



AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

Electronics and Communication Engineering Department

Trajectories Classification of two different types of ships

By

MOHAMED FATHI ABDELAAL ELWAKDY

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for

Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) Degree

In

Electronic and Communication Engineering

Under Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Wagdy Rafaat Anis

Electronics & Communication Eng Dept.
Faculty of engineering - Ain Shams University

Dr. Mostafa Eltokhy

Electronic Technology Department
Faculty of Industrial Education – Helwan University

Dr. Mohsen El-Bendary

Electronic Technology Department
Faculty of Industrial Education – Helwan University

CAIRO, EGYPT 2018



AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

Electronics and Communication Engineering Department

APPROVAL SHEET

Thesis: **PhD in Electrical Engineering (Electronics and Communication Engineering)**

Student Name: **Mohamed Fathi Abdelaal Elwakdy**

Thesis Title: **Trajectories Classification of two different types of ships**

Examiners' Committee

Name and Affiliation

Signature

Prof. Wagdy Refaat Anis

Emeritus Professor

Electronics and Communications

Ain Shams University

Prof. Abdel Halim Abdel Naby Zekry

Emeritus Professor

Electronics and Communications

Ain Shams University

Prof. Mostafa Sayed AbdelRahman Afifi

ECE Professor

Electrical and Computer Engineering

Modern Academy for Engineering and Technology

Date: / / 2018

STATEMENT

This dissertation is submitted to Ain Shams University for the degree of PhD of Science in Electrical Engineering (Electronics and Communication Engineering). The work included in this thesis was carried out by the author at the Electronics and Communication Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt. No part of this thesis was submitted for a degree or a qualification at any other university or institution.

Name: Mohamed Fathi Abdelaal Elwakdy

Signature:

Date: / / 2018

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to ALLAH who gives us the power and hope to succeed.

I should first thank Allah who created you and gave you all facilities to do this work. Words will never be enough to express my gratitude to my advisors **Prof. Dr. Wagdy Anis, Prof. Dr. Adel Elhenawy, Dr. Mohsen El-Bendary and Dr. Mostafa Eltokhy** for his constant and precious guidance throughout my doctoral program, for the time spent on discussing and accurately reviewing all the research work of this thesis. Besides his scientific competence, I enjoyed a lot his positive attitude to make a friendly work atmosphere. I learned much more than scientific concepts from him, and his enthusiasm has been fundamental to overcome all the difficulties which arose during my study of Ph.D, as I would like to thank the external reviewers of this thesis for their valuable comments and suggestions.

Unreserved thanks go to **Prof. Dr. Adel Elhenawy and Prof. Dr. Wagdy Anis** for their fundamental scientific contribution to this manuscript. They were very closed to me, I learnt really a lot from their discussions, and their encouragement were essential to believe in this research project. They are special persons, I like their nice attitude to make me feel at ease every time we meet.

Last but not least, my deepest gratitude goes to my family members for their support, patience, and encouragement during my graduate journey that makes me forget all my worries with his joyful smile.

Finally, there are no enough words to thank **my Father, mother and wife** for their continuous support and encouragement during the research period.

Many Thanks to all of you, this thesis would have no sense without any person I named!

ABSTRACT

The classification of various trajectories of different objects is an important investigation technique for predicting the kind of the moving objects. In this thesis, object types including fishing boats, tanker ships, Cattle, Deer and Elk are distinguished based on their trajectories and their features. Polynomial functions are used as an efficient tool to extract these features from the segments of the recorded trajectories of the objects under investigation. The features extracted are fed into subtractive clustering procedure to put the data in a group of clusters. then serve as an input to a neural network based identification algorithm.

The Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference System (ANFIS) is used for the classification procedure. The features extracted for all trajectories are represented by groups of membership functions and groups of the Fuzzy If-Then rules. The Initial Fuzzy Inference System (IFIS) is trained using Artificial Neural Network (ANN) by tuning the membership functions to obtain the lowest possible number of hits by the Fuzzy Inference System (FIS) output that misses the targeted object. After training the IFIS we obtain a new system which is called Final Fuzzy Inference System (FFIS).

The Classification of trajectories Algorithm (TCA) is devised for classifying trajectories of two different types of ships: fishing boats and tanker ships. The locations of a tanker ship and a fishing boat are assumed to be collected in the same region without distinction. The performance of the proposed TCA using polynomial functions and ANFIS is tested using different trajectories obtaining highest classification accuracy of 99.5%.

The Developed Classification of trajectories Algorithm (DTCA) is devised for classification of trajectories of dissimilar type like mariner and animal wanderers. The locations are assumed to be collected for all objects in the same unidentified territory. There are two different cases of classification of trajectories: similar and non-similar trajectories. The similar trajectories include only animal trajectories and non-similar trajectories include mariner trajectories. The similar trajectories of combinations of two animals are classified in pairs to get highest classification accuracy of 98.83%, while the non-similar trajectories of ships are classified against the animal trajectories to get highest classification accuracy of 99.11% by using ANFIS. The performance of DTCA is tested by using different trajectories of combinations of object pairs.

The Advanced Classification of trajectories Algorithm (ATCA) is further proposed to classify the trajectories of different objects. The Three-fold Cross

Validation Technique is applied to the datasets available where they get divided into 3 sets for optimized training and detection. The similar trajectories of each two objects are classified to get the highest classification accuracy of 97.29%. The non-similar trajectories are classified versus similar trajectories to get the highest classification accuracy of 95.30%. The performance of ATCA is tested using different trajectories of all kinds of investigated objects. The proposed algorithm results are compared to the Support Vector Machine (SVM) which was developed by other researchers as baseline for our results. The results of our proposed algorithm ACTA outperform the SVM baseline results in terms of accuracy.

Keywords- Subtractive Clustering; ANFIS; Classification of trajectories Algorithm (TCA), Developed Classification of trajectories Algorithm (DTCA), Advanced Classification of trajectories Algorithm (ATCA)

Monday, 23 January 2017

RE: Mohamed Elwakdy

To Whom It May Concern

This letter is to confirm that the Advanced Algorithm for Trajectories Classification of Different Objects developed by Mohamed Elwakdy could have significant commercial benefit. Currently we are in discussions with one of the government appointed Accelerators who may be interested in co-funding it with a commercial entity already operating in relevant industries.

If they proceeded this we believe could provide a potentially significant benefit to New Zealand, through both recognition on the broader world stage and generation of employment to further develop the algorithm in to commercial products.

Kind Regards



Michael Masterson

Global Head of Commercial - +64 21 703999

CONTENTS

Acknowledgment.....	IV
Abstract	IV
Letter from EverEdgeIP	IV
List of Figures	IV
List of Tables	IV
List of Articles/Published	IV
List of Symbols and Abbreviations	IV
 CHAPTER 1	 18
1.1 Introduction	18
1.2 Literature Review	21
1.3 Outline of The Thesis	24
 CHAPTER 2	 25
2.1 Devised Structures for Three Algorithms	25
2.2 Trajectories	26
2.3 Trajectories Classification Algorithm (TCA)/ Developed Trajectories Classification Algorithm (DTCA)/ Advanced Trajectories Classification Algorithm (ATCA)	32
2.4 Features Extraction	33
2.5 Subtractive Clustering	43
2.5.1 Case 1: Similar Trajectories (DTCA)	46
2.5.2 Case 2: Non- Similar Trajectories (DTCA)	47
2.5.3 Case 1: Similar Trajectories (ATCA)	48
2.5.4 Case 2: Non- Similar Trajectories (ATCA)	49
2.6 Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference System (ANFIS)	50
2.6.1 Case 1: Similar Trajectories (DTCA).....	63
2.6.2 Case 2: Non- Similar Trajectories (DTCA).....	65
2.7 Support Vector Machine (SVM)	71
 CHAPTER 3	 76
3.1 Method Application	76
3.2 Experiment Results	77
3.2.1 Results of applying a Trajectories Classification Algorithm (TCA) using ANFIS	78

3.2.2. Results of applying a Developed Trajectories Classification Algorithm (DTCA) using ANFIS	79
3.2.2.1 Case 1: Similar Trajectories	80
3.2.2.2 Case 2: Non-Similar Trajectories	82
3.2.3. Results of applying an Advanced Trajectories Classification Algorithm (ATCA) using ANFIS	88
3.2.3.1 Case 1: Similar Trajectories	88
3.2.3.2 Case 2: Non-Similar Trajectories	91
3.2.4 Results of applying an Advanced Trajectories Classification Algorithm (ATCA) using SVM	97
3.3 Discussion	98
CHAPTER 4	100
4.1 Conclusion	100
4.2 Future Work	103
REFERENCES	104
ABSTRACT ARABIC	

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 Sequence of the location and timestamp of a moving object Hurricanes Turtles Vessels Vehicles	19
Figure 2.1 Tanker ship's trajectories (6 trajectories)	27
Figure 2.2 Fishing boat's trajectories (6 trajectories)	28
Figure 2.3 Elk's trajectories (6 trajectories)	29
Figure 2.4 Deer's trajectories (6 trajectories)	30
Figure 2.5 Cattle's trajectories (6 trajectories)	31
Figure 2.6 Proposed Algorithm of the Trajectories' Classification (TCA/DTCA/ATCA) of different objects using Features Extraction, Subtractive Clustering and ANFIS	32
Figure 2.7 Blue line indicates the tanker ship's trajectories at sea. The Green line depicts to plot Y through the constructed polynomial model evaluated at each X- component values	34
Figure 2.8 Blue line indicates the fishing boat's trajectories at sea. The Green line depicts to plot Y through the constructed polynomial model evaluated at each X components values.	35
Figure 2.9 Blue line indicates the Elk's trajectories. The Green line depicts to plot Y through the constructed polynomial model evaluated at each X- component values.....	36
Figure 2.10 Blue line indicates the Deer's trajectories. The Green line depicts to plot Y through the constructed polynomial model evaluated at each X- component values	37
Figure 2.11 Blue line indicates the Cattle's trajectories. The Green line depicts to plot Y through the constructed polynomial model evaluated at each X- component values	38
Figure 2.12 (A) Good representation of a segment is shown by using a polynomial function. The segment of fishing boat trajectory consists of three consecutive points; (B) Good representation of a segment is shown by using a polynomial function. The segment of tanker ship trajectory consists of three consecutive points; (C) Good representation of a segment is shown by using a polynomial function. The segment of Elk trajectory consists of three consecutive points; (D) Good representation of a segment is shown by using a polynomial function. The segment of Cattle trajectory consists of three consecutive points; (E) Good representation of a segment is shown by using a polynomial function. The segment of Deer trajectory consists of three consecutive points.....	39
Figure 2.13 Analysis Framework (TCA)	40

Figure 2.14 Analysis Framework (DTCA)	41
Figure 2.15 (A) Analysis Framework (ATCA) using ANFIS; (B) Analysis Framework (ATCA) using SVM	42
Figure 2.16 Cell body	51
Figure 2.17 Network Diagram	51
Figure 2.18 Data Representation using Network Diagram	52
Figure 2.19 Complex Network Diagram	53
Figure 2.20 Deep Neural Network	53
Figure 2.21 The schematic of ANFIS architecture based on Sugeno fuzzy model “Tanker ship and Fishing boat trajectories”	54
Figure 2.22 The schematic of ANFIS architecture based on Sugeno fuzzy model “Elk and Cattle trajectories”	54
Figure 2.23 The schematic of ANFIS architecture based on Sugeno fuzzy model “Elk and Deer trajectories”	55
Figure 2.24 The schematic of ANFIS architecture based on Sugeno fuzzy model “Cattle and Deer trajectories”	55
Figure 2.25 The schematic of ANFIS architecture based on Sugeno fuzzy model “Cattle and Tanker ship trajectories”	56
Figure 2.26 The schematic of ANFIS architecture based on Sugeno fuzzy model “Deer and Tanker ship trajectories”	56
Figure 2.27 The schematic of ANFIS architecture based on Sugeno fuzzy model “Elk and Tanker ship trajectories”	57
Figure 2.28 The schematic of ANFIS architecture based on Sugeno fuzzy model “Cattle and Fishing boat trajectories”	57
Figure 2.29 The schematic of ANFIS architecture based on Sugeno fuzzy model “Deer and Fishing boat trajectories”	58
Figure 2.30 The schematic of ANFIS architecture based on Sugeno fuzzy model “Elk and Fishing boat trajectories”	58
Figure 2.31 The schematic of ANFIS architecture based on Sugeno fuzzy model “Tanker ship and Deer trajectories”	59

Figure 2.32 ANFIS architecture	60
Figure 2.33 Membership function plots of 5 inputs “Fishing boat and Tanker ship trajectories”	63
Figure 2.34 Membership function plots of 5 inputs “Cattle and Elk trajectories”	64
Figure 2.35 Membership function plots of 5 inputs “Deer and Elk trajectories”	64
Figure 2.36 Membership function plots of 5 inputs “Deer and Cattle trajectories”	65
Figure 2.37 Membership function plots of 5 inputs “Tanker ship and Elk trajectories” ..	66
Figure 2.38 Membership function plots of 5 inputs “Tanker ship and Cattle trajectories” ..	67
Figure 2.39 Membership function plots of 5 inputs “Tanker ship and Deer trajectories” ..	67
Figure 2.40 Membership function plots of 5 inputs “Fishing boat and Elk trajectories” ...	68
Figure 2.41 Membership function plots of 5 inputs “Fishing boat and Cattle trajectories” ..	69
Figure 2.42 Membership function plots of 5 inputs “Fishing boat and Deer trajectories” ..	70
Figure 2.43 Membership function plots of 5 inputs “Tanker ship and Elk trajectories” ...	70
Figure 2.44 The hyperplane separates groups of circles and squares in two and three dimensions	71
Figure 2.45 Separate the features into two groups with more than one choice of dividing line between the groups	72
Figure 2.46 The MMH is defined by the support vectors	72
Figure 2.47 The MMH is as far away as possible from the outer boundaries of the two group of data points	73
Figure 2.48 Two points falling on the wrong side of the line	74
Figure 3.1 Input and Output parameters on Fuzzy Inference System	78
Figure 3.2 Trained FIS against the training and checking data "Trajectories of the Tanker ship and Fishing boat	79
Figure 3.3 Trained FIS against the training and checking data "Trajectories of the Elk and Cattle”	80
Figure 3.4 Trained FIS against the training and checking data "Trajectories of the Elk and Deer”	81

Figure3.5 Trained FIS against the training and checking data "Trajectories of the Cattle and Deer"	82
Figure3.6 Trained FIS against the training and checking data "Trajectories of the Tanker ship and Elk"	83
Figure3.7 Trained FIS against the training and checking data "Trajectories of the Tanker ship and Cattle"	84
Figure3.8 Trained FIS against the training and checking data "Trajectories of the Tanker ship and Deer"	84
Figure3.9 Trained FIS against the training and checking data "Trajectories of the Fishing boat and Elk"	85
Figure3.10 Trained FIS against the training and checking data "Trajectories of the Fishing boat and Cattle"	86
Figure3.11 Trained FIS against the training and checking data "Trajectories of the Fishing boat and Deer"	87
Figure 3.12 Macro-average of Classification accuracies for Cattle vs. Elk (solid), Deer vs. Elk (dashed) and Deer vs. Cattle (dash-dot) for (A) small Range of Influence and (B) large Range of Influence	91
Figure 3.13 Macro-average of Classification accuracies for Tanker ship vs. Cattle (solid), Tanker ship vs. Elk (dashed) and Tanker ship vs. Deer (dash-dot) for (A) small Range of Influence and (B) large Range of Influence	94
Figure 3.14 Macro-average of Classification accuracies for Fishing boat vs. Cattle (solid), Fishing boat vs. Elk (dashed) and Fishing boat vs. Deer (dash-dot) for (A) small Range of Influence and (B) large Range of Influence	96

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Number of Trajectories of Each Object (Points)	26
Table.2.2	The clustering parameters of the “Tanker ship and Fishing boat”	45
Table 2.3	Clustering Parameters of the “Elk and Cattle trajectories”, “Elk and Deer trajectories” and “Cattle and Deer trajectories”	47
Table 2.4	Clustering Parameters of the “Tanker ship and Cattle trajectories”, “Tanker ship and Deer trajectories” and “Tanker ship and Elk trajectories”	47
Table 2.5	Clustering Parameters of the “Fishing boat and Cattle trajectories”, “Fishing boat and Deer trajectories” and “Fishing boat and Elk trajectories”	47
Table 2.6	Clustering Parameters of the “Elk and Cattle trajectories”, “Elk and Deer trajectories” and “Cattle and Deer trajectories”	48
Table 2.7	Clustering Parameters of the “Elk and Cattle trajectories”, “Elk and Deer trajectories” and “Cattle and Deer trajectories”	48
Table 2.8	Clustering Parameters of the “Tanker ship and Cattle trajectories”, “Tanker ship and Deer trajectories” and “Tanker ship and Elk trajectories”	49
Table 2.9	Clustering Parameters of the “Tanker ship and Cattle trajectories”, “Tanker ship and Deer trajectories” and “Tanker ship and Elk trajectories”	49
Table 2.10	Clustering Parameters of the “Fishing boat and Cattle trajectories”, “Fishing boat and Deer trajectories” and “Fishing boat and Elk trajectories”	49
Table 2.11	Clustering Parameters of the “Fishing boat and Cattle trajectories”, “Fishing boat and Deer trajectories” and “Fishing boat and Elk trajectories”	50
Table 3.1	The ACC “Fishing boat and Tanker ship trajectories”	79
Table 3.2	The ACC “Elk and Cattle trajectories”	80
Table 3.2	The ACC “Elk and Cattle trajectories”	81
Table 3.4	The ACC “Cattle and Deer trajectories”	82
Table 3.5	The ACC “Tanker ship and Elk trajectories”	83
Table 3.6	The ACC “Tanker ship and Cattle trajectories”	84
Table 3.7	The ACC “Tanker ship and Deer trajectories”	85
Table 3.8	The ACC “Fishing boat and Elk trajectories”	86
Table 3.9	The ACC “Fishing boat and Cattle”	86
Table 3.10	The ACC “Fishing boat and Deer trajectories”	87

Table 3.11 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Cattle and Elk trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.01 to 0.09)	88
Table 3.12 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Cattle and Elk trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.1 to 0.9)	89
Table 3.13 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Deer and Elk trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.01 to 0.09)	89
Table 3.14 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Deer and Elk trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.1 to 0.9)	89
Table 3.15 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Deer and Cattle trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.01 to 0.09)	90
Table 3.16 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Deer and Cattle trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.1 to 0.9)	90
Table 3.17 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Tanker ship and Cattle trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.01 to 0.09)	92
Table 3.18 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Tanker ship and Cattle trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.2 to 0.6)	92
Table 3.19 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Tanker ship and Elk trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.01 to 0.09)	92
Table 3.20 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Tanker ship and Elk trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.2 to 0.6)	92
Table 3.21 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Tanker ship and Deer trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.01 to 0.09)	93
Table 3.22 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Tanker ship and Deer Tanker ship and Deer trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.2 to 0.6)	93
Table 3.23 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Fishing boat and Cattle trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.01 to 0.09)	94
Table 3.24 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Fishing boat and Cattle trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.2 to 0.6)	95
Table 3.25 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Fishing boat and Elk trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.01 to 0.09)	95
Table 3.25 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Fishing boat and Elk trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.01 to 0.09)	95
Table 3.26 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Fishing boat and Elk trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.2 to 0.6)	95
Table 3.27 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Fishing boat and Deer trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.01 to 0.09)	95
Table 3.28 Macro-average of classification accuracies for Fishing boat and Deer trajectories (range of influence parameter from 0.2 to 0.6)	96
Table 3.29 Macro-average of classification accuracies based SVM	97