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Tuan Hue Thi\textsuperscript{1}, Li Cheng\textsuperscript{2}, Jian Zhang\textsuperscript{1}, Li Wang\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1}National ICT of Australia (NICTA) & University of New South Wales, 2032, NSW, Australia
\textsuperscript{2}Toyota Technological Institute at Chicago, 60637, Illinois, USA
\textsuperscript{3}Southeast University, Nanjing, 210096, China

ABSTRACT

We develop a robust technique to find similar matches of human actions in video. Given a query video, Motion History Images (MHI) are constructed for consecutive keyframes. This is followed by dividing the MHI into local Motion-Shape regions, which allows us to analyze the action as a set of sparse space-time patches in 3D. Inspired by the idea of Generalized Hough Transform, we develop the Implicit Motion-Shape Model that allows the integration of these local patches to describe the dynamic characteristics of the query action. In the same way we retrieve motion segments from video candidates, then project them onto the Hough Space built by the query model. This produces the matching score by running Parzen window density estimation under different scales. Empirical experiments on popular datasets demonstrate the efficiency of this approach, where highly accurate matches are returned within acceptable processing time.

Index Terms—Action Matching, Implicit Motion-Shape Model, Motion History Image, Generalized Hough Transform

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider the problem of finding similar matches of human actions, an important yet challenging task in automatic analysis and retrieval of video content.

Motion History Image (MHI), developed by Bradski and Davis \cite{1}, is an effective technique in combining the motion characteristics over consecutive time interval. In fact, many techniques have adopted this silhouette-based concept to extract the motion regions for each video, and use the obtained motion field as a 2D shape for recognition \cite{1, 2, 3, 4, 8}. Despite the fact that these approaches are quite fast and simple, they are heavily dependent on how good the motion extraction, and are sensitive to motion noises.

Recent works \cite{7, 9, 11, 12, 13} have focused on using local space time features to detect salient motion regions in video, and using scale-invariant local descriptors to capture the video content. The detected points are then fed into a trained classifier to infer the matching possibility of unknown data. These works rely on the intensive analysis of sparse regions, which focuses mainly on how to derive the characteristics of each common part of the action model and use them to differentiate between different actions, under different forms of integral optimization \cite{11, 12}. In these approaches, the entity of each separate part is well defined, but the global structure is often neglected. This generally makes them vulnerable under circumstances when the core parts cannot be detected (occluded or weakly distinctive), or when actions having similar elements but totally different behaviors.

Our main contribution in this work is the development of a nonparametric model for action matching, which integrates local scale-invariant motion features (using Histogram of Oriented Gradients and clustered description on MHI) with global implicit structure of the action (implemented as the Hough Space projection). We developed a complete video search system based on the proposed matching algorithm, which performs competitively to the state-of-the-arts on standard testbeds such as KTH \cite{12} and Weizmann \cite{3} datasets.

2. MOTION-SHAPE FEATURES FOR VIDEO

Human action in our perspective is represented as a sparse set of local \textit{Motion-Shape} features. Those are the selective patches detected at different scale from the Motion History Image (MHI), each contains information about the motion field and the shape of the actor, hence we loosely use the term \textit{Motion-Shape} to describe. By analyzing these local attributes and their global configuration, we can conceptually articulate the behavior of the formulated action. Figure 1 describes our feature extraction algorithm. From the query video 1(a), we compute a collection of MHIs following \cite{1}. For each MHI, there will be detected the dominant motion region and its center point (white rectangle and circle in Figure 1(b)). This motion blob and its center are used as references for \textit{Motion-Shape} searching. In our design, we call those center points \textit{Local Action Centers}, as opposed to \textit{Global Action Center}, the mean position of all \textit{Local Action Centers} in each video.

Sliding the window search at different scales in Figure 1(c) will help to produce a collection of \textit{Motion-Shapes}, drawn as the thin colored circles. Each \textit{Motion-Shape} is
defined by its relative position \((x, y, t)\) to the Action Centers. Since each Motion-Shape by its nature is a motion field, we easily compute the Histogram of Oriented Gradients (HOG), and also the orientation \(\omega\) of the most dominant gradient in each patch. Using HOG values obtained from each patch, we cluster the patches into different representative group, each defined by a cluster identification number \(c\). Figure 1(c) shows the cluster id of Motion-Shape circles using different colors. At this stage, a video shot is genuinely decomposed into a set of Motion-Shapes \(m(x, y, t, c, \omega)\), which will be encoded into our model, described in the next section.

3. IMPLICIT MOTION-SHAPE MODEL

In order to produce a generic design for modeling the human action, we extend the Generalized Hough Transform [1] technique to detect the 3D action structure formed by different distinctive Motion-Shapes. Using Global Action Center as the reference point in our 3D structure, we build a Hough Space to quantitatively represent the relative position of all Motion-Shapes in the action model, illustrated as the Lookup Table in Figure 1(d). In that coordinate system, each Motion-Shape is indexed by a key pair \(I = (c, \omega)\) consisting of its cluster id \(c\) and gradient orientation id \(\omega\). The 3-tuple entries \((x, y, t)\) in the Lookup Table are filled by those Motion-Shapes attributes extracted from the model video based on index key value.

Providing this Hough Space, the action matching task now becomes projecting the Motion-Shapes collected from video candidate to this space, matching value will be calculated as how well those projected points fit in the model. Figure 2 illustrates the main steps of the matching task, starting with the MHI construction (Figure 2(a)) to calculate new Motion-Shapes in 2(b). Using the filled Model Hough Space (top left of 2(b)), a particular Motion-Shape \(m_o\) (circled in white) will use its index key \((c_o, \omega_o)\) to find its corresponding entries in the Lookup Table. In this example, at its located index, there are 5 records about the relative position of the model reference point (Model Action Center) and will all be considered as possible locations for the new Action Center of this video. The search for this new Action Center will help to determine how well this video action matches the model action. Formally, with each hypothesis about Action Center position \(\gamma\), we can factor the marginalization probability \(p(\gamma|m, I)\) using Motion-Shape evidence \(c\) and its location \(I = (c, \omega)\) based on the pair index \(I = (c, \omega)\), this factorization is adopted from 2D Object Recognition work of Leibe et al. [10]

\[
p(\gamma|e, l) = \sum_I p(\gamma|e, I, l)p(I|e, l) \quad (1)
\]

\[
p(\gamma|I, l) = \sum_I p(\gamma|I, l)p(I|e) \quad (2)
\]

In our case, \(p(I|e)\) is simply the calculation of \((c, \omega)\) from detected Motion-Shapes, and \(p(\gamma|I, l)\) is the retrieval of Action Center location \(l\) using index key \(I\). The quantitative matching score of an unknown motion compared to the action model is then defined as the summation of all Motion-Shape entities and Action Center locations

\[
score(\gamma) = \sum_k \sum_j p(\gamma_j|e_k, l_k) \quad (3)
\]

In our design, we run mean-shift Parzen window density estimation to find the Model Fitting Region, which is the pro-
jected region that has the highest density of voted Action Centers (Figure 2(c)). In our model, we adopt two kinds of reference points, Global Action Center and Averaging Local Action Centers. While the former runs 3D volume density searches using 3-tuple \((x, y, t)\) location of a Global Action Center, the latter runs 2D area searches using 2-tuple \((x, y)\) location of all Local Action Centers on multiple MHs and the average of all best matching will be used. We will discuss the effects of these two referencing systems in section 4.

The search criteria for mean-shift is the ratio \(r\) of vote counts on searching region. Matching score can then be interpreted in different ways using this ratio. In our video search system (described in the next section), we rank video relevancy based on this ratio in ascending order, best match has the highest \(r\). Using the Model Fitting Region we also backtrack all Motion-Shapes that contribute votes to this region and consider them as the detected action region, as an attempt to Action Segmentation task (Figure 2(d)), however, we do not formally analyze this part in the scope of this paper.

4. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We developed a complete video search system based on the proposed action matching algorithm, Figure 4 shows a snapshot of its user interface. On the left panel, the Query Video is loaded and processed to generate the codebook dictionary of Motion-Shapes (in this particular query, there are 289 clusters obtained); also a Segmentation thumbnail is generated to illustrate the relative position of the nominated Action Center. The right panel shows the video from the database that have high matches with the query video. There are three different views for each match (Original, Motion-Shapes, or Segmentation). The results are ordered according to the matching score \(r\) and the relative matching correspondence is implied by the yellow square Model Fitting Regions.

In order to attain a thorough evaluation of our technique, we use this Video Search system to run the tests on the two datasets KTH [12] (2400 video shots of 6 actions) and Weizmann [3] (92 video shots of 10 actions). The common benchmark train/test amount for these two datasets is 2/3 Split on KTH, 16 persons for training and 9 persons for testing, and leave-one-out on Weizmann, 8 persons for training and 1 person for testing. Since we are carrying out searching task, we only need one training sample per query. Therefore, in order to produce fair comparison with reported works, we do a random selection (with equal samples of each action) of the search queries, and run the search on the same testing amount.

In our evaluation process, we are also interested in understanding the accuracy-time tradeoff relationship and view change sensitivity. We conduct three independent test runs based on three principal methods, namely, Global.Mirrored, Local.Mirrored, and Local.NonMirrored. The first term indicates whether the Global or average of Local Action Centers is used as reference point, the second term specifies if the search is mirrored in left-right direction, that is, each video candidate will be flipped horizontally to generate a mirror of itself, the test is then done on both instances, and the maximum matching score is used. Empirical results show that on average, the Global search requires double the processing time of Local search, while the Mirrored algorithm is 1.5 times slower than NonMirrored. Figure 3 summarizes the performance of three techniques on KTH and Weizmann using the Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve.

Tests on Weizmann dataset generally return better results than KTH, which is quite reasonable since the backgrounds in Weizmann are static, while the cameras in KTH are not stable. It is also shown that using Global Action Center as a reference for 3D point cloud search does yield better result than averaging individual 2D Local Action Centers. The performance decline in two NonMirrored techniques does imply that our technique is sensitive to view change, which is expected since we rely on the motion field shape to analyze action behavior, this drawback can be overcome with Mirrored method, sacrificing an overhead portion of processing time.

The black straight line in Figure 3 is called Cut-off Line which connects the two ends of True Positive Rate \([0, 1]\) and True Negative Rate \([1, 0]\), intersections of this line with ROC curves are called Cut-off points (represented as black circles), indicating the position where Sensitivity is equal to Specificity, and we use those points to analyze the average performance of our system specific for each action and as compared to other reported works on KTH and Weizmann. The performance of Global.Mirrored are elaborated as per action at Cut-off points using the Confusion Matrix with normalized sum on each row and column, as shown in Figure 5.

Using the average accuracy, we also conduct a comparison survey between our methods and reported state-of-the-art action recognition approaches, as shown in Table 4. Interestingly, while other works seem to work well for either one of the datasets, our system performs equally well, having the second best classification score on both KTH and Weizmann.
Fig. 4. Video Search GUI for Example using KTH boxing Action: Left Panel shows the loaded Query Video with nominated Action Centers. Right Panel displays the Best Matches returned, ranked using ratio \( r \) of vote counts in Fitting Regions.

(a) KTH 92.17%  
(b) Weizmann 98.9%

Fig. 5. Matching Results based on Action Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>KTH</th>
<th>Weizmann</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global.Mirrored</td>
<td>92.17</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local.Mirrored</td>
<td>85.93</td>
<td>94.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local.NonMirrored</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>85.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuld et al. [12]</td>
<td>71.70</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke et al. [8]</td>
<td>80.90</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niebles et al. [11]</td>
<td>81.50</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiang et al. [6]</td>
<td>84.40</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathi and Mori [2]</td>
<td>90.50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhuang et al. [5]</td>
<td>91.70</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang and Mori [14]</td>
<td>91.17</td>
<td>98.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptev et al. [9]</td>
<td>91.80</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundmann et al. [4]</td>
<td>93.52</td>
<td>96.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Comparison with state-of-the-art
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5. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTION

We tackled the problem of action matching in videos using a nonparametric approach generalized from the Hough Transform algorithm. Dictating a query video by its structured motion fields, we have successfully integrated local invariant motion features with global action configuration. Our system does not rely on any particular model parameter, hence makes it highly dynamic and generative. Ongoing work is improving the current system performance to realtime, producing a complete visual-based system for video search.