Stressed or Just Running? Differentiation of Mental Stress and Physical Activity by Using Machine Learning
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Abstract: Recently, modern people have excessive stress in their daily lives. With the advances in physiological sensors and wearable technology, people’s physiological status can be tracked, and stress levels can be recognized for providing beneficial services. Smartwatches and smartbands constitute the majority of wearable devices. Although they have an excellent potential for physiological stress recognition, some crucial issues need to be addressed, such as the resemblance of physiological reaction to stress and physical activity, artifacts caused by movements and low data quality. This paper focused on examining and differentiating physiological responses to both stressors and physical activity. Physiological data are collected in the laboratory environment, which contains relaxed, stressful and physically active states and they are differentiated successfully by using machine learning.
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1. Introduction

Stress is one of the significant issues in modern society. It is generally experienced when individuals fail to respond to mental, emotional, or physical demands competently [1]. Hence, the major causes of stress can be listed as the exposure to the demands and pressures from physical or mental activities or self-imposed requirements, obligations and self-criticism [2]. Severe illnesses can be caused by stress such as depression, cardiovascular diseases, infectious diseases, and cancer [3] and therefore, continuous measurement of stress in daily life gains importance. In behavioral science, researchers usually employ self-reports by periodically collecting instantaneous assessments of perceived stress. However, it is not possible to recognize stress levels with this approach continuously because of its burden and obtrusiveness. Therefore, researchers investigated different sensing techniques for recognizing stress levels automatically, such as facial expressions, physiological signals, speech and gestures. Due to their non-invasiveness, privacy and ease of use in daily lives, detecting stress by using smartbands and smartwatches from physiological signals attracted more attention.

Notwithstanding the high potential of smartbands and smartwatches in stress detection, researchers need to deal with several issues in exploiting physiological reactions. The first one is the similar physiological reactions to stressors and changes in physical or mental conditions. A physiological pattern might not necessarily indicate a stress level change [4, 5]. Similar physiological reactions can be seen under demanding physical activities, physical discomfort, noise, changes in posture, lighting conditions, demanding mental task and emotional stress [1]. The second issue is the limitations of these devices for detecting physiological signals. They are sensitive to
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noise, might miss samples, and have problems with battery life. The third issue is the different types of stress
can have varying physiological expressions. Under physical stress, the sympathetic nervous reaction is more
dominant, but under cognitive stress, the adrenal reaction is more dominant. Finally, physiological reactions to
stressors depend on individuals. Personalizing stress models might be necessary for accurate systems.

With the widespread usage of these wrist-worn wearables, health applications have been developed for
improving the life quality of users. However, these devices are not without challenges. Periodical stress detection
apps were developed by consumer smartwatch companies, but they require users to be still during these periodic
measurements. The exact instruction is "During a stress test, wear your watch correctly and keep still.". This
means that these applications are not appropriate for recognizing the stress levels of individuals in their daily
lives because the movements are unlimited. The reasons for this requirement could be artifacts caused by
movements or difficulty in differentiating physical activity and stress from physiological responses.

In this study, a stress and physical activity differentiation system is developed, which is implemented for
unobtrusive smart wearable devices. To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first one to differentiate
stress and physical activity system works with smart bands. The system is tested on 14 participants in the
laboratory environment. Heart rate variability (HRV) and electrodermal activity (EDA) signals obtained from
an Empatica E4 smartband are used for this purpose. After cleaning the artifacts, most discriminative features
were extracted. A variety of classifiers were tested for differentiating stressful, relaxed, physically active states.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, the related work is provided for automatic
stress and physical activity recognition systems that use smart bands or smartwatches. In Section 3, the data
collection procedure is explained. In Section 4, the proposed smart band-based stress and physical activity
differentiation scheme is presented. In Section 5, the experimental results of the proposed system are discussed.
In Section 6, the findings of the study are evaluated and future work of the current research is discussed.

2. Literature Review

After the emergence of smartbands and smartwatches, researchers used them to improve the quality of life.
In the literature, there are studies for recognizing physical activity and mental stress levels. Physical activity
intensity level detection studies were accelerated with the emergence of smartphones. The motion sensors (accelerometer and gyroscope) were used for this purpose [6]. After smartphones, smartwatches and smartbands
were also employed for physical activity detection. Degroote et al. [7] used Polar M600, Huawei watch and
Asus Zenwatch for detecting physical activity levels. The accelerometer sensors were employed in these devices.
In daily life, they achieved approximately 72.25% accuracy. Dobbins and Rawssizadeh [8] developed a physical
activity level recognition system. They used an LG watch and Samsung Gear S watch and utilized the combina-
tion of acceleration data of smartwatches and a smartphone for physical activity level detection. They achieved
78.61% accuracy. Davoudi et al. [9] conducted a validity study of Samsung Gear S devices for physical activity
level recognition and showed that they have 87% accuracy.

Another widely conducted research field with smartwatches and smartbands is automatic stress recogni-
tion. Stress has a physiological reaction and it can be measured from physiological signals such as Electrodermal
Activity (EDA), HRV, Skin Temperature (ST) and Acceleration (ACC). Samsung Gear S, S2 and Microsoft
Band 2 are among the widely used commercial smartwatches and Empatica E4 is a commonly used research-
HRV information and detected stress levels in real-life settings. De Arriba-Perez et al. [11] used Microsoft
Band 2 for detecting mental stress in laboratory settings and achieved 85% accuracy. Siirtola et al. [12] used a
public dataset WESAD and performed experiments. This dataset contains physiological data of participants in
a laboratory environment collected with Empatica E4. Can et al. [13] used a combination of smartwatches and
smartbands for collecting data in a real-life event. By using HRV and EDA, they achieved 90% accuracy for
detecting mental stress. They also analyzed the difference in physiological reactions between cognitive load and
mental stress. As it can be seen from the literature, physical activity intensity and mental stress are studied
separately in several studies. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is not any study that investigates
both physical activity and mental stress and tries to differentiate them.

Figure 1: The experiment procedure is shown.

3. Laboratory Data Collection
The laboratory data were collected through a psychological experiment by using an implementation of the Trier
Social Test (TSST) [14]. TSST is commonly used to induce stress in the literature. Controlled laboratory data
were obtained from the 14 subjects who participated in the experiment. All participants followed the same
process. They were college students whose ages are between 20 and 25. Nine of them were males and five of
them were females. The experiment took approximately 1 hour and it consists of baseline (pre-stress), mental
stress, recovery and physical activity sessions (see Figure 1).

Interviewers and the participants communicated in Turkish which is the mother tongue of all participants.
Furthermore, they can speak English as a foreign language. This fact is utilized for inducing stress on the
participants. The participants wear the Empatica E4 smart bands during the experiment and the sessions were
recorded with a camera. The physiological signals of a participant during the experiment are shown in Figure
2.

In total, we collected 14 hours of physiological data and 56 self-reports in the laboratory environment.
The data is imbalanced in terms of labels. Approximately 50% of the data is stressed data, 33% of the data is
relaxed data, and the remaining 16% of the data is divided into physically active and recovery sessions equally.
In order to overcome the class imbalance problem, the randomly undersampling method is used while extracting
the results.

3.1. Set Up
In the set-up phase;
1. Experiment areas are prepared, the camera is set and we check the Empatica E4 smartband battery and functionalities.

2. Interviewers are prepared. They keep an eye contact with the participant during the experiment. Their gestures and mimics should be neutral.

3. We informed the participants about the procedure and then they sign the consent forms.

4. The participant wears the smartband (Empatica E4).

5. The participants are asked to turn off their cellphone to refrain from distraction.

3.2. Pre-stress Phase

In the pre-stress phase;

1. Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-14) form is filled.

2. The participants stay in the waiting area and relax for 10 minutes. We put emotionally neutral magazines such as home, garden, car, furniture, fashion related ones for them to read.

3.3. The TSST Phase

The TSST is implemented as follows;

1. The participant enters the interview area.

2. For preparing the TSST speech, we read the following text to all the participants: "This is the speech preparation portion of the task; you are expected to prepare a five-minute speech describing why you study [name of the degree that the participant studies/studied] and why you would be a good candidate for your ideal job. Your speech will be videotaped and reviewed by the psychologists that we conduct the research. You have five minutes to prepare and your time begins now."

3. After that, the participants prepare their speech. The digital timer is set to five minutes. Interviewers leave the room during this phase.

4. At the end of the speech preparation phase we inform them by reading the following text: "This is the speech portion of the task. You should speak for the entire five-minute time period. Your time begins now.". Interviewers should start the recording of the camera.

5. TSST speech performance period: If the participant stops during this period, interviewers allow him/her to stay silent for around 20 seconds and then prompt: "You still have time remaining."

6. After the first 2 minutes of the speech period, the participants are interrupted and asked to continue their speech in English by telling them: "Could you continue in English from now on, please?"

7. At the end of 2.5 minutes, if the participant does not attempt to reply to both questions, interviewers prompt the participant to answer the other question.
8. At the end of the speech performance period, the communication between interviewers and the participant resumes in Turkish. Interviewers reset the timer to 5 minutes and read the following to the participant: "During the final five-minute math portion of this task, you will be asked to sequentially subtract 13 from 1,022. You will verbally report your answers aloud and be asked to start over from 1,022 if a mistake is made. Your time begins now." If the participant makes any mistake, the interviewer says the following: "That is incorrect, please start over from 1,022."

3.4. Post-stress Recovery Phase

In order to decrease the stress levels of participants, we applied a biofeedback-based intervention technique which is the built-in breathing application of Apple Watch. The technique is applied as follows:

1. Participants sit on the couch as a relaxing place.
2. Participants wear the Apple Watch provided to them and follow the breathing exercise built in the Apple Watch for a minute and then follow a mindfulness video, for the remaining four minutes, on a comfortable couch, while sitting or lying as they prefer.
3. Interviewers leave the room after giving the Apple Watch to the participants.
4. At the end of the five-minute-long recovery period, interviewers return to the room.

3.5. Physical Activity Phase

1. Interviewers leave the room in order not to induce stress during the physical-activity period.
2. Participant follows a five-minute-long exercise on Youtube. It is an intense cardio workout without using any equipment. The link could be accessed at "https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tz9d7By2ytQ"
3. Interviewers return to the room and return the pieces of equipment.

Figure 2: The changes in physiological signals of a participant during the experiment. The top signal is EDA, the middle signal is Acceleration and the bottom one is heart rate signal.
4. Mental Stress and Physical Activity Level Detection Method

An unobtrusive stress and physical activity detection system which is suitable for daily life use is proposed (see Figure 3). Empatica E4 smart wristband is selected as the unobtrusive device. Battery life of this device is around forty eight hours and it has a 3D accelerometer sensor, a photoplethysmography (PPG) sensor, a skin temperature sensor and an EDA sensor. However, it has lower data quality than medical-grade devices and it is more sensitive to unrestricted motions in daily life. Therefore, state-of-the-art preprocessing, feature extraction and machine learning algorithms are required for daily life stress and physical activity level detection and differentiation system. Pre-processing and feature extraction modules were developed in our previous study [15].

![Figure 3: The high-level block diagram of the proposed system is shown.](image)

4.1. Preprocessing

Physiological time-series data obtained from various sensors of the smartband were divided into non-overlapping windows. The window sizes are determined as 120 seconds because stress stimulation and recovery processes lasted around a 3-4 minutes and selected window lengths can capture them 1.

4.1.1. HRV Artifact Detection and Removal Module

An artifact detection percentage threshold between each R to R interval and the local average was applied for the heart rate signal. The threshold was selected as 20% because it is unlikely that RR intervals can deviate from the local mean with that amount [16]. The removed artifact data points were replaced with a cubic spline interpolation function, as implemented in Kubios [16]. The interpolation technique achieved better results, and therefore it is preferred to the application of minimum consecutive time and sample constraints on the remaining data [17]. The windows that contain more than 10% artifacts were discarded.

---

4.1.2. EDA Artifact Detection and Removal Module
The toolbox developed by Taylor et al. [18] was used to detect and remove the artifacts in the EDA signal.
The EDAExplorer toolbox employs the SVM algorithm and determines artifact data points in the EDA signal
with less than 5% error by examining ST, ACC, and EDA signals. The artifacts were automatically removed
after detected by this tool. The batch processing feature was further added. Then, the cleaned signal is passed
to the EDA feature extraction unit.

4.2. Feature Extraction
For each modality, discriminative features are extracted. These state-of-the-art features were commonly used in
the literature [19–21]. The feature extraction methodologies for each of the physiological signals are described
in this section.

4.2.1. HRV Feature Extraction Module
Thirteen HRV features were computed by analyzing the RR intervals. To extract frequency-domain features,
two methods are applied. Firstly, RR intervals are re-sampled at 4 Hz [22] and Fast Fourier transform (FFT)
is applied. In a second way, the Lomb-Scargle technique is applied, which is a special technique for converting
non-equidistant sampled signals to the frequency domain. The extracted heart rate variability features are listed
as: 1. Mean value of the inter-beat (RR) intervals 2. Standard deviation of the inter-beat interval 3. Root
mean square of the successive difference of the RR intervals. 4. Percentage of the number of the successive RR
intervals varying more than 50 ms from the previous interval 5. Total number of RR intervals divided by the
height of the histogram of all RR intervals measured on a scale with bins of 1/128 s 6. Triangular interpolation
of RR interval histogram 7. Power in the low-frequency band (0.04–0.15 Hz), 8. Power in the high-frequency
band (0.15–0.4 Hz) 9. Ratio of LF to HF. 10. Prevalent low-frequency oscillation of the heart rate 11. Prevalent
high-frequency oscillation of the heart rate 12. Power in the very low-frequency band (0.00–0.04 Hz) 13. Related
standard deviation of successive RR interval differences.

4.2.2. EDA Feature Extraction Module
EDA signal is decomposed into phasic and tonic components using the convex optimization-based EDAcvx tool
[18]. EDAcvx also cleanses the Gaussian noise. Ten discriminative features from both the tonic and phasic
components of the EDA signal were extracted. Percentiles are very usable for examining the distribution of
number sets using various EDA graphs, and different percentiles were used. The following EDA features were
percentile 10. Quartile deviation.

4.2.3. ACC Feature Extraction Module
The sensor data of the accelerometer is employed for two different purposes. First, features are extracted
from this sensor. This sensor was further used to clean the EDA signal in the EDAExplorer tool. Extracted
accelerometer features are Mean X (Mean acceleration over x-axis), Mean Y (Mean acceleration over y-axis),
Mean Z (Mean acceleration over z-axis), Mean ACC MAG (Mean acceleration over acceleration magnitude
axis).
4.3. Machine Learning Classification Algorithms

To detect stress and physical activity levels separately and differentiate them, the Python Keras and Scikit libraries are employed. Several preprocessing tools were applied to the data before initiating the classification process. When the number of instances in each class is concerned, our dataset is not balanced. Extra samples of the majority class were removed, and this issue was solved. Therefore, the biasing of the classifiers towards the majority classes was prevented. Five different machine learning classifiers were used. They are the most widely applied classifiers in the literature [19], [25], Logistic Regression (LR), kNN, Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP), Support Vector Machine (SVM) and Random Forest (RF). Python scikit library was used for the implementation of these classifiers. The default parameters were used. In order to evaluate the performance of the classifiers, 10-fold cross-validation was applied.

4.3.1. Support Vector Machines (SVM)

SVM creates decision planes that define decision boundaries. A decision plane can be defined as the plane that divides objects belonging to different classes. In some classification tasks, complex decision structures are needed to separate these objects into their classes correctly. Support Vector Machines are designed to cope with this kind of task. SVM rearranges objects using kernels which are a set of mathematical functions [26]. The objects are mapped or transformed so that they can be easily separated by less complex planes.

4.3.2. k Nearest Neighbors (kNN)

This method relies on memory for saving instances with known outputs. Labels of these instances are known. When a new test instance is to be decided, the output of the closest known objects is examined. The majority of votes rule is applied. The output that has emerged on the majority among these neighbors is assigned to the test instance. The distance formula (Euclidean, Mahalanobis, etc.) and the number of closest objects that are being evaluated (k number) are important parameters for the kNN algorithm.

4.3.3. Decision Tree / Random Forest

Decision trees are ML tools that are used for regression or classification of both continuous and discrete variables [26]. The structure of this ML model inspired its name. The decision tree mechanism is as follows: For each iteration, local regions are created recursively. It is a supervised, and hierarchical model [27]. The decision tree comprises of decision nodes and leaves. Each decision divides the data. Low entropy divisions are created in this manner. Appropriate sized tree generation requires expert knowledge [26]. A Random Forest is a variation of A Decision Tree that uses multiple trees instead of a single one.

4.3.4. Logistic Regression

Logistic regression (LR) is a method of representing the probability of a discrete outcome provided by an input [28]. The most widely used LR model is the model with a binary output, such as true/false, yes/no, and so on. Multinomial logistic regression can be employed if there are more than two possible discrete outputs. LR is also a helpful analysis tool for classification problems where researchers try to decide whether a new sample fits best into a category.
4.3.5. Multilayer Perceptron

The Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) is a feedforward artificial neural network [29]. It has a minimum of three layers which are the input layer, hidden layer(s) and the output layer. The hidden layer(s) uses the activation functions to capture nonlinear data relations. Therefore, MLPs can discriminate between classes that are non-linearly separated. We selected them as representative of a shallow neural network to compare with the traditional machine learning algorithms. Unipolar Sigmoid Function was used as an activation function in hidden volumes of MLP. We used a plain MLP with only one hidden layer.

5. Experimental Results and Discussion

Three different states were differentiated which are physically active, stressed and relaxed states by using machine learning classifiers. The performance metrics were defined first the results which are obtained with data coming from EDA, ACC and PPG sensors were presented separately.

5.1. Metrics

To evaluate our system performance, we used four different metrics. These metrics are widely used in stress detection studies.

5.1.1. Classification Accuracy

The first metric is accuracy. It can be calculated by dividing the accurately classified windows by the number of all windows of all participants (it is calculated for all tuples separately).

5.1.2. Precision, Recall and F_Measure

We also computed and presented the precision, recall and F_measure metrics. Recall, and precision metrics are employed to compute the F_measure. Their formulas are as follows:

\[ \text{Precision} = \frac{\text{TruePositive}}{\text{TruePositive} + \text{FalsePositive}} \quad (1) \]

\[ \text{Recall} = \frac{\text{TruePositive}}{\text{TruePositive} + \text{FalseNegative}} \quad (2) \]

\[ F_{\text{measure}} = \frac{2 \times \text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}} \quad (3) \]

5.2. Differentiation of Physically Active and Relaxed States

First, physically active and relaxed states were differentiated. The classification accuracies are presented in Tables 1, 2 and 3. Since the movements of participants are constrained in relaxed states, it is more convenient to use acceleration data to differentiate them from physically active states. Furthermore, the EDA signal is also sensitive to movements and it is the most distinctive signal along with the acceleration signal. The heart activity signal obtained from the PPG sensor achieves the lowest accuracy for distinguishing these two states. This could be explained by the contamination of this signal by the increased artifacts during physical activity.
Figure 4: The ROC curves of the best performing classifier (kNN) using heart activity signal for differentiating physical activity and relax states. The top ROC curve belongs to the relax label and the bottom ROC curve belongs to the physical activity label.

Table 1: The differentiation results of physically active and relaxed sessions by using the Accelerometer sensor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F_measure</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Area under ROC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>92.647</td>
<td>0.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>89.706</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kNN</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>90.124</td>
<td>0.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>91.176</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>90.441</td>
<td>0.966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: The differentiation results of physically active and relaxed sessions by using the PPG sensor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F_measure</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Area under ROC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>82.638</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>83.333</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kNN</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>91.667</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>88.889</td>
<td>0.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>80.556</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The differentiation results of physically active and relaxed sessions by using the EDA sensor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F_measure</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Area under ROC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>89.923</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>86.046</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kNN</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>86.821</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>91.473</td>
<td>0.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>88.372</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3. Differentiation of Physically Active and Stressed States

Physically active and stressed states were differentiated. This classification is the most challenging one since the physiological reactions to them are similar to each other. The classification accuracies are presented in Tables 4, 5 and 6. The acceleration signal achieved the best performance while differentiating between these two states, which is expected because the physical activity intensity level is different in these sessions. Around 70% accuracies with heart activity signal were obtained and 60% accuracies with EDA signal were obtained. This proves the similarity of physiological reactions.

5.4. Differentiation of Relax and Stressed States

Finally relaxed and stressed states were differentiated. The classification accuracies are presented in Tables 7, 8 and 9. The accuracies with all modalities are around 75% and 80%. The results could be higher but since participants perceived stress levels could be different than the expected stress level of the known context, this decreases the performance of our system. As an example, some participants might have lower stress levels in the TSST session, which will cause a false ground truth and misleading training data segments.

5.5. Discussion

The main purpose of this study is to differentiate stress and physical activity. The most successful signal is the acceleration for this purpose. Heart activity also has around 75% accuracy for differentiating these two signals. Combining these two signals will achieve a more robust system for differentiating stress and physical

Table 4: The differentiation results of physically active and stressed sessions by using the Accelerometer sensor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F_measure</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Area under ROC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>87.143</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>90.491</td>
<td>0.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kNN</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>81.428</td>
<td>0.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>90.714</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>88.571</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: The ROC curves of the best performing classifier (Random Forest) using electrodermal activity signal for differentiating physical activity and stress states. The top ROC curve belongs to the stress label and the bottom ROC curve belongs to the physical activity label.

Table 5: The differentiation results of physically active and stressed sessions by using the PPG sensor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F_measure</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Area under ROC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>65.97</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kNN</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>74.028</td>
<td>0.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>0.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>76.389</td>
<td>0.762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: The differentiation results of physically active and stressed sessions by using the EDA sensor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F_measure</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Area under ROC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>68.254</td>
<td>0.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>69.047</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kNN</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>65.873</td>
<td>0.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>63.492</td>
<td>0.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>67.46</td>
<td>0.681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: The differentiation results of relaxed and stressed sessions by using the Accelerometer sensor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F_measure</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Area under ROC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td>71.212</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>78.03</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kNN</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>76.5153</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>68.939</td>
<td>0.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>68.261</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: The differentiation results of relaxed and stressed sessions by using the PPG sensor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F_measure</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Area under ROC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>80.9497</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>81.918</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kNN</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>84.119</td>
<td>0.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>82.232</td>
<td>0.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>79.088</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: The differentiation results of relaxed and stressed sessions by using the EDA sensor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F_measure</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Area under ROC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>71.969</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>78.03</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kNN</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>83.333</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>77.272</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>68.949</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Comparison of studies that detect physical activity and mental stress levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Wearable Devices</th>
<th>Signals</th>
<th>Mental Stress</th>
<th>Physical Activity</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>LG Watch and Samsung Gear S</td>
<td>Accelerometer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>Polar M600, Huawei Watch, and Acer Wearwatch</td>
<td>Accelerometer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Daily Life</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>Samsung Gear S</td>
<td>Accelerometer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>Empatica E4</td>
<td>HRV, ST, HR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>Empatica E4</td>
<td>HRV, ST</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Real-Life Event</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>Microsoft Band 2</td>
<td>HR, ST, EDA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Study</td>
<td>Empatica E4</td>
<td>HRV, EDA, ST, ACC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6: The ROC curves of the best performing classifier (Random Forest) using acceleration signal for differentiating relax and stress states. The top ROC curve belongs to stress label and the bottom ROC curve belongs to relax label.
activity. For detecting stress from relax sessions, heart activity achieves the best results. This proves that stress
detection systems must monitor heart activity. The acceleration signal is especially needed in the presence
of potential physical activity. EDA signal is affected by environmental conditions such as temperature and
physical activity, and it could be easily contaminated, and that is why it could not achieve higher results than
the other signals. The easiest task is to differentiate physical activity and relax states, and all signals can easily
detect physical activity with over 90% accuracy. SVM and Random Forest algorithms are the most successful
classifiers in these tasks. Furthermore, I selected the best classifiers for differentiating each tuple (relax-stress,
physical activity-stress and relax-physical activity) and draw the ROC curves (see Figures 4,5 and 6) to compare
the results visually.

We further compared our work with the studies that detect physical activity or stress levels (see Table
10). To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first one to differentiate stress and physical activity from
physiological signals. I also achieved over 90% accuracy, which was aligned with the best-reported results in
the literature for recognizing mental stress levels or physical activity levels alone. This promising result shows
that the proposed system could be used to differentiate these two physiological responses with success.

6. Conclusion

In this study, a physiological signal-based system that can differentiate physically active, relaxed and stressed
states was developed. Artifact detection and removal, feature extraction and machine learning classification
modules were implemented. The results for differentiating different tuples of these three states by using
acceleration, heart activity and electrodermal activity signals were presented. When the physically active
session is tried to be differentiated from the other two sessions, the accelerometer signal played an important role.
Acceleration signal achieved around 90% accuracy for these classifications. Around 90% accuracies for classifying
physically active and relaxed sessions with the EDA and 70% accuracy with the HRV signal were achieved.
Stressed and relaxed sessions can be differentiated with approximately 80% accuracy with all modalities. The
accuracies could be improved by analyzing the expected stress level of context and the actual perceived stress
level of participants. The most challenging classification is between physically active and stressed states. A
maximum of 70% accuracy by using HRV signal was achieved which shows that the heart activity pattern of
physical activity and stress has differences. Multilayer Perceptron and Random Forest are generally the most
successful classifiers. Furthermore, this study is not without limitations. In order to generalize the conclusions,
more experiments based on larger sample groups should be conducted. Furthermore, stressed, physically active
and relaxed sessions were differentiated and the success of each modality is shown. However, the physiological
signals were not analyzed when mental stress occurs during physical activity. It is planned to conduct more
experiments by including this state. It is believed that the contribution of this research will be beneficial
to both academia and industry, and it could be used to improve the stress detection algorithms running on
commercial smartbands. This study could be used for a deeper understanding of physiological reactions of
stressed and physically active states and it will guide researchers in developing more robust continuous daily
life stress detection algorithms.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank Professor Cem ERSOY for his contributions in this study and for managing the project.
References


