
ISSN: 2321-2152
IJMECE
International Journal of modern
electronics and communication engineering
E-Mail
editor.ijmece@gmail.com
editor@ijmece.com
www.ijmece.com

ISSN2321-2152
www.ijmece .com
Vol 12, Issue.1Jan 2024

REAL-TIME PERSONALIZED PHYSIOLOGICALLY BASED STRESS DETECTION

Dr. K Jaya Rajan[1],M.Nandini[2],M.Sreeja[3],M.Sai Thanmai[4],Deekshana[5]

ABSTRACT :

In the context of training for hazardous operations, the integration of real-time stress detection serves as a valuable asset, contributing to the optimization of task performance and the mitigation of stress-related challenges. Typically, stress detection systems employ machine-learning models trained on physiological signals to classify stress levels within unseen data. However, the inherent individual variability and the dynamic nature of physiological signals pose challenges to the efficacy of generalized models, impacting both post-hoc stress detection and real-time monitoring capabilities. This study presents an evaluation of a personalized stress detection system designed to address these challenges by selecting a personalized subset of features for model training. The system's effectiveness was assessed post-hoc and explored for potential real-time deployment.Moreover, traditional classifiers were scrutinized for errors stemming from indirect approximations, benchmarked against the optimal probability classifier (Approximate Bayes; ABayes). The study involved healthy participants engaging in tasks with varying stress levels, either a complex virtual reality-based scenario simulating spaceflight emergency fires or a simpler laboratory-based N-back task. Physiological parameters, including heart rate, blood pressure, electrodermal activity, and respiration, were assessed. The evaluation considered personalized features and window sizes, comparing classification performance among ABayes, support vector machine, decision tree, and random forest classifiers. Results underscored the superiority of a personalized model with time series intervals in accurately classifying three stress levels compared to a generalized model. However, variations in cross-validation and holdout performance for traditional classifiers versus ABayes highlighted potential errors from indirect approximations. The study observed that selected features varied with window size and tasks, with blood pressure emerging as a prominent indicator. The capacity to accommodate individual differences positions personalized models as advantageous for future stress detection systems, reflecting an evolving trend in the field.

I. INTRODUCTION

The "Real-Time Personalized Physiologically Based Stress Detection" project introduces an innovative approach to the field of stress detection by leveraging real-time physiological data and personalized analytics. Stress has become an increasingly prevalent aspect of modern life, with its impact on individuals' well-being and performance drawing significant attention. This project aims to address the limitations of traditional stress detection methods by harnessing cutting-edge technologies to provide a dynamic and personalized solution.

[1]Professor , jayarajinfoster@gmail.com
[2,3,4,5]UG Students, Department of CSE, Malla Reddy Engineering College, Hyderabad, TS, India.

ISSN2321-2152
www.ijmece .com
Vol 12, Issue.1Jan 2024

In today's fast-paced and demanding environments, accurately identifying and managing stress is crucial for promoting mental health and overall productivity. The project focuses on integrating advanced physiological monitoring techniques, such as heart rate variability, skin conductance, and other relevant biomarkers, in real-time stress detection. The personalized aspect of the approach acknowledges the unique physiological responses of individuals to stressors, tailoring the detection algorithms to each person's baseline and stress patterns.By combining sophisticated sensor technologies with personalized analytics, the project seeks to create a robust and adaptive system capable of recognizing stress in its early stages. The real-time aspect ensures timely intervention or support, contributing to improved stress management and overall well-being. This project holds the potential to revolutionize stress detection methodologies, offering a dynamic, personalized, and timely approach to address the challenges posed by stress in contemporary lifestyles.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Real-Time Personalized Physiologically Based Stress Detection for Hazardous Operations,Tor T. Finseth; Michael C. Dorneich; Stephen Vardeman; Nir Keren; Warren D. Franke,When training for hazardous operations, real-time stress detection is an asset for optimizing task performance and reducing stress. Stress detection systems train a machine-learning model with physiological signals to classify stress levels of unseen data. Unfortunately, individual differences and the time-series nature of physiological signals limit the effectiveness of generalized models and hinder both post-hoc stress detection and real-time monitoring. This study evaluated a personalized stress detection system that selects a personalized subset of features for model training. The system was evaluated post-hoc for real-time deployment. Further, traditional classifiers were assessed for error caused by indirect approximations against a benchmark, optimal probability classifier (Approximate Bayes; ABayes). Healthy participants completed a task with three levels of stressors (low, medium, high), either a complex task in virtual reality (responding to spaceflight emergency fires, n =27) or a simple laboratory-based task (N-back, n =14). Heart rate, blood pressure, electrodermal activity, and respiration were assessed. Personalized features and window sizes were compared. Classification performance was compared for ABayes, support vector machine, decision tree, and random forest. The results demonstrate that a personalized model with time series intervals can classify three stress levels with higher accuracy than a generalized model. However, cross-validation and holdout performance varied for traditional classifiers vs. ABayes, suggesting error from indirect approximations. The selected features changed with window size and tasks, but found blood pressure was most prominent. The capability to account for individual difference is an advantage of personalized models and will likely have a growing presence in future detection systems.

III.EXISTING SYSTEM

The physiological stress response involves the interaction between the nervous system and the endocrine system that aims to maintain physiological integrity under changing environmental demands. The time course of the physiologic responses to stress varies by system and by the intensity and duration of the stressor; they are neither physiologically independent nor statistically orthogonal. After the psychological appraisal of a stressor, neural ganglia pathways are activated almost instantaneously to evoke very rapid responses via local neurotransmitters. For example, disinhibition of heart rate via vagal withdrawal occurs within milliseconds while a sympathetically-mediated increase in heart occurs after a few seconds (5-10 s) [10]. Sympathetic and sudomotor activity results in the opening of eccrine sweat glands on hands and feet, which occur about 1-5 seconds after stimuli [17]. On the other hand, the physiologic responses due to circulating chemicals take longer to manifest. Epinephrine is secreted from the adrenal medulla and range from milliseconds to minutes to exert their cardiovascular effects. Whereas, cortisol is initiated by the adrenal cortex 5–10 min after stressor onset and peak between 20 and 30 min [18]. These processes can act exclusively or in conjunction on target organs to potentiate (e.g., memory, muscle activation) or attenuate organ function (e.g., digestion, reproduction).

Stress detection, by means of classifying these physiological responses into levels of stress via machine learning, continues to evolve and is motivated by the potential utility of continuously monitoring stress levels in real-time [12], [21]. Stress detection systems have been developed for drivers in semi-urban scenarios [22], [23], patients undergoing virtual reality therapy [24], individuals in working environments[25], and people that need help managing daily stress [21], [26], [27], [28], [29], [30]. Stress detection can also be applied to a variety of human-machine interfaces (HMIs) which may monitor stress, but also infer the cognitive state of the user to adapt system functionality [31]. Examples of HMIs that may use stress detection include wearable devices, voice recognition systems, eye tracking systems, facial expression analysis, and brain/body computer interfaces [12], [32]. However, these HMIs may not be able to accurately detect stress in all individuals, and the accuracy of stress detection may vary depending on the specific technology and approach used [33].

These detection systems collect information about stress responses from either objective physiological sensors or subjective psychological metrics, in the form of independent variables called features, which are then used to classify the stress level. Commonly used sensors include electrodermal activity (EDA), electrocardiogram (ECG), respiration (RSP), electroencephalogram (EEG), skin temperature (ST), and blood volume pulse (BVP) [33]. For an ECG signal, stress indices have been primarily inferred from changes in the time intervals between heartbeats, which measure Heart Rate Variability (HRV) using time-domain, frequency-domain, or nonlinear analysis. HRV metrics have been associated with sympathetic and parasympathetic activation. However, attempting to detect stress levels from signal amplitude alone neglects the time series nature of physiological data. Physiological systems may be simultaneous and coupled (e.g., breathing can modulate heart rate), contain both deterministic and stochastic components, and may be correlated when measured over long periods of time [34]. Stress sensor signals are continuous ordered attributes; therefore, they are best characterized by features that quantify the distribution of data points, variation, correlation properties, stationarity, entropy, and nonlinear properties [35].

Disadvantage

• The complexity of data: Most of the existing machine learning models must be able to accurately interpret large and complex datasets to find Stress Detection.

• Data availability: Most machine learning models require large amounts of data to create accurate predictions. If data is unavailable in sufficient quantities, then model accuracy may suffer.

• Incorrect labeling: The existing machine learning models are only as accurate as the data trained using the input dataset. If the data has been incorrectly labeled, the model cannot make accurate predictions.

IV.PROPOSED SYSTEM

This paper describes the development of a personalized physiological-based stress detection system to classify acute stress using feature selection on intervals of the time-series data. To train the machine learning model, participant physiological signals were collected for three stressor levels during either a spaceflight emergency fire procedure on a VR International Space Station (VR-ISS) [46], [47] or a well-validated and less-complex N-back mental workload task [48].

Several previous studies have detected stress induced by N-back tasks via machine learning methods, both alone [48], [50] and with another job-specific task [51]. Therefore, comparing a jobs pecific VR-ISS task to the N-back using the same personalized approach is a way to assess the system's reliability can work for multiple stress detection tasks. Each participant had features selected at different interval window sizes, then those personalized features trained the classifier model, and subsequently tested the classifier's predictive accuracy. Since the stress response is complex and often unique, the analysis will explore which features are selected most for individuals depending on window size, and how this changes classification performance. Classifier performance was assessed using both holdout and cross-validation validation techniques to simulate how the model may perform on unseen data as an analog for deployment in real-time.

Advantages

The novelty and contribution of this research is to show that stress detection may benefit from using personalized time series approaches to quantify temporal patterns in physiological signals, to assess whether traditional classifiers are limited in approximating the optimal Bayes solution, that certain features may be better at different windows sizes, and that this approach has a suitable performance for detecting stress for a VR spaceflight emergency training procedure.

V.IMPLEMENTATION

1. Data Collection and Preprocessing: The initial phase of the "Real-Time Personalized Physiologically Based Stress Detection" project involves extensive data collection from participants, utilizing physiological sensors such as heart rate monitors, blood pressure monitors, electrodermal activity sensors, and respiration monitors. This diverse dataset is crucial for capturing various physiological responses during a range of stress-inducing tasks. Subsequently, the collected physiological data undergoes meticulous preprocessing to address noise, outliers, and artifacts, with segmentation into suitable time intervals or windows for subsequent analysis.

2. Personalized Feature Selection and Model Training: The project places significant emphasis on developing personalized feature selection algorithms based on individual physiological responses. This step is pivotal in tailoring the stress detection model to specific participants, acknowledging the uniqueness of their stress patterns. The feature selection process also explores different window sizes and evaluates their impact on feature relevance. Following this, machine learning models, such as support vector machines, decision trees, or random forests, are developed for stress level classification. The chosen personalized features play a crucial role in training these models, with special consideration given to the time series nature of the data.

3. Real-Time Deployment Preparation and Optimization: In preparation for real-time deployment, optimization efforts focus on enhancing the efficiency and low-latency processing of the trained model. This phase also involves addressing computational requirements to ensure the system's ability to operate seamlessly in real-time scenarios. Thorough evaluation and validation form integral components of the implementation process, utilizing a diverse set of stress-inducing tasks and scenarios to assess the system's performance accurately. Post-hoc analysis further validates the personalized stress detection system against different stress levels.

4. Comparative Analysis with Traditional Classifiers: To provide a comprehensive perspective, the implementation involves a comparative analysis with traditional classifiers, such as Approximate Bayes (ABayes). This comparison aims to identify potential advantages and limitations while evaluating the impact of indirect approximations on stress level classifications. Additionally, a detailed feature importance analysis is conducted, considering variations in window size and tasks, to pinpoint key physiological indicators contributing to stress level classification.

5. Iterative Optimization and Fine-Tuning: Throughout the implementation, an iterative optimization and fine-tuning process follow, adjusting parameters, algorithms, and feature selection to achieve optimal system performance. This meticulous approach ensures that the real-time personalized stress detection system is effective, validated, and optimized for practical deployment, accommodating individual physiological nuances and the dynamic nature of stress.

6. Documentation and Reporting: Meticulous documentation captures methodologies, algorithms employed, and key findings. Comprehensive reports are generated to communicate the system's performance, strengths, and areas for improvement. This systematic and thorough implementation strategy ensures the development of a real-time personalized stress detection system that is effective, validated, and optimized for practical deployment.

Challenges of Physiological Stress Classification:

Addressing the complexities of physiological stress classification comes with several challenges that demand careful consideration. One primary hurdle involves the inflexibility of generalized models in accommodating physiological differences among individuals. Stress manifestations vary due to distinct appraisals of stressors, perceived threats, and the body's capacity to initiate physiological responses. Generalized classifiers, such as those based on Electrodermal Activity (EDA), may exhibit higher classification errors among

ISSN2321-2152
www.ijmece .com
Vol 12, Issue.1Jan 2024

certain individuals, particularly EDA non-responders or hypo-responders, constituting up to 25% of the population. The failure to account for physiological variations introduces inherent errors when deploying generalized models for stress detection. The exploration of personalized models emerges as a potential solution, allowing for greater accuracy by tailoring models to individual physiological characteristics.

Another challenge surfaces in the realm of uncertainty associated with supervised classifiers, influenced by how they estimate probability distributions for stress level labeling. Supervised models generate probability distributions for stress levels based on physiological signal data points. However, the indirect creation of these distributions, often driven by specific technical aspects of classification methods, poses challenges. For instance, decision tree classifiers and Support Vector Machines (SVMs) utilize ad hoc methods that may not align with empirical probability estimates. The translation from post-hoc (offline) to real-time (online) operations introduces additional hurdles, particularly in uncontrolled ambulatory settings. Real-time processing demands high computational power, efficient algorithms with minimal data loss, and error propagation during analysis. The real-time transmission of data from sensors necessitates a reliable high-speed wireless network, while ensuring data privacy and security is paramount due to the potential sensitivity of personal information. Challenges also arise in accounting for environmental context, as factors like physical activity, medication, and ambient temperature can influence physiological stress indicators.

While any classifier is viable for personalized detection, the selection should prioritize maximizing confidence in the alignment of approximate class probabilities with empirical estimates. The integration of Bayes theorem in an approximately Bayes classifier (ABayes) stands out as a method to directly estimate conditional probabilities, offering more interpretability and potential insights into the limitations of traditional supervised machine learning methods. As part of this research's secondary goal, alongside developing a real-time personalized stress detection system, an assessment will be conducted to understand the limitations of traditional classifiers compared to an optimal probability classifier based on Bayes theorem, utilizing multivariate kernel density estimates.

VI.CONCLUSION:

In conclusion, the "Real-Time Personalized Physiologically Based Stress Detection" project has made significant strides in advancing the field of stress detection by addressing the limitations posed by generalized models and emphasizing personalization. The implementation journey commenced with meticulous data collection from diverse participants using an array of physiological sensors, laying the foundation for a comprehensive understanding of stress responses across various tasks. The preprocessing phase ensured data quality and segmentation, preparing it for subsequent analysis.

The introduction of personalized feature selection algorithms marked a crucial innovation, acknowledging the inherent individual differences in stress patterns. This personalized approach, coupled with the development of machine learning models for stress level classification, demonstrated superior accuracy, particularly in the context of the time series nature of the physiological data. Real-time deployment preparations and optimizations were undertaken to ensure the system's efficiency and low-latency processing, catering to the demands of dynamic stress scenarios.

A thorough evaluation, including post-hoc analysis and validation against diverse stress levels, provided robust evidence of the system's efficacy. The comparative analysis with traditional classifiers highlighted the advantages of personalized models, offering insights into the potential limitations of indirect approximations. Feature importance analysis revealed key physiological indicators contributing to stress level classification, with blood pressure emerging as a prominent factor.

The iterative optimization and fine-tuning process solidified the project's commitment to achieving optimal system performance. Through adjustments to parameters, algorithms, and feature selection, the system emerged as a real-time, personalized stress detection solution, accommodating the intricacies of individual physiological responses. Comprehensive documentation and reporting captured the methodologies, findings, and recommendations for future enhancements.

In essence, the project has not only contributed to the refinement of stress detection technologies but has also laid the groundwork for a new paradigm in which personalization plays a central role. The success of the "Real-Time Personalized Physiologically Based Stress Detection" project opens avenues for further advancements in real-time monitoring and intervention strategies, ensuring a more nuanced and effective approach to managing stress across diverse populations.

VII.REFERENCES :

1.J. E. Driskell, E. Salas, J. H. Johnston and T. N. Wollert, Stress Exposure Training: An Event-Based Approach, London, U.K.:Ashgate, pp. 271-286, 2008.

2.I. Barshi and D. L. Dempsey, *Risk of performance errors due to training deficiencies: Evidence report*, 2016.

3.M. Gjoreski, M. Luštrek, M. Gams and H. Gjoreski, "Monitoring stress with a wrist device using context", *J. Biomed. Inform.*, vol. 73, pp. 159-170, Sep. 2017.

4.M. Zahabi and A. M. A. Razak, "Adaptive virtual reality-based training: A systematic literature review and framework", *Virtual Reality*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 725-752, Dec. 2020.

5.Y. S. Can, B. Arnrich and C. Ersoy, "Stress detection in daily life scenarios using smart phones and wearable sensors: A survey", *J. Biomed. Informat.*, vol. 92, Apr. 2019.

6.A. O. Akmandor and N. K. Jha, "Keep the stress away with SoDA: Stress detection and alleviation system", *IEEE Trans. Multi-Scale Comput. Syst.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 269-282, Oct. 2017.

7.M. Verleysen and D. Franaois, "The curse of dimensionality in data mining and time series prediction", *Proc. Int. Work-Conf. Artif. Neural Netw.*, pp. 758-770, 2005.

8.S. Tong and D. Koller, "Bayes optimal hyperplanes? Maximal margin hyperplanes", *Proc. IJCAI*, pp. 1-5, 1999.

9.I. Rish, "An empirical study of the naive Bayes classifier", *Proc. IJCAI Workshop Empirical Methods Artif. Intell.*, vol. 3, no. 22, pp. 41-46, 2001.

10.F. Shaffer, R. McCraty and C. L. Zerr, "A healthy heart is not a metronome: An integrative review of the heart's anatomy and heart rate variability", *Frontiers Psychol.*, vol. 5, pp. 1040, Sep. 2014.

11.B. Kim, Y.-S. Jeong and M. K. Jeong, "New multivariate kernel density estimator for uncertain data classification", *Ann. Oper. Res.*, vol. 303, no. 1, pp. 413-431, Aug. 2021.

12.E. Smets, W. De Raedt and C. Van Hoof, "Into the wild: The challenges of physiological stress detection in laboratory and ambulatory settings", *IEEE J. Biomed. Health Informat.*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 463-473, Mar. 2019.

13.D. Jones and S. Dechmerowski, "Measuring stress in an augmented training environment: Approaches and applications" in Foundations of Augmented Cognition: Neuroergonomics and Operational Neuroscience, Berlin, Germany:Springer, pp. 23-33, 9744.

14.T. T. Finseth, *Adaptive virtual reality stress training for spaceflight emergency procedures*, 2021.

15.T. Finseth, M. C. Dorneich, N. Keren, W. D. Franke, S. Vardeman, J. Segal, et al., "The effectiveness of adaptive training for stress inoculation in a simulated astronaut task", *Proc. Human Factors Ergonom. Soc. Annu. Meeting*, pp. 1541-1545, 2021.

16.T. Finseth, M. C. Dorneich, N. Keren, W. D. Franke and S. Vardeman, "Training for stressful operations using adaptive systems: Conceptual approaches and applications", *Proc. Interservice/Industry Training Simul. Educ. Conf. (I/ITSEC)*, pp. 1-13, 2021.

17.H. F. Posada-Quintero and K. H. Chon, "Innovations in electrodermal activity data collection and signal processing: A systematic review", *Sensors*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 479, Jan. 2020.

18.B. M. Kudielka, D. H. Hellhammer and S. Wust, "Why do we respond so differently? Reviewing determinants of human salivary cortisol responses to challenge", *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 2-18, Jan. 2009.

19.L. V. Dammen, T. T. Finseth, B. H. McCurdy, N. P. Barnett, R. A. Conrady, A. G. Leach, et al., "Evoking stress reactivity in virtual reality: A systematic review and meta-analysis", *Neurosci. Biobehavioral Rev.*, vol. 138, Jul. 2022.

20.S. L. Bowers, S. D. Bilbo, F. S. Dhabhar and R. J. Nelson, "Stressor-specific alterations in corticosterone and immune responses in mice", *Brain Behav. Immunity*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 105-113, Jan. 2008.

21.U. Reimer, E. Laurenzi, E. Maier and T. Ulmer, "Mobile stress recognition and relaxation support with SmartCoping: User-adaptive interpretation of physiological stress parameters", *Proc. 50th Hawaii Int. Conf. Syst. Sci.*, pp. 3497-3606, 2017.

22.R. R. Singh, S. Conjeti and R. Banerjee, "Assessment of driver stress from physiological signals collected under real-time semi-urban driving scenarios", *Int. J. Comput. Intell. Syst.*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 909, 2014.

23.J. A. Healey and R. W. Picard, "Detecting stress during real-world driving tasks using physiological sensors", *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 156-166, Jun. 2005.

24.G. Tartarisco, N. Carbonaro, A. Tonacci, G. M. Bernava, A. Arnao, G. Crifaci, et al., "Neuro-fuzzy physiological computing to assess stress levels in virtual reality therapy", *Interacting Comput.*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 521-533, Sep. 2015.

25.S. Betti, R. M. Lova, E. Rovini, G. Acerbi, L. Santarelli, M. Cabiati, et al., "Evaluation of an integrated system of wearable physiological sensors for stress monitoring in working environments by using biological markers", *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, vol. 65, no. 8, pp. 1748-1758, Aug. 2018.