TransLingualVisionary

Kavish Purani, Neeraj Ramesh, Sandra Serbu Team E6

Use Case

Problem Difficult for deaf or hard of hearing (HOH) individuals to participate in live digital environments (online meetings, live streams, etc.)

Lack of widespread understanding of American Sign Language (ASL) often requires the hearing impaired to rely on assistance from translators to communicate.

Solution A real-time ASL speech to English text translator on a user friendly web application

Design Requirements

| <u>Requirement</u> | <u>Metric</u> |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Recognize when a user is signing | ~95% sign recognition rate |
| Correctly identify ASL words | Recognize 2000 words at ~80% accuracy |
| Correctly interpret ASL semantics | Translate identified clusters of words into full english sentences with a BLEU score of $\sim 40\%$ |
| Classification Distance | Recognize and retain accuracy of the classification model up to 4-5 feet away from the camera. |
| Text Accessibility | Display and collect the ASL Speech in an accessible user format that can be easily found and read. |
| Overall Latency ~ real time | Present visual feed and translation on web UI within ~3 seconds |

Solution Approach

Welfare Accessible Technology serves to foster Autonomy



Health and Safety Data Security Exposure



Important for users to see the accuracy of their intended speech

TLV runs locally, there is low to no risk of a malicious actor overhearing sensitive information

Classification Model LLM Model **Solution Approach** Class ŧ Softmax **JSON File** Linear Encoder Decoder Add & Norm Add & Norm Human Pose Estimation Prompt Context Feed Feed Forward Forward Nx Add & Norm Llama 2 Add & Norm Multi-Head Mx Multi-Head Pose Attention Attention Landmark Detection Model Output Add & Norm Input Sequence Multi-Head Projection Memory ŧ Positional Encoding Class Query flatten flatten flatten Hand Q Hand Crop Landmark Detection to Face Landmark Face Crop Detection My name 100

Trade-offs and Decisions

| Overall Pipeline | HPE + Transformer Pipeline | Single Transformer |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Pros | Lightweight transformer (fewer parameters) Removes extra detail | - Single model \Rightarrow Easier pipeline to train |
| Cons | - Need to modify data between models | Can capture extraneous detail Far more model parameters |
| Classification Architecture | Transformer | RNN |
| Pros | Captures short and long term dependencies via self-attention Parallel processing | - Lighter model - Simpler architecture |
| Cons | - Heavier model | Exploding/Vanishing Gradient Sequential Processing |

Trade-offs and Decisions (cont.)

| HPE | Jetson | FPGA | | | |
|------|---|--|----------|--|--|
| Pros | - More CPU processing power - Models on device limits communication latency | Opportunity to optimize models Splitting models between devices to prevent excessive compute cost | | | |
| Cons | More models running Jetson could decrease compute speed Tighter space restriction due to multiple models on device | Higher performance dependent on quantizability of models Communicating between devices would increase latency | | | |
| FPS | ~ 17 fps | Unaccelerated Accelerated | | | |
| | | ~3 fps | ~25 fps* | | |
| LLM | Llama 2 | GPT-4 | | | |
| Pros | Free and open source and LLM access | API access \rightarrow Ease of use and offloaded computation | | | |
| Cons | Runs locally– computation time may be slower and setup | Requires credits to access model | | | |

*calculated using different HPE model than ours; didn't use said model due to lack of necessary landmarks

Complete Solution and Demonstration

Simple User Display



TLV on Local Resources



Classification



Reporting Quantitative Results

| <u>Metric</u> | <u>Tests</u> | <u>Goal</u> | <u>Results</u> |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Recognition Rate | Calculate how often the model provides a sign classification when a user is signing. * | ~95% | ~98% |
| Word Classification Accuracy | Split data into training and validation sets and then calculate how often the model's output and the desired output is the same. | Training ~95% Validation ~85% | Training ~ 97.82% Validation ~ 72.44% |
| Inference Accuracy | Calculate accuracy of inference (how often the user's sign and the model's word is the same) | ~80% | ~55% |
| Overall Latency | Run timer from beginning of HPE to classification output | ~ 3 seconds | ~ 2.2 seconds |
| Unit Latency | Measure latency via inter-component timestamps during live inferencing for various and signs | HPE: ~600 ms Classification: ~800ms | HPE: ~65 ms Classification: ~12 ms |

*Tendency towards false positives (preferred over false negatives); optimize to prevent excessive false positive rate

Quantitative Results

Confusion matrix of validation accuracy. Model prediction on the x-axis, true label on the y-axis. Frequency shown through heatmap.

Training ~ 97.82% Validation ~ 72.44%



Technical Challenges

- HPE Model isn't quantizable on FPGA
 - Running on Jetson
- No API access through OpenAI
 - Running LLM locally using Llama 2
- False positives with word recognition
 - Thresholding softmax to prevent classification that the model is not "confident" about
- Extraneous frames in training set affecting classification model
 - Pruning training set based on whether there is a hand in the frame
- Frame count of inferencing
 - Training transformer based on set frame count that we are going to use for inferencing
 - Pruning training should allow for leniency with set frame count

Project Management

| | W4 | W5 | W6 | W7 | W8 | W9 | W10 | W11 | W12 | W13 | W13 | W13 |
|---|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|------|------|
| | 2/5 | 2/12 | 2/19 | 2/26 | 3/11 | 3/18 | 3/25 | 4/1 | 4/8 | 4/15 | 4/22 | 4/29 |
| Presentation And Report | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposal | SKN | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Design Review | | | | SKN | | | | | | | | |
| Final | | | | | | | | | | SKN | SKN | SKN |
| Hardware | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FPGA Ramp-up | к | к | к | к | к | | | | | | | |
| Camera I/O | | к | к | | | | | | | | | |
| Model Verification | | к | | | | | | | | | | |
| Model Implementation | | | к | | | | | | | | | |
| Model Implementation Benchmarking | | | | к | | | | | | | | |
| I/O Testing and Benchmarking | | | | | к | к | к | | | | | |
| Mediapipe Implementation | | | | | | | | К | | | | |
| Software | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Find and test datasets | SN | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mediapipe Implementation on Jetson | | SN | | | | | | | к | к | | |
| Testing and Optimization of Mediapipe | | - | | | | | | | 2 | ĸ | к | |
| Developing Transformer model | | | SN | SN | N | N | N | N | | - | | |
| Testing and Optimization | | - | | SN | | | | | Ν | N | Ν | N |
| Prompt Engineering LLM | | SN | SN | SN | S | S | S | S | S | | | |
| Fine Tuning Local LLM Model | | | | | | | | S | S | S | S | |
| Testing LLM From Jestion Word Classification | | | | | | | | | | | | S |
| Integration of Word Classification and LLM Models | | | | | | | | | | | | SKN |
| Simple Web App | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Developement | | | | | | К | К | | | | | |
| Testing | | | | | | | | К | К | к | К | к |
| Final Integration | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Testing | | | | | | | | | KN | KN | KN | SKN |
| Slack | | | | | | | | | SKN | SKN | SKN | SKN |

| SKN | Sandra, Kavish, Neeraj | |
|-----|------------------------|--|
| к | Kavish | |
| SN | Sandra, Neeraj | |
| Ν | Neeraj | |
| S | Sandra | |
| KN | Kavish, Neeraj | |

Remaining work

- Retrain word classification
- Integration on
 local device
- User interface