

Real-time performance evaluation of BGSLibrary algorithms for intelligent surveillance

Imane Benraya¹, Nadjia Benblidia², Yasmine Amara³

^{1,2}LATSI Laboratory, Electronics Department, University of Saad Dahleb/Blida 1 University, Blida, Algeria

³Department of Electronics, University of Saad Dahleb/Blida 1 University, Blida, Algeria

Article Info

Article history:

Received Apr 30, 2021

Revised Oct 12, 2021

Accepted Oct 18, 2021

Keywords:

Background subtraction

BGSLibrary

Evaluation

Foreground

Moving detection

ABSTRACT

Background subtraction is the first and basic stage in video analysis and smart surveillance to extract moving objects. In fact, the background subtraction library (BGSLibrary) was created by Andrews Sobral in 2012, which currently combines 43 background subtraction algorithms from the most popular and widely used in the field of video analysis. Each algorithm has its own characteristics, strengths and weaknesses in extracting moving objects. The evaluation allows the identification of these characteristics and helps researchers to design the best methods. Unfortunately, the literature lacks a comprehensive evaluation of the algorithms included in the library. Accordingly, the present work will evaluate these algorithms in the BGSLibrary through the segmentation performance, execution time and processor, so as to, achieve a perfect, comprehensive, real-time evaluation of the system. Indeed, a background modeling challenge (BMC) dataset was selected using the synthetic video with the presence of noise. Results are presented in tables, columns and foreground masks.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Imane Benraya

LATSI Laboratory, Electronics Department, University of Saad Dahleb/Blida 1 University

09000 Blida, Algeria

Email: benrayaimane@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The smart surveillance system can detect and track people, accidents and objects. Besides, it can be also adapted under dangerous situations that threaten human security and abnormal behaviour. In fact, a smart surveillance system relies on video analysis, detection and tracking of moving objects. It is important to know that the detection of movement in the video is the first stage to consider after the subtraction of the background and before starting the analysis of any system [1].

With the tremendous development in the computer vision field, several research papers are focusing on intelligent surveillance through different manner. Qasmieh *et al.* [2] used iris system self-customized artificial intelligence models and iterative randomized Hough transform to segment and classify the iris system. Aswini and Uma [3] detected obstacles encountered by drones using computerized monocular vision. Boulfrifi *et al.* [4] suggested a method to detect motion in a real time video by extracting automatically the foreground.

In fact, to segment moving objects in a sequence of images, a BS method is used. It is started by designing the background model of the scene. Then, a comparison to the current frame is fulfilled before updating the background model. Thus, a flexible, accurate and reliable background model is required to obtain good tracking of the moving object. Indeed, the background template must: (i) be precise in its texture and react to changes over time, (ii) flexible under different lighting conditions, and (iii) rapid real-time rendering [1], [5]. A number of researches focus on developing background subtraction techniques [6], [7],

citing as examples the statistical models [5], [8], fuzzy models and neural models. Unfortunately, the majority of the developed methods lack precision in detecting the intriguing target of video streams.

Over the past years, several background modelling methods have been proposed to identify foreground objects in a video clip. These methods differ according to their strength and weakness in discovering objects of interest. Accordingly, the background subtraction library was created by Andrews Sobral in 2012, the library is a collection of background subtraction algorithms. Where the library contained 29 algorithms compiled in the C++ programming language. Several other methods have been added and developed. Currently, the library is containing about 43 of the most popular and widely used algorithms in the field of video analysis and smart monitoring [9], [10].

Several others research papers deal with the issue of evaluating background subtraction methods under different scenarios. The main challenge faced by background subtraction methods is analyzed and studied in [11] and [12]. Al-Yassin *et al.* [13] tested the statistical accuracy which analysis the real-time monitoring systems detection algorithms using four criteria : i) false recognition, ii) unrecognized, iii) true recognition, and iv) total fragmentation ratios. In order to teste the ability and efficiency of the methods in extracting the moving objects under dynamic background, the aforementioned methods are analyzed and compared using the K-way ANONVA. Lahlraichi *et al.* [14] presented a new approach through two criteria : the first is based on creating a probabilistic image based on Kernel density estimation method and the second is the extraction of the moving pixels using graph cutting algorithm. Zaharin *et al.* [15] studied different methods of the background subtraction and the frame difference. Whereas Prakoso and Sari [16] studied three methods of image segmentation of a video through separating the foreground and background pixels, then, a comparison study is done using mean-square error (MSE) and peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR) values. Rekha *et al.* [17] built a background subtraction application for mobile platform and improved the algorithm open source computer vision library (OPENCV). Then, a comparison of the performance for the foreground detection algorithms are carried out through execution time, resolution and required resources.

In [11] the analyses of the advantages and disadvantages of background modeling methods and comparison of their performance in terms of quality and computational cost, using chang.net dataset and another dataset with different environmental conditions is done. The challenges faced during the use of BS techniques are well identified and considered in [18]. In [19] a comparison of 29 methods in background subtraction library (BGSLibrary) from the large group of BG, using the background models challenge (BMC) dataset is done. The evaluation of the methods' strength and performance in terms of processor and memory is also considered. López-Rubio *et al.* [20] evaluated nine methods of background subtraction under the influence of two types of regular and Gaussian noise. In this paper, all the algorithms in the background subtraction library were comprehensively evaluated in real-time. Among the evaluation methods, emphasis was placed on. Firstly, segmentation performance in demonstrating the ability of the algorithms to extract moving objects, by choosing the most commonly used set of measurements in the literature. Second, the execution time differs from one algorithm to another, some of the themes have a fast response time while others take a long time to respond. Third, the majority of algorithms have a constant value in memory consumption over time and some of them have an increasing value over time. Fourth, the processor is used for a good, comprehensive, real-time evaluation. A BMC dataset was selected using the synthetic video type with the presence of noise. Results are presented in tables, columns and images for intro masks. The BMC dataset is a set of evaluation data based on real and synthetic videos that present many of the challenges that researchers need in evaluating subtraction methods in the background video [21].

The rest of this article is divided as follows: section 2 presents a state of the art on background methods, in which most of the techniques in the background subtraction library are studied. Section 3, evaluates the criteria used in this article are explored and highlighted and all steps of subtraction analysis are provided in essential details of the experiments. All algorithms simulated. A table of images of the foreground masks and a table of metrics used in the evaluation, are presented. This section also details the results obtained in the form of bars and curves, which are discussed and analyzed in section 4. Finally, the conclusion and future work are done in section 5.

2. STATE OF THE ART

2.1. Basic background model

The main operating of the background subtraction process is to create a background template without any moving objects to compare it to serial frames. The basic background is modeled using the average, the median or the histogram analysis over time [22], Several studies are developing methods to achieve this goal, where they demonstrate that each method has its drawbacks and advantages. First, the background can be set manually using static image free of moving object. Then, the difference between the current image and static image is calculated. This method is named static frame difference, it is simple to

implement, however, it fails in extracting the foreground during high light changes or when the moving object stop suddenly [19]. Frame difference is another method to create a background template. It is relatively simple to analyze the difference between adjacent frames in the sequence of images in the video. The illumination does not affect the extraction of the moving object. However, it is impossible to extract complete information when the target is moving, or, when the background color is similar to the target color, where, the information in the moving target is considered as background information [23], the arithmetic mean of pixels between two consecutive images is used to configure and maintain the background model in [24]. The background model (B) can be obtained as [22],

$$B = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{t=1}^l Z_t \tag{1}$$

where l is the length containing gray scale images Zi. The background must be maintained with the following serial process.

$$B_t = (1 - \alpha)B_{t-1} + \alpha Z_t \quad \alpha \in [0,1] \subset \mathbb{R} \quad t \in \{1, l\} \subset \mathbb{Z} \tag{2}$$

This method is called adaptive background learning. The feature of this algorithm is adaptive maintenance during scene changes. However, some pixels of the moving object are updated with the background [22].

2.2. Statistical models based on Gaussian distributions

Several static models of background extraction based on Gaussian distributions are developed such as Pfinder [25], ElgammaKDE 2000 [26], Stauffer and Grimson GMM [8], ZivkovicGMM2004 2006 [27], [28], Lopez-RubioAE. Where, Pfinder, Stauffer and Grimson are the most popular and adapted models. Pfinder [25] used to model the color of each object through the Gauss distribution of each pixel of the image. A class a is calculated for each background and foreground point by (3).

$$P_a(x_t) = \eta(x_t, \mu_{a,t}(x), \Sigma_{a,t}(x)) \tag{3} \quad \eta(X, \mu, \Sigma) = (2\pi)^{-D/2} \det(\Sigma)^{-1/2}$$

Where, Probability is defined by $P_a(x_t)$, x is the pixel, $a_t(x)$ is the class. If the probability limited to background class is greater than threshold $P_b(x_t) > T$ the pixel belongs to the background. The Stauffer and Grimson model [8] is based on a parametric probabilistic background. For scene modeling, it uses a mixture of K Gaussian distributions, k is chosen between 3 and 5. The probability of pixel color is given by,

$$P(x_t) = \sum_{i=1}^K w_{i,t} \eta(x_t, \mu_{i,t}(x), \Sigma_{i,t}(x)) \tag{4}$$

where x_t is the pixel, number distribution Gaussian is K, $w_{i,t}$ is the probability of k Gaussian at time t, $\mu_{i,t}$ is the average, $\Sigma_{i,t}$ is the covariance matrix, η is the probability distribution function of the Gaussian k.

Zivkovic [27], [28] improved the model [8] where they used mixture distribution with unstable components. The number of components is K_t^x for a pixel $x_t \quad 1 \leq K_t^x \leq K$. Only the required number of pixels is used at every moment, that is why this method achieves a better processing time than [8] and gives better results. the function of weight update is,

$$w_{i,t} = w_{i,t-1} + \alpha(M_{i,t} - w_{i,t-1}) - \alpha cT \tag{5}$$

where cT is a constant

2.3. Fuzzy models

Sugeno integral method is used to distinguish between the input image and the background model the measurement of the color and texture [29], Choquet integral is adapted in [30], [31]. It is based on color, edge and texture features. This method shows better results compared to the existing techniques. Fuzzy running average is used to extract the background model in [32], where, 2-fuzzy method in the multimedia background is adapted in [33]-[35].

2.4. Neural and neuro-fuzzy methods

The neural network method is used to determine whether the pixel belongs to the foreground or to the background. In fact, a background segmentation approach using a multi-layer neural network containing 124 neurons is adapted in [36]. This method is based on probabilistic neural networks (PNN). A self-organizing network method for background subtraction (SOBS) is used in [37]. Whereas, a combined SOBS with a fuzzy function is adapted in the learning stage of the background in [19], [38].

3. EXPERIMENTS

3.1. Detection performance and evaluation

In the present work, all algorithms in the subtraction library were evaluated in the background by segmentation performance, execution time and memory consumption and processor. Firstly, assessing segmentation performance is to demonstrate the ability of algorithms to extract moving objects, by choosing the most commonly used set of measurements in the literature, recall, precision, F-measure, accuracy, true positive rate (TPR) and false positive rate (FPR). In fact, these measurements are calculated by true positives (TP), true negatives (TN), false positives (FP), false negatives (FN). We get by the following equations. Where TP is the set of pixels in the front, which are captured as belonging to the front after the simulations. FP is the set of background pixels that are captured as belonging to the foreground. TN is the set of background pixels that are captured as belonging to the background. FN is the set of foreground pixels that are captured as belonging to the background.

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}$$

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}$$

$$F - \text{measure} = \frac{2 * \text{Recall} * \text{Precision}}{\text{Recall} + \text{Precision}}$$

$$\text{Accuracy}(AC) = \frac{TP}{TP + FN + FP}$$

$$\text{FalsePositiveRate}(FPR) = \frac{FP}{FP + TN}$$

$$\text{FalseNegativeRate}(FNR) = \frac{FN}{TP + FN}$$

$$\text{True Positive Rate}(TPR) = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}$$

The results of the measurements are shown in Table 1. It is important to note that the simulated algorithm provides a visual note of the extracted images which are represented by the foreground masks. On the other hand, metrics help algorithms to evaluate and make a comparison between them. The foreground masks are shown in Figure 1.

Each algorithm has a certain execution time, some of which are executed at a short speed and some that take a long time. With a certain amount of memory consumption, where the majority of algorithms have a constant value in memory consumption over time and some have an increasing value over time, such as (T2FMRF_UM, T2FMRF_UV). The core processor on which the analyses were performed is i5, 2.40 GHZ, RAM(8 GO). The library is compiled in C++ programming language, based on OpenCV. Moreover, visual studio 2017 is used to simulate these algorithms. Then, comparisons are performed through MATLAB 2017.

3.2. The dataset used

For a good, comprehensive, real-time evaluation. A BMC dataset was selected using the synthetic video type with the presence of noise. The video number selected from the dataset is 211. In this case, cloudy with noise are the variables parameters. They are measured and compared as in the Figure 1. Where each sub-figure presents a part of tests as follows:

1=FrameDifference	17=DPEigenbackground	33=VuMeter
2=StaticFrameDifference	18=DPTtexture	34=KDE
3=WeightedMoving Mean	19=T2FGMM_UM	35=IndependentMultimodal
4=WeightedMovingVariance	20=T2FGMM_UV	36=MultiCue
5=MixtureOfGaussianV1	21=T2FMRF_UM	37=SigmaDelta
6=MixtureOfGaussianV2	22=T2FMRF_UV	38=SuBSENSE
7=AdaptiveBackgroundLearning	23=FuzzySugenoIntegral	39=LOBSTER
8=AdaptiveSelectiveBackgroundLearning	24=FuzzyChoquetIntegral	40=PAWCS
9=GMG	25=MultiLayer	41=TwoPoints
10=KNN	26=PixelBasedAdaptiveSegmenter	42=ViBe
11=DPAdaptiveMedian	27=LBSimpleGaussian	43=CodeBook
12=DPGrimsonGMM	28=LBFuzzyGaussian	44=Ground truth
13=DPZivkovicAGMM	29=LBMixtureOfGaussians	45=Original fram
14=DPMean	30=LBAdaptiveSOM	
15=DPWrenGA	31=LBFuzzyAdaptiveSOM	
16=DPPratiMediod	32=LBP_MRF	

Table 1. The rating scales used for BMC data analysis, synthetic video 211 and use case in cloudy with noise

Methods	RC	PC	TPR	FPR	FNR	FM	AC
FrameDifference;	0.6845	0.4092	0.6845	0.0257	0.3155	0.5122	0.3443
StaticFrameDifference	0.9264	0.1580	0.9264	0.1285	0.0736	0.2699	0.1560
WeightedMovingMean	0.6043	0.8619	0.6043	0.0025	0.3957	0.7105	0.5509
WeightedMovingVariance	0.6937	0.8293	0.6937	0.0037	0.3063	0.7555	0.6071
MixtureOfGaussianV1	0.6909	0.9385	0.6909	0.0012	0.3091	0.7958	0.6609
MixtureOfGaussianV2	0.6668	0.5596	0.6668	0.0137	0.3332	0.6085	0.4373
AdaptiveBackgroundLearning	0.9278	0.5376	0.9278	0.0208	0.0722	0.6808	0.5160
AdaptiveSelectiveBackgroundLearning	0.9047	0.7330	0.9047	0.0086	0.0953	0.8098	0.6804
GMG	0.9553	0.6100	0.9553	0.0159	0.0447	0.7446	0.5931
KNN	0.9201	0.6888	0.9201	0.0108	0.0799	0.7878	0.6499
DPAdaptiveMedian	0.4136	0.9379	0.4136	7.1289e-04	0.5864	0.5741	0.4026
DPGrimsonGMM	0.9193	0.6732	0.9193	0.0116	0.0807	0.7772	0.6356
DPZivkovicAGMM	0.8864	0.8327	0.8864	0.0046	0.1136	0.8587	0.7524
DPMean	0.4800	0.8611	0.4800	0.0020	0.5200	0.6164	0.4455
DPWrenGA	0.8549	0.8714	0.8549	0.0033	0.1451	0.8631	0.7591
DPPratiMediod	0.8525	0.9419	0.8525	0.0014	0.1475	0.8950	0.8099
DPEigenbackground	0.9159	0.7320	0.9159	0.0087	0.0841	0.8137	0.6859
DPTtexture	0.3768	0.9395	0.3768	6.3151e-04	0.6232	0.5379	0.3679
T2FGMM_UM	0.0392	0.9812	0.0392	1.9531e-05	0.9608	0.0753	0.0391
T2FGMM_UV	0.6205	0.0430	0.6205	0.3597	0.3795	0.0803	0.0419
T2FMRF_UM	0	NaN	0	0	1	NaN	0
T2FMRF_UV	0.3872	0.5659	0.3872	0.0077	0.6128	0.4598	0.2985
FuzzySugenoIntegral	0.8364	0.8690	0.8364	0.0033	0.1636	0.8524	0.7427
FuzzyChoquetIntegral	0.8695	0.8451	0.8695	0.0041	0.1305	0.8571	0.7500
MultiLayer	0.9222	0.9041	0.9222	0.0025	0.0778	0.9130	0.8400
PixelBasedAdaptiveSegmenter	0.9423	0.6804	0.9423	0.0115	0.0577	0.7902	0.6532
LBSimpleGaussian	0.9424	0.0624	0.9424	0.3687	0.0576	0.1170	0.0621
LBFuzzyGaussian	0.9378	0.2239	0.9378	0.0846	0.0622	0.3615	0.2206
LBMixtureOfGaussians	0.9189	0.6897	0.9189	0.0108	0.0811	0.7880	0.6502
LBAdaptiveSOM	0.9198	0.6943	0.9198	0.0105	0.0802	0.7913	0.6547
LBFuzzyAdaptiveSOM	0.9119	0.7404	0.9119	0.0083	0.0881	0.8172	0.6910
LBP_MRF	0.9398	0.7640	0.9398	0.0076	0.0602	0.8429	0.7284
VuMeter	0.7281	0.7764	0.7281	0.0055	0.2719	0.7515	0.6019
KDE	0.9401	0.1613	0.9401	0.1272	0.0599	0.2753	0.1596
IndependentMultimodal	0.9140	0.6821	0.9140	0.0111	0.0860	0.7812	0.6410
MultiCue	0.9769	0.7029	0.9769	0.0107	0.0231	0.8175	0.6913
SigmaDelta	0.9226	0.6455	0.9226	0.0132	0.0774	0.7596	0.6124
SuBSENSE	0.9291	0.8976	0.9291	0.0028	0.0709	0.9131	0.8400
LOBSTER	0.9079	0.9053	0.9079	0.0025	0.0921	0.9066	0.8292
PAWCS	0.9232	0.9008	0.9232	0.0026	0.0768	0.9118	0.8380
TwoPoints	0.8539	0.3270	0.8539	0.0457	0.1461	0.4729	0.3097
ViBe	0.8475	0.9273	0.8475	0.0017	0.1525	0.8856	0.7947
CodeBook;	0.9299	0.1123	0.9299	0.1912	0.0701	0.2005	0.1114




Figure 1. Foreground masks obtained from Street Video 211 from BMC dataset

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The evaluation results for this video are done in Table 1. It can be noticed that this type takes very high scaling scores F-measure. So, when the scale value is equal to 1 better result may be obtained. In the Table 1 some of the algorithms are considered using scale value of 0.9, all such as: SuBSENSE, LOBSTER, and pixel-based adaptive c (PAWCS). Although these methods are difficult to implement. Moreover, they take a long time to response (about 6 to 8 minutes) leading to a reduction of the effectiveness in extracting objects in motion at the ideal time. Also, some other methods implemented and done as in Figure 2. Took lowest values in the evaluation measures and ease to implement using this kind of video. As a result, they are effective and give acceptable results, where we can list them as follows: CodeBook, LBSimpleGaussian, static frame difference. In other hand, some of the given methods are capable to achieve good and consistent results between the values of the measurements of the Table 1, with the execution time and memory of the Figure 2. These methods may be done as: AdaptiveSelectiveBackgroundLearning, MultiCue, DPWrenGA, and DPZivkovicAGMM. The foreground masks extracted from the BMC video (Frame 597) of the Figure 1, are well interpreted in Table 1 and can be depicted as shown in Figures 3-5.




Figure 2. Average value of time, memory consumption and processor




Figure 3. The columns represent the precision and recall value, taken from the street video211, for the BMC data set




Figure 4. The columns represent the F-measure and accuracy value, taken from the street video211, for the BMC data set




Figure 5. The curves represent false negative rate and true positive rate of the synthetic street video from the BMC data set

5. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this work, a comprehensive evaluation of the performance of the BGSLibrary's algorithms was performed. In fact, hash performance, execution time, memory and processor consumption are considered to fulfil this goal, where, a noise-containing synthetic video from the BMC dataset was used. The experimental results showed that the synthetic video from the BMC dataset had good results, where, a higher true positive rate and lower false negative rate and an increase in the F scale value to 0.91 are obtained. The MultiCue, DPWrenGA, pixel based adaptive segmenter, DPZivkovicAGMM, adaptive selective background learning algorithms are successfully deal with shadows and noise. Indeed, they achieve good results consistent with high benchmark values and low execution time.

Future work will focus on validating these methods under different challenges such as snow, fog, wind, crowd, shadows, noise. The design and the update of a background model is one of the biggest challenges in artificial vision. So, the development of a system capable of detecting a background model correctly and completely with high performance and ease algorithm, then, adapt it to the external dynamic changes and acquired shadows through real time implementation will be considered.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Cucchiara, C. Grana, M. Piccardi and A. Prati, "Detecting moving objects, ghosts and shadows in video streams," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 25, no. 10, pp. 1337-1342, Oct. 2003, doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2003.1233909.
- [2] I. Qasmieh, H. Alquran and A. Alqudah, "Occluded iris classification and segmentation using self- customized artificial intelligence models and iterative randomized Hough transform," *International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering (IJECE)*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 4037-4049, Oct. 2021, doi: 10.11591/ijece.v11i5.pp4037-4049.
- [3] N. Aswini and S. V. Uma, "Obstacle avoidance and distance measurement for unmanned aerial vehicles using monocular vision," *International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering (IJECE)*, vol. 9, no. 5, p. 3504, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.11591/ijece.v9i5.pp3504-3511.
- [4] I. Boulfrifi, K. Housni and A. Mouloudi, "Automatic moving foreground extraction using random walks," *Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (IJECS)*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 511-516, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.11591/ijeecs.v15.i1.pp511-516.
- [5] Z. Tang, Z. Miao and Y. Wan, "Background Subtraction Using Running Gaussian Average and Frame Difference," in *Entertainment Computing - ICEC 2007*, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007, pp. 411-414. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-74873-1_50.
- [6] N. J. B. McFarlane and C. P. Schofield, "Segmentation and tracking of piglets in images," *Mach. Vis. Appl.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 187-193, May 1995, doi: 10.1007/BF01215814.
- [7] S. Calderara, R. Melli, A. Prati and R. Cucchiara, "Reliable background suppression for complex scenes," in *Proceedings of the 4th ACM international workshop on Video surveillance and sensor networks*, Santa Barbara, California, USA, Oct. 2006, pp. 211-214, doi: 10.1145/1178782.1178814.
- [8] C. Stauffer and W. Grimson, "Adaptive Background Mixture Models for Real-Time Tracking," in *Proceedings. 1999 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (Cat. No PR00149)(CVPR)*, 1999, vol. 02, p. 2246, doi: 10.1109/CVPR.1999.784637.
- [9] A. Sobral, "A background subtraction library. Contribute to andrewssobral/bgslibrary development by creating an account on GitHub," 2019. Accessed: Jul. 29, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/andrewssobral/bgslibrary>
- [10] A. Sobral, "BGSLibrary: An OpenCV C++ Background Subtraction Library," *Conference: IX Workshop de Visão Computacional (WVC'2013)*, p. 6, Jun, 2013.
- [11] Y. Xu, J. Dong, B. Zhang and D. Xu, "Background modeling methods in video analysis: A review and comparative evaluation," *CAAI Trans. Intell. Technol.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 43-60, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.trit.2016.03.005.
- [12] S. Brutzer, B. Höferlin and G. Heidemann, "Evaluation of background subtraction techniques for video surveillance," in *CVPR 2011*, Jun. 2011, pp. 1937-1944, doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2011.5995508.
- [13] H. Al-Yassin, I. Jaafar, M. Fadhel, O. Al-Shamma and L. Alzubaidi, "Statistical accuracy analysis of different detecting algorithms for surveillance system in smart city," *Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (IJECS)*, vol. 18, pp. 979-986, May 2020, doi: 10.11591/ijeecs.v18.i2.pp979-986.
- [14] M. Lahraichi, K. Housni and S. Mbarki, "Automatic foreground detection based on KDE and binary classification," *Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (IJECS)*, vol. 15, pp. 517-526, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.11591/ijeecs.v15.i1.pp517-526.
- [15] M. S. Zaharin, N. Ibrahim and T. M. A. T. Dir, "Comparison of human detection using background subtraction and frame difference," *Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics (BEEI)*, vol. 9, no. 1, Art. no. 1, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.11591/eei.v9i1.1458.
- [16] P. B. Prakoso and Y. Sari, "Vehicle detection using background subtraction and clustering algorithms," *TELKOMNIKA Telecommunication, Computing, Electronics and Control*, vol. 17, no. 3, Art. no. 3, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.12928/telkomnika.v17i3.10144.
- [17] V. Rekha, K. Natarajan, and J. I. Rose, "Foreground algorithms for detection and extraction of an object in multimedia," *International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering (IJECE)*, vol. 10, no. 2, Art. no. 2, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.11591/ijece.v10i2.pp1849-1858.
- [18] K. Toyama, J. Krumm, B. Brumitt and B. Meyers, "Wallflower: principles and practice of background maintenance," in *Proceedings of the Seventh IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, Sep. 1999, vol. 1, pp. 255-261, doi: 10.1109/ICCV.1999.791228.

- [19] A. Sobral and A. Vacavant, "A comprehensive review of background subtraction algorithms evaluated with synthetic and real videos," *Comput. Vis. Image Underst.*, vol. 122, pp. 4-21, May 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.cviu.2013.12.005.
- [20] F. J. López-Rubio, E. López-Rubio, M. A. Molina-Cabello, R. M. Luque-Baena, E. J. Palomo and E. Domínguez, "The effect of noise on foreground detection algorithms," *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 407-438, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1007/s10462-016-9525-3.
- [21] A. Vacavant, T. Chateau, A. Wilhelm and L. Lequière, "A Benchmark Dataset for Outdoor Foreground/Background Extraction," in *Computer Vision-ACCV 2012 Workshops*, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013, pp. 291-300. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-37410-4_25.
- [22] T. Bouwmans, "Recent Advanced Statistical Background Modeling for Foreground Detection-A Systematic Survey," *Recent Pat. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 147-176, Sep. 2011.
- [23] L. Shang, F. You, C. Han, X. Wang and S. Zhao, "Optimization of Three-Frame Difference Method and Improvement of Pedestrian Detection Code Book," *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, vol. 1302, p. 022014, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1302/2/022014.
- [24] A. H. S. Lai and N. H. C. Yung, "A fast and accurate scoreboard algorithm for estimating stationary backgrounds in an image sequence," in *1998 IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems (ISCAS)*, May 1998, vol. 4, pp. 241-244, doi: 10.1109/ISCAS.1998.698804.
- [25] C. R. Wren, A. Azarbayejani, T. Darrell and A. P. Pentland, "Pfinder: real-time tracking of the human body," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 19, no. 7, pp. 780-785, Jul. 1997, doi: 10.1109/34.598236.
- [26] A. Elgammal, D. Harwood and L. Davis, "Non-parametric Model for Background Subtraction," in *Computer Vision-ECCV 2000*, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000, pp. 751-767, doi: 10.1007/3-540-45053-X_48.
- [27] Z. Zivkovic, "Improved adaptive Gaussian mixture model for background subtraction," in *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Pattern Recognition, ICPR 2004.*, Aug. 2004, vol. 2, pp. 28-31, doi: 10.1109/ICPR.2004.1333992.
- [28] Z. Zivkovic and F. van der Heijden, "Efficient adaptive density estimation per image pixel for the task of background subtraction," *Pattern Recognit. Lett.*, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 773-780, May 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.patrec.2005.11.005.
- [29] H. zhang and D. xu, "Fusing Color and Texture Features for Background Model," in *Fuzzy Systems and Knowledge Discovery*, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006, pp. 887-893. doi: 10.1007/11881599_110.
- [30] G. Choquet, "Theory of capacities," *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, vol. 5, pp. 131-295, 1954, doi: 10.5802/aif.53.
- [31] M. M. Azab, H. A. Shedeed and A. S. Hussein, "A new technique for background modeling and subtraction for motion detection in real-time videos," in *2010 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, Sep. 2010, pp. 3453-3456, doi: 10.1109/ICIP.2010.5653748.
- [32] M. H. Sigari, N. Mozayani and H. R. Pourreza, "Fuzzy Running Average and Fuzzy Background Subtraction: Concepts and Application," *International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security*, vol 8, no. 2, Feb 2008.
- [33] T. Bouwmans and F. El Baf, "Modeling of Dynamic Backgrounds by Type-2 Fuzzy Gaussians Mixture Models," *MASAUM J. Basic Appl. Sci.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 265-276, Feb. 2010.
- [34] F. El Baf, T. Bouwmans and B. Vachon, "Type-2 Fuzzy Mixture of Gaussians Model: Application to Background Modeling," in *Advances in Visual Computing*, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008, pp. 772-781, doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-89639-5_74.
- [35] F. E. Baf, T. Bouwmans and B. Vachon, "Fuzzy statistical modeling of dynamic backgrounds for moving object detection in infrared videos," in *2009 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, Jun. 2009, pp. 60-65, doi: 10.1109/CVPRW.2009.5204109.
- [36] D. Culibrk, O. Marques, D. Socek, H. Kalva and B. Furht, "Neural Network Approach to Background Modeling for Video Object Segmentation," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw.*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 1614-1627, Nov. 2007, doi: 10.1109/TNN.2007.896861.
- [37] L. Maddalena and A. Petrosino, "A Self-Organizing Approach to Background Subtraction for Visual Surveillance Applications," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 17, no. 7, pp. 1168-1177, Jul. 2008, doi: 10.1109/TIP.2008.924285.
- [38] L. Maddalena and A. Petrosino, "A fuzzy spatial coherence-based approach to background/foreground separation for moving object detection," *Neural Comput. Appl.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 179-186, Mar. 2010, doi: 10.1007/s00521-009-0285-8.