

# Contents

<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>List of Symbols</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>Preface</b>	<b>xix</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Motivation . . . . .	4
1.2 Challenges and main objectives of this thesis . . . . .	6
1.3 Contributions of the thesis . . . . .	7
1.4 Organization of the thesis . . . . .	8
<b>2 Background and Related Works</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 Background . . . . .	11
2.1.1 Time series representation . . . . .	11
2.1.2 Time series distance/similarity measures . . . . .	13
2.1.3 Time series classification . . . . .	14
2.1.4 Early classification on time series . . . . .	16
2.2 Related works . . . . .	18
2.2.1 Instance-based methods . . . . .	19
2.2.2 Shapelet-based methods . . . . .	20
2.2.3 Model-based methods . . . . .	22
2.2.4 Other methods . . . . .	24
2.2.5 Research Gap . . . . .	29

<b>3</b>	<b>Early classification on UTS</b>	<b>31</b>
3.1	3.1 Introduction . . . . .	31
3.2	3.2 Preliminaries . . . . .	32
3.3	3.3 Early classification by measuring uncertainty . . . . .	33
	3.3.1 Model description . . . . .	34
	3.3.2 Experimental evaluation . . . . .	39
3.4	3.4 Early classification by learning optimal decision rule . . . . .	45
	3.4.1 Model description . . . . .	45
	3.4.2 Classification and optimization method . . . . .	51
	3.4.3 Experimental evaluation . . . . .	53
3.5	3.5 Summary . . . . .	66
<b>4</b>	<b>Early classification on MTS</b>	<b>67</b>
4.1	4.1 Introduction . . . . .	67
4.2	4.2 Motivation and significant contributions: . . . . .	68
4.3	4.3 Model description . . . . .	69
	4.3.1 Training phase . . . . .	70
	4.3.2 Prediction phase . . . . .	76
4.4	4.4 Experimental evaluation . . . . .	76
	4.4.1 Evaluation metrics . . . . .	76
	4.4.2 Dataset description . . . . .	77
	4.4.3 Parameter selection . . . . .	78
	4.4.4 Results analysis . . . . .	79
4.5	4.5 Summary . . . . .	89
<b>5</b>	<b>Early classification on time series by using deep learning approach</b>	<b>91</b>
5.1	5.1 Introduction . . . . .	91
5.2	5.2 Motivation and significant contributions . . . . .	93
5.3	5.3 Preliminaries . . . . .	94
5.4	5.4 Model description . . . . .	95
	5.4.1 Training phase . . . . .	95
	5.4.2 Prediction phase . . . . .	102
5.5	5.5 Experimental evaluation . . . . .	102
	5.5.1 Datasets description . . . . .	102
	5.5.2 Results analysis . . . . .	104
5.6	5.6 Summary . . . . .	110

---

<b>6 Conclusion and Future Directions</b>	<b>113</b>
6.1 Conclusion . . . . .	113
6.2 Future directions . . . . .	116
<b>References</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>List of Publications</b>	<b>130</b>



# List of Figures

1.1	Illustration of (a) Traditional TSC and (b) Early classification approach.	3
1.2	A general framework of early classification model . . . . .	4
2.1	Taxonomy of time series representation and dimensionality reduction methods . . . . .	12
2.2	Traditional TSC approach. . . . .	14
2.3	Early classification on time series. . . . .	16
3.1	Models Comparison: CD diagram for accuracy using Nemenyi post-hoc procedure ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). The goodness of models is considered as best to worse ( <i>left to right</i> ). The bold line shows that methods do not yield statistically significance differences. . . . .	44
3.2	Models Comparison: CD diagram for earliness using Nemenyi post-hoc procedure ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). The goodness of models is considered as best to worse ( <i>right to left</i> ). The bold line shows that methods do not yield statistically significance differences. . . . .	44
3.3	Block diagram of the proposed early classification model . . . . .	46
3.4	Learning of classifier using truncated training set at every time point $t$	47
3.5	Prediction Process . . . . .	51
3.6	CD diagram for accuracy. The goodness of the model is considered as best to worse (left to right), and the bold line shows that methods do not yield statistical significance differences. . . . .	58
3.7	CD diagram for earliness. The goodness of the model is considered as best to worse (left to right), and the bold line shows that methods do not yield statistical significance differences. . . . .	58
3.8	Accuracy and earliness plot for ESR1, ESR2, and ESR3 . . . . .	59
3.9	Accuracy and earliness plot for five sample datasets includes Coffee, ECG200, Gun_Point, Synthetic Control and Wafer . . . . .	60

3.10	Accuracy and earliness plot over different values of $\alpha$ for ESR1, ESR2 and ESR3 . . . . .	61
3.11	Effect of accuracy, earliness, and execution time for PSO and GA . . . . .	63
4.1	Block diagram of the proposed model for early classification on MTS . . . . .	69
4.2	Training a set of classifiers for MTS . . . . .	71
4.3	Cost evaluation process for a MTS $\mathbf{X}$ . . . . .	75
4.4	Prediction process for a incoming MTS $\mathbf{X}$ . . . . .	76
4.5	Effect of $\alpha$ parameter : (a) Scattered plot between Accuracy and Earliness by taking average over all the datasets (b) Earliness vs. Accuracy plot for individual dataset. . . . .	79
4.6	Accuracy plot at increasing length of MTS on different datasets. . . . .	81
4.7	Effect of $\alpha$ parameter on different combination of ESRs and cost function. . . . .	82
4.8	Regularization effect on ESRs $\mathcal{R}1_{\Theta}$ and $\mathcal{R}2_{\Theta}$ . . . . .	83
4.9	Accuracy and earliness plot of ESR $\mathcal{R}1$ for $\alpha \in \{0.8, 0.9\}$ . . . . .	84
4.10	Accuracy and earliness plot of ESR $\mathcal{R}2$ for $\alpha \in \{0.8, 0.9\}$ . . . . .	85
4.11	Comparison of the proposed model with GP-full by considering $\alpha = 0.9$ . . . . .	87
5.1	Classification model for sensory time series data. . . . .	93
5.2	The Block diagram of the proposed ETMD model is divided into two phases: training and prediction. Part (a) denotes the training process of base classifier $\mathcal{H}$ and its architecture. Part (b) represents the confidence threshold selection for early decision making. Part (c) represents the prediction process on incoming time series data. . . . .	96
5.3	Accuracy vs. earliness curve for $\alpha$ . . . . .	105
5.4	Effect of $\alpha$ on accuracy and earliness over individual transportation mode. . . . .	106
5.5	Confusion matrix (a) TMD dataset (b) SHL dataset . . . . .	107
5.6	Comparison between proposed ETMD and traditional approach. The last <i>bar</i> , named as average, denotes the mean accuracy or earliness over all transportation modes. . . . .	108
5.7	Effect of optimizers SGD and Adam . . . . .	109
5.8	Accuracy vs. epoch and loss vs. epoch learning curve of hybrid-DL classifier. . . . .	109

# List of Tables

2.1	Comparative analysis of early classification approaches . . . . .	25
3.1	Intraclass accuracy at different time points . . . . .	36
3.2	Accuracy of five classifiers on fifteen dataests: GP(DotProduct), GP(rbf), SVM(linear), SVM(rbf), Naive Bayes . . . . .	41
3.3	Earliness of five classifiers on fifteen dataests: GP(DotProduct), GP(rbf), SVM(linear), SVM(rbf), Naive Bayes . . . . .	41
3.4	Accuracy values on fifteen datasets for ECTS, EDSC , RelClass, ECDIRE and Proposed method . . . . .	42
3.5	Earliness values on fifteen datasets for ECTS, EDSC, RelClass, ECDIRE and Proposed. . . . .	43
3.6	Parameter setting for other early classification models . . . . .	55
3.7	Accuracy values for ECTS, EDSC, RelClass, ECDIRE, ECTS_OAE, and Proposed (ESR1, ESR2, ESR3) methods. . . . .	56
3.8	Earliness values for ECTS, EDSC, RelClass, ECDIRE, ECTS_OAE, and Proposed (ESR1, ESR2, ESR3) methods. . . . .	57
3.9	Domination counts for the proposed ESR1, ESR2 and ESR3 compared to other methods. The first entry tells about how many times the proposed model dominates other methods, and third entry tells how many times others dominate the proposed model. In between, second entry refers to the draw condition. . . . .	59
3.10	The performance of the proposed early classification model (ESR3) on malware dataset by considering different values of $\alpha$ . . . . .	65
4.1	Datasets description . . . . .	77
4.2	Comparison of proposed models with other methods . . . . .	86
4.3	Accuracy and earliness of proposed model over six MTS datasets . . . . .	88
5.1	Comparison of base classifiers in ETMD model . . . . .	110