



### Validation of RumiWatch sensors: a confusion matrix approach

Salla Ruuska<sup>1,2</sup>, Sara Mämmi<sup>1</sup>, Sari Kajava<sup>2</sup>, Mikaela Mughal<sup>1</sup> and Jaakko Mononen<sup>1, 2</sup>

Salla Ruuska's work was supported by Olvi foundation and Niemi foundation.

#### THE THIRD DAIRYCARE CONFERENCE, ZADAR, CROATIA OCTOBER 5<sup>TH</sup> AND 6<sup>TH</sup> 2015





**UEF** // University of Eastern Finland

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>University of Eastern Finland, Finland

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Natural Resources Institute Finland (Luke), Finland

## RumiWatch is a pressure sensor based system measuring eating, ruminating and drinking time of cattle.

- RumiWatch (Itin+Hoch GmbH, Switzerland) validation against continuous behaviour recording (CR) (Experiment 1)
  - random coefficient regression model and paired t-test
    - → random and systematic errors
- In addition, eating time measured by RWS was compared with the visiting time at automated feeders (Experiment 2)



Manuscript under revision!



#### Our regression line approach showed that

- The RWS measurements were relatively free from random errors for rumination and eating but not for drinking.
- There was systematic error for eating and drinking.



#### We used confusion matrix for validation to find out what kind of erroneous classifications RWS makes.

- Sensitivity: the proportion of positives that are correctly identified as such
  - true positives / (true positives + false negatives)
- Precision: the proportion of the true positives against all the positive results
  - true positives / (true positives + false positives)



Two trained observers recorded eating, ruminating and drinking bouts by continuous recording from video-recordings and these measures were compared to RWS classifications second by second.

- Data consisted of 34 h
  - Five dairy cows in tied stalls
  - From three to nine hours per cow
- Sub data of the validation study
  - Preliminary analysis with limited data!



RWS measured eating time little more reliably than rumination time (sensitivity). On the other hand, RWS misclassified other four behaviours more to eating than to rumination (precision).

|            | Sensitivity | Precision |  |
|------------|-------------|-----------|--|
| Eating     | 90.3 %      | 48.6 %    |  |
| Ruminating | 82.7 %      | 87.3 %    |  |
| Drinking   | 3.4 %       | 2.4 %     |  |

Sensitivity: the proportion of positives that are correctly identified as such

Precision: the proportion of the true positives against all the positive results

The results are consistend with our previous results!

# A confusion matrix for eating, ruminating, drinking, "other behaviours" and "behaviour resembling eating".

Overestimation of eating

|     |            | Gold standard |            |          |       | لــــّــــ        |
|-----|------------|---------------|------------|----------|-------|-------------------|
|     |            | Eating        | Ruminating | Drinking | Other | Resembling eating |
| RWS | Eating     | 20716         | 3002       | 862      | 6972  | 11043             |
|     | Ruminating | 2044          | 21248      | 3        | 860   | 190               |
|     | Drinking   | 43            | 0          | 43       | 1316  | 368               |
|     | Other      | 143           | 1453       | 354      | 49226 | 2514              |

Eating is some times classified as ruminating

Drinking is difficult to measure

### RWS classified eating and rumination, but not drinking, reasonably well.

