

DeepPhys: Video-Based Physiological Measurement Using Convolutional Attention Networks

Supplemental Material III

Weixuan Chen¹ and Daniel McDuff²

¹Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts

²Microsoft Research, Redmond, Washington

March 2018

Implementation Details of Previous Methods

For comparison with our proposed approach, we implemented several state-of-the-art methods of video-based physiological measurement as faithfully as possible based on their original papers. Below are some details we feel worth mentioning in our implementations:

McDuff et al. [7]: The OpenFace [2] landmark tracker was used for facial region of interest segmentation. The whole face was segmented along the chin contour and around the top of the forehead. The pixels in the region of interest were spatially averaged to obtain the observation signals. The detrending parameter λ was fixed at 1000 and the bandpass filter thresholds at [0.7, 2.5] Hz, or [42, 150] BPM. The Jade implementation of ICA was used for signal decomposition. The blood volume pulse was selected as the source signal with the greatest power in the range [0.7, 2.5] Hz.

Estepp et al. [5]: The implementation was identical to that described above except the whole frame was used in the spatial averaging step (i.e., no face segmentation was applied).

Balakrishnan et al. [1]: The algorithm assumes that a normal adult’s resting pulse rate falls within [0.75, 2] Hz, or [45, 120] beats/min, so it applied a 5th order Butterworth filter with a passband of [0.75, 5] Hz to its output signals. However, some of the subjects in our four datasets have a slightly lower heart rate than 45 beats/min, so we used a passband of [0.7, 5] Hz instead in the filter.

De Haan et al. [6]: To minimize the impact of unintended motion, 500 consecutive pictures (25 seconds in time length) exhibiting the smallest amount of inter-frame motion were selected from their 60-second test windows to represent the whole sequences. However, in our experiments the test windows are 30 seconds in length. As selecting 25 seconds from 30-second windows made nearly no difference to the results, we omitted this step. Also, the paper says it applies a simple skin selection process after face detection, but does not give any details about the process. We used a widely adopted method [3] for skin selection in our implementation.

Table 1: Root mean square error (RMSE) and Pearson’s correlation coefficient (r) of heart rate and breathing rate measurement for RGB Video I. Participant dependent (p.-dep.) and participant independent results are shown, as are task independent results for the six tasks with varying levels of head rotation

HEART RATE Methods	Root Mean Square Error / BPM							Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Avg.	1	2	3	4	5	6	Avg.
Estepp et al. [5]	7.15	8.52	7.59	11.5	18.0	17.4	12.5	.802	.761	.807	.676	.312	.235	.564
McDuff et al. [7]	2.17	4.00	4.77	9.24	10.5	16.3	9.18	.981	.946	.919	.754	.692	.339	.741
Balakrishnan et al. [1]	10.6	12.0	18.5	22.3	23.3	18.5	18.2	.855	.838	.710	.738	.715	.818	.729
De Haan et al. [6]	10.2	9.83	10.1	11.2	15.4	17.9	12.8	.669	.726	.712	.681	.481	.392	.592
Wang et al. [10]	3.03	2.97	4.38	4.83	5.06	10.7	5.78	.964	.971	.933	.925	.917	.709	.891
Tulyakov et al. [9]	3.89	4.57	19.1	24.0	21.0	26.4	16.5	.945	.931	.070	.163	.236	-.004	.390
OURS: Part. Dep.														
Motion-only CNN	2.30	2.43	3.71	4.33	6.09	7.75	4.44	.979	.980	.949	.938	.872	.810	.921
Stacked CNN	2.75	2.76	3.59	3.76	5.55	7.48	4.31	.970	.974	.952	.954	.893	.824	.928
CAN	2.65	2.45	3.26	4.09	6.33	4.95	3.96	.973	.979	.960	.945	.863	.919	.940
OURS: Part. Ind.														
Motion-only CNN	2.39	2.81	3.89	4.67	8.50	12.2	5.75	.977	.973	.944	.929	.772	.598	.866
Stacked CNN	1.98	4.12	3.93	4.19	6.36	12.3	5.47	.984	.943	.942	.942	.866	.578	.876
CAN	2.46	2.88	3.63	4.47	6.69	11.4	5.25	.976	.972	.951	.934	.851	.638	.887
CAN (task 1)	2.46	9.34	9.97	11.3	14.0	17.6	10.8	.976	.746	.677	.637	.480	.162	.613
CAN (task 2)	1.96	2.82	4.48	7.37	13.5	16.8	7.82	.985	.994	.927	.833	.505	.247	.748
CAN (task 3)	2.44	2.62	3.63	4.86	7.73	14.4	5.95	.977	.976	.951	.921	.803	.459	.848
CAN (task 4)	1.99	3.46	3.69	4.47	7.71	14.6	5.98	.984	.959	.949	.934	.805	.462	.849
CAN (task 5)	2.17	2.61	3.61	3.66	6.69	13.0	5.28	.981	.977	.951	.956	.851	.552	.878
CAN (task 6)	2.09	2.33	3.34	3.58	5.84	11.4	4.75	.983	.982	.959	.958	.883	.638	.900
CAN (all tasks)	1.98	4.58	6.91	3.54	4.01	12.1	5.52	.985	.925	.852	.958	.939	.566	.871
BREATH. RATE														
Methods	Root Mean Square Error / BPM							Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Avg.	1	2	3	4	5	6	Avg.
Tarassenko et al. [8]	4.84	4.52	4.82	6.17	5.60	6.85	5.52	.363	.452	.299	.197	.192	.071	.294
OURS: Part. Dep.														
Motion-only CNN	3.51	4.15	5.07	4.73	4.78	6.17	4.74	.530	.458	.348	.482	.415	.197	.405
Stacked CNN	3.15	3.93	4.48	4.28	4.62	7.21	4.61	.594	.490	.422	.531	.489	.125	.442
CAN	3.10	3.77	5.29	4.84	4.95	6.01	4.66	.605	.516	.351	.452	.450	.237	.435
OURS: Part. Ind.														
Motion-only CNN	3.55	4.50	6.42	6.35	6.55	6.06	5.57	.559	.437	.274	.173	.098	.224	.294
Stacked CNN	3.93	4.11	7.34	7.34	7.99	7.49	6.37	.502	.529	.136	.031	-.014	.100	.214
CAN	3.15	3.70	6.68	6.52	5.65	6.54	5.37	.642	.602	.276	.221	.416	.109	.377
CAN (task 1)	3.14	3.73	8.54	9.25	8.08	5.82	6.43	.642	.612	.136	-.106	.112	.216	.269
CAN (task 2)	2.92	3.70	8.34	7.18	6.68	5.73	5.76	.692	.602	.124	.256	.160	.228	.344
CAN (task 3)	3.58	3.73	6.68	6.50	6.14	5.74	5.39	.556	.598	.276	.238	.357	.259	.381
CAN (task 4)	3.76	3.83	6.14	6.52	6.69	5.39	5.39	.530	.582	.286	.221	.132	.311	.344
CAN (task 5)	3.55	3.79	6.69	6.47	5.65	5.45	5.27	.566	.595	.251	.309	.416	.333	.411
CAN (task 6)	4.20	3.73	8.00	7.72	7.24	6.54	6.24	.430	.601	.190	.088	.095	.109	.252
CAN (all tasks)	3.50	6.97	5.58	4.09	7.04	5.30	5.41	.592	.331	.339	.516	.241	.385	.400

Tulyakov et al. [9]: The algorithm has five hyper-parameters ν , γ , μ , β and ρ . In the paper, the authors selected four of them by cross-validation on a subset of the MMSE-HR dataset and showed their great generalization ability. Thus we directly used the same settings ($\nu = 0.0357$, $\gamma = 0.01$, $\mu = 0.0011$ and $\beta = 0.005$) in our implementation. However, the authors do not mention how they selected ρ . After trying several different numbers, we chose $\rho = 0.05$ in all of our experiments. It is

Table 2: RGB Video II, MAHNOB-HCI and Infrared Video dataset results. (RMSE = Root Mean Square Error, r = Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient)

DATASET	RGB VIDEO II		MANHOB-HCI		DATASET	IR Video			
	Heart Rate		Heart Rate			Heart Rate		Breath. Rate	
Methods	RMSE	r	RMSE	r	Methods	RMSE	r	RMSE	r
	/BPM		/BPM			/BPM		/BPM	
Estepp et al. [5]	19.2	-.0541	-	-	Chen et al. [4]	2.75	.9682	0.89	.9740
McDuff et al. [7]	0.33	.9995	13.6	0.36	OURS: Part. Ind.				
Balakrishnan et al. [1]	16.3	.0530	21.0	0.11	Motion-only CNN	5.20	.8900	1.71	.9049
De Haan et al. [6]	0.39	.9993	6.52	0.82	Stacked CNN	2.87	.9635	0.33	.9966
Wang et al. [10]	0.33	.9996	-	-	CAN	1.91	.9844	0.31	.9970
Tulyakov et al. [9]	7.06	.7571	6.23	0.83					
OURS: Transfer Learning									
CAN	0.26	.9998	6.44	0.84					

also worth mentioning that the algorithm was only tuned and tested on the MMSE-HR dataset and the MAHNOB-HCI dataset, neither of which includes subjects with large head rotations. Nevertheless, in Task 3 to 6 of our RGB Video I dataset, every subject has significant levels of head rotation, which explains why Tulyakov et al. [9] performs badly on these tasks.

References

- [1] Guha Balakrishnan, Fredo Durand, and John Guttag. “Detecting pulse from head motions in video”. In: *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 3430–3437.
- [2] Tadas Baltrušaitis, Peter Robinson, and Louis-Philippe Morency. “Openface: an open source facial behavior analysis toolkit”. In: *IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–10.
- [3] Frédéric Bousefsaf, Choubeila Maaoui, and Alain Pruski. “Continuous wavelet filtering on webcam photoplethysmographic signals to remotely assess the instantaneous heart rate”. In: *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control* 8.6 (2013), pp. 568–574. ISSN: 17468094. DOI: 10.1016/j.bspc.2013.05.010.
- [4] Weixuan Chen, Javier Hernandez, and Rosalind W. Picard. “Non-contact physiological measurements from near-infrared video of the neck”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.09511* (2017).
- [5] Justin R Estepp, Ethan B Blackford, and Christopher M Meier. “Recovering pulse rate during motion artifact with a multi-imager array for non-contact imaging photoplethysmography”. In: *IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics (SMC)*. Vol. 940. IEEE, 2014, pp. 1462–1469.
- [6] Gerard de Haan and Vincent Jeanne. “Robust pulse rate from chrominance-based rPPG”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* 60.10 (2013), pp. 2878–2886.
- [7] D McDuff, S Gontarek, and RW Picard. “Improvements in Remote Cardio-Pulmonary Measurement Using a Five Band Digital Camera.” In: *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* 61.10 (2014), pp. 2593–2601.

- [8] L Tarassenko et al. “Non-contact video-based vital sign monitoring using ambient light and auto-regressive models”. In: *Physiological measurement* 35.5 (2014), p. 807.
- [9] Sergey Tulyakov et al. “Self-adaptive matrix completion for heart rate estimation from face videos under realistic conditions”. In: *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE. 2016, pp. 2396–2404.
- [10] Wenjin Wang et al. “Algorithmic principles of remote PPG”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* 64.7 (2017), pp. 1479–1491. DOI: 10.1109/TBME.2016.2609282.