

A Multimodal Intermediate Fusion Network with Manifold Learning for Stress Detection

1st Morteza Bodaghi
Dept. MCHE. Engineering
University of Louisiana
Lafayette, USA
Bodaghi.Morteza@gmail.com

2nd Majid Hosseini
Dept. C. Science
University of Louisiana
Lafayette, USA
Mjhoseiny@gmail.com

3rd Raju Gottumukkala
Dept. MCHE. Engineering
University of Louisiana
Lafayette, USA
Raju.Gottumukkala@louisiana.edu

Abstract—Multimodal deep learning methods capture synergistic features from multiple modalities and have the potential to improve accuracy for stress detection compared to unimodal methods. However, this accuracy gain typically comes from high computational cost due to the high-dimensional feature spaces, especially for intermediate fusion. Dimensionality reduction is one way to optimize multimodal learning by simplifying data and making the features more amenable to processing and analysis, thereby reducing computational complexity. This paper introduces an intermediate multimodal fusion network with manifold learning-based dimensionality reduction. The multimodal network generates independent representations from biometric signals and facial landmarks through 1D-CNN and 2D-CNN. Finally, these features are fused and fed to another 1D-CNN layer, followed by a fully connected dense layer. We compared various dimensionality reduction techniques for different variations of unimodal and multimodal networks. We observe that the intermediate-level fusion with the Multi-Dimensional Scaling (MDS) manifold method showed promising results with an accuracy of 96.00% in a Leave-One-Subject-Out Cross-Validation (LOSO-CV) paradigm over other dimensional reduction methods. MDS had the highest computational cost among manifold learning methods. However, while outperforming other networks, it managed to reduce the computational cost of the proposed networks by 25% when compared to six well-known conventional feature selection methods used in the preprocessing step.

Index Terms—Psychological Stress Detection, Early Fusion, Intermediate Level Fusion, Manifold Learning, Dimension Reduction, Multimodal Learning, Biometric Signals, Facial Landmarks, video

I. INTRODUCTION

Predicting stress in the real world is a very challenging problem because of the high variability of how stress manifests across individuals and the influence of environmental context. [1]. Multimodal learning integrates signals from multiple modalities and captures complementary information across sources and their cross-modal interaction. Prior work in multi-modal learning from biometric signals, voice, and facial expression has been shown to improve prediction accuracy [1]. However, as pointed out by prior research [2], multimodal learning models come with high computational costs of data processing, training, and validation. Training the model requires synchronization across multiple modalities, and optimizing the model to capture the correlation between different modalities gets quite expensive[3]. More research is needed

to optimize the performance trade-offs [4, 5, 6]. Various strategies exist to optimize the performance trade-offs between achieving good accuracy and computational needs, such as improving network architecture [7], model compression [8], dimensionality reduction[9], regularization[10] and hardware optimization [11]. In this paper, we study the problem of dimensionality reduction using manifold learning.

Dimensional reduction benefits multimodal learning in various ways. First, unnecessary features are eliminated, and a cleaner set of features is retained. Second, the data size is reduced, reducing the storage and processing requirements[12] that decreases memory and computational cost. Finally, a reduced feature set minimizes the number of dimensions and redundancy, thereby minimizing overfitting and improving model performance [13]. Existing methods, such as PCA, offer good dimensionality reduction, but these models work well for transformations where the combination of features is predominantly linear. Emotion and stress-related features involve complex geometric transformations that are inherently nonlinear [14, 15]. Manifold learning assumes that the data lies on a two-dimensional manifold embedded in a higher-dimensional space, and the structure can be preserved by geometric space, so Manifold learning can potentially capture low-dimensional structures within high-dimensional data where the structure is inherently geometric. Manifold learning has been applied in image recognition [16], multiple sensor translation [17], neuroscience and brain network analysis [18, 19]. In this paper, we introduce a low-cost intermediate fusion model for stress detection that implements manifold dimensional reduction and convolutional neural network. We investigate different variations of multimodal learning techniques with various manifold learning techniques and PCA to study the accuracy vs computational cost trade-offs. The models are investigated using the LOSO-CV method. We also compared the performancecost trade-offs of using manifold learning in unimodal, early, and intermediate-level fusion neural networks.

We discuss closely related work in this area in Section 2; the details of the proposed intermediate fusion network are discussed in Section 3; manifold learning methods are explained in Section 4, and then we discuss results and analysis in Section 5. Section 6 compares the computational cost of different networks with and without using various

dimensionality reduction techniques. Finally, we discuss the limitations and conclusion in sections 7 and 8.

II. RELATED WORK

Multimodal stress detection is a valuable approach, as it leverages multiple sensory data sources to uncover intriguing patterns and correlations across different modalities simultaneously [20]. In this regard, researchers have explored three distinct classes of multimodal learning models: early fusion, late fusion, and intermediate-level fusion.

Early fusion has been extensively examined in existing literature. For instance, Wu, Yujin, et al. [21] proposed an innovative geometric multimodal LSTM-based stress detection framework, incorporating representations of physiological and behavioral signals derived from covariance and cross-covariance. Similarly, Seo, Wonju, et al. [22] introduced a deep learning feature-level (early-fusion) fusion network that combined ECG, respiration, and facial features, achieving a binary stress detection accuracy of 73.3%. Additionally, [23] employed ECG signals, peripheral physiological signals, and eye movement for emotion detection, reducing data dimensions through the ISO algorithm at the feature level and subsequently feeding it into a Convolutional Neural Network (CNN), achieving an accuracy of 90.05

Moving to intermediate-level fusion, [24] attained an accuracy of 75.5% using a multimodal fusion model based on CNNs for subject-independent stress detection. This model incorporated physiological signals, such as Electrocardiogram (ECG) and Electrodermal Activity (EDA). Furthermore, [25] successfully fused raw video and audio signals to create an emotion detection system tailored for the elderly population, showing significant improvements in detecting happiness and sadness.

Other approaches integrated various modalities for stress detection. For instance, [26] integrated ECG, voice, and facial expression data, achieving an accuracy of 85.1% in stress detection. Meanwhile, [27] proposed subject-independent emotion recognition using EEG signals, employing a Semi-Supervised Dimension Reduction algorithm (SSDR) to reduce deep feature dimensions and improve classification accuracy. Notably, fusion after profound feature reduction yielded the highest accuracy. Lastly, [28] combined EEG and speech features for emotion recognition, employing a weighted fusion approach and achieving an average accuracy of 86.59%.

These studies underscore the significance of employing multiple modalities for stress detection, as they enable the integration of complementary information. However, there remains a need for improved, more accurate, and faster stress detection methods suitable for real-world scenarios, facilitating timely stress monitoring and management.

This paper focuses on exploring the computational cost and performance trade-offs of various Manifold-based dimensional reduction methods within an intermediate-level fusion network. We compare these methods to unimodal and early fusion networks for stress detection. Among these dimensionality

reduction techniques, our experiments reveal that Multidimensional Scaling (MDS) achieves a remarkable accuracy of 96% when utilized in an intermediate-level fusion network, particularly in a Leave-One-Subject-Out Cross-Validation (LOSO-CV) framework.

III. MULTIMODAL INTERMEDIATE LEVEL FUSION NETWORK

Figure 1 illustrates our proposed intermediate fusion network. This model employs manifold dimensional reduction before the fusion of the representations of each modality separately.




Fig. 1. Intermediate Level Fusion Network

In this network architecture, the process begins with the preprocessing of biometric signals and facial landmarks. The biometric signals are input into a 3×1 CNN layer, while in parallel, a 3×3 CNN layer is responsible for generating representations of facial landmarks. Subsequently, both sets of representations go through (2×1) and (2×2) max-pooling layers, followed by flattening layers.

The representations derived from biometric signals and facial landmarks are then combined through concatenation before being fed into a series of fully connected Deep Neural Network (DNN) layers. The DNN layers consist of the following components: A fully connected layer with 16 neurons employing a ReLU activation function, followed by a 0.2 dropout, and a layer with eight neurons utilizing ReLU activation, L2 regularization with a coefficient of 0.01, followed by a 0.2 dropout. The final output layer comprises three neurons and employs a softmax activation function for the purpose of classifying stress into three distinct levels.

The source code and network architectures related to this work are made publicly available through the CPHS lab at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette [CPHSLAB].

IV. MANIFOLD LEARNING BASED DIMENSIONALITY REDUCTION

Manifold learning is a technique that uncovers the underlying structure or geometry within data and then transforms it into a space with fewer dimensions. This approach allows us to gain insights into high-dimensional data either by projecting it onto a lower-dimensional space or by learning the mapping

itself. By identifying a non-linear mapping that connects the high-dimensional space to a lower-dimensional manifold, manifold learning preserves the inherent relationships between the data points while simultaneously simplifying computational complexity [29]. We employed six different dimension reduction methods, including Locally Linear Embedding (LLE)[30], Spectral Embedding (SE)[31], Multidimensional Scaling (MDS)[32], Isometric Mapping (ISO)[33], t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE)[34], and Principal Component Analysis (PCA)[35]. The following sections explain various manifold learning techniques.

A. Locally Linear Embedding (LLE)

The LLE method, introduced by [30], is an unsupervised dimensionality reduction technique that attempts to retain the essential geometric characteristics of the original nonlinear feature structure. The method aims to find a lower-dimensional representation of the data while ensuring that the distances between the k-nearest neighbors are maintained. It achieves this by modeling the data as a linear combination of its neighboring points and then determining the weights that minimize the dissimilarity between the original data and its reconstructed version.

To illustrate the performance of LLE, we provide a 2D visualization of our data in Figure 2, along with the time it took to reduce their dimension using LLE. The plots clearly demonstrate that LLE encountered challenges in effectively clustering the data while preserving the local structure. For this visualization, we employed the following parameters: Number of neighbors = 10, Number of Components = 2, method = 'standard', and random state = 42.




Fig. 2. Biometric and Landmarks data visualization using LLE

B. Spectral Embedding (SE)

SE is another manifold nonlinear dimension reduction technique introduced in 2002 by [31]. SE simplifies complex data relationships by analyzing the connections between points using Laplacian Eigenmaps and creating a smaller data version. This helps to understand complex relationships that do not follow a straight line. To visualize our data in 2D using SE, we used the following parameters: Number of neighbors = 5, Number of Components = 2, and random state = 42. Figure 3

shows the 2D visualization of our data using SE. As shown in the plots, SE exhibited nonsensical clustering in the data and yielded the worst performance due to its limitation in capturing only the global aspect of the data, making it unsuitable for our dataset.




Fig. 3. Biometric and Landmarks data visualization using SE

C. Multi-Dimensional Scaling (MDS)

MDS measures distances or similarities between data points in high-dimensional data and generates a new map that accurately retains these relationships. This method captures a strong local structure of the data based on pairwise distances between the data points [32]. The visualization of our data using 2D MDS is illustrated in Figure 4. We used the following parameters for visualization: Number of Components = 2 and random state = 42. Our study shows that MDS plots effectively cluster the data, especially for biometric signals, making it the best-performing technique in this study when using intermediate-level fusion. However, the downside of MDS is its high computational cost, which needs to be considered. Despite this, MDS is a powerful method with notable strengths.




Fig. 4. Biometric and Landmarks data visualization using MDS

D. Isometric Mapping (ISO)

ISO is an extension of MDS. It uses graph distance, which approximates the geodesic distance between all pairs of points [33]; in Figure 5, you can see the 2D visualizations of our

data obtained using ISO. We used the following parameters for visualization: Number of Neighbors = 10, Number of Components = 2, and random state = 42. The plots obtained through ISO exhibit effective clustering, particularly for biometric signals data, while retaining the global structure of the data. In this study, the accuracy yielded by ISO and MDS was almost the same in a unimodal network for biometric signals.




Fig. 5. Biometric and Landmarks data visualization using ISO

E. *t*-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (*t*-SNE)

t-SNE models each high-dimensional object by a point so that nearby points model similar objects, and dissimilar objects are modeled by distant points with high probability, as described in [34]. We used *t*-SNE to visualize our data in 2D, as shown in Figure 6. The visualization was performed using the following parameters: perplexity = 30, Number of Components = 2, and random state = 42. The *t*-SNE plots exhibit promising results in clustering the data, primarily landmarks data, as they capture the local structure of the data. *t*-SNE ranks as the second method in our study with a high computational cost, and it also corresponds to the second-worst performer in terms of overall performance in multimodal networks. This trade-off between clustering efficacy and computational expense should be carefully considered when choosing *t*-SNE for dimensionality reduction in similar studies.




Fig. 6. Biometric and Landmarks data visualization using *t*-SNE

F. Principal Component Analysis (PCA)

PCA is a linear, well-known method for reducing the dimensions of high-dimensional data. It works by finding the directions of maximum variance and projecting them onto a new subspace with fewer dimensions [35]. The figures in 7 show how our data is visualized in 2D using PCA. We used the following parameters to generate these visualizations: Number of Components = 2 and random state = 42. PCA plots are effective in clustering, primarily for biometric data and preserving the global structure of the data. The PCA algorithm is more computationally efficient than the manifold methods used in this study. PCA performs the best when using unimodal networks but yields lower performance when it comes to multimodal learning.




Fig. 7. Biometric and Landmarks data visualization using PCA

V. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

We utilized the EmpathicSchool dataset, as introduced in [36]. This dataset has biometric signals, including heart rate, electrodermal activity, skin temperature, and accelerometer data, alongside video recordings, all of which were employed for stress detection purposes. To efficiently process emotional information without incurring excessive computational costs, we employed the dlib library [37] to extract facial landmarks from video data.

For consistency with prior work [2], we set the signal frequency to 1 Hz. To extract relevant features in both the time and frequency domains, we applied a rolling window of 20 seconds with a 10-second overlap. Within each window, we calculated the average stress level of the user, which served as the stress label. To simplify the stress levels, originally ranging from 0 to 19, we reclassified them into three categories: no-stress (0) for values less than or equal to 6.5, medium-stress (1) for values between 6.5 and 13, and stressful (2) for values exceeding 13.

We applied random down-sampling to address potential data imbalances and minimize bias in our performance evaluation. Furthermore, we independently normalized the minimum and maximum values of each signal for each user. This normalization process helped maintain the original data distribution and mitigated the impact of inter-subject variability.

The resulting dataset featured 1904 features derived from facial landmarks and 175 features from biometric signals. Subsequently, we reduced the data dimension to 49 for facial landmarks and 20 for biometric signals.

We first compared the effect of six manifold learning methods on unimodal networks, and then we applied the manifold learning to the multimodal models.

A. Unimodal Networks

Figure 8 shows the unimodal network visualization. In these networks, after preprocessing the signals, the data is fed into a (3×1) CNN for the biometric signals or a (3×3) CNN for facial landmarks, followed by a (2×1) or a (2×2) max-pooling, flattened layer, and DNN layers. The DNN layers consist of a fully connected layer with 16 neurons and a ReLU activation function, followed by a 0.2 dropout. The next layer consists of eight neurons, ReLU activation, L2 regularization of (0.01), followed by 0.2 dropout. The final output layer includes three neurons and a softmax activation function to be consistent with the proposed network. We compare unimodal and multimodal networks to evaluate the effectiveness of multimodal networks in capturing complementary information from different modalities. We investigate the performance computational cost trade-offs of manifold learning using unimodal models.




Fig. 8. Separate unimodal networks for stress detection using biometric signals and facial landmarks.

Table I and II show the performance of unimodal deep neural networks using manifold learning. Using LOSO-CV, we trained and tested the deep neural network models for biometric signals (Bio) and facial landmarks (Land) separately. However, manifold learning could not outperform PCA in unimodal networks. Moreover, the PCA has shown lower computational cost than the rest of the dimensionality reduction methods.

B. Multimodal Early Level Fusion Network

Figure 9 shows the multimodal early-fusion learning network. The dimension reduction method was applied separately

TABLE I
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF MANIFOLD LEARNING METHODS ON UNIMODAL NETWORK USING BIOMETRIC SIGNALS

method	LLE	SE	MDS	ISO	t-SNE	PCA
Acc(%)	75.27	64.35	81.62	80.04	48.84	82.22
Pre(%)	70.66	66.57	76.19	74.02	46.25	84.13
Rec(%)	73.34	59.62	80.59	74.27	46.83	82.10
F1(%)	69.77	54.40	76.52	72.85	42.66	80.11

TABLE II
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF MANIFOLD LEARNING METHODS ON UNIMODAL NETWORK USING FACIAL LANDMARKS

Method	LLE	SE	MDS	ISO	t-SNE	PCA
Acc(%)	59.77	36.68	69.25	55.26	61.96	74.13
Pre(%)	58.61	44.75	64.88	53.74	67.98	70.56
Rec(%)	59.55	45.61	65.17	52.98	57.50	69.63
F1(%)	54.46	31.64	62.40	46.68	54.53	67.52

to each data type and then concatenated and fed to a 1D-CNN layer followed by max-pooling, flattening, and DNN hidden layers. The DNN layers were consistent throughout all models to facilitate the comparisons. This allows the researchers to compare the effect of adding the manifold learning models on the performance and computational cost of different multimodal learning models.




Fig. 9. Multimodal early fusion network for stress detection using biometric signals and facial landmarks.

Table III summarizes the performance of the manifold dimension reduction methods on the early fusion network. LLE showed promising results and outperformed other methods with an accuracy of 90.99%, followed by ISO and PCA. Manifold learning has enhanced feature integration, while multimodal learning combines features from multiple modalities, leading to a richer data representation [38]. LLE performed better than PCA in the early fusion network, attributed to their ability to effectively capture and preserve the intrinsic geometry [39] and structure of the combined biometric signals and facial landmarks.

C. Multimodal Intermediate Level Fusion Network

Table IV shows the performance of the intermediate-level fusion network using various manifold learning models discussed in Section 4. The results indicate that utilizing the MDS method outperformed other techniques, achieving an accuracy of 96%. PCA and ISO are followed closely, with accuracies

TABLE III
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF MANIFOLD LEARNING METHODS ON
EARLY FUSION NETWORK

Method	LLE	SE	MDS	ISO	t-SNE	PCA
Acc(%)	90.99	71.45	87.80	89.68	74.14	89.01
Pre(%)	86.22	75.86	83.00	87.49	68.26	90.84
Rec(%)	86.87	64.95	85.71	88.67	68.53	87.92
F1(%)	86.13	61.62	82.84	87.29	66.30	86.76

of 93.14% and 88.48%, respectively. The results show that the MDS accurately represents the pairwise distance in our data and can preserve similarities between data points. Biometric signals and facial landmarks are complex data types that have non-linear relationships between their variables. MDS’s ability to capture these relationships becomes crucial in this matter. Our study showed that choosing a suitable dimension reduction method and the intermediate fusion of convolution layers can result in accurate stress detection compared to early multimodal fusion and unimodal networks. The strength of the 2D-CNN model lies in its ability to extract spatial information from facial landmarks, while the 1D-CNN model excels in capturing temporal dependencies from biometric signals. This integration of spatiotemporal features is crucial for stress detection, as stress manifests in both spatial and temporal aspects. The findings underscore the significance of manifold learning methods in enhancing stress detection performance and cost within the context of an intermediate fusion network.

TABLE IV
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF MANIFOLD LEARNING METHODS ON
INTERMEDIATE FUSION NETWORK

Method	LLE	SE	MDS	ISO	t-SNE	PCA
Acc(%)	83.16	46.44	96.00	88.48	78.51	93.14
Pre(%)	81.74	38.56	93.97	84.96	73.68	92.64
Rec(%)	81.24	38.47	96.67	82.98	74.63	90.59
F1(%)	79.04	31.57	94.99	82.96	72.20	89.63

VI. COMPUTATIONAL COST

Table V shows the computational cost of each network in terms of the dimension reduction (DR), training, and prediction times. We used a two-28-core (56 CPUs) node with an Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2660 v4 @ 2.00GHz, with L1d, L1i, L2, and L3 cache sizes of 32K, 32K, 256K, and 35840K, respectively. The node was equipped with a P100 Tesla GPU for deep-learning computations.

Manifold dimension reduction methods had higher computational costs than PCA, completing the process in 270 milliseconds for biometric signals (Bio) and 3.28 seconds for facial landmarks (Land). However, the MDS method took the most dimension reduction time, requiring 368 and 483 seconds to reduce the Bio and Land data dimensions, respectively (approximately 100 to 1000 times slower).

[2] explored six different feature selection methods, determining that Lasso regularization outperformed others and yielded the best performance for multimodal deep learning models. The Lasso features selection method took 138 and

1001 seconds to select 20 features from biometric signals and 49 features from facial landmarks, respectively. In contrast, the MDS approach achieved the same dimensional reduction, resulting in higher overall performance in the multimodal methods in a shorter time, showing a 25% improvement in preprocessing time. This shows the effectiveness of manifold learning in computational cost reduction.

A. Effect of adding extra non-linearity using 1D-CNN

Adding an extra 1D-CNN layer, followed by a max-pooling, right after data fusion yields performance improvement by adding non-linearity to the model, enhancing the average performance of the models by an increase of 7.41% in accuracy, 6.18% in precision, 9.23% in recall, and 9.42% in f1-score. This final 1D-CNN layer plays a significant role in capturing higher-level patterns by combining extracted features from both modalities [24].

VII. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORKS

In this paper, we presented a streamlined intermediate-level fusion network that leverages manifold learning techniques to enhance stress detection. Within this model, manifold-based dimension reduction is separately applied to each signal in the initial stages. This unique approach enables the extraction of meaningful representations from biometric signals and facial landmarks, both of which possess intricate and non-linear relationships, independently. These representations are later combined to inform the stress detection process. It’s worth noting that this approach can be customized to different levels for various network configurations.

In this study, we demonstrate the efficacy of non-linear dimension reduction methods within intermediate multimodal neural networks when compared to early fusion and unimodal models. Notably, our model, incorporating Multidimensional Scaling (MDS), outperforms the other models, while Locally Linear Embedding (LLE) strikes a balance between performance and computational costs. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) offers higher processing speed due to its efficiency. However, the incorporation of manifold learning techniques results in a substantial 41.69% reduction in errors (from 93.14% to 96%) compared to using PCA.

We plan to investigate the effect of implementing manifold learning the multimodal learning network at various levels of fusion: multimodal early, late, and intermediate-level fusion models. Another research area is investigating how manifold learning preserves complementary information to enhance multimodal learning for stress detection.

VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary, this study introduced a lightweight intermediate fusion network that employs manifold learning for dimensionality reduction. We systematically investigated the impact of incorporating manifold learning in the preprocessing phase across unimodal, early, and intermediate-fusion networks. Remarkably, manifold learning yielded a substantial 41.69% reduction in errors when compared to Principal Component

TABLE V
COMPARING COMPUTATIONAL COST OF THE METHODS IN UNIMODAL, EARLY, AND INTERMEDIATE NETWORKS

Method	DR Time (s)		Number of Parameters				Train Time (s)				Test Time (s)			
	Bio	Land	Unimodal		Early	Intermediate	Unimodal		Early	Intermediate	Unimodal		Early	Intermediate
			Bio	Land			Bio	Land			Bio	Land		
LLE	7.99	10.10	5,043	2,675	5,043	82,099	413	346	402	674	0.084	0.080	0.081	0.394
SE	118	42.70					258	236	343	391	0.079	0.064	0.082	0.387
MDS	368	483					350	254	413	466	0.077	0.108	0.097	0.403
ISO	8.44	12.60					359	281	389	510	0.078	0.065	0.084	0.389
t-SNE	62	414					298	282	435	592	0.078	0.065	0.080	0.375
PCA	0.27	3.28					343	238	326	468	0.077	0.064	0.122	0.383

Analysis (PCA) within intermediate-level fusion networks. Our analysis involved the examination of various manifold dimension reduction methods, assessing their effects on stress detection performance and computational costs. We evaluated six manifold learning models, including LLE, SE, MDS, ISO, t-SNE, and PCA.

The results underscored the superiority of the intermediate-level fusion model that integrated the MDS manifold learning dimensionality reduction method, achieving an impressive 96% accuracy in the Leave-One-Subject-Out Cross-Validation (LOSO-CV) paradigm. Furthermore, the implementation of data balancing through down-sampling played a pivotal role in reducing dimension reduction and train-test times, ensuring that performance assessments remained unbiased in the context of stress detection.

Additionally, the inclusion of an extra 1D-CNN layer had a substantial positive impact on the model’s performance, leading to a 7.41% increase in accuracy, a 6.18% boost in precision, a 9.23% improvement in recall, and a 9.42% enhancement in the f1-score. These findings collectively highlight the significance of manifold learning, data balancing, and architectural enhancements in advancing the state-of-the-art in stress detection techniques.

REFERENCES

- [1] Russell Li and Zhandong Liu. “Stress detection using deep neural networks”. In: *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making* 20 (2020), pp. 1–10.
- [2] Majid Hosseini et al. “Multimodal Stress Detection Using Facial Landmarks and Biometric Signals”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03606* (2023).
- [3] Seyedmajid Hosseini et al. “A multimodal sensor dataset for continuous stress detection of nurses in a hospital”. In: *Scientific Data* 9.1 (2022), p. 255.
- [4] Ioannis Kapsouras, Spiros Nikolopoulos, and Ioannis Kompatsiaris. “A Deep Learning Approach Towards Multimodal Stress Detection”. In: *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Affective Computing*. 2020, pp. 1–8.
- [5] Shengdong Zhao et al. “Stress Detection via Multimodal Multitemporal-Scale Fusion: A Hybrid of Handcrafted and Deep Learning Features”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing* (2023).
- [6] Zhenyu Zhang et al. “Multimodal Stress Detection from Multiple Heterogeneous Data Sources”. In: *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 2019, pp. 2410–2418.
- [7] Hector M Romero Ugalde et al. “Computational cost improvement of neural network models in black box nonlinear system identification”. In: *Neurocomputing* 166 (2015), pp. 96–108.
- [8] Xunyu Zhu et al. “A Survey on Model Compression for Large Language Models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07633* (2023).
- [9] Jing Wang, Haibo He, and Danil V Prokhorov. “A folded neural network autoencoder for dimensionality reduction”. In: *Procedia Computer Science* 13 (2012), pp. 120–127.
- [10] Pushparaja Murugan and Shanmugasundaram Durairaj. “Regularization and optimization strategies in deep convolutional neural network”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.04711* (2017).
- [11] Abdullah Al-Dujaili and Saad Al-Saadi. “Review of deep learning: concepts, CNN architectures, challenges, applications, future directions”. In: *Journal of Big Data* 8.1 (2021), pp. 1–49.
- [12] Lam Ho Nguyen and Susan Holmes. “Ten quick tips for effective dimensionality reduction”. In: *PLOS Computational Biology* 15.6 (2019), e1006907.
- [13] Saad Al-Saadi, Abdullah Al-Dujaili, and Jingpeng Li. “Redundancy detection and removal in big data: A comprehensive review”. In: *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), pp. 106328–106344.
- [14] Weilin Huang and Hujun Yin. “On nonlinear dimensionality reduction for face recognition”. In: *Image and Vision Computing* 30.4–5 (2012), pp. 355–366.
- [15] Moulay A Akhloufi, Abdelhakim Bendada, and Jean-Christophe Batsale. “Multispectral face recognition using non linear dimensionality reduction”. In: *Visual Information Processing XVIII*. Vol. 7341. SPIE. 2009, pp. 152–161.
- [16] Malte Hoffmann et al. “Learning multi-modal image registration without real data”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10282* (2020).
- [17] Aditya Dutt, Alina Zare, and Paul Gader. “Shared Manifold Learning Using a Triplet Network for Multiple Sensor Translation and Fusion With Missing Data”.

- In: *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing* 15 (2022), pp. 9439–9456.
- [18] Qi Zhu et al. “Multimodal brain network jointly construction and fusion for diagnosis of epilepsy”. In: *Frontiers in Neuroscience* 15 (2021), p. 734711.
- [19] Chaofan Song et al. “Multi-modal feature selection with self-expression topological manifold learning”. In: *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering* 18.5 (2021), pp. 6468–6482.
- [20] Rahee Walambe et al. “Employing Multimodal Machine Learning for Stress Detection”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09385* (2023).
- [21] Yujin Wu et al. “Fusion of Physiological and Behavioural Signals on SPD Manifolds with Application to Stress and Pain Detection”. In: *2022 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 2949–2955.
- [22] Wonju Seo et al. “Deep learning approach for detecting work-related stress using multimodal signals”. In: *IEEE Sensors Journal* 22.12 (2022), pp. 11892–11902.
- [23] Yong Zhang, Cheng Cheng, and YiDie Zhang. “Multimodal emotion recognition based on manifold learning and convolution neural network”. In: *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 81.23 (2022), pp. 33253–33268.
- [24] K Radhika and V Ramana Murthy Oruganti. “Deep multimodal fusion for subject-independent stress detection”. In: *2021 11th International Conference on Cloud Computing, Data Science & Engineering (Confluence)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 105–109.
- [25] P Sreevidya, S Veni, and OV Ramana Murthy. “Elder emotion classification through multimodal fusion of intermediate layers and cross-modal transfer learning”. In: *Signal, image and video processing* 16.5 (2022), pp. 1281–1288.
- [26] Jing Zhang et al. “Real-time mental stress detection using multimodality expressions with a deep learning framework”. In: *Frontiers in Neuroscience* 16 (2022), p. 947168.
- [27] Behrooz Zali-Vargahan et al. “Deep time-frequency features and semi-supervised dimension reduction for subject-independent emotion recognition from multi-channel EEG signals”. In: *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control* 85 (2023), p. 104806.
- [28] Qingshan She et al. “Cross-subject EEG emotion recognition using multi-source domain manifold feature selection”. In: *Computers in Biology and Medicine* 159 (2023), p. 106860.
- [29] Yunqian Ma and Yun Fu. *Manifold learning theory and applications*. CRC press, 2011.
- [30] Sam T Roweis and Lawrence K Saul. “Nonlinear dimensionality reduction by locally linear embedding”. In: *science* 290.5500 (2000), pp. 2323–2326.
- [31] Mikhail Belkin and Partha Niyogi. “Laplacian eigenmaps for dimensionality reduction and data representation”. In: *Neural computation* 15.6 (2003), pp. 1373–1396.
- [32] Ingwer Borg and Patrick JF Groenen. *Modern multidimensional scaling: Theory and applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- [33] Joshua B Tenenbaum, Vin de Silva, and John C Langford. “A global geometric framework for nonlinear dimensionality reduction”. In: *science* 290.5500 (2000), pp. 2319–2323.
- [34] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. “Visualizing data using t-SNE.” In: *Journal of machine learning research* 9.11 (2008).
- [35] Ian T Jolliffe and Jorge Cadima. “Principal component analysis: a review and recent developments”. In: *Philosophical transactions of the royal society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 374.2065 (2016), p. 20150202.
- [36] Majid Hosseini et al. “EmpathicSchool: A multimodal dataset for real-time facial expressions and physiological data analysis under different stress conditions”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.13542* (2022).
- [37] Davis E King. “Dlib-ml: A Machine Learning Toolkit”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 10 (2009), pp. 1755–1758.
- [38] Fadi Dornaika. “Multi-layer manifold learning with feature selection”. In: *Applied Intelligence* 50.6 (2020), pp. 1859–1871.
- [39] Bo Jiang, Chris Ding, and Bin Luo. “Robust data representation using locally linear embedding guided PCA”. In: *Neurocomputing* 275 (2018), pp. 523–532.