consuming data annotation processes [4], [5].

Concerning the data elaborated by HAR algorithms, they are typically collected from i) cameras; ii) ambient sensors (e.g., temperature, humidity, brightness, seismic) and iii) wearable embedded sensors (e.g., inertial or physiological sensors) [6]–[8]. Cameras are broadly used in HAR, nevertheless, collecting video data presents privacy issues, and in addition, their elaboration requires high computational resources. For these reasons, many researchers has started to work with other ambient and embedded sensors extensively [9], [10]. In particular, accelerometer sensors have shown excellent results in HAR, and their use in combination with other sensors is rising rapidly. The diffusion of accelerometer sensors is strongly related to their capacity to map the human body movement directly [3], [11] and also human psychological state (e.g., pain level [12]). Besides, accelerometer sensors present affordable costs and they can be integrated into the most of wearable objects people own.

Concerning the algorithmic design, HAR has seen an increasing interest in Deep Learning (DL) methods, mainly due to their capabilities to work with raw data that do not require explicit data handling techniques as normalization, filtering, or feature extractions [13]. However, since DL models produce high accuracy results on large HAR datasets, the lack of large datasets with lower dimensionality requires to apply different processing techniques [3].

Figure 1 presents the HAR standard workflow, which generally consists of: 1) the identification of data sources, i.e., sensors and devices used to collect data, 2) the data collection and pre-processing, 3) the model selection and training, and 4) the evaluation of the achieved results. Despite this general workflow, the data pre-processing and the model selection phases include a high number of non-standardized steps which represents the most critical aspects for the quality of the HAR approach. In particular, the data pre-processing includes different elaborations, as normalization, noise removal, balancing, and feature extraction. Their application profoundly impacts the recognition model selection and the recognition quality. Indeed, no well-defined workflow that identifies how these data processing steps should be applied exists, as well as, there are not precise rules for the model selection and

Manuscript received Month Day, 2021; revised Month Day, 2021; accepted Month Day, 2021. Date of publication Month Day, 2021; date of current version Month Day, 2021. The associate editor coordinating the review of this article and approving it for publication was Dr/Prof. XXXX XXXXX. This research has been partially supported by the FSE Projects n. 1695-0013-1463-2019 (Smart-PUMP) and n. 1695-0007-1463-2019 (Biofeedback) funded by Veneto Region.

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible. (Corresponding author: Florenc Demrozi.)

F. Demrozi, C. Turetta and G. Pravadelli are with the Computer Science Department, University of Verona, Italy (e-mail: name.surname@univr.it).




Fig. 1. Overview of the HAR workflow.

training. In addition, the testing phase is still an underestimated process that is not clearly described in most of the existing methodologies.

The lack of a standard in the application of the workflow reported in Fig. 1 makes very difficult to analyze, compare and evaluate the quality of different HAR approaches, even by adopting the same dataset. Indeed, many datasets are available in the literature [14]–[23], which represent human activities perceived through inertial sensors, such as accelerometers, gyroscopes, magnetometers, or physiological sensors, like electromyography (EMG), electrocardiogram (ECG), or electroencephalogram (EEG). However, to the best of our knowledge, at the state-of-the-art, there is no work (article or tool) that can be used as a baseline for fairly comparing different HAR methodologies.

To fill in this gap, this paper provides the scientific community with Baseline-HAR (B-HAR)<sup>1</sup>, a Python framework that, starting from the target input dataset<sup>2</sup>, provides the user with: i) the possibility of easily configuring the different phases of data pre-processing and training, thus avoiding errors; ii) efficiency indicators of the most used classification models applied to the target dataset.

In particular, the main characteristics B-HAR are:

- it unifies the general workflow of Fig. 1 into a single framework;
- it defines precise data pre-processing steps, which minimize possible user errors;
- it provides the user with baseline information about the most famous HAR datasets [14], [16], [17], [21], [22], [24], such that new approaches can be exhaustively compared with respect to existing results;
- given a new HAR dataset, it automatically applies on it the most used pattern recognition models to provide the user with baseline results.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces some preliminary concepts. B-HAR and the underpinning methodology are described in Section III. An exhaus-

tive experimental campaign is then presented in Section IV. Finally, Section V concludes the papers with final remarks.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

This section offers an overview of basic pattern recognition techniques exploiting machine and deep learning, and data pre-processing techniques (e.g., noise removal, data balancing, segmentation or feature extraction), which have been considered in B-HAR.

### A. Machine learning overview

Classical Machine Learning (CML) algorithms are categorized into two major groups: unsupervised learning (aka clustering) and supervised learning. Unsupervised learning aims to identify existing patterns in input data without any information regarding the output [25]. Instead, supervised learning aims to construct a mathematical model that exemplifies the relationship between input and output training data. Besides, one or more pre-processing steps can be necessary, including feature extraction, segmentation, normalization, signal noise removal, data balancing, or features projection [26]. The resulting model is applied to predict the outcome of unseen data samples. The most common CML algorithms are Naïve Bayes (NB), k-means clustering, Support Vector Machine (SVM), Random Forests (RF), Decision Trees (DT), and k-Nearest Neighbours (k-NN).

In the last decade, Deep Learning (DL) algorithms have also become popular in many domains. Starting from raw input data, DL techniques automatically identify optimal features that otherwise would remain unknown without any human knowledge [27]. Nevertheless, DL models present some limitation [28]: data interpretation is not easy (black box model) and DL requires large datasets for training and high computational devices for execution. The most common DL models are: Convolutional Neural Network (CNN), Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs), and Long Short-Term Memory Networks (LSTMs) [29].

### B. Data pre-processing

Besides the pattern recognition models, an essential step in HAR workflow is the pre-processing of raw data. This is

<sup>1</sup>B-HAR website.

<sup>2</sup>Represented by time series of data perceived by inertial, physiological sensors and/or other type of data.




Fig. 2. Overview of the B-HAR structure.

necessary, since raw data perceived by sensors are generally affected by different issues [30] as hardware and environmental noise, errors related to null and/or missing values and user mistakes made during the collection phase. In addition, the data can present unbalanced distribution of classes (unbalanced datasets), or require the extraction of specific feature before being elaborated. The data pre-processing step aims to reduce the effect of such issues and prepare the data for the model training phase.

Concerning the hardware noise, in the literature, most of the existing techniques make use of digital filters as low-pass, highpass, bandpass, or statistical filters [31]–[33] as the Kalman filter [34]. Furthermore, the unbalanced datasets issue is usually handled, through specific techniques, by reducing/increasing the number of samples in the most/less populated class [35]. Finally, since raw data does not provide interpretable characteristics, feature extraction approaches are adopted to derive interpretable characteristics in the time and frequency domains. However, no existing standard shows the correct order in which the previous pre-processing steps should be applied.

### III. METHODOLOGY

B-HAR comprises six dedicated modules: one input module, one output module, and four computation modules including various sub-modules. Its structure is shown in Figure 2. Red bullets identify computationally heavy and time-consuming

operations. The green bullet refers to a computation module that executes only one of its sub-modules. Grey sub-modules identify optional computations that B-HAR users may use or not. Internal sub-modules are executed in the order indicated by the dashed lines. Details on the structure are reported in the following sections.

#### A. Input module

B-HAR takes in input two files containing, respectively, i) the dataset, i.e., values of the signals perceived by sensors during human activities, enriched by information concerning the testing subject identity, the data collection session, and the performed activity at a specific timestamp, and ii) a configuration file that defines the library workflow.

1) *Dataset format:* Since HAR datasets present different structures and information types, B-HAR can flexibly handle different dataset formats. Fig. 3 shows the generic, customizable, structure of the input dataset that can be provided to B-HAR; ✓ identifies mandatory data, while [✓] identifies optional data. B-HAR requires a dataset composed of signals from one or more sensors ( $Sensor_{xyx}^i$ ), a label ( $A_{ID}$ ) indicating the human activity performed by the testing subject, and his/her identifier ( $T_{ID}$ ). B-HAR can handle datasets including data from different types of sensors (e.g., accelerometers, gyroscopes, magnetometers, or other physiological sensors) that can be related to different activities, each one identified by a different session identifier ( $S_{ID}$ ). Besides, if time information

lacks, B-HAR users have to indicate, into the configuration file, the discrete sampling frequency adopted by the sensors.

<i>Time</i>	<i>Sensor</i> <sub>xyz</sub> <sup>1</sup>	...	<i>Sensor</i> <sub>xyz</sub> <sup><i>n</i></sup>	<i>AID</i>	<i>TID</i>	<i>SID</i>
[✓]	✓	...	[✓]	✓	✓	[✓]
<i>n</i> ≥ 1	✓ ≡ <i>is needed</i>			[✓] ≡ <i>is optional</i>		

Fig. 3. B-HAR dataset structure.

2) *Configuration file*: The B-HAR configuration file provides the user with total control over the computation modules and relative sub-modules. Through such a file, B-HAR users can easily modify the data processing workflow and test different configuration pipelines. Table I shows the implemented configuration parameters (Column 2) alongside with their description (Column 3) and possible usable values (Column 4).

### B. Data cleaning

The quality of the collected data depends mainly on two factors: i) environment and hardware noise, and ii) data collection technology and architecture, which often leads to the loss or corruption of the data during its transmission. Missing or corrupted data must be examined and integrated to maintain the structure and the information of the time series. Instead, environmental and hardware noise is handled through a noise removal phase. The data cleaning phases is devoted to handle such issues.

1) *Handling of data errors*: Missing and inconsistent data, such as NaN, or Inf, represent one of the main obstacles for an accurate analysis of observed data. B-HAR provides four different methods to handle missing data:

- *bfill*: it is used to backward fill the missing values in the time series;
- *ffill*: it is used to forward fill the missing values in the time series;
- *interpolate*: it performs linear interpolation for missing data based on previous and successive data points;
- *constant(k)*: it substitutes missing values with a constant value *k*;
- *mean*: it substitutes missing data with the arithmetic mean of the previous and successive observations.

B-HAR returns an error if the input dataset has more than 5%<sup>3</sup> of not adjacent missing values [36].

2) *Noise removal*: Time series noise removal is an essential and indisputable step in HAR signal processing. B-HAR provides four different types of filters [37]:

- *low-pass filters* pass signals with a frequency lower than a selected cutoff and attenuate the rest;
- *high-pass filters* pass signals with a frequency higher than a selected cutoff and attenuate the rest;
- *band-pass filters* pass signals within a specific range and attenuates frequencies outside it;
- *band-stop filters* pass most frequencies unaltered, but attenuate those in a specific range.

<sup>3</sup>5% of the samples in a time series column.

The B-HAR users can also choose not to apply noise removal techniques, relying entirely on pattern recognition models.

### C. Data representation

In general, the data collected for HAR models can be used in different forms:

- raw data with no transformation;
- after features extraction techniques have been applied;
- after segmentation, for grouping them in time windows.

Since single data observations in a time series are not statistically informative, segmentation is generally applied. Moreover, HAR models resonate with ongoing activities over the time, and not on single observation. On such an aim, segmentation and feature extractions have become state-of-the-art procedures for HAR. B-HAR provides to the user with the possibility of selecting one of the aforementioned data treatment procedures.

1) *Raw data*: No data treatment is carried out by B-HAR in this case. The pre-processing module takes in input the original datasets. This representation becomes useful when the user has already prepared the data offline and he/she wants to use B-HAR just to study different pattern recognition models.

2) *Segmentation*: Given a  $n \times 1$  time series  $HAR_D$ , sampled at a fixed frequency  $S_f$  (expressed in Hertz), and a time-window segment of dimension  $T_w$  (expressed in seconds), the basic segmentation process implemented in B-HAR returns a dataset  $SHAR_D$  of dimension  $(n/(T_w * S_f)) \times (T_w * S_f)$ . For example, given a  $100 \times 1$  time series  $HAR_D$ , a sampling frequency  $S_f = 25\text{Hz}$ , and a time window  $T_w = 2$  seconds, the segmentation process returns a dataset  $SHAR_D$  of dimension  $(100/(25 * 2)) \times (2 * 25)$ , i.e.,  $2 \times 50$ .

However, many methodologies maintain an overlapping fragment between two consecutive segments. This part provides the model with information of the preceding context. B-HAR can also handle this overlapping, if specified by the user.

3) *Features extraction*: The feature extraction process explores the time and frequency domains of the input data. Time-domain features are mostly used because their extraction process requires a lower computation effort compared to the extraction of frequency-domain features [30], [38].

B-HAR, given the original time series dataset, the type of features to be extracted in the desired domain (time and/or frequency), the time-window size, and the overlapping size, returns the corresponding time and/or frequency feature-based representation. B-HAR uses the [Time Series Feature Extraction Library \(TSFEL\)](#) presented in [38].

### D. Pre-processing

This module adopts a set of techniques to reduce the dataset size by dropping unnecessary data, selecting a subset of extracted features, and balancing the dataset. In addition, it standardizes the data through normalization approaches.

Nr.	Parameter	Description	Values Range
1	path	Path to the dataset directory.	String.
2	separator	.csv separator	Separator character
3	has_header	The input dataset file contains also the header	Bool.
4	header_type	Header format of the input dataset.	<i>tdc, tdcv, dc, dcp</i>
5	time window	Time for desired window length, in seconds.	Float
6	sampling_frequency	Sampling frequency of loaded dataset in Hz.	Integer
7	overlap	Overlap between time windows, in seconds.	Float
8	group_by	Show stats by attribute.	<i>CLASS, P_ID</i>
9	data_treatment	Data treatment type.	<i>segmentation, raw, features_extraction</i>
10	features_domain	Available domains for features extraction .	<i>statistical, spectral, temporal, all.</i>
11	features_selection	Toggle features selection.	Bool ( <i>true, false</i> )
12	use_ml	Implemented Machine Learning models.	<i>kNN, wkNN, LDA, QDA, SVM, RF, DT</i>
13	use_dl	Implemented Deep Learning models.	<i>CNN</i>
14	normalization_method	Normalize data.	<i>none, minmax, robust, standard</i>
15	split_method	Train/Test split method.	<i>intra, inter</i>
16	selection_method	Features selection technique.	<i>variance, ll, tree-based, recursive</i>
17	n_features_to_select	Number of features to select, available only with <i>recursive</i> selection method.	Integer
18	data_balancing_method	For unbalanced dataset, balancing techniques. (Under • Over sampling techniques)	<i>random_under, near_miss, edited_nn • random_over, smote, adasyn, kmeans_smote.</i>
19	sub_method	Substitute NaN and Inf values method.	<i>mean, forward, backward, constant, interpolate</i>
20	constant_value	The value which substitute NaN and $\pm\infty$ values.	Float
21	filter	Data filtering techniques.	<i>lowpass, highpass, bandpass, bandstop</i>
22	filter_order	The order of the applied filter.	Integer (e.g., 4)
23	cut	Low/High-Cutoffs frequency in Hz.	Integer (e.g., 20 Hz).
24	test_size	The size of test data.	Float (e.g., 25%)
25	epochs	Training epochs for CNN	Integer (e.g., 100)
26	k_fold	Number of fold for CNN <i>k-fold</i> training	Integer (e.g., 3)
27	loss_threshold	Bias used in CNN model ensembles	Float (e.g., 0.4)
28	use_features	If features selection is enabled, extracted features are used as input of the CNN.	Bool ( <i>true, false</i> )

TABLE I

B-HAR CONFIGURATION PARAMETERS. GRAY LINES DEFINES THE CONFIGURATION USED IN THE EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS SECTION.)

1) *Drop of unnecessary data:* One of the main problem for HAR, and pattern recognition techniques in general, is represented by the presence in the dataset of imbalanced class distribution and noisy data related to a specific tester (subject) or activity (class). To solve such an issue, B-HAR provides the possibility of excluding data from the input dataset. In particular, B-HAR can exclude data related to:

- a single tester or a group of testers;
- a single activity or a group of activities;
- a single data collection session or a group of sessions.

2) *Training/testing approach:* In machine learning, data usually are split into two (training and testing) or three (training, validation, and testing) subsets. The recognition model is then trained on the training dataset (and cross-checked with the validation dataset when required) to make predictions on the testing dataset. However, in HAR, train and test datasets are usually partitioned by considering the presence of data collected from several different testers [25]. For such a purpose, B-HAR presents two different types of train/test splitting approaches:

- *Inter-subject (Leave-out):* The inter-subject train/test partitioning approach works as follows: B-HAR users select data related to the human activities of a specific subset of testers creating the testing dataset (e.g., 10 of 100), and the remaining testers represent the training dataset (e.g., 90 of 100). By using this approach, we are absolutely sure that there is no overlap between the training dataset and the test dataset, minimizing the possibility of overfitting.

- *Intra-subject (Hold-out):* In the intra-subject train/test approach B-HAR provides the possibility of performing a traditional hold-out approach. B-HAR users give as input the *test partition dimension* that usually goes from 15% to 25% and a *k* value in the range 3 to 10. In particular, the datasets is initially divided into training and testing dataset (e.g., 75% train and 25% test), subsequently, a classic *k*-fold cross-validation approach is applied only over the training dataset.

3) *Normalization:* During the training phase, features with higher values govern the training process. However, such features are not those that mostly represent the characteristics of the dataset or the final accuracy of the pattern recognition model. Data normalization transforms multi-scaled data to the same scale, where all variables positively influence the model, thus improving the stability and the performance of the learning algorithm [25]. Besides, when working with datasets, where different features represent every single sample, the datasets perform independent normalization for every single feature. B-HAR provides the following normalization techniques:

- *Robust scaling:* it scales each feature of the data set  $HAR_D$  by subtracting the median ( $HAR_D^{Q_2}$ ) and then dividing by the Interquartile Range (IQR). The IQR is defined as the difference between the third and the first quartile ( $HAR_D^{Q_3} - HAR_D^{Q_1}$ ). The robust scaler of a

dataset  $HAR_D$  is expressed as:

$$HAR_D^{norm} = \frac{HAR_D - HAR_D^{Q_2}}{HAR_D^{Q_3} - HAR_D^{Q_1}} \quad (1)$$

This scaler uses statistics that are robust to outliers, in contrast with the other scalers, which use statistics that are highly affected by outliers such as the maximum, the minimum, the mean, and the standard deviation.

- *Standard scaling (z-Score)*: it maps the data into a distribution with mean 0 and a standard deviation 1. Each normalized value is computed by subtracting the corresponding feature's mean and then dividing by the standard deviation. The standard scaler of a dataset  $HAR_D$  is expressed as:

$$HAR_D^{norm} = \frac{HAR_D - HAR_D^u}{HAR_D^s} \quad (2)$$

where  $HAR_D^u$  is the mean of the training dataset, and  $HAR_D^s$  is the standard deviation of the training datasets.

- *Min-Max scaling*: it rescales the feature to a  $[0, 1]$  fixed range by subtracting the minimum value of the feature and then dividing by the range:

$$HAR_D^{norm} = \frac{HAR_D - HAR_D^{min}}{HAR_D^{max} - HAR_D^{min}} \quad (3)$$

4) *Features selection*: A higher number of features do not necessarily imply better results from the pattern recognition model. This is because features can positively or negatively impact the recognition process. For this purpose, feature selection techniques have been defined to identify and order the features by importance. Such techniques, starting from a training dataset, automatically select features that contribute most to the prediction accuracy. Moreover, the elimination of features reduces the time required for the training and the testing phases. The main benefits of feature selection techniques are: i) reduction of the overfitting by eliminating redundant data that consequently reduces also noise-related errors, ii) improvement of the accuracy, since misleading data are eliminated, and iii) reduction of the training time due to fewer data points [25], [39].

B-HAR provides the following feature selection techniques:

- *Variance*: It removes all features whose variance is not greater than a defined threshold. By default, it removes zero-variance features, i.e., features with the same value in all samples.
- *Recursive features elimination (RFE)*: It fits a model and removes the less critical feature (or features) until a defined number of features is reached, without knowing how many features are valid. Features are ranked based on their importance and by recursively eliminating a small number of features per loop. Besides, RFE attempts to eliminate dependencies and collinearity that may exist in the model.
- *Lasso regularization (L1)*: It is based on the Lasso regularization linear model that estimates sparse coefficients starting from the non-zero coefficients returned by a linear regression model, thus effectively reducing the

number of features upon which the given solution is dependent.

- *Tree-based*: It used to compute impurity-based feature importance, which in turn can be used to discard irrelevant features in cooperation with other feature selection techniques. Tree-based estimators, by definition, internally create an ordering of the features representing the training dataset, which makes them very suitable for using within feature selection methods.

5) *Balancing*: Training a HAR model on an imbalanced dataset can introduce unique challenges during the model training process, returning an influenced recognition model. There are two categories of techniques that manage this issue at the state-of-art: i) oversampling the less populated classes to the same number of observations of the most populated class, and ii) undersampling the most populated classes to the same number of observations of the less populated class [35]. B-HAR provides different techniques to handle such issues:

- *Undersampling random*: It randomly eliminates a sub-set of observations of the most populated classes such that all classes have the same population (equal to the initial less populated class). The main limitation is that the removed observations can be more informative than the kept ones.
- *Undersampling near miss*: Given two observations, which are part of two different classes and are very similar to each other, it eliminates the observation belonging to the most populated class.
- *Undersampling edited nearest neighbors*: It removes observations whose actual class label differs from the class of at least  $\frac{k}{2}$  nearest neighbors. It can undersample indiscriminately over all the existing classes or a subset of the most populated classes.
- *Oversampling random*: It randomly duplicates observation of the less populated classes such that all classes have the same population (equal to the initial most populated class). The main limitation is that the duplicated observations possibly lead to an overfitting problem.
- *Oversampling synthetic minority over-sampling technique (SMOTE)*: It randomly selects an observation  $a$  from the less populated class and identifies its  $k$  nearest neighbors from the same class. A synthetic observations  $s$  is generated as a convex combination of  $a$  and an observation  $b$  randomly selected from its  $k$  nearest neighbors.
- *Oversampling k-means SMOTE*: It uses the well-known k-means unsupervised learning algorithm to generate new observations of the less populated class in safe and crucial input dataset areas. This technique avoids the generation of noise and effectively overcomes imbalances between and within classes.
- *Oversampling adaptive synthetic (ADASYN)*: It uses a weighted distribution for different minority class observations according to their learning phase difficulty. Then, less populated classes are enriched by new synthetic observations of such harder to learn observations than those minority examples that are easier to learn. [40].

### E. Model training and testing

In such a module, B-HAR, starting from the pre-processed input dataset, takes a known set of input data and responses (training dataset) and trains a model to generate reasonable predictions of new data (testing dataset). In particular, B-HAR provides to the user with the possibility of training eight different pattern recognition models: seven machine learning models, i.e., kNN, wkNN, Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA), Quadratic Discriminant Analysis (QDA), RD, DT, and SVM, and one deep learning model, i.e., CNN. SVM and CNN are the least efficient in terms of training time. Instead, LDA and QDA are the least efficient<sup>4</sup> in terms of required memory space.

B-HAR does not perform the usual model training phase, but it applies the grid search training approach. This exhaustively generates candidates from a given grid of parameters. For example, the SVM model learns from the training dataset by using different configuration parameters (e.g., kernel function  $\in$  [linear, polynomial, sigmoid, radial basis function], penalty  $\in$  [1,12], or loss function  $\in$  [hinge, squared hinge]) and it is tested on the testing dataset for each configuration. Finally, B-HAR returns, for each tested model, the configuration that achieved the best results in terms of sensitivity, specificity, precision, f1-score, and accuracy.

### F. Performance measures

The quality of a pattern recognition model is measured by using accuracy as the main parameter. However, this metric could be negatively affected in cases where an unbalanced training dataset is given in input. To overcome such an issue, more representative metrics are used [41]. A confusion matrix is a specific item that clearly visualizes the performance of the model. The mathematical representation of a multi-class confusion matrix is as follows, where rows represent the instances in a predicted class, and columns represent the instances in an actual class.

$$C = \begin{matrix} & \text{predicted} \\ \text{actual} & \begin{bmatrix} c_{11} & \dots & c_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{n1} & & c_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

The confusion elements for each class are given by:

- true positives:  $tp = \sum c_{ii}$ ;
- false positives:  $fp = \sum_{l=1}^n c_{li} - tp_i$ ;
- false negatives:  $fn = \sum_{l=1}^n c_{il} - tp_i$ ;
- true negatives:  $tn = \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n c_{lk} - tp_i - fp_i - fn_i$ .

On the basis of the confusion matrix the following model quality metrics are computed by B-HAR:

$$Precision = \frac{tp}{tp+fp} \quad Specificity = \frac{tn}{fp+tn}$$

$$Sensitivity = \frac{tp}{tp+fn} \quad Accuracy = \frac{tp+tn}{p+n}$$

<sup>4</sup>Concerning datasets with a high number of data sources.

$$F1_{Score} = 2 \times \frac{Precision \times Sensitivity}{Precision + Sensitivity}$$

Moreover, to better explicate the results and the behavior of the tested models, B-HAR shows the trend of the loss function and the total accuracy at each step of the model training.

Finally, B-HAR provides detailed statistics regarding the execution time of each module.

## IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

This section presents the results of an extensive experimental campaign performed by using B-HAR on seven of the most popular open-source HAR datasets, and two dedicated datasets (i.e., Channel State Information (CSI) and Received Signal Strength Indicator (RSSI)) used to recognize the occupancy (empty or occupied) status of an environment starting from the radio signal propagation patterns. The goal of the campaign is twofold: i) testing the flexibility and easiness of use of B-HAR on heterogeneous datasets concerning number of testers, kind of activities, and type of sensors, and ii) measuring the performances achieved by state-of-the-art machine and deep learning models implemented in B-HAR on the selected datasets. Table II presents the main characteristics of the considered datasets. Column 1 shows the name and the reference of the datasets. Columns 2, 3 and 4 report, respectively, the number of testers, activities, and used sensors, where A refers to accelerometers and G to gyroscopes. Column 5 indicates the data sampling frequency. Finally, Column 6 presents the dimension of the time window and of the overlapping fragment in seconds.

Dataset name	# of Subjects	# of Activities	Used Sensors	Sampling Frequency	Ref. (w,o)
WISDM v1 [14]	51	18	1 (A)	20 Hz	[42] (10, 0)
WISDM v2 [24]	225	6	1 (A)	20 Hz	[42] (10, 0)
DAPHNET [16]	10	2	3 (A)	65 Hz	[11] (3, 1)
HHAR (phone) [21]	9	6	2 (A, G)	200 Hz	[21] (2, 1)
HHAR (watch) [21]	9	6	2 (A, G)	200 Hz	[21] (2, 1)
PAPAM [17]	9	14	3 (A, G)	100 Hz	[17] (5, 1)
mHealth [22]	10	12	3 (A, G)	50 Hz	[43] (5, 2.5)
BLE RSSI [44]	4	2	4 (BLE)	200 Hz	[44] (1, 0)
802.11ac CSI	3	2	12 (AP)	40 Hz	(1, 0)

A = Accelerometer      G = Gyroscope      BLE device  
AP (Access Points)      w = window (seconds)      o = overlap (seconds)

TABLE II  
CHARACTERISTICS OF DATASETS

B-HAR provides the users with two function calls. The first takes in input the target dataset and returns statistics that help the user in defining the B-HAR configuration file. In particular, such function call returns:

- the distribution of observations concerning testers and activities, helping the user in the identification of possible under/overpopulation issues;
- the boxplot distribution for all or specific activities or testers, helping the user in the identification of outlier distribution or noisy data.

The second function call takes in input the configuration file and it returns the following information:

- the performance metrics discussed above;
- the most performing configuration returned by the grid search engine;
- the plot of the loss and accuracy variation during the training process;

	Dataset	<i>k</i> NN	LDA	QDA	RF	DT	CNN
Data Segmentation	WISDM v1 [14]	[98,61,62,61,62]	[95,12,12,12,12]	[95,20,17,20,17]	[99,76,76,76,76]	[97,55,53,55,53]	[96,26,26,26,26]
	WISDM v2 [24]	[94,69,78,69,78]	[64,40,34,40,34]	[86,65,58,65,58]	[96,90,91,90,91]	[92,77,77,77,77]	[60,62,62,66,60]
	DAPHNET [16]	[16,90,87,90,88]	[09,91,83,91,83]	[08,91,82,91,82]	[14,91,91,91,91]	[08,91,83,91,83]	[12,90,87,90,87]
	PAPAM [17]	[90,65,66,65,66]	[90,45,45,45,45]	[92,15,19,15,19]	[93,80,83,80,83]	[91,60,60,60,60]	[90,73,76,73,73]
	HHAR (phone) [21]	[96,83,85,83,85]	[88,43,45,43,45]	[88,40,50,40,50]	[98,89,89,88,89]	[93,67,66,67,66]	[96,84,84,84,84]
	HHAR (watch) [21]	[95,78,82,78,82]	[90,54,52,54,52]	[84,26,27,26,27]	[97,85,85,85,85]	[94,69,69,69,69]	[96,83,83,83,83]
	mHealth [22]	[81,76,81,76,81]	[75,38,59,38,59]	[09,91,82,91,82]	[73,85,85,85,85]	[74,77,77,77,77]	[65,80,80,80,80]
	RSSI [44]	[91,91,91,91,91]	[91,91,91,91,91]	[91,91,91,91,91]	[91,91,91,91,91]	[91,91,91,91,91]	[90,91,90,91,91]
	CSI	[93,93,93,93,93]	[93,93,93,93,93]	[92,92,92,92,92]	[93,93,93,93,93]	[93,93,93,93,93]	[92,92,92,92,92]
Features Extraction	WISDM v1 [14]	[97,56,57,56,57]	[97,49,49,49,49]	[96,42,45,42,45]	[99,84,84,84,84]	[98,60,60,60,60]	[95,25,24,25,24]
	WISDM v2 [24]	[98,92,92,92,92]	[96,86,86,86,86]	[82,61,56,61,56]	[97,94,93,94,93]	[96,87,87,87,87]	[59,41,17,41,17]
	DAPHNET [16]	[35,92,90,92,90]	[64,90,92,90,91]	[09,91,82,91,82]	[57,94,93,94,93]	[56,90,91,90,91]	[09,90,82,90,82]
	PAPAM [17]	[92,74,76,74,76]	[95,65,67,65,67]	[96,03,18,03,18]	[95,87,88,87,88]	[95,75,75,75,75]	[89,71,66,71,66]
	HHAR (phone) [21]	[96,81,82,81,82]	[90,56,56,56,56]	[83,28,28,28,28]	[99,93,93,93,93]	[97,83,83,83,83]	[97,86,86,86,86]
	HHAR (watch) [21]	[94,69,69,69,69]	[91,54,54,54,54]	[83,26,24,26,24]	[98,89,89,89,89]	[95,76,77,76,77]	[95,77,78,77,78]
	mHealth [22]	[92,89,90,89,90]	[98,88,91,88,91]	[30,71,52,71,52]	[96,94,94,94,94]	[82,87,87,87,87]	[64,82,78,82,78]
	RSSI [44]	[95,95,95,95,95]	[95,95,95,95,95]	[95,95,95,95,95]	[95,95,95,95,95]	[95,95,95,95,95]	[94,95,94,95,94]
	CSI	[99,99,99,99,99]	[99,99,99,99,99]	[97,98,97,97,97]	[99,99,99,99,99]	[99,99,99,99,99]	[99,99,99,99,99]

Classification results are shown in terms of [Specificity, Sensitivity, Precision, Accuracy, F1-Score]

TABLE III

B-HAR RESULTS ON SEGMENT/FEATURES DATA REPRESENTATION OF THE MOST FAMOUS HAR DATASETS.

- if used, the most important features selected by the feature selection model;
- if required, the segmented or features dataset;
- if required, execution time statistics for each computation module and sub-modules.

Concerning the experimental analysis, Table III shows the results achieved by using B-HAR on the datasets of Table II by applying the six of the eight pattern recognition models reported in Section III-E. The configuration of B-HAR used for the experiments is shown by the gray rows of Table I. In the first block of Table III, data segmentation has been applied. Instead, in the second block of Table III, feature extraction in the time and frequency domains has been used.

By observing the results reported in III the user can identify which model performs better for each metrics, at varying of the considered state-of-the-art datasets. Of course, the users can provide B-HAR with new datasets and configure the framework by following different workflow. In this way, B-HAR is proposed as a baseline framework for fairly comparing existing and new HAR approaches and easily identifying, via its grid search engine, the one that provides the best results, given the target dataset.

## V. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE EXTENSIONS

HAR based on inertial sensor data includes several processing steps that affect the quality of the achieved results. However, there is no a clear pipeline that shows the order in which such steps have to be applied. Thus, researchers might make elementary mistakes that affect the result quality. This article proposed B-HAR, a framework that facilitates the study of the behavior of the most famous pattern recognition models in the context of HAR. B-HAR allows the users defining elaboration pipelines, including different pre-processing steps, like noise removal, segmentation, feature extraction, normalization, feature selection, and balancing, in the right order, and it returns the evaluation metrics for eight state-of-the-art recognition models. This reduces the possibility of the incorrect usage of HAR methodologies and provides the

users with a baseline framework for fairly comparing the corresponding results.

Future work will regard the creation of a GUI, the extension of each sub-module with a larger set of state-of-the-art techniques, and the integration of new recognition and regression models. Finally, we plan to provide the users with the capability of inserting their models directly in B-HAR.

## REFERENCES

- [1] V. Bianchi, M. Bassoli, G. Lombardo, P. Fornacciari, M. Mordonini, and I. De Munari, "Iot wearable sensor and deep learning: An integrated approach for personalized human activity recognition in a smart home environment," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 8553–8562, 2019.
- [2] A. Poli, G. Cosoli, L. Scalise, and S. Spinsante, "Impact of wearable measurement properties and data quality on adls classification accuracy," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 2020.
- [3] F. Demrozi, G. Pravadelli, A. Bihorac, and P. Rashidi, "Human activity recognition using inertial, physiological and environmental sensors: A comprehensive survey," *IEEE Access*, pp. 1–1, 2020.
- [4] O. D. Lara and M. A. Labrador, "A survey on human activity recognition using wearable sensors," *IEEE communications surveys & tutorials*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 1192–1209, 2012.
- [5] E. Fullerton, B. Heller, and M. Munoz-Organero, "Recognizing human activity in free-living using multiple body-worn accelerometers," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 17, no. 16, pp. 5290–5297, 2017.
- [6] L. Pucci, E. Testi, E. Favarelli, and A. Giorgetti, "Human activities classification using biaxial seismic sensors," *IEEE Sensors Letters*, vol. 4, no. 10, pp. 1–4, 2020.
- [7] E. Gambi, G. Temperini, R. Galassi, L. Senigagliales, and A. De Santis, "Adl recognition through machine learning algorithms on iot air quality sensor dataset," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 20, no. 22, pp. 13 562–13 570, 2020.
- [8] J. Lu, X. Zheng, M. Sheng, J. Jin, and S. Yu, "Efficient human activity recognition using a single wearable sensor," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2020.
- [9] J. Donahue, L. Anne Hendricks, S. Guadarrama, M. Rohrbach, S. Venugopalan, K. Saenko, and T. Darrell, "Long-term recurrent convolutional networks for visual recognition and description," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2015, pp. 2625–2634.
- [10] C. P. Burgos, L. Gärtner, M. A. G. Ballester, J. Noailly, F. Stöcker, M. Schönfelder, T. Adams, and S. Tassani, "In-ear accelerometer-based sensor for gait classification," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 20, no. 21, pp. 12 895–12 902, 2020.
- [11] F. Demrozi, R. Bacchin, S. Tamburin, M. Cristani, and G. Pravadelli, "Towards a wearable system for predicting the freezing of gait in people affected by parkinson's disease," *IEEE journal of biomedical and health informatics*, 2019.

- [12] F. Demrozi, G. Pravadelli, P. J. Tighe, A. Bihorac, and P. Rashidi, "Joint distribution and transitions of pain and activity in critically ill patients," in *2020 42nd Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine Biology Society (EMBC)*, 2020, pp. 4534–4538.
- [13] E. Kanjo, E. M. Younis, and C. S. Ang, "Deep learning analysis of mobile physiological, environmental and location sensor data for emotion detection," *Information Fusion*, vol. 49, pp. 46–56, 2019.
- [14] J. R. Kwapisz, G. M. Weiss, and S. A. Moore, "Activity recognition using cell phone accelerometers," *ACM SigKDD Explorations Newsletter*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 74–82, 2011.
- [15] D. Roggen, A. Calatroni, M. Rossi, T. Holleczeck, K. Förster, G. Tröster, P. Lukowicz, D. Bannach, G. Pirkl, A. Ferscha *et al.*, "Collecting complex activity datasets in highly rich networked sensor environments," in *2010 Seventh international conference on networked sensing systems (INSS)*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 233–240.
- [16] M. Bachlin, M. Plotnik, D. Roggen, I. Maidan, J. M. Hausdorff, N. Giladi, and G. Troster, "Wearable assistant for parkinson's disease patients with the freezing of gait symptom," *IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 436–446, 2009.
- [17] A. Reiss and D. Stricker, "Introducing a new benchmarked dataset for activity monitoring," in *2012 16th International Symposium on Wearable Computers*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 108–109.
- [18] P. Zappi, T. Stiefmeier, E. Farella, D. Roggen, L. Benini, and G. Troster, "Activity recognition from on-body sensors by classifier fusion: sensor scalability and robustness," in *2007 3rd international conference on intelligent sensors, sensor networks and information*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 281–286.
- [19] D. Anguita, A. Ghio, L. Oneto, X. Parra, and J. L. Reyes-Ortiz, "A public domain dataset for human activity recognition using smartphones." in *Esann*, 2013.
- [20] M. Zhang and A. A. Sawchuk, "Usc-had: a daily activity dataset for ubiquitous activity recognition using wearable sensors," in *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Conference on Ubiquitous Computing*. ACM, 2012, pp. 1036–1043.
- [21] A. Stisen, H. Blunck, S. Bhattacharya, T. S. Prentow, M. B. Kjærgaard, A. Dey, T. Sonne, and M. M. Jensen, "Smart devices are different: Assessing and mitigating mobile sensing heterogeneities for activity recognition," in *Proceedings of the 13th ACM conference on embedded networked sensor systems*, 2015, pp. 127–140.
- [22] O. Banos, R. Garcia, J. A. Holgado-Terriza, M. Damas, H. Pomares, I. Rojas, A. Saez, and C. Villalonga, "mhealthroid: a novel framework for agile development of mobile health applications," in *International workshop on ambient assisted living*. Springer, 2014, pp. 91–98.
- [23] O. Baños, M. Damas, H. Pomares, I. Rojas, M. A. Tóth, and O. Amft, "A benchmark dataset to evaluate sensor displacement in activity recognition," in *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Conference on Ubiquitous Computing*. ACM, 2012, pp. 1026–1035.
- [24] J. W. Lockhart, G. M. Weiss, J. C. Xue, S. T. Gallagher, A. B. Grosner, and T. T. Pulickal, "Design considerations for the wisdm smart phone-based sensor mining architecture," in *Proceedings of the Fifth International Workshop on Knowledge Discovery from Sensor Data*, 2011, pp. 25–33.
- [25] C. M. Bishop, *Pattern recognition and machine learning*. springer, 2006.
- [26] P. M. Domingos, "A few useful things to know about machine learning," *Commun. acm*, vol. 55, no. 10, pp. 78–87, 2012.
- [27] B. Shickel, P. J. Tighe, A. Bihorac, and P. Rashidi, "Deep ehr: a survey of recent advances in deep learning techniques for electronic health record (ehr) analysis," *IEEE journal of biomedical and health informatics*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1589–1604, 2017.
- [28] G. Marcus, "Deep learning: A critical appraisal," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.00631*, 2018.
- [29] J. Brownlee, *Master Machine Learning Algorithms: discover how they work and implement them from scratch*. Machine Learning Mastery, 2016.
- [30] M. Shoaib, S. Bosch, O. D. Incel, H. Scholten, and P. J. Havinga, "A survey of online activity recognition using mobile phones," *Sensors*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 2059–2085, 2015.
- [31] P. Nardi, "Human activity recognition: Deep learning techniques for an upper body exercise classification system," 2019.
- [32] F. Ordóñez and D. Roggen, "Deep convolutional and lstm recurrent neural networks for multimodal wearable activity recognition," *Sensors*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. 115, 2016.
- [33] K. Li, R. Habre, H. Deng, R. Urman, J. Morrison, F. D. Gilliland, J. L. Ambite, D. Stripelis, Y.-Y. Chiang, Y. Lin *et al.*, "Applying multivariate segmentation methods to human activity recognition from wearable sensors' data," *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, vol. 7, no. 2, p. e11201, 2019.
- [34] Y. Zhu, J. Yu, F. Hu, Z. Li, and Z. Ling, "Human activity recognition via smart-belt in wireless body area networks," *International Journal of Distributed Sensor Networks*, vol. 15, no. 5, p. 1550147719849357, 2019.
- [35] G. Lemaître, F. Nogueira, and C. K. Aridas, "Imbalanced-learn: A python toolbox to tackle the curse of imbalanced datasets in machine learning," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 18, no. 17, pp. 1–5, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v18/16-365>
- [36] I. Pratama, A. E. Permanasari, I. Ardiyanto, and R. Indrayani, "A review of missing values handling methods on time-series data," in *2016 International Conference on Information Technology Systems and Innovation (ICITSI)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [37] "Sensormotion," <https://pypi.org/project/sensormotion/>, accessed: 2020-11-24.
- [38] M. Barandas, D. Folgado, L. Fernandes, S. Santos, M. Abreu, P. Bota, H. Liu, T. Schultz, and H. Gamboa, "Tsfel: Time series feature extraction library," *SoftwareX*, vol. 11, p. 100456, 2020.
- [39] G. Chandrashekar and F. Sahin, "A survey on feature selection methods," *Computers & Electrical Engineering*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 16–28, 2014.
- [40] H. He, Y. Bai, E. Garcia, and S. A. Li, "Adaptive synthetic sampling approach for imbalanced learning. iee international joint conference on neural networks. 2008," 2008.
- [41] D. M. Powers, "Evaluation: from precision, recall and f-measure to roc, informedness, markedness and correlation," –, 2011.
- [42] G. M. Weiss, K. Yoneda, and T. Hayajneh, "Smartphone and smartwatch-based biometrics using activities of daily living," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 133 190–133 202, 2019.
- [43] L. T. Nguyen, M. Zeng, P. Tague, and J. Zhang, "Recognizing new activities with limited training data," in *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Symposium on Wearable Computers*, 2015, pp. 67–74.
- [44] F. Demrozi, F. Chiarani, and G. Pravadelli, "A low-cost ble-based distance estimation, occupancy detection and counting system," in *ACM/IEEE DATE*, 2021.



**Florenc Demrozi**, PhD in computer science, IEEE member, received the B.S. and M.E. degrees in Computer Science and Engineering from the University of Verona, Italy, respectively in 2014 and 2016, and the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science from University of Verona, Italy, in 2020. He is currently a Postdoctoral researcher and Temporary Professor at the Department of Computer Science, University of Verona, Italy, where he is member of the ESD (Electronic Systems Design) Research Group, working on Ambient Intelligence (AmI), Ambient Assisted Living (AAL) and Internet of Things (IoT).



**Cristian Turetta**, received the B.S. and M.E. degrees in Computer Science and Engineering from the University of Verona, Italy, respectively in 2017 and 2020. He is currently a research fellow at the Department of Computer Science, University of Verona, Italy working on Ambient Assisted Living (AAL), Internet of Things (IoT) and IoT Security.



**Graziano Pravadelli**, PhD in computer science, IEEE senior member, IFIP 10.5 WG member, is full professor of information processing systems at the Computer Science Department of the University of Verona (Italy) since 2018. In 2007 he cofounded EDALab s.r.l., an SME working on the design of IoT-based monitoring systems. His main interests focus on system-level modeling, simulation and semi-formal verification of embedded systems, as well as on their application to develop IoT-based virtual coaching platforms for people with special needs.

In the previous contexts, he collaborated in several national and European projects and he published more than 120 papers in international conferences and journals.