



# Objective

• Human actions recognition under view changes.

### **Related work**

- Volumetric 3D reconstruction [Weinland et al. CVIU'06]
- Body part trajectories, projective geometry [Yilmaz and Shah ICCV'05], [Parameswaran and Chellapa IJCV'06]
- View-stable 2D trajectory features [Rao et al. IJCV'02].
- Projective geometry, no point correspondence [Wolf and Zomet IJCV'06].

## Problems

- 2D/3D posture recovery is a difficult and generally unsolved problem.
- Direct extension of multiple view geometry methods to human actions is difficult due to the hard cross-view correspondence problem.
- Pure learning approach is difficult due to the limited number of action samples in different views.

## Hypothesis

• View-invariance for non-rigid motion might be an easier problem compared to static scenes due to the additional time dimension.









# This paper

- Cross-view action recognition under weak assumptions:
- –Only one test view
- Different training view(s)
- No 2D/3D reconstruction
- No multi-view point correspondence
- Assuming bounding box person localization

# **CROSS-VIEW ACTION RECOGNITION FROM TEMPORAL SELF-SIMILARITIES**

# Imran Junejo, Emilie Dexter, Ivan Laptev, and Patrick Pérez

IRISA / INRIA Rennes, Campus universitaire de Beaulieu 35042 Rennes Cedex France



## **View Invariance Properties**







- eras





### Weizman dataset (single view)

- et al. ICCV'07]

# **IXMAS dataset (multi-view)**





# IRISA

### **Action Recognition Results**

### CMU MoCap dataset (multi-view)

• Projected tracks for 13 joints, 12 action classes • Simulated noise in joint tracking; six virtual cam-

					test views										
					cami	cam2	camo	cand	camb	camo	All				
	camo			ami	92.1	89.0	76.2	71.3	73.2	84.8	81.1				
			NS	came	87.2	92.7	83.5	72.6	64.6	78.7	79.9				
am3	cam2			ans	78.7	83.5	89.0	90.9	67.7	61.0	78.5				
		cam1	viev	cam <sup>A</sup>	78.0	75.6	88.4	90.9	72.6	63.4	78.2				
+			ning v	camb	81.1	73.8	76.8	83.5	95.7	80.5	81.9				
					86.0	88.4	73.8	76.2	78.0	91.5	82.3				
			rai	All	90.9	90.2	87.8	90.9	92.7	90.9	90.5				
	•		Ţ												
neels din	t iump	instroke	oot	ilact	inul	4ict	IN	walt	walktum	All					
0	96.8	29.2	100.0	97.2	64.6	96.3	100.0	99.6	68.8	90.5					

• 9 classes of actions, performed by 9 actors.

• NNC recognition accuracy 95.3% with SSM-pos and 94.6% with SSM-of-ofx-ofy-hog, compared to 92.6% [Ali

• Dataset: 5 different views, 11 action classes, performed 3 times by 10 actors.

te	est	vie	ws													
cam2	carn?		cama	d	ams	11										
77.6	69.4	1	70.3		44.8	67	1.2									
77.6	73.9	)	67.3		43.9	67	1.4	Г						All-to-	All	
70.6	73.0	5	63.6		53.6		65.0		hog					57.8%		
70.0 63.0			68.8		44.2	63	9	Γ	of					65.9%		
70.0 05.0				12					of+ofx+ofy			fy		66.5%		
38.8	51.8	3	34.2	(	<b>66.1</b> 45.2		5.2	F	of-	+hog				71.9%		
74.5	74.8	3	70.6		61.2	72.7		F	of-	+hog+ofx+ofy			72.7%			
		car	cam2			cam3		cam4		cam5						
This paper					76.4	77.6%			73.6	3.6% 68.8%		8%	66.1%	ĺ		
Weinland et al. 3D					65.4	70.0%			54.3% 6		66.	.0%	33.6%			
Weinland et al. 2D					55.2	63.5%			— 60.0%			.0%				
		na scratch	entread un at on a star and and				Wave	oundr	40t	SiCK-UR						
check-watch		83.3	0.0	0.7	1.3	0.7	1.3	8.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	4.0				
cross-arms		0.0	94.0	2.0	1.3	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.7				
scratch-head		0.0	0.0	68.7	2.0	9.3	2.0	1.3	4.7	10.0	2.0	0.0				
sit-down		0.7	4.7	3_3	55.3	1.3	20.0	3.3	0.7	10.7	0.0	0.0				
get-up		2.0	3.3	7_3	0.7	59.3	0.7	0.0	23.3	2.7	0.7	0.0				
A 107							the second se									
turn-	around	3.3	1.3	0_0	27.3	0.0	56.7	3.3	2.0	2.7	0.0	3.3				
turn-	around walk	3.3 10.0	1.3 0.7	0.0	27.3	0.0	<b>56.7</b> 2.7	3.3 68.7	2.0	2.7	0.0	3.3				