

Contents

List of Figures	xi
List of Tables	xiii
List of Symbols	xv
List of Abbreviations	xvii
Preface	xix
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Motivation of the Research Work	5
1.2 Contributions of the Thesis	6
1.3 Organization of the Thesis	8
2 Preliminaries and Related Work	11
2.1 Preliminaries	11
2.1.1 Smart home	11
2.1.2 Sensor modalities	13
2.1.3 Activities of daily living	15
2.2 Related Work	15
2.2.1 Detection of dementia at an early stage	16
2.2.2 Future ADL prediction	18
2.2.3 ADL recognition	20
2.2.4 Transfer learning for ADL recognition	24
2.3 Conclusion	25
3 Sensor Signals based Early Dementia Detection System using Travel Pattern Classification	29
3.1 Introduction	29

3.1.1	Motivation	31
3.1.2	Major contributions	31
3.2	Preliminary and Overview of the EDD System	32
3.2.1	Smart home	32
3.2.2	Travel pattern model for PwD	33
3.2.3	Overview of the EDD system	34
3.3	Early Dementia Detection System	34
3.3.1	Episode segmentation from sensor events	35
3.3.2	High-level features generation	36
3.3.3	Objective loss formulation	38
3.4	Experiments and Results	39
3.4.1	Datasets	40
3.4.2	Implementation details	41
3.4.3	Performance metrics	42
3.4.4	Baseline comparison	43
3.4.5	Results and discussion	44
3.4.6	Comparison with other approaches	48
3.5	Conclusion	50
4	Jointly Prediction of Activities, Locations, and Starting Times for Isolated Elderly People	53
4.1	Introduction	53
4.1.1	Motivation	55
4.1.2	Major contributions	56
4.2	Activities of Daily Living Prediction system	56
4.2.1	Role of different features	57
4.2.2	Network architecture	58
4.2.3	Objective loss formulation	58
4.3	Experiments and Results	63
4.3.1	Deployment schemes	63
4.3.2	Datasets	64
4.3.3	Implementation details	68
4.3.4	Performance metrics	68
4.3.5	Results and discussion	68
4.3.6	Comparison with other approaches	70
4.4	Conclusion	71

5	Real-time Activities of Daily Living Recognition under Long-Tailed Class Distribution	73
5.1	Introduction	73
5.1.1	Motivation	76
5.1.2	Major contributions	77
5.2	Preliminary and Overview of the ADLR System	78
5.2.1	Preliminary	78
5.2.2	Overview of the ADLR system	79
5.3	Activities of Daily Living Recognition System	79
5.3.1	Generating sliding windows from event stream	80
5.3.2	Generating hand-crafted features	81
5.3.3	Generating high-level features	83
5.3.4	Ensemble technique	88
5.3.5	Objective loss formulation	88
5.4	Experiments and Results	90
5.4.1	Datasets	91
5.4.2	Implementation details	92
5.4.3	Performance metrics	93
5.4.4	Models for ADLR system	94
5.4.5	Results and discussion	96
5.4.6	Comparison with other approaches	104
5.5	Conclusion	105
6	Deep Transfer Learning for Activities of Daily Living Recognition	107
6.1	Introduction	108
6.1.1	Major contributions	109
6.2	Preliminary and overview of TNADLR system	110
6.2.1	Preliminary	110
6.2.2	Problem definition	111
6.3	Transfer Network for Activities of Daily Living Recognition	112
6.3.1	Generating sliding windows from event stream	112
6.3.2	Features extraction	114
6.3.3	Classification	115
6.4	Experiments and Results	117
6.4.1	Datasets	118
6.4.2	Implementation details	118

6.4.3	Evaluation Design	119
6.4.4	Results and discussion	119
6.5	Conclusion	121
7	Conclusion and Future Work	123
	References	129
	List of Publications	143

List of Figures

1.1	Percentage of older adults in the world during 1950 and 2050 [1].	2
3.1	Illustration of classification of travel patterns in the EDD system.	30
3.2	Travel patterns: (a) Direct (b) Pacing (c) Lapping (d) Random.	34
3.3	EDD system to classify travel patterns, where m and n are number of nodes in a FC layer and nodes in a RNN unit, respectively.	35
3.4	Illustration of episode segmentation: part (a) depicts a direct episode and part (b) shows corresponding generated sensor events. Marks “■” and “●” are IR motion, and wide-area IR motion sensors, respectively.	37
3.5	Aruba smart home floor plan and sensor layout. Marks “■” and “●” are IR motion, and wide-area IR motion sensors, respectively.	40
4.1	Illustration of prediction of activity labels, locations, and starting times using the sequence of previous activities.	54
4.2	Overview of the proposed ADLP system.	55
4.3	Architecture of the ADLP system.	59
4.4	Illustration of different deployment schemes for label prediction (\mathbf{T}_1), location prediction (\mathbf{T}_2), and starting time prediction (\mathbf{T}_3), where symbol \oplus denotes sharing (integration) of models.	64
4.5	Smart home floor plan and sensor layout for collected dataset.	66
4.6	Performance (averaged over all datasets) under different schemes (MAE=Mean Absolute Error).	69
4.7	Impact of window size on performance of ADLP system.	70
5.1	Illustration of ADL dataset having long-tailed class distribution.	74
5.2	Illustration of recognition of ADL in the proposed system.	76
5.3	Architecture of the ADLR system, where k , f , m , n and v are number of sensors, filters, nodes in a FC layer, nodes in a GRU or LSTM unit, and the dimensions of the feature vector, respectively.	80

5.4	CASAS smart home floor plan and sensor layout for \mathbf{D}_5 . Marks “ \blacksquare ”, “ \bullet ”, and “ \blacktriangle ” are IR motion (\mathbf{S}_1), wide-area IR motion (\mathbf{S}_2), and magnetic sensors (\mathbf{S}_3), respectively.	91
5.5	Illustration of the impact of window size (part (a)) and λ (part (b)) on the performance of the ADLR system.	98
5.6	Performance comparison among three loss functions on \mathbf{D}_1 - \mathbf{D}_5 datasets, where \mathbf{P}_1 denotes overall activity classification accuracy.	99
6.1	Architecture of the TNADLR, where m and n are number of nodes in a FC layer, and nodes in a LSTM unit, respectively.	112

List of Tables

2.1	Comparative summary of some of the existing work on human activity recognition, where \mathbf{W} , \mathbf{V} , \mathbf{E} , \mathbf{Hc} and \mathbf{Hi} indicate wearable sensors, video sensors, environmental sensors, hand-crafted features, and high-level features, respectively.	21
3.1	Summary of the datasets used in the EDD system.	41
3.2	Comparison of different architectures for travel pattern classification using \mathbf{D}_1 dataset.	45
3.3	Comparison of different RNN variants for travel pattern classification using \mathbf{D}_1 dataset.	47
3.4	Comparison with other approaches, where \mathbf{C} , \mathbf{D} , \mathbf{P} , \mathbf{R} , \mathbf{S} , F_1 , and \mathbf{A} , denote classifier, dataset, precision, recall, specificity, F_1 score, and accuracy, respectively.	49
3.5	Confusion matrix for EDD system datasets.	50
3.6	Confusion matrix for difference between EDD and existing work [2]. . .	50
4.1	Illustration of used sensors with their description.	65
4.2	Comparison of proposed approach (\mathbf{S}_5) with existing approaches for predictions of activity, location, and starting time.	70
5.1	The summary of CASAS smart home datasets.	92
5.2	Comparison of the architectures of different models.	96
5.3	Performance comparison among \mathbf{M}_1 - \mathbf{M}_{13} models for ADL recognition on \mathbf{D}_1 - \mathbf{D}_5 datasets, where \mathbf{P}_1 , \mathbf{P}_2 , \mathbf{P}_3 , and \mathbf{Q} denote overall activity classification accuracy, predefined activity classification accuracy, F1-score, and average \mathbf{P}_1 of all the datasets, respectively.	100

5.4	Comparison with the traditional ensemble approaches using \mathbf{M}_{12} model, where \mathbf{P}_1 , \mathbf{P}_2 , \mathbf{P}_3 , and \mathbf{Q} denote overall activity classification accuracy, predefined activity classification accuracy, F1-score, and average \mathbf{P}_1 of all the datasets, respectively.	102
5.5	Time and space requirements of models on \mathbf{D}_1 dataset.	103
5.6	Confusion matrix for the ADLR system recognizes on \mathbf{D}_1 dataset. Each cell consists of $\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ (b) \end{smallmatrix}$, where a and b denote the recognized activity in number and percentage, respectively. The \bullet indicates $a = 0$ and $b = 0$	104
5.7	Comparison of the proposed system (\mathbf{M}_{12}) with other approaches on the CASAS datasets, where \mathbf{P}_1 and \mathbf{P}_3 denote overall activity classification accuracy and F1-score, respectively.	105
6.1	Transfer between \mathbf{D}_1 and \mathbf{D}_2 datasets.	120