Human Emotion Recognition from Static Images CS771 Project







Problem Statement

- Our project is aimed at recognizing human emotions from static images
- We have approached it as a supervised classification problem to compare different existing standard techniques like SVM, Naive Bayes and KNN and compare their performance against Convolutional Neural Networks.
- Seven basic emotion classification categories are Happy, Surprise, Sadness, Anger, Disgust, Fear and Neutral

Prior Work

- We reviewed papers where similar kind of problems had been dealt with on different datasets using methods like SVM, Naive Bayes
- It compared the SVM accuracy on POFA dataset and showed that accuracy of 88.1% achievable using linear kernel for C-SVC formulation
- The studies reported accuracies upto 80% in person dependent results and 63% in person independent results in case of Naive Bayes Classifier



Dataset: SFEW 2.0 (from Static Facial Expression Recognition sub challenge)

Feature Generation: Google Cloud Vision API

Convolutional Neural Networks

Classification: Support Vector Machines

Naive Bayes

K- Nearest Neighbour

Improving Accuracy: Principal Component Analysis

Experimental Results

Accuracy using SVM: Linear Kernel:

Polynomial Kernel: 30-31 percent (C=3.0)

RBF Kernel:

23 percent (C=3.0)

39-40 percent (C=3.0)

- For any value of C, Linear Kernel always had highest accuracy

- C=3.0 gives best accuracy for Linear Kernel and RBF Kernel

Accuracy using Naive Bayes:

Accuracy using K-NN:

25 percent (K=6)

16 percent

Accuracy vs Degree of Kernel



Accuracy vs Parameter C in Linear Kernel



Accuracy vs Parameter C in RBF Kernel



Accuracy vs Number of Nearest Neighbour



Confusion Matrix

SVM

K-NN

r	Model 5.2									
0	117	2	11	21	33	25	14			
1	14	3	4	11	13	11	5			
2	19		27	5	21	16	18			
clas clas	32	3	6	118	27	16	6			
4	26	5	14	20	94	38	10			
5	31	2	6	22	43	78	12			
6	34	1	21	7	21	22	22			
	0	7	ې Pree	ۍ dicted c	⊄ lass	5	в			

Model 2.1									
0	77	14	17	32	30	33	20		
1	13	7	7	9	9	11	5		
2	6	3	43	9	12	15	18		
True class ω	41	11	19	66	29	24	18		
4	25	7	15	31	61	36	32		
5	44	9	23	16	22	62	18		
6	17	5	14	17	19	25	31		
	0	7	ې Pi	ۍ redicted clas	\$ SS	5	6		

<u>Results</u>

Bagged Trees(33.8) Linear Discriminant Analysis(42.1) Decision Trees (31)

Model 1.2										
0	99	2	10	33	34	29	16			
1	14	1	5	17	11	11	2			
2	22		25	15	13	19	12			
True class °	47	4	5	95	31	19	7			
4	36	2	7	34	84	34	10			
5	47	1	11	18	50	54	13			
6	32		6	16	28	23	23			
	0	7	ې Pi	ۍ redicted clas	⊄ SS	Ś	6			

	Model 10.3							
0	116	3	14	22	31	19	18	
1	21	2	2	6	16	11	3	
2	26	2	22	8	16	15	17	
3	33	4	6	122	23	17	3	
4	32	4	7	16	102	34	12	
5	35	3	3	21	36	82	14	
6	45	1	10	8	21	15	28	
l	0	7	ې 2	ۍ م hotol	8	5	6	



Lessons Learnt

Challenges associated with selecting a proper dataset and extracting features from a dataset

We need to extract better features as there is large training error for all different classifiers

During literature survey and also from experimental results, we realised that Convolutional Neural Networks generate features that can provide better accuracy using SVM and Naive Bayes.

Acknowledgement

We are really grateful to Prof Piyush Rai for providing us with this opportunity to explore machine learning. This project has been a really good learning experience in many aspects from working on non ML things like finding suitable dataset, extracting features using API's, writing scripts to clean the features obtained and then towards the ML stuff like implementing SVM and Naive Bayes and improving the accuracy through various methods.

We all are thankful to you all for coming here to listen to us.