

Counterfactual Explanation-Based Badminton Motion Guidance Generation Using Wearable Sensors

Minwoo Seong¹, Gwangbin Kim¹, Yumin Kang¹, Junhyuk Jang¹, Joseph DelPreto², and SeungJun Kim^{1*}

Abstract—This study proposes a framework for enhancing the stroke quality of badminton players by generating personalized motion guides, utilizing a multimodal wearable dataset. These guides are based on counterfactual algorithms and aim to reduce the performance gap between novice and expert players. Our approach provides joint-level guidance through visualizable data to assist players in improving their movements without requiring expert knowledge. The method was evaluated against a traditional algorithm using metrics to assess validity, proximity, and plausibility, including arithmetic measures and motion-specific evaluation metrics. Our evaluation demonstrates that the proposed framework can generate motions that maintain the essence of original movements while enhancing stroke quality, providing closer guidance than direct expert motion replication. The results highlight the potential of our approach for creating personalized sports motion guides by generating counterfactual motion guidance for arbitrary input motion samples of badminton strokes.

I. INTRODUCTION

Learning sports skills often involves observing and imitating expert athletes’ movements [1]. However, novices face challenges in determining the quality of their actions and in improving their skills without the guidance or prior knowledge of a coach. The scarcity of guidance for reproducing the exact movements of an expert or a successful sports action can lead to difficulties in fine-tuning movements [1].

In particular, racket sports pose additional training challenges owing to the rapid nature of the actions, which requires players to correct their movements based on feedback received. Given the fast-paced nature of stroke actions in racket sports, it is often difficult for experts to holistically capture this feedback.

In this regard, the use of multiple wearable sensor data has made it possible to analyze how athletes coordinate their movements without prior knowledge [2]. These sensors allow for the capture of motion from multiple viewpoints and at a microsecond-level time resolution. Hence, these sensors provide quantitative evidence of motion quality and areas for improvement.

In addition, advances in AI technology have revolutionized sports training. AI can not only predict ball trajectories and analyze game strategies [3], but also assess individual movements and provide personalized training programs [4]. In this context, we propose a framework for generating

visualizable joint-level motion guidance by leveraging counterfactual (CF) explanations derived from latent space-level differences in the motions of novices and experts (see Figure 1). Counterfactual explanations refer to the understanding of how a given outcome would change if certain aspects of the initial conditions were altered, providing a “what if” analysis that can illuminate the path from novice to expert performance [5]. By integrating counterfactual explanations with multimodal wearable sensor data, the framework provides feedback on how novice players modify their movements to achieve expert-level performance.

II. METHODS

A. Wearable Sensor-based Badminton Dataset

We used the MultiSenseBadminton dataset [6], which contains 7,763 badminton swing motions and annotations regarding the performance of each swing. The dataset comprised 25 badminton players with varying skill levels, including 12 beginners, 8 intermediate players, and 5 experts. For each player, data were collected for two swing types: forehand high clear drive and backhand drive. The dataset was collected while participants were equipped with multiple wearable sensors, allowing for the simultaneous measurement of eye tracking, muscle activity, foot pressure, and joint data. The dataset also provides annotations for each swing, including the ball landing location, hit point, and stroke quality. We used the joint global position data as our input and the stroke quality as our target annotation to relate swing mechanics and stroke quality for motion guidance generation.

Algorithm 1 LatentCF-based motion guidance generation

```
1: input: A time series motion sample  $x$ , target stroke quality class  $y'$ , learning rate  $\alpha$ , maximum iteration  $max\_iter$ , pre-trained classifier  $C$ , pre-trained autoencoder  $AE$ 
2: Output: A generated counterfactual motion  $x'$  with desired target class  $y'$ 
3:  $z \leftarrow AE\text{-Encode}(x)$ 
4:  $y_{pred} \leftarrow C(AE\text{-Decode}(z))$ 
5:  $loss \leftarrow \text{CrossEntropyLoss}(y_{pred} - y')$ 
6:  $iter \leftarrow 0$ 
7: while  $y_{pred} < \tau \wedge iter < max\_iter$  do
8:    $z \leftarrow \text{AdamOptimize}(z, loss, \alpha)$ 
9:    $y_{pred} \leftarrow C(AE\text{-Decode}(z))$ 
10:   $loss \leftarrow \text{CrossEntropyLoss}(y_{pred} - y')$ 
11:   $iter \leftarrow iter + 1$ 
12: end while
13:  $x' \leftarrow AE\text{-Decode}(z)$ 
14: return  $x'$ 
```

¹Minwoo Seong, Gwangbin Kim, Yumin Kang, Junhyuk Jang, and SeungJun Kim are with the School of Integrated Technology, Gwangju Institute of Science and Technology, Gwangju, South Korea; *SeungJun Kim is the corresponding author. ²Joseph DelPreto is with the Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA;




Fig. 1. Motion guidance generation framework

B. Motion Guidance Generation Framework

This framework aims to generate improved full-body motion guidance trajectories, guiding users from their current motion towards expert-like motions without direct imitation, by leveraging a network trained on expert performances. Our framework for generating motion guides consists of three components: 1) a **pretrained classifier** that utilizes badminton players’ joint global position data to predict stroke quality, 2) a **model explainer** that applies a CF algorithm to generate motion guidance based on the original motion data, and 3) a **motion visualizer**. The model explainer transforms the input data into a latent space using an autoencoder and adjusts it based on discrepancies between the model’s predicted stroke quality and the target stroke quality, and a decoder is used to restore the adjusted data (see **Algorithm 1**). Finally, the motion visualizer implemented in Unity was used to compare the original and CF-generated data.

III. EXPERIMENT AND ANALYSIS

A. Model Training Results

We built a model to predict stroke quality based on wearable sensor data, and trained it on people across different skill levels. We selected the Conv1D, ConvLSTM, LSTM, and Transformer models. A baseline model was also established to predict the majority class for comparison.

In terms of metrics for evaluating the model performance, we utilized accuracy, balanced accuracy, and the F1 score. Each model underwent a fivefold cross-validation process. Additionally, data augmentation was performed on the training dataset to enhance the model training and generalization.

After reviewing the outcomes of our model training, as shown in **Table I**, we chose the transformer model for our final implementation. It consistently achieved higher scores across all evaluated metrics than did the other models.

B. Motion Guidance Generation Results

We compared motion guides created by our LatentCF algorithm against those generated by a 1-nearest neighbor (1NN) baseline, calculated using L1 distance, L2 distance, and Dynamic Time Warping (DTW) [7], [8], [9], utilizing standard CF-specific and motion-specific metrics such as

TABLE I
EVALUATION RESULT OF STROKE QUALITY CLASSIFIER

Model	Fivefold Forehand Clear Results		
	Acc _{avg} (SD)	BalAcc _{avg} (SD)	F1 _{avg} (SD)
Transformer	85.12 (1.62)	85.67 (1.57)	85.22 (1.60)
Conv1D	79.97 (2.04)	76.82 (3.43)	78.94 (2.70)
ConvLSTM	80.83 (4.15)	78.41 (6.65)	79.74 (5.51)
LSTM	84.29 (1.78)	84.84 (1.72)	84.40 (1.77)
Baseline	59.17 (2.25)	50.00 (0.00)	44.01 (2.72)
Model	Fivefold Backhand Drive Results		
	Acc _{avg} (SD)	BalAcc _{avg} (SD)	F1 _{avg} (SD)
Transformer	87.89 (0.89)	88.93 (0.76)	88.22 (0.87)
Conv1D	87.53 (3.03)	88.16 (1.50)	87.84 (2.85)
ConvLSTM	85.80 (7.57)	85.92 (3.57)	86.03 (7.16)
LSTM	87.92 (0.77)	88.15 (1.13)	88.19 (0.74)
Baseline	70.77 (2.03)	50.00 (0.00)	58.68 (2.68)

validity (accuracy of the CFs in predicting targets) [8], proximity (measured by L1, L2, and L_{inf} distances) [7], [8], plausibility assessed via local outlier factor (LOF), isolation forest (IF), and one class support vector machine (OCSVM) methods [7], [9], closeness determined via DTW [8], Fréchet motion distances (FMD) and Fréchet pose distances (FPD) [10]. For the 1NN-based CF example, we select the nearest example predicted to have the target stroke quality among the neighbors obtained through 1NN, utilizing raw data for this purpose. To evaluate the performance of each CF generation algorithm, we randomly selected 100 instances of each stroke type, calculated their metrics, and averaged them. Generated CF algorithms were visualized as ghost avatars overlaid on the user’s avatar, with examples at <https://youtu.be/o7bDM5yRbtw>.

The summarized results in **Table II**, show our CF method outperforming the 1NN baselines, significantly reducing the L1, L2, and L_{inf} distances and closely mirroring the original movements. Our approach excels in temporal and sequential alignment, as shown by the DTW, and it demonstrates high validity, thereby affirming its accuracy for motion generation. With plausibility confirmed via LOF, ISO, and OCSVM as

TABLE II

EVALUATION RESULTS OF COUNTERFACTUAL MOTION GUIDANCE

Metric	Forehand Clear			
	Ours (SD)	INN _{L1} (SD)	INN _{L2} (SD)	INN _{DTW} (SD)
Validity ↑	1	1	1	1
L1 ↓	3.41 (1.07)	5.43 (1.63)	5.51 (1.62)	5.54 (1.88)
L2 ↓	0.58 (0.18)	0.91 (0.26)	0.91 (0.26)	0.92 (0.28)
L _{inf} ↓	0.23 (0.06)	0.35 (0.09)	0.34 (0.09)	0.35 (0.09)
LOF ↓	0.36 (0.26)	0.63 (0.30)	0.62 (0.30)	0.62 (0.29)
IF ↓	0.91 (0.13)	0.97 (0.07)	0.97 (0.06)	0.97 (0.08)
OCSVM ↓	0.55 (0.21)	0.68 (0.22)	0.69 (0.21)	0.69 (0.22)
DTW ↓	3.39 (1.16)	5.36 (1.66)	5.42 (1.65)	5.41 (1.75)
FPD ↓	0.33 (0.37)	0.71 (0.56)	0.70 (0.56)	0.69 (0.44)
FMD ↓	1.02 (1.13)	2.16 (1.71)	2.14 (1.71)	2.09 (1.34)

Metric	Backhand Drive			
	Ours (SD)	INN _{L1} (SD)	INN _{L2} (SD)	INN _{DTW} (SD)
Validity ↑	1	1	1	1
L1 ↓	2.99 (0.98)	3.92 (1.14)	3.97 (1.15)	3.97 (1.16)
L2 ↓	0.51 (0.16)	0.67 (0.19)	0.67 (0.19)	0.67 (0.19)
L _{inf} ↓	0.21 (0.06)	0.28 (0.08)	0.26 (0.08)	0.27 (0.08)
LOF ↓	0.44 (0.21)	0.63 (0.26)	0.59 (0.27)	0.61 (0.26)
IF ↓	0.99 (0.03)	0.99 (0.05)	0.98 (0.07)	0.98 (0.07)
OCSVM ↓	0.61 (0.16)	0.78 (0.21)	0.77 (0.22)	0.77 (0.21)
DTW ↓	3.02 (1.06)	3.87 (1.10)	3.92 (1.11)	3.91 (1.11)
FPD ↓	0.28 (0.21)	0.44 (0.25)	0.42 (0.25)	0.44 (0.25)
FMD ↓	0.85 (0.65)	1.33 (0.75)	1.28 (0.75)	1.32 (0.76)

well as the motion-specific metrics provided by FPD and FMD, our method enhances stroke quality.

IV. FUTURE WORKS AND CONCLUSIONS

This study presents a method using CF algorithms to generate badminton guide motions from player movements. In future work, we will use multitask learning for dual assessment of stroke quality and direction, and include user evaluations to validate real-world applicability. Specifically, we plan to incorporate various visual and haptic systems for motion guidance, such as Electrical Muscle Stimulation [11], electrical and vibration feedback [12], [13], [14], and diverse visual cues [15], [16], to enhance the effectiveness of our framework. Additionally, we plan to explore the applications of our multimodal data-based guide motion generation framework in robotics, leveraging its potential for skill transfer and imitation learning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the GIST-MIT Research Collaboration grant funded by the GIST in 2024. We appreciate the high-performance GPU computing support of HPC-AI Open Infrastructure via GIST SCENT.

REFERENCES

- [1] C.-C. Liao, D.-H. Hwang, and H. Koike, "Ai golf: Golf swing analysis tool for self-training," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 106 286–106 295, 2022.
- [2] S. Qiu, H. Zhao, N. Jiang, Z. Wang, L. Liu, Y. An, H. Zhao, X. Miao, R. Liu, and G. Fortino, "Multi-sensor information fusion based on machine learning for real applications in human activity recognition: State-of-the-art and research challenges," *Information Fusion*, vol. 80, pp. 241–265, 2022.
- [3] M. Seong, J. Oh, and S. Kim, "Team badminseok at ijcai coachai badminton challenge 2023: Multi-layer multi-input transformer network (mulminet) with weighted loss," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08262*, 2023.

- [4] I. Ghosh, S. R. Ramamurthy, A. Chakma, and N. Roy, "Decoach: Deep learning-based coaching for badminton player assessment," *Pervasive and Mobile Computing*, vol. 83, p. 101608, 2022.
- [5] S. Wachter, B. Mittelstadt, and C. Russell, "Counterfactual explanations without opening the black box: Automated decisions and the gdpr," *Harv. JL & Tech.*, vol. 31, p. 841, 2017.
- [6] M. Seong, G. Kim, D. Yeo, Y. Kang, H. Yang, J. DelPreto, W. Matusik, D. Rus, and S. Kim, "Multisensebadminton: Wearable sensor-based biomechanical dataset for evaluation of badminton performance," *Scientific Data*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 343, 2024.
- [7] E. Delaney, D. Greene, and M. T. Keane, "Instance-based counterfactual explanations for time series classification," in *International conference on case-based reasoning*. Springer, 2021, pp. 32–47.
- [8] Z. Wang, I. Samsten, R. Mochaourab, and P. Papapetrou, "Learning time series counterfactuals via latent space representations," in *Discovery Science: 24th International Conference, DS 2021, Halifax, NS, Canada, October 11–13, 2021, Proceedings 24*. Springer, 2021, pp. 369–384.
- [9] Z. Wang, I. Samsten, and P. Papapetrou, "Counterfactual explanations for survival prediction of cardiovascular icu patients," in *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine: 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Medicine, AIME 2021, Virtual Event, June 15–18, 2021, Proceedings*. Springer, 2021, pp. 338–348.
- [10] H. Y. Au, J. Chen, J. Jiang, and Y. Guo, "Choreograph: Music-conditioned automatic dance choreography over a style and tempo consistent dynamic graph," in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2022, pp. 3917–3925.
- [11] S. Hwang, J. Oh, S. Kang, M. Seong, A. I. A. M. Elsharkawy, and S. Kim, "Ergopulse: Electrifying your lower body with biomechanical simulation-based electrical muscle stimulation haptic system in virtual reality," in *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2024, pp. 1–21.
- [12] S. Hwang, Y. Kim, Y. Seo, and S. Kim, "Enhancing seamless walking in virtual reality: Application of bone-conduction vibration in redirected walking," in *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality (ISMAR)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1181–1190.
- [13] S. Hwang, J. Lee, Y. Kim, Y. Seo, and S. Kim, "Electrical, vibrational, and cooling stimuli-based redirected walking: Comparison of various vestibular stimulation-based redirected walking systems," in *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2023, pp. 1–18.
- [14] S. Hwang, J. Lee, Y. Kim, and S. Kim, "Reves: Redirection enhancement using four-pole vestibular electrode stimulation," in *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems Extended Abstracts*, 2022, pp. 1–7.
- [15] E. Wu, T. Nozawa, F. Perteneder, and H. Koike, "Vr alpine ski training augmentation using visual cues of leading skier," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, 2020, pp. 878–879.
- [16] E. Wu, F. Perteneder, H. Koike, and T. Nozawa, "How to vizski: Visualizing captured skier motion in a vr ski training simulator," in *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Virtual-Reality Continuum and Its Applications in Industry*, 2019, pp. 1–9.