

Contents

Abstract	ii
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	xi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Learning Paradigms	1
1.1.1 Eager Learning	1
1.1.2 Lazy Learning	2
1.1.3 EaZy Learning	3
1.1.4 Incremental Learning	3
1.1.5 Ensemble Based Models	5
1.2 Spoof Fingerprint Detection	5
1.3 Automatic Hate Speech Detection on SMPs	6
1.4 Structure of the Thesis	8
2 Literature Survey	9
2.1 Ensemble Learning	9
2.2 Incremental Learning	9
2.3 Spoof Fingerprint Detection	11
2.4 Automatic Hate Speech Detection	13
3 EaZy Learning: An Adaptive Variant of Ensemble Learning	16
3.0.1 Learning Paradigms for Spoof Fingerprint Detection	17
3.1 EaZy Learning	19
3.2 Experimental Setup	22

3.2.1	Datasets	22
3.2.2	Features	23
3.2.3	Setup	23
3.3	Results and Discussion	25
3.3.1	Discussion	26
4	AILearn: An Adaptive Incremental Learning Model for Fingerprint Liveness Detection	28
4.1	AILearn: A Generic Model for Incremental Learning	31
4.2	AILearn for Spoof Fingerprint Detection	33
4.2.1	Feature Extraction	34
4.2.2	Ensemble Generation	36
4.3	Experimental Results and Discussion	36
4.3.1	Experimental Settings	36
4.3.2	Results	38
4.3.3	Feature-Level Comparison	40
4.3.4	Comparison with State-of-the-art	42
4.3.5	Discussion on Results	43
5	A-Stacking and A-Bagging	46
5.1	Introduction	46
5.1.1	Contributions	47
5.2	Stacking	48
5.2.1	A-Stacking	48
5.3	Bagging	49
5.3.1	A-Bagging	50
5.4	Results and Discussion	53
5.4.1	Experimental Setup	53
5.4.2	Datasets and Pre-processing	54
5.4.3	Results	54
5.4.4	Discussion on Results	61

6	Handcrafted V/S Deep Features	64
6.1	Introduction	64
6.2	Feature Representation	65
6.2.1	Handcrafted Features	66
6.2.2	Deep Features	66
6.3	Experimental Study	67
6.3.1	Feature Extraction	67
6.3.2	Dataset	67
6.3.3	Classifiers	67
6.3.4	Experimental Protocol	69
6.3.5	Results	70
6.3.6	Discussion	74
7	Combating Hate Speech using an Adaptive Ensemble Learning Model with a case study on COVID-19	76
7.1	Introduction	76
7.2	Importance of Automatic Hate Speech Detection	81
7.2.1	Hate Speech in the Times of COVID-19	81
7.2.2	Hate Speech Related to US Presidential Election	82
7.3	Proposed Model for Automatic Hate Speech Detection	82
7.4	Parallel Ensemble Learning Models	84
7.4.1	Parallelized Bagging	85
7.4.2	Parallelized A-Stacking	85
7.4.3	Parallelized Random-Subspace	86
7.5	Experimental Setup, Analysis and Discussion	87
7.5.1	Datasets	88
7.5.2	Experimental Setup	90
7.5.3	Results	91
7.5.4	Discussion	97
8	Conclusions and Future Work	101
A	List of Publications	104

List of Tables

3.1	Description of datasets.	23
3.2	Performance evaluation of EaZy learning on Category-1.	25
3.3	Performance evaluation of EaZy learning on Category-2.	26
4.1	Partitioning of the datasets in Phase I and Phase II for evaluation of the AIIearn algorithm.	37
4.2	Stability-Plasticity calculation on LivDet 2011 [1].	42
4.3	Stability-Plasticity calculation on LivDet 2013 [2]-LivDet 2015 [3] dataset.	43
4.4	Performance evaluation of AIIearn in comparison to the state-of-the-art [4,5] on LivDet2011 [1] datasets. In this table, FPR, NF and KF denotes false positive rate, new fake and known false, respectively.	44
5.1	Performance evaluation of A-Stacking on class-balanced datasets.	55
5.2	Performance evaluation of A-Bagging on class-balanced datasets.	56
5.3	Performance evaluation of A-Stacking on class imbalanced Biometrika datasets.	56
5.4	Performance evaluation of A-Stacking on class imbalanced DigitalPersona datasets.	57
5.5	Performance evaluation of A-Stacking on class imbalanced ItalData datasets.	58
5.6	Performance evaluation of A-Stacking on class imbalanced Sagem datasets.	59
5.7	Performance evaluation of A-Bagging on class imbalanced Biometrika datasets.	60
5.8	Performance evaluation of A-Bagging on class imbalanced DigitalPersona datasets.	60
5.9	Performance evaluation of A-Bagging on class imbalanced ItalData datasets.	61
5.10	Performance evaluation of A-Bagging on class imbalanced Sagem datasets.	62
6.1	Description of the LivDet datasets used in this study.	68

6.2	Performance evaluation of hand-crafted and deep features in combination with different classifiers under Category-1.	71
6.3	Performance evaluation of hand-crafted and deep features in combination with different classifiers under Category-2. The experiments are performed by considering different sensors for training and testing and viceversa. The average of both experiments is reported.	72
6.4	Performance evaluation of hand-crafted and deep features in combination with different classifiers under Category-3.	73
7.1	Comparison with state-of-the-art.	80
7.2	Description of Datasets.	89
7.3	Performance evaluation of various models under within-dataset environment. (a) Waseem & Hovy, (b) SemEval 2019. The first row for each dataset represents the Micro average and the second represents the Macro average.	92
7.4	Performance evaluation of various models on COVID-19 datasets under within-dataset environment. (a) <i>Covid – Hate_{HL}</i> , (b) <i>Covid – Hate_{ML}</i> . The first row for each dataset represents the Micro average, and the second represents the Macro average.	93
7.5	Performance evaluation of the various models on US presidential election dataset. The first row for each method represents the Micro average and the second represents the Macro average.	94
7.6	Performance evaluation of the models under cross-dataset environment. (a) Train: Waseem & Hovy, Test: SemEval 2019 (b) Train: SemEval2019, Test: Waseem & Hovy. The first row for each dataset represents the Micro average and the second represents the Macro average.	95
7.7	Performance evaluation of the proposed model while considering the user-distribution on Waseem and Hovy dataset. We have restricted the number of tweets per user to 250. The first row for each method represents the Micro average, and the second represents the Macro average.	96
7.8	Performance evaluation of serial and parallel versions of ensemble classifiers under within-dataset environment. The top row for each classifier denotes the weighted average and the bottom one represents the macro average. . .	97

7.9	Performance evaluation of serial and parallel versions of ensemble classifiers under cross-dataset environment. The top row for each classifier denotes the weighted average and the bottom one represents the macro average. . .	98
7.10	Performance evaluation of serial and parallel versions of ensemble classifiers while controlling the user-bias. The top row for each classifier denotes the weighted average and the bottom one represents the macro average. . . .	98

List of Figures

1.1	Schematic Representation of Eager Learning.	2
1.2	Schematic Representation of Lazy Learning.	3
1.3	Conceptual model of EaZy learning.	4
3.1	Visual comparison between live and spoofs created using various spoof materials.	18
3.2	Conceptual Model of Adaptive Ensemble Learning [6].	20
4.1	Schema of the proposed AILearn incremental learning algorithm for Spoof Fingerprint Detection.	35
4.2	Comparison of the performance of AILearn when used with different features shown on Y axis. Percentage Gain on NF and percentage Loss on KF while learning in second phase are shown on X axis.	41
5.1	Conceptual model of A-Stacking.	49
5.2	Conceptual model of A-Bagging.	50
6.1	Accuracy comparison of various handcrafted and deep features under three environments. The accuracy is averaged across various classifiers used in the study.	75
7.1	Schematic diagram of the proposed model.	83
7.2	Schematic representation of the proposed parallelization of ensemble models.	85
7.3	Calculating the percentage drop in F1-score (micro) of various models when tested under cross-dataset environment in comparison with within-dataset environment. The significant drop in performance justifies the need of cross-dataset generalization. rival-1= [7], rival-2= [8]	99

7.4 Performance comparison of various models on Waseem and Hovy dataset under two environments: dataset with no restrictions on the number of tweets and dataset with a cap of 250 tweets per user. We show the F1 score-micro values for this comparison. Proposed model observes no drop. . 99