

Multi Sensor-based Implicit User Identification

Muhammad Ahmad, Ali Kashif Bashir, Adil Mehmood Khan, Manuel Mazzara, Salvatore Distefano, Shahzad Sarfraz

Abstract—Smartphones have ubiquitously integrated into our home and work environments, however, users normally rely on explicit but inefficient identification processes in a controlled environment. Therefore, when a device is stolen, a thief can have access to the owner’s personal information and services against the stored passwords. As a result of this potential scenario, this work proposes an automatic legitimate user identification system based on gait biometrics extracted from user walking patterns captured by a smartphone. A set of preprocessing schemes is applied to calibrate noisy and invalid samples and augment the gait-induced time and frequency domain features, then further optimized using a non-linear unsupervised feature selection method. The selected features create an underlying gait biometric representation able to discriminate among individuals and identify them uniquely. Different classifiers (i.e. Support Vector Machine (SVM), K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN), Bagging, and Extreme Learning Machine (ELM)) are adopted to achieve accurate legitimate user identification. Extensive experiments on a group of 16 individuals in an indoor environment show the effectiveness of the proposed solution: with 5 to 70 samples per window, KNN and bagging classifiers achieve 87–99% accuracy, 82–98% for ELM, and 81–94% for SVM. The proposed pipeline achieves a 100% true positive and 0% false-negative rate for almost all classifiers.

Index Terms—Sensors, Smartphone, Legitimate User Identification, Artificial Intelligence.

I. INTRODUCTION

RECENTLY, the smartphone users exponentially increased to 3 billion and are expected to further grow by several hundred million in coming years¹. Boosted by information and communication technologies (ICT), mobile, and personal devices are becoming a more and more powerful and thus trustworthy inseparable companion of our lives. Our cyber alter egos often store sensitive personal information such as photos, videos, bank account, credit, and debit card details, as well as cookies, passwords, and personal data managed by Internet applications. Such information should be kept confidential and not disclosed, preserving the smartphone from unauthorized accesses [1]. Robust and reliable user identi-

fication methods can be an effective solution for achieving smartphone security [2].

Considering that each individual has their own walking pattern, a gait (user walking) based identification mechanism has been proposed in [3], [4] using built-in sensors such as accelerometer and linear accelerometer. Gait-based legitimate user identification has more advantages than limits, including but not limited to unobtrusiveness, passive, implicit, concurrent, and continuous observability. However, the main advantage is the cost-effectiveness, exploiting built-in sensors without any additional hardware required for the identification, just walking with the smartphone. Furthermore, gait-based legitimate user identification avoids identification processing and delays during login by continuously operating in the background while the user is walking. It is also hard to violate since an attacker needs to exactly reproduce the smartphone owner’s gait, which depends on their silhouette and activity, captured by several-different sensors. Gait-based legitimate user identification can also be used as one of the security levels in *multilevel security systems* [5] combining gait patterns with other security info in crime analysis.

In recent years, several identification approaches have been proposed leveraging smartphone’s sensors such as [6], [7], [8], [9]. For instance, [10], [11] presented a method for continuous user identification implicitly. Explicit identification is performed only when there is important evidence of change in the user activity, which is not a real-life scenario in many cases. A method to directly compute the distance between pattern traces using the dynamic time warping algorithm is presented in [12]. Sae, et.al., [13] presents 22 special touch patterns for user identification, most of which involve all five fingers simultaneously. The work [14] studied the correlation between 22 analytic features from touch traces and classified them using k-nearest neighbors and support vector machines.

Moreover, the idea behind the behavior-based model is that the person’s habits are a set of attributes; therefore, each activity (event) correlates with two fundamental attributes: time and space. For instance, the works [15], [16], utilizes the user calls, schedules, GNSS, device battery level, user applications, and sensors for identification. The works [17], [18], [19], [20] proposed a multi-model-based continuous user identification. Whereas, the work [21] put forward another unique implicit user identification framework by using recorded phone call history and location for continuous user identification.

The above-discussed works present several propositions, but to some extent, all these required additional information and source for user identification. Several works have been proposed to overcome these propositions, such as [43] presented a gait-based user identification over biometric unobtrusive pattern. A geometric concept of a convex hull was utilized

M. Ahmad and S. Sarfraz are with the Department of Computer Science, National University of Computer and Emerging Sciences, Islamabad, Chiniot-Faisalabad Campus, Chiniot 35400, Pakistan. e-mail: (mahmad00@gmail.com).

A. K. Bashir is with the Department of Computing and Mathematics, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, United Kingdom.

A.M. Khan is with Machine Learning & Knowledge Representation (MIKR) lab, Institute of Data Science & AI, Innopolis University, Innopolis, 420500, Russia.

M. Mazzara is with the Institute of Software Development and Engineering, Innopolis University, Innopolis, 420500, Russia.

S. Distefano is with Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica—MIFT, University of Messina, Messina, 98121, Italy.

Manuscript received September 2020.

¹Statista: www.statista.com

TABLE I: Summary of related work.

Reference	Features	Methods
Ahmad [1]	Time Domain	SVM and KNN
Ahmad [4]	Time and Frequency	Decision Tree, KNN, SVM
Ahmad [22]	Time and Frequency	Extreme Learning Machine
Hughes [23]		Genetic Programming
Derawi [24]	Magnitude of the acceleration Weighted moving average filter, cycle detection, Manhattan distance	SVM
Davidson [25]	Gait, Time and Frequency	KNN and Random Forest
Kobayashi [26]	Cross-correlations of Fourier transform	Nearest means in Fisher discriminant space and majority voting
Thang [27]	Time and Frequency	Gait templates, DTW, SVM
Wolff [28]	Variance in acceleration and orientation across x, y, z	Gaussian distribution model
Juefei-Xu [29]	Accelerometer and gyroscope data	SVM and a time frequency spectrogram and a cyclo-stationary model
S. Sprager [30]	Acceleration	SVM
Pan [31]	Extrema in acceleration	Difference-of-Gaussian and KNN
Kwapisz [32]	Time domain	J48 and ANN
Lin [33]	Spectral energy diagrams of pitch, roll, acceleration x, y, z	$\alpha\beta$ filtering, Empirical Mode Decomposition, Fourier Transform, Linear Discriminant Analysis
Lu [34]	Time and Frequency	Gaussian Mixture Model and Universal Background Model
Johnston [35]	Time and Frequency	MLP, Nivie Bayer, Random Forest
Trivino [36]	Acceleration	FFSM and linguistic model
Wang [37]	Domain specific	DTW distance
Rong [38]	Acceleration	DTW
Ailisto [39]	Averaged x and z signals	Correlation, Template Matching
Bachlin [40]	FFT coefficients	FFT and ANOVA
Hoang [41]	Magnitude of the acceleration forces acting x, y, z	Gait template matching
Nickel [42]	Mel and Bark frequency cepstral coefficients	SVM

in 4-layered architecture. One of the major limitations is non-user-friendliness, e.g., only works in specific and controlled environments. The works [18], [44], [45], [46], [47], [48] utilized portable devices based on gait signals acquired with a 3-dimensional accelerometer, where the accelerometer was put on the user's belt only at the back. Whereby, [18] proposed a 3-fold method based on data distribution statistics, correlation, and frequency domain features for user identification while the individuals are intentionally asked to walk with different speeds such as slow, normal, and fast. Mantyjarvi's work is novel but the major drawback is its limitations to not only walked by the same user but with very limited variations.

Despite the success of the gait-based systems demonstrated by a relevant number of existing solutions, summarized above as well as in Table I, there is still room for improving this approach, strongly depending on factors like physical changes i.e., aging, weight loss or gain, injury, shoes, clothes, carrying objects, orientation, and placement, walking surface, psychological states of an individual, stimulants, etc. All these factors significantly reduce the effectiveness of the gait-based system in real scenarios.

Considering the aforementioned scenarios, this work proposes a novel, non-intrusive, and automatic legitimate user identification system exploiting built-in smartphone motion dynamics captured by four different sensors namely, Accelerometer (AC), Linear Accelerometer (LAC), Gyroscope (GY), and Magnetometer (MM) sensors, able to overcome the limitations of existing solutions. To test the system, we first collect raw data from 16 individuals walking with the smartphone freely placed in one of their pants pockets (*front left, front right, back left, and back right*), then extracting relevant features from the raw data. To reduce the redundancy

among such features a non-linear Extended Sammon Mapping Projection (ESMP) feature selection method is adopted, thus resulting in an underlying representation for the gait characteristics able to uniquely identify individuals. Finally, several machine learning classifiers e.g., SVM, KNN, Bagging, and ELM are implemented and compared to show the effectiveness-accuracy of the proposed gait-based legitimate user identification. In a nutshell, the following points are added in this research as compared to the previous works.

- 1) Previous works only considered an activity/sub-activity-based user identification, however, our current research aims to propose a semi-controlled environment system in which we overcome the limitations of users' jeans style (loose or tight) and walking style (we intentionally asked users to walk differently in various times to investigate the ambulatory activity performed by each user). In this regard, our current work aims to investigate several research questions relevant to building a walking-based legitimate user identification system in real-life:
 - How to achieve real-time user identification in practice? Since our goal is to develop an algorithm that identifies the user in real-time, thus computation complexity is extremely important. System performance measurements ought to be considered to balance the trade-off between accuracy and computational cost.
 - Does the data variation affect the performance of the LUI process?
 - Does the Extended Sammon Mapping Projection (ESMP), a non-linear unsupervised feature selection method improve the identification accuracy more

than the other existing and well-studied unsupervised feature selection methods such as Principal Component Analysis (PCA)? It is a known fact that the output of the smartphone sensor depends on the position of the smartphone while walking. This could result in a high within-class variance. Therefore, it is desirable to improve both the discriminatory power and achieve dimensionality reduction, by employing an optimum method. The advantages of the feature selection process are to avoid the curse of dimensionality, as well as to reduce the abundant, irrelevant, misleading, and noisy features, but above all, to be able to reduce the system's running cost pertaining to real-time applications. In addition to the above, effective feature selection can increase the accuracy of the resulting model.

- Does kernel-based Extreme Learning Machine (KELM) an effective classifier for the non-linear signal-based user identification method then the state-of-the-art classification methods such as SVM, KNN, and Bagging? The reason to chose these classifiers, because these have been extensively utilized in the literature and rigorously analyzed for comparative analysis. Moreover, this work aims to show that the proposed pipeline can work well with a diverse set of classifiers.
- 2) In our current work, we have invited 16 users with 4 activities i.e., user walked with the phone freely placed in one of their pants pockets i.e., front left, front right, back left, back right.
 - 3) Previous works only considered a limited number of features extracted from two types of sensors, however, this work further involved the gait based features together with frequency and time domain features obtained through four different sensors which provide more confidence towards the ultimate results.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section II describes the proposed approach and main components of the gait-based legitimate user identification system. Section III reports on the experiments performed to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach by discussing the obtained results. Section IV compares the proposed solution against state-of-the-art related works and finally, Section V concludes this paper with remarks and future research directions.

II. METHODOLOGY

Smartphone sensors generate highly fluctuating time-series signals making legitimate user identification more challenging. Therefore, it is required to transform raw signals into relevant and meaningful features through a complex process including preprocessing, feature extraction, and selection.

A. Hardware and Preprocessing

Smartphones are equipped with a variety of sensors (hardware/software) that are useful for monitoring device movements. Some of them are AC, LAC, GY, and MM in which AC and LAC record the acceleration along three axes (x, y, z)

and can measure both the effects of Earth's gravity on the device and device movement, whereas, GY and MM eradicate the effects of Earth's gravity [49].

The smartphone (LG Nexus 4 smartphone with Android Wear v4.2 OS in the experiments) runs a custom application gathering data from AC, LAC, GY, and MM sensors temporarily stored into a text file in a micro SD card and then transferred to a computer. The sensor sampling frequency is set to $50Hz$ and in total, 10 minutes of raw samples were gathered from each individual (8 male and 8 female) without any fixed protocol while carrying a smartphone in one of their pants pocket (i.e., *front left, front right, back left, and back right*). It is worth mentioning that different smartphones have different sampling rates, therefore, in order to control the sensor reading process and for better generalization and validation, the sample rate is set to $50Hz$ instead to use the highest sampling rate within different smartphones [22].

For these reasons, we split the raw signals into windows (5 to 105 samples per window, respectively) to control the flow rate hence passing fewer data to the system. The selected sample size provides enough data to be able to extract quality features while ensuring a fast response. Before extracting relevant features, a third ordered moving average filter is applied in the preprocessing stage to reduce the sensor noise.

B. Feature Extraction

The raw AC, LAC, GY, and MM signals are processed to extract frequency, time, and gait features. These features are later combined into three feature vectors. Time-domain features solely consist of time and gait features vectors whereas the frequency and time feature vectors consist of both frequency and time domains.

The feature extraction process first analyzes sensors reading by applying time series modeling (i.e., Auto-regressive [50], Moving average [51] and both auto-regressive and moving average models) to understand the behavior of users' physical patterns which reveals unusual observations and data patterns [22]. Partial Auto-Correlation (PAC) and Auto-Correlation (AC) coefficients are used to identify the best model which revealed the pattern of each datum. Later each model is determined individually based on the characteristics of the theoretical PAC and AC. The best fit time-series model is calculated by estimating the parametric values based on the former model. Auto-regressive and moving average parameters are estimated through the box Jenkins model due to its flexibility for the inclusion of both models. The model and parameters need to be verified to ensure that the estimated results are statistically significant [3], [22]. Our experiments revealed that the frequency and time domain features, including the coefficients from the time-series model, provide the best accuracies. Therefore, as listed in Table II, gait, frequency, and time domain features are extracted from raw signals for each sensor individually. In total, 180 features are extracted from each window.

C. Feature Selection

The sensor's output mainly depends upon the position of the smartphone, which may result in a high within-class variance

TABLE II: Extracted features for gait-based legitimate user identification

Feature Characteristics	Mathematical Reasoning
Moving Variance	$Var = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \left(N \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2 - \left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \right)^2 \right)$, where $x_i = a_z$ is accelerometer data along z -axis. Similarly computed along x & y -axis and for other sensors.
Moving Variance Intensity	$Var = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \left(N \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2 - \left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \right)^2 \right)$, where $x = \sqrt{a_x^2 + a_y^2 + a_z^2}$ is accelerometer data. Similarly computed for other sensors.
First eigenvalue of Moving Covariance	$E_1 = eig(Cov(a_x - g_x, a_y - g_y, a_z - g_z))$ where $a_x, a_y, a_z, g_x, g_y, g_z$ are accelerometer and gyroscope readings. Similarly computed the other sensors.
Moving Covariance	$E_a = eig_1 \left(Cov(a_x(1:N), a_y(1:N), a_z(1:N)) \right)$ where a_x, a_y, a_z are accelerometer readings. Similarly computed the other sensors.
Moving energy	$ME = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2$, where $x = a_z$, where a_z is accelerometer reading along z -axis. Similarly computed for other sensors.
Moving Energy	$ME = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - y_i)^2$, where $x = a_z, y = g_z$ are accelerometer and gyroscope data along z -axis. Similarly computed for other sensors.
Moving Energy of Orientation	$MEA = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_i^2$, where $\phi = \frac{arccos(a_x \times a_y)}{ a_x \times a_y }$ is accelerometer readings. Similarly computed the other sensors.
Movement Intensity	$MI_a = \sqrt{a_x^2 + a_y^2 + a_z^2}$, where a_x, a_y, a_z are accelerometer readings. Similarly computed the other sensors.

[22]. Therefore, it is required to enhance the discriminatory power of features that can achieve by deploying an optimum feature selection method. The feature selection process eliminates the irrelevant, abundant, noisy, and misleading features that reduce the system cost on run-time applications and improve the accuracy of the resulting model. A number of feature selection methods have been used for legitimate user identification. Filtering methods are interdependent to the classifier and depend on discriminating criteria i.e., maximum relevance and minimum redundancy. These methods are scalable, fast, and less computationally complex; however, ignore the interaction with the classifier. Wrapper methods utilize the classifier as a black box to obtain a subset based on their predictive power. The main drawback of the wrapper method is its dependency on the classifier which makes the classifier choice a key component. LDA and KLDA seek a linear combination of features. However, the number of dimensions depends on the number of classes which limits the use of such methods, especially for legitimate user identification.

To overcome the aforementioned issues, Extended Sammon Mapping Projection (ESMP) was first introduced in [22] for smartphone-based physical activity recognition and legitimate user identification. ESMP is a nonlinear metric multi-dimensional scaling method that projects the high dimensional input space into lower dimensions while preserving the structure of inter-point distances. Let d_{ij} and d_{ij}^* be the Euclidean distance between two neighboring points x_i and x_j in input and mapped space, respectively. The Sammon stress error E between the input and mapped space can be measured as explained in Equation 1 which is further optimized by the gradient descent method explained in Equation 2.

$$E = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n (d_{ij})} \times \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{d_{ij}^* - d_{ij}}{d_{ij}^*} \quad (1)$$

$$x_{ik}^*(t+1) = x_{ik}^*(t) - \alpha \times \frac{\partial E(t)}{\partial x_{ik}^*(t)} \quad (2)$$

where x_{ik}^* be the k_{th} coordinate of x_i in mapped space. The gradient descent methods have issues at inflation points

in which the second-order derivatives appear to be quite small therefore the trade-off parameter α need to be set as a minimum (in our case $\alpha = [0.3 - 0.4]$) using grid search between $[0, 1]$. However, there is no guarantee that the given interval is to be optimal for all problems. Further details can be found in our previous work [22].

D. Classifiers

The selected features are processed through Kernel Extreme Learning Machine (KELM), Bagging, SVM, and KNN. Several statistical measures are performed on the resulting false and true positive rates, ROC and accuracies for legitimate user identification are calculated for a different number of samples per window.

1) *Kernel Extreme Learning Machine (KELM)*: ELM has fast learning speed and better generalization abilities than the other neural network frameworks. ELM randomly generates the input weights and bias with the help of a simple activation function. The tune-able activation functions were proposed to overcome the random assignments [52]. However, to find the suitable combinations for activation functions are still infancy. The KELM is used when the feature mapping functions of hidden neurons are unknown. However, the kernel parameters need to be tuned very carefully when it comes to real-time applications. Therefore, our current study explores the use of swarm optimizer to tune the kernel parameters. In this hierarchy, at the first hidden layer, all nonlinear piecewise continuous functions can be used as hidden neurons as these parameters need not be tuned. Thus, for N samples i.e., $(x_i, y_i) \mid x_i \in R^m$ and $y_i \in R^m$ where $i \in 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$ and the output function can be represented as $f_L(x) = \sum_{i=1}^L \beta_i h_i(x) = h(x)\beta$, where L is the number of hidden neurons, $\beta_i = [\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_L]$ be the output weights among the output neurons and hidden layer. Finally, $h_i(x) = [h_1(x), h_2(x), h_3(x), \dots, h_L(x)]$ be the output vector that maps the input to the feature space. The least square solution that minimizes the error between training and output

weights to boost the generalization capabilities can be represented in Eq. 3:

$$\beta = H^T \left(\frac{1}{C} + HH^T \right)^{-1} T \quad (3)$$

where T , H and C are expected output, hidden layer output and regularization coefficients respectively. Thus, the training model output is expressed in Eq. 4:

$$f(x) = h(x)H^T \left(\frac{1}{C} + HH^T \right)^{-1} T \quad (4)$$

The output and kernel function $f(x)$ for unknown hidden mapping $h(x)$ can be written as $M = HH^T$ where $m_{i,j} = h(x_i)h(x_j) = \mathbf{k}(x_i, x_j)$. Thus, the final representation can be expressed as shown in Eq. 5:

$$f(x) = [\mathbf{k}(x, x_1), \mathbf{k}(x, x_2), \dots, \mathbf{k}(x, x_N)] \left(\frac{1}{C} + M \right)^{-1} T \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{k}(x_i, x_j) = \cos \left(\frac{\|x - y\|^2}{a} \right) \exp \left(\frac{\|x - y\|^2}{b} \right) \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{k}(x_i, x_j)$ be the kernel function, a, b are the tune-able parameters that plays an important role.

2) *Support Vector Machine (SVM)*: Among the most popular methods for regression and classification problems, SVM is the most common classifier. SVM has been deployed for several real-world applications for instance bioinformatics, biometrics, cheminformatics, and remote sensing [53]. The SVM hierarchy works in two phases as the training examples are used to build the model for classification later the trained model is used to classify an unknown example. The tuning parameters of SVM are considered as key to success for any classification problems. These parameters include kernel and penalty parameters [54]. The penalty is important to maintain a trade-off between maximizing the decision margin while minimizing the training error [55]. Whereas, the kernel parameters are used to map the low dimensional input feature space to a higher dimensional feature space. These two parameters are labeled as a backbone to control the performance of SVM for any classification problem. SVM works while separating several known classes using the concept of hyperplanes and achieved remarkable results in linearly separable data examples.

III. RESULTS

The classifier’s output indicates the ability to predict which user is walking while carrying the smartphone without considering its orientation, age, and gender. The 5-fold cross-validation process is adopted to get meaningful and statistically significant results. The cross-validation process split the dataset into 5 equal subsets in which 4 subsets are selected to train the model and the remaining subset is selected to validate the model. This process is repeated 5-times by picking a new subset (every time) as a validation set and remaining subsets

are used as a training data lead to a total of 5 experiments that weighted for the result.

The proposed pipeline has been evaluated against 3 different types of classifiers such as KNN, SVM, and Bagging. The reason to chose these classifiers, because these have been extensively utilized in the literature and rigorously analyzed for comparative analysis. Moreover, this work aims to show that the proposed pipeline can work well with a diverse set of classifiers. For KELM, [1 – 500] hidden neurons are selected, and SVM is evaluated with the polynomial kernel, similarly, for KNN, k is set to [2 – 20]. For bagging, a tree-based method is used to train the classifier from a range of [1 – 100] trees. All the parameters are adjusted carefully while setting up the experiments. The reason to provide the range is that because the number of samples in each round (samples per window) changes so the parameters need to be tuned in each round. For the main proposal, KELM classifier training and testing accuracy concerning the number of hidden neurons is presented in Figure 1.




Fig. 1: ELM: Accuracy vs Hidden Neurons

For fair experimental evaluation of our proposed pipeline, several benchmark metrics are bring considered such as overall and average accuracies. For experimental validation and statistical analysis, true positive (TP), false positive (FP), true negative (TN), and false-negative (FN) is usually computed from the confusion matrix shown in Tables III-VI.

Moreover, to validate the statistical significance, several statistical measures are considered such as Recall, Precision, and F1-score. Furthermore, this work carried out several statistical tests including but not limited to true positive rate (TPR), true negative rate (TNR), false-positive rate (FPR), and false-negative rate (FNR). Meanwhile, this study also used several other statistical measures to validate the performance of our proposed model as shown in Tables VII-VIII. The FPR and TPR show two crucial aspects such as TPR and FPR show how usable and secure this would be as a legitimate user identification model. A low TPR shows that several legitimate attempts to identify would fail, thus making this too much of a burden to use, whereas a high FPR means illegitimate users could bypass the security and identification when they were not supposed to. Therefore, the ultimate goal of this work is

TABLE VII: Statistical Tests for KELM and Bagging Classifiers.

(a) KELM							(b) Bagging						
Users	Precision	Sensitivity	Specificity	NPV	FDR	FOR	Users	Precision	Sensitivity	Specificity	NPV	FDR	FOR
User 1	1.0000	0.8689	1.0000	0.9903	0.0000	0.0097	User 1	0.9434	0.9259	0.9964	0.9952	0.0566	0.0048
User 2	0.7581	0.8393	0.9818	0.9890	0.2419	0.0110	User 2	0.9677	0.8108	0.9975	0.9828	0.0323	0.0172
User 3	0.7937	0.8929	0.9842	0.9926	0.2063	0.0074	User 3	0.9365	0.8551	0.9951	0.9877	0.0635	0.0123
User 4	0.9245	0.8596	0.9951	0.9903	0.0755	0.0097	User 4	0.9434	0.8621	0.9963	0.9903	0.0566	0.0097
User 5	0.9434	0.9259	0.9964	0.9952	0.0566	0.0048	User 5	1.0000	0.8833	1.0000	0.9915	0.0000	0.0085
User 6	0.9355	0.7945	0.9950	0.9816	0.0645	0.0184	User 6	0.9032	0.8889	0.9926	0.9914	0.0968	0.0086
User 7	0.8254	0.9123	0.9866	0.9939	0.1746	0.0061	User 7	0.9683	0.7922	0.9975	0.9804	0.0317	0.0196
User 8	0.8679	0.6866	0.9914	0.9745	0.1321	0.0255	User 8	0.7925	0.8750	0.9867	0.9927	0.2075	0.0073
User 9	0.7609	0.7143	0.9867	0.9832	0.2391	0.0168	User 9	0.8261	0.9268	0.9904	0.9964	0.1739	0.0036
User 10	0.8333	0.8730	0.9865	0.9901	0.1667	0.0099	User 10	1.0000	0.8800	1.0000	0.9889	0.0000	0.0111
User 11	0.7692	0.8889	0.9856	0.9939	0.2308	0.0061	User 11	0.8269	0.9556	0.9892	0.9976	0.1731	0.0024
User 12	0.6818	0.8333	0.9834	0.9928	0.3182	0.0072	User 12	0.8636	0.9500	0.9928	0.9976	0.1364	0.0024
User 13	0.6957	0.9143	0.9834	0.9964	0.3043	0.0036	User 13	0.6957	0.9143	0.9834	0.9964	0.3043	0.0036
User 14	0.8939	0.8310	0.9913	0.9852	0.1061	0.0148	User 14	0.8788	0.8923	0.9902	0.9914	0.1212	0.0086
User 15	0.7692	0.7843	0.9855	0.9867	0.2308	0.0133	User 15	0.6923	0.9730	0.9810	0.9988	0.3077	0.0012
User 16	0.7273	0.6809	0.9856	0.9820	0.2727	0.0180	User 16	0.7273	0.8649	0.9857	0.9940	0.2727	0.0060

TABLE VIII: Statistical Tests for KNN and SVM Classifiers.

(a) KNN							(b) SVM						
Users	Precision	Sensitivity	Specificity	NPV	FDR	FOR	Users	Precision	Sensitivity	Specificity	NPV	FDR	FOR
User 1	0.9811	0.9630	0.9988	0.9976	0.0189	0.0024	User 1	0.8679	0.9388	0.9916	0.9964	0.1321	0.0036
User 2	0.9839	0.8841	0.9988	0.9902	0.0161	0.0098	User 2	0.9032	0.9032	0.9926	0.9926	0.0968	0.0074
User 3	0.9841	0.9538	0.9988	0.9963	0.0159	0.0037	User 3	0.8571	0.7397	0.9888	0.9767	0.1429	0.0233
User 4	0.9623	0.9107	0.9976	0.9939	0.0377	0.0061	User 4	0.9057	0.8889	0.9939	0.9927	0.0943	0.0073
User 5	0.9811	1.0000	0.9988	1.0000	0.0189	0.0000	User 5	0.9245	0.9800	0.9952	0.9988	0.0755	0.0012
User 6	1.0000	0.7949	1.0000	0.9804	0.0000	0.0196	User 6	0.9032	0.7568	0.9925	0.9779	0.0968	0.0221
User 7	0.9206	0.8286	0.9938	0.9853	0.0794	0.0147	User 7	0.8413	0.8689	0.9878	0.9902	0.1587	0.0098
User 8	0.7925	1.0000	0.9868	1.0000	0.2075	0.0000	User 8	0.8113	0.8113	0.9879	0.9879	0.1887	0.0121
User 9	0.9348	1.0000	0.9964	1.0000	0.0652	0.0000	User 9	0.8043	0.8222	0.9892	0.9904	0.1957	0.0096
User 10	1.0000	0.9565	1.0000	0.9963	0.0000	0.0037	User 10	0.9394	0.9118	0.9951	0.9926	0.0606	0.0074
User 11	0.9423	0.9608	0.9964	0.9976	0.0577	0.0024	User 11	0.8269	0.9149	0.9892	0.9952	0.1731	0.0048
User 12	0.7955	0.9722	0.9893	0.9988	0.2045	0.0012	User 12	0.6591	0.9667	0.9823	0.9988	0.3409	0.0012
User 13	0.9130	0.9767	0.9952	0.9988	0.0870	0.0012	User 13	0.6087	0.7568	0.9786	0.9892	0.3913	0.0108
User 14	0.9242	0.8841	0.9938	0.9901	0.0758	0.0099	User 14	0.9091	0.7229	0.9925	0.9717	0.0909	0.0283
User 15	0.7500	0.8864	0.9844	0.9939	0.2500	0.0061	User 15	0.7115	0.6852	0.9818	0.9794	0.2885	0.0206
User 16	0.8409	1.0000	0.9917	1.0000	0.1591	0.0000	User 16	0.5909	0.6842	0.9786	0.9856	0.4091	0.0144

where M be the number of users.

$$Precision = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{TP_i}{TP_i + FP_i} \quad (9)$$

$$Sensitivity = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{TP_i}{TP_i + FN_i} \quad (10)$$

$$Specificity = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{TN_i}{TN_i + FP_i} \quad (11)$$

$$NPV = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{TN_i}{TN_i + FN_i} \quad (12)$$

$$FDR = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{FP_i}{FP_i + TP_i} \quad (13)$$

$$FOR = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{FN_i}{FN_i + TN_i} \quad (14)$$

where NPV stands for Negative Predictive Values, FDR is False Discovery Rate, and FOR is False Omission Rate. NPV is the score of the negative statistical results based on TN and FN values across the users used in this study. FDR and FOR

are usually used in multiple hypothesis testing to make sure the multiple comparisons. FOR can be computed by taking the complement of NPV values or another way around, it can be measured using TN and FN values. FOR is used to measure the rate of false negatives, which are incorrectly rejected whereas, FDR measures the actual positives which were incorrectly identified.

In-terms of machine learning, the extensive model performance measurement is required. Moreover, when it comes to the classification, overall accuracy (as shown in Figure 2) and the area under the curve, such as the receiver Operating Characteristics Curve (ROC) is an essential evaluation metric at various threshold settings. ROC is a probability curve that measures the degree of separability among classes. ROC curve is plotted with TPR against the FPR values obtained through the classification method. To validate the statistical significance of the proposed pipeline, the ROC has been drawn for two different sample sizes i.e., 5 and 105 samples per window. The results presented in Figure 3 uphold the effectiveness of the proposed pipeline for real-time applicability with a 99% confidence interval of legitimate user identification by using a pairwise T-test between a group of individuals. Looking at Figure 3, significant statistical results are seen; showing that all the classifiers outperform. Finally, we present the computational cost in terms of the time of enlisted experiments. Figure

4 shows the computational time taken by the feature extraction and feature selection process for average users with a different number of samples per window.




Fig. 2: Cumulative Overall Accuracy across all the users for all classifiers.




Fig. 3: ROC for two different sample sizes, i.e., 5 and 105 samples per window. Here are the values of AuC’s for each classifier: ELM = 0.8175 (5 samples) and 0.9853 (105 samples). Bagging = 0.8734 (5 samples) and 0.9988 (105 samples). SVM = 0.8161 (5 samples) and 0.9408 (105 samples). KNN = 0.9197 (5 samples) and 0.9993 (105 samples).

As shown in Figure 4, the processing time is increased

gradually at the start and then increased exponentially as the sample size increases. Therefore, to cope with the high computational time may become an important issue for the legitimate user identification system for larger sample sizes. There are many ways to overcome such high computational time, however, for this one needs to work on fewer features, i.e., either gait-based features or time and frequency domain feature processed through one of the feature selection methods but this may bring incompetency for statistical significance.




Fig. 4: Processing Time with different number of samples per window selected ([5 : 5 : 105]) in each round for Legitimate User Identification. All the experiments are carried out on notebook using MATLAB (2017a) on Intel Core (TM) i5 CPU 2.40 GHz, with 8 GB RAM.

From experimental results, one can conclude that the ESMP helps to boost legitimate user identification performance. Based on the results listed in Figure 2 and Tables VII-VIII, we observe that the ESMP together with almost all classifiers works better and accurately than the several state-of-the-art legitimate user identification methods. The experiments show the process of analyzing the behavior of a different number of samples per window taken by the user for legitimate user

TABLE IX: Cross subjects performance comparison with State-of-the-art works.

Work	Users	Features	Classifier	Accuracy
[1]	2	Time Domain	SVM and KNN	90%
[4]	6	Time and Frequency	Decision Tree, KNN, SVM	98%
[22]	20	Time and Frequency	Extreme Learning Machine	97%
[25]	10	Gait, Time and Frequency	KNN and Random Forest	90%
[26]	58	Cross-correlations of Fourier transform	Nearest means in Fisher discriminant space and majority voting	50%
[27]	11	Time and Frequency	Gait templates, DTW, SVM	93%
[28]	36	Variance in acceleration and orientation across x, y, z	Gaussian distribution model	83%
[30]	6	Acceleration	SVM	93%
[32]	36	Time domain	J48 and ANN	93%
[33]	10	Spectral energy diagrams of pitch, roll, acceleration x, y, z	$\alpha\beta$ filtering, Empirical Mode Decomposition, Fourier Transform, Linear Discriminant Analysis	90%
[23]	2	Genetic Programming		90%
[24]	10	Magnitude of the acceleration Weighted moving average filter, cycle detection, Manhattan distance	SVM	88%
[31]	30	Extrema in acceleration	Difference-of-Gaussian and KNN	96%
Proposed	16	Time, Frequency and Gait	Extreme Learning Machine	98%
Proposed	16	Time, Frequency and Gait	Support Vector Machine	94%
Proposed	16	Time, Frequency and Gait	K Nearest Neighbour	99%
Proposed	16	Time, Frequency and Gait	BAG	99%

TABLE X: Average Accuracy, Confidence Intervals and Time taken for Legitimate User Identification for 50 Sample Per Window With Different Feature Selection Methods and Different Number of Features for two different sensors data.

Features	Metric	Back Left Pocket				Back Right Pocket				Front Left Pocket				Back Right Pocket			
		ACC		LACC		ACC		LACC		ACC		LACC		ACC		LACC	
		PCA	ESMP	PCA	ESMP	PCA	ESMP	PCA	ESMP	PCA	ESMP	PCA	ESMP	PCA	ESMP	PCA	ESMP
5	Accuracy	55±5.1	50±3.2	50±4.5	53±5.7	52±4.9	53±3.8	51±3.6	50±2.7	54±3.6	55±2.9	57±2.9	54±3.9	54±4.6	63±2.9	54±3.8	52±4.5
	Time	0.140	0.138	0.209	0.243	0.265	0.261	0.553	0.527	0.175	0.173	0.268	0.270	0.164	0.133	0.201	0.202
10	Accuracy	74±6.3	85±3.3	67±4.8	85±3.8	63±4.5	77±2.3	63±3.4	84±3.9	66±2.9	90±4.6	72±4.1	81±3.9	69±3.8	74±5.9	64±4.7	77±4.8
	Time	0.140	0.142	0.209	0.214	0.255	0.252	0.535	0.523	0.177	0.178	0.270	0.271	0.131	0.131	0.194	0.188
15	Accuracy	72±6.2	98±1.1	75±4.6	89±4.1	76±5.5	99±0.9	78±3.9	96±2.0	70±5.8	95±3.4	77±4.1	95±2.1	74±4.1	98±1.3	71±5.7	98±1.0
	Time	0.142	0.142	0.211	0.238	0.255	0.254	0.536	0.517	0.177	0.178	0.269	0.273	0.135	0.132	0.197	0.203
20	Accuracy	73±6.1	97±1.4	73±4.9	97±2.0	76±4.6	99±0.4	82±2.5	98±1.6	76±3.6	99±0.7	76±6.7	98±2.6	71±7.1	95±2.4	73±5.8	94±4.2
	Time	0.142	0.142	0.216	0.219	0.259	0.256	0.538	0.529	0.178	0.189	0.269	0.281	0.132	0.132	0.194	0.212
25	Accuracy	78±3.8	99±0.5	74±4.9	98±2.7	72±4.4	96±3.4	80±4.6	98±1.6	75±6.7	98±1.2	76±4.9	94±2.3	73±6.7	96±3.9	73±8.3	90±4.9
	Time	0.148	0.140	0.221	0.219	0.258	0.257	0.532	0.528	0.180	0.179	0.254	0.270	0.134	0.133	0.200	0.203
30	Accuracy	78±3.8	97±0.4	76±4.3	98±1.8	73±6.9	98±1.5	76±3.6	98±1.4	76±6.7	94±3.2	76±6.4	99±0.3	74±3.7	99±0.5	68±7.8	91±4.1
	Time	0.148	0.143	0.216	0.217	0.260	0.258	0.539	0.532	0.179	0.179	0.268	0.284	0.132	0.149	0.197	0.181
35	Accuracy	77±5.4	99±0.5	71±6.2	94±4.7	72±4.5	99±0.3	74±5.9	87±6.2	75±4.5	97±1.7	73±5.5	97±3.6	76±7.2	99±0.8	69±7.9	54±4.9
	Time	0.143	0.143	0.216	0.208	0.258	0.259	0.536	0.548	0.180	0.179	0.267	0.275	0.134	0.133	0.194	0.201
40	Accuracy	74± 5.9	98± 0.6	70± 6.4	99± 0.4	71± 4.2	98± 0.8	72± 5.9	99± 0.4	73± 4.6	50± 2.8	71± 4.9	75± 5.9	69± 8.2	98± 1.1	69± 6.3	99± 0.4
	Time	0.144	0.142	0.216	0.212	0.262	0.259	0.537	0.532	0.180	0.172	0.276	0.278	0.133	0.148	0.196	0.196

identification (i.e., 05 : 05 : 105). Tables III-VI present the accuracy of our proposed pipeline for an individual user being identified correctly with the different number of samples per window after the fusion of four different built-in sensors data. From the results, we found that the proposed pipeline produces acceptable results with 30 – 50 samples per window. Figure 2 enlists the results of overall accuracy across an all user with a 99% confidence interval.

IV. COMPARISON AGAINST STATE-OF-THE-ART SOLUTIONS

Hereby we present and compare some of the critical works from the literature [1], [4], [22], [25], [26], [27], [28], [30], [32], [33], [23], [24], [31] that can be categorized in two groups such as implicit and multi-modality biometrics. All these methods have some limitations i.e., required some additional information and source or may require user interaction. Therefore, to some extent, all these methods are innovative but require some external legitimate user identification process.

The works compared in Table IX require user interaction in-terms to perform a predefined activity or user data has been gathered in controlled environments which are not a real representation of frequent user interactions. Therefore, the proposed method could be considered as an exciting alternative for continuous and explicit legitimate user identification or impostor identification in a semi-controlled environment. Hence the proposed method overcomes the limitations of the smartphone in power consumption and user interaction. We have worked on combining different feature extraction (time, frequency, and gait) and selection (ESMP) techniques and to concatenating the selected features to deliver a reliable legitimate user identification model using built-in sensors data in a semi-controlled environment.

As we earlier discussed, this study focuses on the idea of identifying a smartphone user by applying different walking patterns. Furthermore, it is assumed that the phone is freely placed without any particular orientation inside any of the user’s pants pockets (*front left, front right, back left, back*

right). Thus to answer the questions "Does the ESMP, a non-linear unsupervised feature selection method improve the identification accuracy more than the other existing and well-studied unsupervised feature selection methods such as Principal Component Analysis (PCA)?" and "Does the data variation affect the performance of the LUI process?". Here we enlist the comparative analysis of these two different feature selection methods with a different number of features and different locations of a smartphone. The experimental results are shown in Table X. One can conclude that ESMP significantly performed better than PCA.

V. CONCLUSION

Smartphones are becoming increasingly popular that have forced the community to study the security implications of these devices. This work suggested that gait-based legitimate user identification is possible in an uncontrolled environment with some limitations. The proposed pipeline has some attractive features to its applicability such as smaller confidence intervals that imply more reliability in training. Furthermore, holding a permanent structure is a useful feature for hardware constraints such as transforming the trained model into a chip which can further increase device security by not allowing software-based attacks but only hardware manipulations. These hardware operations would require access to the smartphone hence making such attacks subject to the device defense.

The proposed pipeline achieves a 100% true positive and 0% false-negative rate for almost all classifiers. However, to further validate the claims, it may be useful to check the sensor quality while changing the smartphone as well as with different operating systems.

The key advantage of our study is that the samples for each user are collected on different days with different jeans, locations, and orientation which significantly helps to understand the characteristic behavior of users which is an essential component for any legitimate user identification system. However, one of the main limitations of gait-based legitimate user identification is that the signals inconsistency e.g., signal reliability, degrades significantly between days due to many factors such as a change in habits, mood, workload, etc. which we will address in our future studies.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Ahmad, A. M. Khan, J. A. Brown, S. Protasov, and A. M. Khattak, "Gait fingerprinting-based user identification on smartphones," in *2016 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, July 2016, pp. 3060–3067.
- [2] M. D. Marsico and A. Mecca, "A survey on gait recognition via wearable sensors," *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 86:1–86:39, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3340293>
- [3] M. Ahmad, A. Khan, M. Mazzara, and S. Distefano, "Seeking optimum system settings for physical activity recognition on smartwatches," in *Advances in Computer Vision*, K. Arai and S. Kapoor, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 220–233.
- [4] M. Ahmad, M. Alqarni, A. Khan, A. Khan, S. Chauhdary, M. Mazzara, T. Umer, and S. Distefano, "Smartwatch-based legitimate user identification for cloud-based secure services," *Mobile Information Systems*, vol. 2018, pp. 1–14, 08 2018.
- [5] R. Damasevicius, R. Maskeliunas, A. Venkauskas, and M. Woniak, "Smartphone user identity verification using gait characteristics," *Symmetry*, vol. 8, p. 100, 09 2016.
- [6] Y. Yang, X. Huang, L. Wu, and J. Sun, "Echoia: Implicit authentication system based on user feedback," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2006.07676, 2020.
- [7] Y. Yang, X. Huang, J. Li, and J. Sun, "Bubblemap: Privilege mapping for behavior-based implicit authentication systems," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2006.08817, 2020.
- [8] B. Ayotte, M. K. Banavar, D. Hou, and S. Schuckers, "Fast free-text authentication via instance-based keystroke dynamics," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2006.09337, 2020.
- [9] X. Lu, S. Zhang, P. Hui, and P. Lio, "Continuous authentication by free-text keystroke based on cnn and rnn," *Computers & Security*, vol. 96, p. 101861, 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167404820301334>
- [10] N. Clarke and S. Furnell, "Authenticating mobile phone users using keystroke analysis," *Int. J. Inf. Sec.*, vol. 6, pp. 1–14, 01 2007.
- [11] W. Shi, J. Yang, Yifei Jiang, Feng Yang, and Yingen Xiong, "Senguard: Passive user identification on smartphones using multiple sensors," in *2011 IEEE 7th International Conference on Wireless and Mobile Computing, Networking and Communications (WiMob)*, 2011, pp. 141–148.
- [12] A. De Luca, A. Hang, F. Brudy, C. Lindner, and H. Hussmann, "Touch me once and i know its you! implicit authentication based on touch screen patterns," in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ser. CHI12. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2012, p. 987996. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2207676.2208544>
- [13] N. Sae-Bae, N. Memon, and K. Isbister, "Investigating multi-touch gestures as a novel biometric modality," in *2012 IEEE Fifth International Conference on Biometrics: Theory, Applications and Systems (BTAS)*, 2012, pp. 156–161.
- [14] M. Frank, R. Biedert, E. Ma, I. Martinovic, and D. Song, "Touchalytics: On the applicability of touchscreen input as a behavioral biometric for continuous authentication," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 136–148, 2013.
- [15] C. C. Rocha, J. C. D. Lima, M. A. R. Dantas, and I. Augustin, "A2best: An adaptive authentication service based on mobile user's behavior and spatio-temporal context," in *2011 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC)*, 2011, pp. 771–774.
- [16] J. C. D. Lima, C. C. Rocha, I. Augustin, and M. A. R. Dantas, "A context-aware recommendation system to behavioral based authentication in mobile and pervasive environments," in *2011 IFIP 9th International Conference on Embedded and Ubiquitous Computing*, 2011, pp. 312–319.
- [17] M. Sabharwal, "Multi-modal biometric authentication and secure transaction operation framework for e-banking," *Int. J. Bus. Data Commun. Netw.*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 102116, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJBDCN.2017010109>
- [18] J. Mantyjarvi, M. Lindholm, E. Vildjiounaite, S. . Makela, and H. A. Ailisto, "Identifying users of portable devices from gait pattern with accelerometers," in *Proceedings. (ICASSP '05). IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 2005.*, vol. 2, 2005, pp. ii/973–ii/976 Vol. 2.
- [19] D. Gafurov and E. Sneekenes, "Gait recognition using wearable motion recording sensors," *EURASIP J. Adv. Signal Process.*, vol. 2009, 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2009/415817>
- [20] A. A. Kale, N. Cuntoor, and V. Krüger, "Gait-based recognition of humans using continuous hmms," in *Proceedings of the Fifth IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition*, ser. FGR 02. USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2002, p. 336.
- [21] M. Jakobsson, E. Shi, P. Golle, and R. Chow, "Implicit authentication for mobile devices," in *Proceedings of the 4th USENIX Conference on Hot Topics in Security*, ser. HotSec'09. USA: USENIX Association, 2009, p. 9.
- [22] M. Ahmad, A. M. Khan, M. Mazzara, S. Distefano, A. Ali, and A. Tufail, "Extended sammon projection and wavelet kernel extreme learning machine for gait-based legitimate user identification," in *Proceedings of the 34th ACM/SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing*, ser. SAC'19. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2019, pp. 1216–1219. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3297280.3297579>
- [23] J. A. Hughes, J. A. Brown, and A. M. Khan, "Smartphone gait fingerprinting models via genetic programming," in *2016 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*, 2016, pp. 408–415.
- [24] M. Derawi and P. Bours, "Gait and activity recognition using commercial phones," *Comput. Secur.*, vol. 39, pp. 137–144, 2013. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2013.07.004>
- [25] S. Davidson, D. Smith, C. Yang, and S. C. Cheahs, "Smartwatch user identification as a means of authentication," CSE 227- Computer

- Security- Group 4- Computer Science department at the University of California, San Diego., Tech. Rep., 2016.
- [26] T. Kobayashi, K. Hasida, and N. Otsu, "Rotation invariant feature extraction from 3-d acceleration signals," in *2011 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, May 2011, pp. 3684–3687.
- [27] H. M. Thang, V. Q. Viet, N. Dinh Thuc, and D. Choi, "Gait identification using accelerometer on mobile phone," in *2012 International Conference on Control, Automation and Information Sciences (ICCAIS)*, Nov 2012, pp. 344–348.
- [28] M. Wolff, "Behavioral biometric identification on mobile devices," in *Foundations of Augmented Cognition*, D. D. Schmorrow and C. M. Fidopiastis, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013, pp. 783–791.
- [29] F. Juefei-Xu, C. Bhagavatula, A. Jaech, U. Prasad, and M. Savvides, "Gait-id on the move: Pace independent human identification using cell phone accelerometer dynamics," in *2012 IEEE Fifth International Conference on Biometrics: Theory, Applications and Systems (BTAS)*, Sep. 2012, pp. 8–15.
- [30] S. Sprager and D. Zazula, "A cumulant-based method for gait identification using accelerometer data with principal component analysis and support vector machine," *WSEAS Trans. Sig. Proc.*, vol. 5, no. 11, pp. 369–378, 2009. [Online]. Available: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1853844.1853846>
- [31] G. Pan, Y. Zhang, and Z. Wu, "Accelerometer-based gait recognition via voting by signature points," *Electronics Letters*, vol. 45, no. 22, pp. 1116–1118, October 2009.
- [32] J. R. Kwapisz, G. M. Weiss, and S. A. Moore, "Cell phone-based biometric identification," in *2010 Fourth IEEE International Conference on Biometrics: Theory, Applications and Systems (BTAS)*, Sep. 2010, pp. 1–7.
- [33] B.-S. Lin, Y.-T. Liu, C. Yu, G. Jan, and B.-T. Hsiao, "Gait recognition and walking exercise intensity estimation," *International journal of environmental research and public health*, vol. 11, pp. 3822–44, 04 2014.
- [34] H. Lu, J. Huang, T. Saha, and L. Nachman, "Unobtrusive gait verification for mobile phones," in *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM International Symposium on Wearable Computers*, ser. ISWC '14. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2014, pp. 91–98. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2634317.2642868>
- [35] A. H. Johnston and G. M. Weiss, "Smartwatch-based biometric gait recognition," in *2015 IEEE 7th International Conference on Biometrics Theory, Applications and Systems (BTAS)*, Sep. 2015, pp. 1–6.
- [36] G. Trivino, A. Alvarez-Alvarez, and G. Bailador, "Application of the computational theory of perceptions to human gait pattern recognition," *Pattern Recogn.*, vol. 43, no. 7, pp. 2572–2581, 2010. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2010.01.017>
- [37] Liang Wang, Tieniu Tan, Weiming Hu, and Huazhong Ning, "Automatic gait recognition based on statistical shape analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 12, no. 9, pp. 1120–1131, Sep. 2003.
- [38] L. Rong, Z. Jianzhong, L. Ming, and H. Xiangfeng, "A wearable acceleration sensor system for gait recognition," in *2007 2nd IEEE Conference on Industrial Electronics and Applications*, May 2007, pp. 2654–2659.
- [39] H. J. Ailisto, M. Lindholm, J. Mantjarvi, E. Vildjiounaite, and S.-M. Makela, "Identifying people from gait pattern with accelerometers," in *Biometric Technology for Human Identification II*, A. K. Jain and N. K. Ratha, Eds., vol. 5779, International Society for Optics and Photonics. SPIE, 2005, pp. 7 – 14. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.603331>
- [40] M. Bächlin, J. Schumm, D. Roggen, and G. Töster, "Quantifying gait similarity: User authentication and real-world challenge," in *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Advances in Biometrics*, ser. ICB '09. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2009, pp. 1040–1049. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-01793-3_105
- [41] T. Hoang, T. Nguyen, C. Luong, S. Do, and C. Deokjai, "Adaptive cross-device gait recognition using a mobile accelerometer," *Journal of Information Processing Systems*, vol. 9, pp. 333–348, 06 2013.
- [42] C. Nickel, H. Brandt, and C. Busch, "Classification of acceleration data for biometric gait recognition on mobile devices," in *BIOSIG 2011 Proceedings of the Biometrics Special Interest Group*, A. Brmmme and C. Busch, Eds. Bonn: Gesellschaft fr Informatik e.V., 2011, pp. 57–66.
- [43] P. Casale, O. Pujol, and P. Radeva, "Personalization and user verification in wearable systems using biometric walking patterns," *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing - PUC*, vol. 16, pp. 1–18, 06 2012.
- [44] L. Rong, Z. Jianzhong, L. Ming, and H. Xiangfeng, "A wearable acceleration sensor system for gait recognition," in *2007 2nd IEEE Conference on Industrial Electronics and Applications*, 2007, pp. 2654–2659.
- [45] M. O. Derawi, C. Nickel, P. Bours, and C. Busch, "Unobtrusive user-authentication on mobile phones using biometric gait recognition," in *Proceedings of the 2010 Sixth International Conference on Intelligent Information Hiding and Multimedia Signal Processing*, ser. IHH-MSP 10. USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2010, p. 306311. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/IHHMSP.2010.83>
- [46] D. Gafurov, E. Snekenes, and P. Bours, "Improved gait recognition performance using cycle matching," in *2010 IEEE 24th International Conference on Advanced Information Networking and Applications Workshops*, 2010, pp. 836–841.
- [47] M. O. Derawi, P. Bours, and K. Holien, "Improved cycle detection for accelerometer based gait authentication," in *2010 Sixth International Conference on Intelligent Information Hiding and Multimedia Signal Processing*, 2010, pp. 312–317.
- [48] P. Bours and R. Shrestha, "Eigensteps: A giant leap for gait recognition," in *2010 2nd International Workshop on Security and Communication Networks (IWSCN)*, 2010, pp. 1–6.
- [49] "Weblink," http://developer.android.com/guide/topics/sensors/sensors_motion.html, accessed: 03-01-2020.
- [50] V. Cuomo, V. Lapenna, M. Macchiato, and C. Serio, "Autoregressive models as a tool to discriminate chaos from randomness in geoelectrical time series: an application to earthquake prediction," *Annals of Geophysics*, vol. 40, no. 2, 1997.
- [51] M. Ruiz-Medina, "Spatial autoregressive and moving average hilbertian processes," *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, vol. 102, no. 2, pp. 292 – 305, 2011. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0047259X10001958>
- [52] M. Ahmad, A. M. Khan, M. Mazzara, and S. Distefano, "Multi-layer extreme learning machine-based autoencoder for hyperspectral image classification," in *Proceedings of the 14th International Joint Conference on Computer Vision, Imaging and Computer Graphics Theory and Applications - Volume 4 VISAPP: VISAPP, INSTICC. SciTePress*, 2019, pp. 75–82.
- [53] M. Ahmad, A. Khan, A. Khan, M. Mazzara, S. Distefano, A. Sohaib, and O. Nibouche, "Spatial prior fuzziness pool-based interactive classification of hyperspectral images," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 11, no. 5, May. 2019.
- [54] M. Ahmad, A. M. Khan, and R. Hussain, "Graph-based spatial spectral feature learning for hyperspectral image classification," *IET Image Processing*, vol. 11, no. 12, pp. 1310–1316, 2017.
- [55] M. Ahmad, S. Protasov, A. M. Khan, R. Hussain, A. M. Khattak, and W. A. Khan, "Fuzziness-based active learning framework to enhance hyperspectral image classification performance for discriminative and generative classifiers," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. e0188996, January 2018.