1 LABELLING HUMAN KINEMATICS DATA USING CLASSIFICATION MODELS

2 February 18th, 2022

3 Machine Learning Classification models can produce highly accurate sensor labels for
4 motion data captured in the motion capture studio

5

6 Yuan Shi,¹ Nihir Chadderwala,² Ujjwal Ratan³

7 ¹ Amazon Web Services, Singapore, Singapore

8 ²Amazon Web Services, Dallas, TX, USA

9 ³Amazon Web Services, Seattle, WA, USA

10

11 **Conflict of Interest Disclosure:** None.

12

13 **Correspondence Address:**

14 Ujjwal Ratan

15 Amazon Web Services,

16 2205 7th Avenue,

17 Seattle, WA 98121

18 Phone: (206) 615-5400, Email: ujjwalr@amazon.com

19

20

21

22

23 **Abstract**

24 The goal of this study is to develop a classification model that can accurately and
 25 efficiently label human kinematics data. Kinematics data provides information about the
 26 movement of individuals by placing sensors on the human body and tracking their
 27 velocity, acceleration and position in three dimensions. These data points are available in
 28 C3D format that contains numerical data transformed from 3D data captured from the
 29 sensors. The data points can be used to analyse movements of injured patients or patients
 30 with physical disorders. To get an accurate view of the movements, the datasets generated
 31 by the sensors need to be properly labelled. Due to inconsistencies in the data capture
 32 process, there are instances where the markers have missing data or missing labels. The
 33 missing labels are a hindrance in motion analysis as it introduces noise and produces
 34 incomplete datapoints of sensor's positioning in 3 dimensional space. Labelling the data
 35 manually introduces substantial effort in the analysis process. In this paper, we will
 36 describe approaches to pre-process the kinematics data from its raw format and label the
 37 data points with missing markers using classification models.

38 **Keywords:** machine learning, c3d, biomechanics, classification model

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

Introduction

47 Biomechanics refer to the study of mechanical laws relating to the movement of living
 48 organisms.(1) When applied to humans and combined with kinematics, it helps us capture
 49 data which is used to infer a variety of human actions. For example, kinematics data is
 50 used to understand human's movements in each gesture, through providing quantitative
 51 data to evaluate each individual's flexibility(2). It is also used to analyse patients'
 52 movements to track their recovery and assist towards rehabilitation(3). Kinematics data is
 53 captured in dedicated labs setup as motion capture studios. In some cases, the sensor data
 54 may not be labelled completely. This can happen for a variety of reasons like the sensor
 55 not being attached securely or some sensors getting blocked from a camera from certain
 56 angles. This introduces noise and missing values in the dataset and poses a challenge for
 57 further analysis of this data. Capturing movements of these patients and labelling them
 58 can be very tedious and an expensive process. To solve this problem, we describe a
 59 method where we use the labelled data from these sensors for training a classification
 60 model that can then label the unlabelled sensor records with high accuracy, thereby
 61 reducing manual efforts.

62 The primary objective of this study is to use a classification model to label the sensor data
 63 corresponding to the mounted location on the human subject's body. We took the records
 64 with pre-labelled information and built classification models that would identify the right
 65 class (sensor label) for the unlabeled dataset. In this study, we firstly clean and
 66 standardize the raw C3D files through data transformation functions. We then use the
 67 processed data to train 4 different machine learning models to classify the sensor data
 68 points into one of the multi-class labels. Lastly, we evaluate the performance of the

models to auto generate labels with test dataset. Interpretation and future work is provided at the end of the paper.

Method

In this section, we go into the details of our method starting with describing the raw dataset, data processing and feature engineering, modelling approaches including the choice of algorithms and the evaluation methods.

Data Description

For the purposes of this study, we downloaded the raw data from CMU Graphics Lab Motion Capture Database in *C3D* format(4), which is a file format that has been widely used in Biomechanics, Animation and Gait Analysis laboratories to record synchronized 3d kinematics data. It contains information needed to read, display, and analyse 3d motion data and additional analog data from force plates, electromyography, accelerometers, and other sensors. The dataset contains numerical data extracted from sensors attached to the human body. It is composed of a list of time-series points. Each point is composed of x , y and z co-ordinates, time of capturing, frame number and the labeled location. The choice of number of sensors and locations mounted vary in each setting as it subjects to the purpose of specific biomedical study. For more details, readers can refer to CMU Graphics Lab Motion Capture Database (4) to visualize how the sensors are mounted on the human body to capture motion data.

The *C3D* dataset being captured can be converted into a standard dataframe (Table 1) using the *c3d* python library(5).

92 Table 1: C3D Sample File in DataFrame

time	x	y	z	cam	err	frame	point_label
1.0125	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	1	R_ASIS
1.0125	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	1	L_ASIS
1.0125	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	1	SACRUM
1.0125	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	1	R_THIGH_1
1.0125	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	1	R_THIGH_2

93 Note: This table captures the structure of a raw C3D file when its converted into a dataframe.

94

95 As shown in Table 1, a typical *C3D* dataset has 8 features, correspond to *time*, *x*, *y*, *z*,
96 *cam*, *err*, *frame* and *point_label*. Here, *time* refers to the capture time of the point starting
97 from 0, *x*, *y* and *z* correspond to captured location at *x*, *y* and *z* axis respectively. *cam*
98 suggests if there is any camera observing the sensor. To ensure accuracy of captured data,
99 it is required to ensure that at least one camera is observing a sensor at the indicated time.
100 Otherwise, the data point is advised to be removed from the dataset. *err* suggests whether
101 there is error in capturing the *3d* location at this frame, and *frame* refers to the time frame
102 of the current position with continuous integer starting from 1. *Point_labels* are the
103 labelled targets which indicate the location where the sensor is attached to.

104 In our experiment, we downloaded a collection of C3D files of *subject #26* provided by
105 Qualisys illustrating human gait(6). Among all the collections, we selected all the files
106 titled as hybrid walking motions, containing 5 C3D files in total.

107 Data Processing and Feature Engineering

108 Data processing is an important stage to prepare data for machine learning models. In
109 addition, data processing gives us a chance to gain insight into the data and perform
110 feature engineering. Using C3D python library (5), we were able to extract *x*, *y* and *z* co-
111 ordinates for each frame of the motion. We followed the following data processing steps :

- 112 1) Identify all missing values and convert them to NaN

113 An initial investigation of the dataset showed that all the missing values captured by
114 sensors have been recorded as 0. As column z has only positive data, while both x and y
115 can have negative, positive and 0 values, we used z as reference to identify missing
116 values and convert all the corresponding values from all axis to NaN if $z=0$.

117 2) Removal of missing values.

118 Removal of missing values includes:

119 a) removal of *sensors* which failed to capture locations with 50% or more
120 of the total frames. After applying the filtering criteria, we were left with 19 labels
121 among the initial 25 labels in total.

122 b) removal of *frames* with consecutive missingness >3 as too many
123 consecutive missingness will result in bad interpretation during data processing.

124 3) Interpolation

125 Polynomial interpolation was later carried out with sensors that contain missing
126 values. We chose polynomial interpolation with 3-degree as it is simple and is
127 still able to approximate complicated curves. As showed in the equation below,
128 we refer to $P(x)$ as the polynomial function with degree of 3.

$$L_{n,j}(x) = \prod_{k \neq j} \frac{x - x_k}{x_j - x_k}$$

$$P(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n=3} y_j L_{n,j}(x)$$

129 3) Feature Engineering

130 Feature engineering was conducted on the sensor data based on kinetic understanding.
 131 The sensors are attached to human body, each part of human body will move according to
 132 a specific trajectory, thus the spatial change of each sensor can be a good indicator of
 133 where the sensor is mounted on the human body. Based on this assumption, we included
 134 the following features in our training set:

135 1) Absolute location: x , y and z values directly generated from the device.

136 Here, t refers to the time point of measurement and x_t , y_t and z_t refer to
 137 the absolute position of respective axis at time t .

138 2) Relative location: the relative rank of each sensor at time point t . It is
 139 calculated through ranking each point x , y and z values among all the x , y
 140 and z at each time t accordingly. Let's take x for example.

$$141 \quad x_{tR} = \text{Rank}(x_t)$$

142
 143 3) Relative change (1-dimensional): the change to the current frame from
 144 previous i frame(s).

$$145 \quad x_{tRi} = x_t - x_{t-i}$$

146
 147 4) Relative change (3-dimenisonal): the change from previous frame to the
 148 current frame.

$$D_t = \sqrt{(x_{t_A} - x_{t-1_A})^2 + (y_{t_A} - y_{t-1_A})^2 + (z_{t_A} - z_{t-1_A})^2}$$

149 In the classification models, the raw data as absolute location (feature 1) plus time
 150 is used in our MLP base and LSTM models, while raw data and enhanced features
 151 1-4 are used in MLP and XGBoost classification.

After feature engineering, the first 4 files are connected together as training dataset and the file 5 is left as testing dataset.

Modelling Algorithms

Our goal of the experiment was to accurately classify the sensor data into one of the 19 sensor labels in our dataset. We assumed the point_label column as the target variable for this classification task. We selected multilayer perceptron (MLP) base model using scikit-learn, XGBoost and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks for this work.

Baseline Model with Multi-Layer Perceptron

We decided to use Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) as our base model (Figure 1) as they are good for both classification and regression problem and can work very well with tabular dataset.

Figure 1: Model topology of MLP baseline. In the basic model, we used raw kinematic data including time, frame, x, y and z as model input, with one hidden layer and output of 23 values corresponding to the 23 unique sensor labels.

MLPs are universal function approximators as shown by Cybenko's theorem(7), and it is a classical neural network where we have input layer, with one or more hidden layer and an output layer.

$$= \varphi(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i x_i + b) = (\quad + \quad)$$

Here, w denotes the vector of weights, x is the vector of inputs, b is the bias and φ refers to the non-linear activation function.

Training MLP involves multiple passes on the dataset while at the same time adjusting weights and biases in relation to the error with the goal of reducing the error. MLP model adjusts the weights and biases using a technique called backpropagation. During forward pass, our input vector passes through the input layer and activation function. The result is then compared with the ground truth value to calculate the error using a loss function. In the backward pass, we compute the gradients using stochastic gradient descent algorithm and adjust the weights and biases. Weights and biases are adjusted in order to reduce the error when making classification.

Enhanced MLP

On top of all the absolute features that we included in MLP baseline model, we further included enhanced features as mentioned in 2.2 data processing section.

As evident from the diagram (Figure 2), additional features are fed into the model as inputs. Features such as frame and time were removed for this model while new features such as changes of position in x , y and z from previous time point to current time point were added. Training the model using feature engineered data helped improve the model.

Figure 2: Model topology of MLP enhanced. In this enhanced model, we included features as introduced in method section while retaining model structure as baseline model.

200

201 XGBoost

202 XGBoost was initially proposed by *Chen and Guestrin* in 2016(8) and it
 203 implements machine learning algorithms under the Gradient Boosting
 204 framework(9). Specifically, XGBoost is a decision-tree-based ensemble machine
 205 learning algorithm based on optimized distributed gradient boosting library and is
 206 thus highly efficient, flexible and portable. We followed the default
 207 hyperparameters, except for *objective* being changed to *multi:softmax* and the
 208 *number_class* being changed to the corresponding 19 classes in the raw C3D
 209 dataset.

210 LSTM

211 Long short-term memory (LSTM) is an artificial recurrent neural network (RNN)
 212 architecture(10) with a LSTM unit composed of a cell, an input gate, an output gate and a
 213 forget gate. For the model topology (Table-2), a sequential model which is a linear stack
 214 of layers is used. the first layer is an LSTM layer with memory units and it returns
 215 sequence. A dropout layer is applied to avoid overfitting of the model; after that, a dense
 216 layer with activation algorithm of *relu* is added, followed by a dense layer with *softmax*
 217 function for classification.

218 For the hyperparameters, we set target to maximize *categorical_crossentropy*,
 219 with 80 epochs and batch size of 100.

220 Table 2: Model topology of LSTM

221	=====		
222	Layer (type)	Output Shape	Param #
223	=====		
224	lstm_2 (LSTM)	(None, 50)	10800
225	-----		
226	dropout_2 (Dropout)	(None, 50)	0

dense_3 (Dense)	(None, 128)	6528
dense_4 (Dense)	(None, 19)	2451
=====		
Total params: 19,779		
Trainable params: 19,779		
Non-trainable params: 0		

Model Evaluation Approach

F1 score

We are dealing with multi-class classification for a set of time-series data points and the purpose is to classify each set of data into one of the classes. The total dataset is randomly split into training and testing dataset with ratio of 0.8, 0.2. Evaluation is carried out on the testing dataset. As the data labels are not uniformly distributed, we chose the F1 score as the harmonic mean of the precision and recall.

$$F1\ score = 2 * \frac{precision * recall}{precision + recall}$$

$$accuracy = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{|G|} \sum_{x: g(x,y,z)} I(g(x,y,z) = \widehat{g})$$

Where *precision* (also called positive predictive value) is the fraction of true positive samples among the predicted true samples, while *recall* (also known as sensitivity) is the fraction of true positive samples among all the positive samples.

Confusion matrix

A confusion matrix is also known as an error matrix. It is a table layout that allows visualization of the performance of a supervised learning model. Each row of the matrix represents the instances in an actual class while each column represents the instances in a predicted class, or vice versa.

253 Results

254 Both training dataset and testing dataset were applied with the same data cleaning
255 strategies with polynomial interpolation and all the feature engineering as described in the
256 methodology. After that, we built four models with MLP baseline, MLP enhanced model,
257 XGBoost enhanced model and LSTM using training dataset. The performance was
258 measured on the testing dataset.

259 Model Accuracy

260 The Table 3 below showed performance (F1 score) of the four models with the same
261 testing dataset. As shown in the table, XGBoost showed highest performance with f1
262 score at 0.94, followed by MLP enhanced (F1 score=0.86), LSTM(F1 score=0.65) and
263 MLP baseline (F1 score=0.64).

264 Table 3: Performance comparison among 4 models

Model	Algorithm	Feature	F1 score
MLP baseline	MLP	absolute location, frame	0.64
MLP enhanced	MLP	absolute location, relative location, changes	0.86
XGboost enhanced	XGBoost	absolute location, relative location, changes	0.94
LSTM	LSTM	absolute location	0.66

265 *Note: This table captures the results of the various algorithms and models used in the evaluation with*
266 *their corresponding F1 scores.*

267 Confusion matrix to show agreement between truth and prediction from the model

268 As XGboost showed highest performance among all the 4 models, we chose predictions
269 from XGboost and use a confusion matrix to demonstrate the agreement between true
270 labels and model output (Figure 3). As illustrated by the side bar, lighter colors refer to
271 higher number while darker colors indicate lower number. In the confusion matrix, we
272 can observe that the matrix diagonal are in lighter color, suggesting high agreement
273 between true labels and predicted labels. Nevertheless, Mislabelling was observed,
274 especially more frequent between *R_HEEL* and *R_MT5*.

275 *Figure 3: Confusion matrix of true labels and predicted labels from model with XGBoost.*

276

277 Feature Importance

278 As XGboost showed highest accuracy among all the model, we further examined
279 the model by checking feature importance. As we can see in figure 4, it showed
280 that relative location of y together with z has the highest importance in the
281 modelling, followed by absolute position of z .

282 *Figure 4: Feature Importance from model with XGBoost.*

283

284 **Discussion**

285 Capturing human kinematics data requires mounting sensors to pre-defined positions on
286 different parts of the subject's body, which may lead to missing labels. In current motion
287 capture pipelines, manual validation and labelling is a time consuming and labour
288 intensive postprocessing step and may become a bottleneck for downstream analysis.
289 Prior to this, Holzreiter(11) used neural network to estimate the positions of sorted
290 markers from a shuffled set through pairing up the marker locations with the shuffled set
291 using the nearest neighbour search. Meyer *et al.*(12) estimated the skeletal configuration
292 by least-squares optimization and exploited the skeletal model to automatically label the
293 markers. Besides, Han *et al.*(13) proposed auto-labelling approaches specifically for
294 labelling hands' kinematics data through keypoint regression problem solved with
295 convolutional neural networks. In addition, Saeed *et al.*(14) used a data-driven approach
296 for automatic labelling through permutation estimation where shuffled markers are ranked
297 based on a pre-defined order.

298 While the previous work has no labelled data and tried to classify the kinematic data to
 299 different locations according to the temporal profile, our work targets to label kinematic
 300 data with missing labels. Specifically, the problem we are focusing on is the data quality
 301 of the captured data with majority of the data being labelled and a few missing data points
 302 due to technical errors. After effective feature engineering and modeling with 3 selected
 303 model algorithms, we are able to achieve decent classification outcome with F1-score over
 304 90%.

305 The list of features, model performance and feature importance will vary based on the
 306 type of motion being captured by the sensors. In this experiment, we used the motion data
 307 of a walking subject, on which over 20 sensors were mounted. Since the motion was
 308 horizontal, all sensors moved by similar distance along the x axis as the subject moved.
 309 As a result, the relative position of x did not contribute as much to differentiation of
 310 sensors, as compared to y and z axes, because the sensors were mounted at different
 311 heights on the subject's body. To apply the models to other movements, we need to retrain
 312 the model with least effort since the list of features, model performance and feature
 313 importance will vary based on the type of motions being captured by the sensors. We also
 314 noticed that appropriate feature engineering was essential to get higher accuracy. By
 315 using relative locations of the sensors along the x , y and z axes, we were able to improve
 316 the performance of the model by over 31% compared to the baseline model that used just
 317 the absolute locations of the sensors. This shows that relative location was the key factor
 318 in determining the appropriate sensors.

319 Conclusion

We tested different data transformation and machine learning algorithms to develop a multi-class classification model that can label kinematics data with high accuracy. It was also important to apply techniques on kinematics timeseries data as it helped us to improve the model. Calculating the 1-dimensional and 3-dimensional relative change to the frames helped with creation of new features. These techniques improved the model performance considerably. XGBoost model gave the best performance compared to the neural architecture models. The models can be used to accurately label the three-dimensional motion data which can provide insights into movements of a patient with injury or a patient with disability. Analyzing these movements can further help in either creating a recovery plan or an exoskeleton that can aid in recovery.

Reference

1. Hatze H. The meaning of the term biomechanics. J Biomech. 1974;7(12):189–190.
2. An K, EY C. Kinematic analysis of human movement. Ann Biomed Eng. 1984;12(6):585-97. doi: 10.1007/BF02371451. PMID: 6534225. Ann Biomed Eng. 1984;12(6):585–97.
3. Bahl JS, Nelson MJ, Taylor M, Solomon LB, Arnold JB, Thewlis D. Biomechanical changes and recovery of gait function after total hip arthroplasty for osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Osteoarthr Cartil. 2018;26(7):847–63.
4. CMU Graphics Lab Motion Capture Database [Internet]. Available from: <http://mocap.cs.cmu.edu/faqs.php>
5. Lab TEC. c3d 0.3.0 [Internet]. Python Library. Available from:

- 343 <https://pypi.org/project/c3d/>
- 344 6. C3D.ORG. No Title. p. <https://www.c3d.org/sampleddata.html>.
- 345 7. Cybenko G. Approximation by superpositions of a sigmoidal function. Math
346 Control Signals, Syst. 1989;2(4):303–314.
- 347 8. Chen T, Guestrin C. XGBoost: A scalable tree boosting system. In: Proceedings of
348 the ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data
349 Mining. 2016.
- 350 9. Friedman JH. Greedy Function Approximation: A Gradient Boosting Machine.
351 1999;
- 352 10. Schmidhuber SHJ. Long short-term memory. Neural Comput. 1997;9(8):1735–
353 1780.
- 354 11. Holzreiter S. Autolabeling 3D tracks using neural networks. Clin Biomech.
355 2005;20(1):1–8.
- 356 12. Meyer J, Kuderer M, Müller J, Burgard W. Online marker labeling for fully
357 automatic skeleton tracking in optical motion capture. 2014 IEEE Int Conf Robot
358 Autom. 2014;
- 359 13. HAN S, LIU B, WANG R, Ye Y, TWIGG CD, KIN K. Online Optical Marker-
360 based Hand Tracking with Deep Labels. ACM Trans Graph. 2018;37(4).
- 361 14. Ghorbani S, Etemad A, Troje N. Auto-labelling of Markers in Optical Motion
362 Capture by Permutation Learning. Comput Vis Pattern Recognit. 2019;167–78.

363

Confusion Matrix from XGboost