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Abstract—Hand gesture recognition (HGR) in real-time and with precision has become an important research topic. In this article, a loose hand gesture recognition (LHGR) system based on relational features using a depth sensor is implemented, which not only maintains an impressive accuracy in real-time processing but also enables the user to use loose gestures. HGR can usually be divided into three stages: hand detection, hand feature extraction, and gesture classification. However, the method we propose has been useful in improving all the stages of HGR. In the hand detection stage, we propose a ROI dynamic estimation method and a wrist-cutting method that conform to the characteristics of a human hand. In the feature extraction stage, we use the more reliable relational features which are constructed by local features, global features, and depth coding. In the gesture classification stage, we use three layers of classifiers including finger counting, finger name matching, and coding comparison; these layers are used to classify 16 kinds of hand gestures. In the end, the final output is adjusted by an adaptive decision. The average processing speed per frame is 38.6 ms. Using our method has resulted in an average accuracy of standard gestures of about 98.29%, and an average accuracy of loose gestures of about 88.32%. In summary, our LHGR system can robustly classify hand gestures and still achieve acceptable results for loose gestures.

Index Terms—Computer vision, hand gesture recognition, human-computer interaction, image processing, kinect.

I. INTRODUCTION

Human-computer interaction (HCI) has become one of the most popular research topics. Owing to the intuitive mode of operation and a high degree of freedom, hand gesture recognition (HGR) has always been a very popular focus area in HCI.

Based on different sensors, HGR systems can be categorized as vision-based [1]-[3] and glove-based [4], [5]. Vision-based HGR that uses optical sensors to capture 2D images is very sensitive to light; so, some studies have added various restrictions for a better hand segmentation. In contrast, glove-based HGR systems capture much more robust information from human hands. Nonetheless, users have to wear additional devices that cause inconvenience, involve extra costs, and give rise to inhibitions when gesturing. Fortunately, the lower-priced depth sensors provide a new opportunity for HGR. The common methods of depth sensing include stereo triangulation [6], structured light [7], and time-of-flight (ToF) [8]. Some research outcomes [9], [10] indicate that these methods have no absolute winner; so, a device that would be widely accepted should promote user interaction. For example, Microsoft has released the Kinect Software Development Kit (SDK) for programmers based on which Kinect has been used in many applications [11].

The past HGR studies can be divided into two types: one deals with the simplification of the complexity of hand gestures for real-time processing [3], [12]; in the other, the amount of calculations overhead required to attain precise gestures is not a significant factor [13], [14]. In addition, the improvements in HGR have attached importance to user experience. Consequently, loose hand gestures have to be as friendly to users as possible. Loose hand gestures allow the rotations in roll, yaw, and pitch; moreover, the fingers can have different degrees of bending, as shown in Fig. 1.

In this article, a loose hand gesture recognition (LHGR) system based on relational features using a depth sensor is implemented via three stages, as shown in Fig. 2; we have realized improvements in all stages. In the hand detection stage, we can define an appropriate region of interest (ROI) size which completely covers the hand region depending on the depth of the hand skeleton point based on the human skeleton provided by Kinect SDK. Next, a wrist-cutting method that conforms to the characteristics of the human hand is proposed to remove the arm region. In the feature extraction stage, the required relational features are composed of three kinds of features, extracted in three steps. The first step is to use two signatures, namely the distance signature and the angle signature to find local features on a hand contour. The second step is implemented based on three rules of hand geometry and a double projection method to generate global features that describe the characteristics of a complete gesture. In the third step, we propose a simple method, called depth coding, to record the distribution of folded fingers within the palm region. The final stage is gesture classification by which we classify 16 kinds of gestures using three layers of classifiers which include finger counting, finger name matching, and coding comparison. Then the output can be adjusted more precisely through an adaptive decision in continuous time.
In our study, we used an Intel Core i3-3220 as the CPU, NVIDIA GeForce GTX 650 Ti as the VGA, and a Kinect for Windows as the sensor. The average processing speed per frame was 38.6 ms; the average accuracy of standard gestures was about 98.29%, and the average accuracy of loose gestures was about 88.32%. The results show that the LHGR system we propose can be implemented on generic hardware devices and a reliable recognition of loose hand gestures can be achieved.

![Fig. 2. The framework of our LHGR system.](image)

**II. RELATED WORKS**

Generally, HGR can be divided into three stages: hand detection, feature extraction, and gesture classification. In this chapter, we will introduce a review of these stages.

**A. Hand Detection**

Hand detection is the first work in HGR. In this stage, the hand regions are estimated from images. In the past, appearance-based methods [15] were used to detect the hands, but were found to be unreliable. Wang [16] proposes a novel, real-time hand detection algorithm based on skin color. The detecting procedure is simple and fast. Nowadays, depth information acquired using depth sensors makes hand detection more easy and effective. One easy approach is to define a valid range through a depth threshold [17], [18] to detect objects. Some studies [19] use the body skeleton provided by Microsoft Kinect to assist hand detection. Ohn-Bar and Trivedi [20] developed a vision-based system that employs a combined RGB and depth descriptor to detect and classify hand gestures.

**B. Feature Extraction**

Feature extraction is used to obtain useful and sufficient features to describe a hand gesture; the three common methods to achieve this [11] are shape-based, 3D model-based, and skeleton-based. An alternative approach is to use the relationships among objects to define relational features [21].

*Shaped-based.* This approach uses hand contours which are easy to obtain with less computation; but the collected data is susceptible to noises. Ren et al. [22] propose the finger-earth mover’s distance (FEMD) approach to measure the differences between hand shapes. Wong et al. [23] present a new superpixel-based HGR system based on a novel superpixel earth mover’s distance (SP-EMD) metric, together with a Kinect depth camera.

*3D model-based.* This approach is an improvement from the traditional model-based method; it offers a breakthrough in the estimation of precision gestures. Oikonomidis et al. [15], [24], [25] propose a series of 3D model-based studies. A 3D hand model is represented as a vector of 27 parameters to encode the 26 degrees of freedom of a human hand. Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) [26] is an efficient optimization algorithm used to minimize the difference between the hypothetical and observed gesture. Because the calculation of 27 parameters is computationally intensive, their studies also exploit GPU processing to speed up the PSO.

**Skeleton-based.* Here, the gesture based on the configuration of the hand skeleton is deduced. Skeleton generation is the key to skeleton-based methods. Keskin et al. [27] propose a real-time skeleton fitting algorithm based on random decision forests, which is used to perform per pixel classification and assign each pixel to a hand part. Fan et al. [28] present an algorithm for estimating a 3D hand skeleton model from a depth map based on the Active Shape Model framework.

**Relational features.* Using this approach, the original features are augmented with knowledge or guidelines such that the performance meets expectations. Relational features can be described in the form of graphs or rules using a specific syntax or language, which provide common relational information including adjacencies, geometrical relationships, behavior patterns, hierarchical structures, etc. Tian et al. [29] propose a set of comprehensive features, termed joints kinetic and relational features, for action recognition. Zweng et al. [30] evaluate a new algorithm for pedestrian detection using a relational feature model in combination with histogram similarity functions.

**C. Gesture Classification**

Gesture classification is used to classify the hand as a specifically defined gesture (static or dynamic) based on the features of the hand. Li [31] organizes three classifiers in a hierarchical manner which include the number of fingers, the finger names, the angles between each pair of fingers, to deduce the hand pose. Giulio et al. [32] introduce novel acquisition devices like Leap Motion and Kinect that can obtain a very informative description of the hand pose for accurate gesture recognition. This information is processed and fed into a multiclass SVM classifier to recognize gestures. Another new approach is Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs)—a type of feed-forward artificial neural network. In recent years, CNNs have been used widely in computer vision [33]. So, some researchers have applied CNNs to hand gesture classification [34], [35] with good outcomes.

**III. THE PROPOSED METHOD**

**A. Hand Detection**

We propose a ROI dynamic estimation method to find the most suitable ROI at different depths. First, the hand skeleton point provided by the Kinect skeleton is defined as the center point of ROI, and the largest size gesture is designated as the “maximally open hand”. We record the length (in pixels) of the ROI needed for a “maximally open hand” at different depths; then the estimation formula

\[ l = 0.00006d^2 - 0.279d + 360 \]  

(1)

is applied based on the least squares estimation principle. In (1), \( d \) is the depth value (in millimeters) of the hand skeleton point and \( l \) is the length (in pixels) of the ROI.

In the general HGR, wrist cutting is not taken seriously. However, the quality of wrist cutting influences the result considerably. So, we present a stable wrist-cutting method...
based on the length difference between the adjacent lines and the distribution of the probability histogram. An example of our wrist-cutting method is shown in Fig. 3. In Fig. 3(a), the red point 0 is a centroid of the whole gesture, the green point c is on the image boundary that belongs to the gesture, G' means all the gray lines which are orthogonal to τ, and S is a set of the center points of G' shown in brown. In Fig. 3(b), L is the principal axis of the arm shown in purple, which is fitted by the least square estimation of S. W' is a set of candidates for the wrist-cutting line, which are orthogonal to L, shown in green. In Fig. 3(c), W' is represented after removing the head and tail of W' to retain the middle half. Finally, the wrist-cutting line Wcf shown in red can be selected from W' by the following formula.

\[ W = \arg \max \{ \langle |D_i \cdot D_{i+1}| + |D_i \cdot D_{i-1}| \rangle \times H_i \} \]

In (2), \( i \in W' \), \( D_i \) means the length of \( i \) presented by Euclidean distance, and \( H_i \) is the probability value of \( i \) in a histogram. If (2) is maximum when \( i = t \), that \( t \) is the \( W_c \). In addition, the left wrist point \( w_l \), right wrist point \( w_r \), and center wrist point \( w \) can be found on \( W_c \). These three wrist points will play an important role in subsequent processing.

**B. Feature Extraction**

Feature extraction is completed in three steps to find local features, global features, and depth coding. The above-mentioned features are used to compose the relational features of hand gestures.

*Local features* include the peaks, valleys, and the known wrist points. Local features have the ability to describe the locations of the fingertips and gaps between fingers, which can be used to identify the number of protruding fingers in hand gestures. In this study, the process can be considered as a local optimum of an optimization problem.

First, we use the Douglas-Peucker algorithm (DP) to simplify the gesture contour, as shown in Fig. 4(a). Scanning the contour clockwise from \( w_1 \) to \( w_n \), the set of sequence vertices is recorded as \( V = \{ v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n \} \), where \( v_1 = w_1 \) and \( v_n = w_n \). Then, we make two signatures, namely the distance and the angle signature to assist local feature extraction. The distance signature is recorded as \( D_a = \{ d(v_1, v), d(v_2, v), \ldots, d(v_n, v) \} \), which represents the distance between each vertex and \( v \); the angle signature is recorded as \( A_a = \{ A(\angle v_1 v_2 v), A(\angle v_1 v_3 v_4), \ldots, A(\angle v_1 v_2 v_3) \} \), which represents the values calculated by the following formula.

\[ A(\text{angle}) = \text{Sign}(\sin(\text{angle})) \times \cos(\text{angle}) \]

In (3), the angle is that which is between each vertex and its two adjacent vertices, \( \text{Sign}(\sin(\text{angle})) \) is the direction of the cross product, and the value of \( \cos(\text{angle}) \) can be used to determine the sharpness of the angle. An example for distance signature is shown in Fig. 4(b); the horizontal axis displays the sequence vertices, and the vertical axis displays their \( D_a \). As regards the angle signature shown in Fig. 4(c), the horizontal axis displays the sequence vertices, and the vertical axis displays their \( A_a \).

Next, we will explain how to extract the local features. First, \( A_a \) can be divided into many regions with each of the two vertices having the same direction of the cross product. Then, the local sharpest vertex in each region, the vertex with the maximum \( A(\text{angle}) \), called a peak is picked; otherwise the vertex with the minimum \( A(\text{angle}) \) is identified as a valley. Next, we use hill climbing to update the positions of peaks and valleys on \( D_a \). Hence, the last peaks and valleys are the local optimal solutions.

**Global features** can be used to describe the overall gesture characteristics which include the palm region, the finger region, and the Metacarpophalangeal (MCP) joints. The most important of global features is MCP which is located at the junctions of the metacarpals and phalanges [36].

Global features are extracted by two processing works. The first work is to divide the gesture into the palm region and the finger region, according to three rules designed by the hand geometry which are:

1) *Generating the corresponding valleys.* Each peak and its two adjacent valleys can create a triangular block. But sometimes the peak nearby a wrist point may have only one adjacent valley; thus we need to generate a new valley with the same distances from the peak to the two adjacent valleys.

2) *Determining the finger region.* The angle between each peak and its adjacent valleys is examined. If the angle is less than 60, this triangle block belongs to the finger region.

3) *Correcting finger region based on trigonometry.* Ideally, the shape of each triangle block that belongs to the finger region should approximate an isosceles triangle. Here, we may generate a new valley on the longer side if needed, and the new tri-angle block forms an isosceles triangle.

Based on these three rules, we now have the local features and the newly generated valleys. Defining peaks as a set of fingertips \( P = \{ p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_t \} \), the remaining feature points are defined as \( Q = \{ q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_s \} \). The palm region is formed by \( Q \).

In the second work, we project \( P \) onto a palm circle with a double projection method to calculate the locations of MCP. The center of the palm circle is the centroid of \( Q \), called \( q_c \).
the radius is equal to \((2\sum q_i \sqrt{q_i^2})/3j\). The first projection consists of projecting \(P\) onto their opposite sides according to the ratio of the hypotenuse side and the adjacent side, named \(p\). The second projection consists of projecting \(p\) onto the palm circle, and the final projection points are the MCP joints. An example for estimating global features is shown in Fig. 5. In Fig. 5(a), the local feature points are displayed; the wrist points are represented in gray, the peaks in yellow, and the valleys in cyan. In Fig. 5(b), the new corresponding valleys are represented in green; the range within the red border is the palm region, and the range outside the red border is the finger region. In Fig. 5(c), the palm circle is represented in green; \(P\) is projected onto \(p\) with the ratio \(b/a = d/c\), and the MCP joints are represented in blue.

Depth coding is proposed to record the distribution of folded fingers. First, we calculate an average depth value \(d_e\) of the palm region, and the points are a part of folded fingers when their depth is less than \(d_e\). Next, the connections between two adjacent MCP joints are denoted right to left as \(M = \{ m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_n \}\), where \(0 \leq n \leq 4\). The proportion of the number of pixels belong to folded fingers on \(m_n\) is calculated as \(rate\). Finally, we code \(M\) sequentially through a customized threshold \(T\) (\(T = 0.55\) in this study). If \(rate > T\), we code \(m_n\) to 1; otherwise, we code it to 0. An example of depth coding is shown as Fig. 6, in which the pixels of folded fingers are represented in gray, and \(M\) are represented in yellow. The codes are respectively 000 in Fig. 6(a) and 001 in Fig. 6(b).

![Fig. 5. An example for estimating global features: (a) Local features of hand gesture; (b) A division of a gesture into palm region and finger region; (c) The result of MCP joints.](image)

![Fig. 6. Using depth coding to classify two gestures; (a) is coded as 000; (b) is coded as 001.](image)

**Fig. 5.** An example for estimating global features: (a) Local features of hand gesture; (b) A division of a gesture into palm region and finger region; (c) The result of MCP joints.

**Fig. 6.** Using depth coding to classify two gestures; (a) is coded as 000; (b) is coded as 001.

### C. Gesture Classification

We propose three layers of classifiers to classify 16 kinds of gestures, which are “Num. 0,” “Num. 1,” “Num. 2,” “Num. 3,” “Num. 4,” “Num. 5,” “Num. 7,” “Num. 8,” “Num.9,” “Let’s Go,” “Little,” “Rock,” “I Love You,” “OK,” and “No Ring,” is shown as Fig. 7.

![Fig. 7. Classification of 16 gestures using three layers of classifiers.](image)

**Table I: The Average Angle of Individual Fingers in Different Categories**

| Finger name | Don’t care | Don’t care | Don’t care | Don’t care | Don’t care |
|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 5 fingers   | 48         | 71         | 87         | 102        | 123        |
| 4 fingers   | 46         | 54         | 89         | 111        | 135        |
| 3 fingers   | 58         | Null       | 103        | 117        | 143        |
| 2 fingers   | 52         | Null       | Null       | 106        | 128        |
| 1 fingers   | Null       | Null       | Null       | Null       | Null       |
| 0 fingers   | Null       | Null       | Null       | Null       | Null       |

The three layers of classifiers are as below:

**Finger counting.** The number of protruding fingers of local features can be used to classify 16 kinds of gestures into 6 categories.

**Finger name matching.** Calculating the included angle between each MCP, \(w\), and \(w_l\) from global features. Next, counting the average angle of each finger in different categories; the results are shown in Table I. Although we can match the protruding fingers using Table I to classify gestures, an ideal result for loose gestures is evasive. Eventually, we only determine whether the thumb exists using the relatively stable thumb angle. The categories can be further divided into two statuses—with thumb and without thumb. Notably, because there is no depth coding information for only one protruding finger, the classification is completed by matching only one finger name.

**Coding comparison.** For the last layer of classifiers, all cases of depth coding corresponding to the two statuses of gestures are shown in Table II(A). This form can be simplified into Table II(B); thus, we can just compare the last
number of depth coding to complete the classification.

TABLE II: DEPTH CODING CORRESPONDING TO THE GESTURES: (A) ALL CASES OF DEPTH CODING CORRESPONDING TO THE TWO STATUSES OF GESTURES; (B) A SIMPLIFIED FORM FROM (A)

| Coding | With thumb | No thumb |
|--------|------------|----------|
| 0      | “Num. 5”   | “Num. 3” |
| 1      | “Num. 6”   | “Rock”   |
| 00     | “Num. 7”   | “Ok”     |
| 01     | “I Love You” | “Num. 3” |
| 10     | X          | “Ok”     |
| 11     | “I Love You” | “Num. 3” |
| 000    | “Num. 5”   | X        |
| 001    | “No Ring”  | X        |
| 010    | X          | X        |
| 011    | X          | X        |
| 100    | X          | X        |
| 101    | X          | X        |
| 110    | X          | X        |
| 111    | X          | X        |

IV. RESULTS

A. Standard Gesture Recognition Results

TABLE III: THE STANDARD GESTURE RECOGNITION RESULTS OF THREE METHODS RESPECTIVELY

| Num. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|------|---|---|---|---|
| Let’s Go | 0.99270773 | 0.99270773 | 0.9708092 |
| Num. 1 | 0.980769231 | 0.980769231 | 0.97438974 |
| Let’s | 0.97910345 | 0.97910345 | 0.98867069 |
| Num. 6 | 0.98013243 | 0.98013243 | 0.95364338 |
| Rock | 0.926380368 | 0.79141104 |
| I Love You | 0.984 | 0.848 | 0.776 |
| Num. 8 | 0.873417322 | 0.77215889 |
| Num. 3 | 0.93071707 | 0.844603415 | 0.76097561 |
| OK | 0.951048953 | 0.864919804 | 0.69230769 |
| No Ring | 0.7961930403 | 0.656719418 |
| Num. 9 | 0.965819686 | 0.79487279 | 0.72594473 |
| Num. 4 | 0.993710962 | 0.993710962 | 0.96228415 |
| Num. 5 | 0.98294243 | 0.927814499 | 0.879231109 |

The standard gesture is defined as a normal hand with straight fingers and without intense rotation. In addition to our method (i), we designed two methods for verification; method (ii) with two layers of classifiers that does not use depth coding; and method (iii) with two layers of classifiers that does not use depth coding but uses peaks instead of MCP joints. The standard gesture recognition results of the above three methods are presented in Table III; the accuracy rate of standard gestures is about 98.29% when using our method (i), 92.28% using method (ii), and 87.29% when using method (iii). The experimental results have proved that MCP joints and depth coding are useful features.

B. Loose Gesture Recognition Results

The loose gesture recognition results from our method are presented in Table IV. The accuracy rate of loose gestures is about 88.32%, and the worst gesture is “OK” at an accuracy rate of about 77.17%. Roughly, although the accuracy of loose gestures is much lower compared to that of standard gestures, we have achieved acceptable results for loose gestures.

There are six examples for loose gesture recognition, as shown in Fig. 8. From a comparison of Fig. 8(a) and Fig. 8(b), while both the actual gestures are “Num. 5,” we can see that Fig. 8(b) is mistaken for “Num. 4” because of its incomplete shape. From a comparison of Fig. 8(c) and Fig. 8(d), while both the actual gestures are “Let’s Go,” we can see that the Fig. 8(d) is mistaken for “Num. 1” because of the violent gesture rotation. Comparing Fig. 8(e) and Fig. 8(f), while both the actual gestures are “Num. 2,” it can be seen that Fig. 8(f) is mistaken for “Rock” due to the distribution of folded fingers (or say, the rotation in yaw is the major reason). Therefore, the yaw rotation is the most harmful to the system because it may simultaneously affect the gestural shape and distribution of folded fingers.

TABLE IV: THE LOOSE GESTURE RECOGNITION RESULTS ON OUR METHOD

| (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Fig. 8. Six examples for loose gesture recognition, the left side of which shows a color image, and right side shows the relational features and the recognition result. |

V. CONCLUSION

We implemented a LHGR system based on relational features using a Kinect, whereby improvements in all the stages have been realized to maintain a good accuracy in real-time processing. The computer that we used for LHGR comprises commonly available parts in our study. The average processing speed of each frame was 38.6 ms, the average accuracy of standard gestures was about 98.29%, and the average accuracy of loose gestures was about 88.32%.

Some directions for future work are to increase the varieties of recognized gestures to improve the accuracy of recognition and to reduce the environmental constraints. Our study is very close to actual life conditions and presents a great potential for development. In future, the findings from our study can be easily applied to user interaction in a variety of control applications.
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