



**HAL**  
open science

## **StressID: a Multimodal Dataset for Stress Identification**

Hava Chaptoukaev, Valeriya Strizhkova, Michele Panariello, Bianca D'alpaos, Aglind Reka, Valeria Manera, Susanne Thümmler, Esma Ismailova, Nicholas Evans, Francois F Bremond, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Hava Chaptoukaev, Valeriya Strizhkova, Michele Panariello, Bianca D'alpaos, Aglind Reka, et al.. StressID: a Multimodal Dataset for Stress Identification. NeurIPS 2023 - 37th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIST, Dec 2023, New Orleans, United States. hal-04245507v2

**HAL Id: hal-04245507**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04245507v2>**

Submitted on 8 Nov 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

---

# StressID: a Multimodal Dataset for Stress Identification

---

Hava Chaptoukaev<sup>1</sup> Valeriya Strizhkova<sup>2</sup> Michele Panariello<sup>1</sup> Bianca D’Alpaos<sup>1</sup>  
Aglind Reka<sup>2</sup> Valeria Manera<sup>3</sup> Susanne Thümmel<sup>3</sup>  
Esma Ismailova<sup>3,4</sup> Nicholas Evans<sup>1</sup> François Bremond<sup>2,3</sup>  
Massimiliano Todisco<sup>1</sup> Maria A. Zuluaga<sup>1\*</sup> Laura M. Ferrari<sup>2,5\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>EURECOM, Sophia Antipolis, France

<sup>2</sup>Inria, Valbonne, France

<sup>3</sup>CoBTek, Université Cote d’Azur, Nice, France

<sup>4</sup>Mines Saint-Etienne, Centre CMP, Gardanne, France

<sup>5</sup>The Biorobotics Institute, Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna, Pontedera, Italy

{chaptouk,panariello,evans,todisco,zuluaga}@eurecom.fr

{valeriya.strizhkova,francois.bremond,laura.ferrari}@inria.fr

## Abstract

StressID is a new dataset specifically designed for stress identification from unimodal and multimodal data. It contains videos of facial expressions, audio recordings, and physiological signals. The video and audio recordings are acquired using an RGB camera with an integrated microphone. The physiological data is composed of electrocardiography (ECG), electrodermal activity (EDA), and respiration signals that are recorded and monitored using a wearable device. This experimental setup ensures a synchronized and high-quality multimodal data collection. Different stress-inducing stimuli, such as emotional video clips, cognitive tasks including mathematical or comprehension exercises, and public speaking scenarios, are designed to trigger a diverse range of emotional responses. The final dataset consists of recordings from 65 participants who performed 11 tasks, as well as their ratings of perceived relaxation, stress, arousal, and valence levels. StressID is one of the largest datasets for stress identification that features three different sources of data and varied classes of stimuli, representing more than 39 hours of annotated data in total. StressID offers baseline models for stress classification including a cleaning, feature extraction, and classification phase for each modality. Additionally, we provide multimodal predictive models combining video, audio, and physiological inputs. The data and the code for the baselines are available at <https://project.inria.fr/stressid/>.

## 1 Introduction

While a healthy amount of stress is necessary for functioning in daily life, it can rapidly begin to negatively impact health and productivity when it exceeds an individual’s coping level. Negative stress can be a triggering or aggravating factor for many diseases and pathological conditions [16], and frequent and intense exposures to stress can cause structural changes in the brain with long-term effects on the nervous system [10]. Monitoring of stress levels could play a major role in the prevention of stress-related issues, and early stress detection is vital in patients exhibiting emotional disorders, or in high-risk jobs such as surgeons, pilots or long-distance drivers.

---

\*Equal contribution.




Figure 1: Data collection set-up of StressID.

In the last few years, machine and deep learning have been playing major roles in stress recognition research. In practice however, building robust and reliable models for stress identification requires; 1) understanding and integrating the differences between subgroups of the population to ensure bias free applications, 2) integrating the relationships between physical and physiological responses to stress, 3) studying responses to various categories of stressors, as the perception of stress differs strongly from one individual to another. An essential element to such analyses is high-quality and versatile multimodal datasets that include varied categories of stressors, and are recorded on large and diverse populations. However, existing datasets do not answer these needs. They are generally restricted in size (i.e. a few dozen of participants) and a majority is focused on a single source of data (i.e. physiological signals, video or audio) – although multimodal datasets have considerable advantages [26, 29]. Moreover, existing datasets often provide imbalanced subject responses, due to both an inability of the recording protocol to elicit strong reactions and a lack of diversity in the stimuli – making it difficult to deploy deriving analyses to real-life applications.

To address these limitations, we propose StressID, a novel multimodal dataset with facial video, audio, and physiological data. To the best of our knowledge, StressID is one of the largest available multimodal dataset in the field that includes varied stimuli. It is composed of 65 subjects and more than 39 hours of annotated data in total. StressID is designed specifically for the identification of stress from different triggers, by using a guided breathing task, 2 video clips, 7 different interactive *stressors*, and a relaxation task. As illustrated in Figure 1, StressID uses a collection of wearable sensors to record the physiological responses of the participants, namely, an Electrocardiogram (ECG), an Electrodermal Activity (EDA) sensor, and a respiration sensor. The data is coupled with synchronized facial video and audio recordings. Each task is associated with 6 different annotations: 4 scores from a self-assessment rating perceived stress and relaxation, along with valence and arousal based on the Self-Assessment Manikin (SAM) [9]; and 2 discrete labels derived from the 4 self-assessments. These data annotations serve to train supervised models.

We summarize our main contributions as follows:

- A novel multimodal dataset focused on stress-inducing tasks, composed of ECG, EDA, respiration, facial video, and audio recordings. The modalities are synchronized and annotated with self-assessments from the participants evaluating their levels of relaxation, stress, valence, and arousal.
- An easy to reproduce experimental protocol for recording behavioral and physiological responses to diverse triggers, using wearable and global sensors.
- Instructions for using the presented dataset and an open-source implementation of several baseline models for stress recognition from video, audio, and physiological signals respectively, as well as multimodal models combining the three inputs.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of the existing datasets for stress recognition. Section 3 describes the dataset design and its contents. In Sections 4 we present multiple baselines for stress detection using machine learning. In Section 5 and 6, we discuss the limitations and ethical considerations of our work. Finally, we summarize our work and discuss future directions.

## 2 Related work

Table 1 places *StressID* in the context of related stress recognition datasets. The SUS datasets [52] gather the recordings of 35 subjects collected during aircraft communication training. This unimodal collection of datasets only features audio recordings without self-assessments or external annotation and employs an uncommon elicitation task. SADVAW [55] is a dataset composed of 1236 video clips from 41 Korean movies, making the setting closer to the real world and including a broader range of responses. However, it features video recordings exclusively, restricting deriving applications to computer vision systems only. Among the works investigating the physiological aspect of stress, DriveDB [25] collects physiological data from 9 subjects exposed to driving-related tasks. The lack of self-assessment or external annotations significantly limits the accuracy of measuring stress. In addition, the dataset is collected in the very specific setting of driving, with a narrow range of stressors – considerably restricting its usage. WeSAD [48] and CLAS [36], two of the most widely explored datasets for stress recognition, contain physiological data from 15 and 62 subjects respectively, collected using wearable devices. The participants partake in various tasks, combining perceptive stressors in the form of audiovisual stimuli, with several variations of the Trier Social Stress Test (TSST) [3]. However, they do not include any behavioral modalities.

There exist a few multimodal datasets for stress recognition, such as MuSE [27] and SWELL-KW [33]. They feature a broader set of modalities and are collected in laboratory environments imitating real-life activities. MuSE participants are elicited through audiovisual and public speaking tasks. SWELL-KW participants perform office work on several topics designed to elicit different emotions. These datasets are limited in size with recordings of respectively 28 and 25 subjects. Finally, the distracted driving dataset [54] gathers recordings of 68 subjects in the setting of simulated driving with stress-inducing distractions. The lack of diversity in the stimuli restricts subsequent applications to the setting of driving. Moreover, cardiac activity is acquired in terms of heart rate, which does not allow the extraction of heart rate variability (HRV) measures, a key measure in the identification of stress [30].

**Comparison with the state-of-the-art.** *StressID* aims to fill the gap in the existing related work. It features both physiological and behavioral modalities, includes a large number of participants, exploits varied stimuli, and includes participants’ replies to 4 self-assessment questions providing insights on the subject’s emotional state. Although CLAS [36] and WeSAD [48] present similar experimental set-ups, they focus on physiological modalities and do not include behavioral data. Instead, *StressID* features three types of modalities: video, audio, and physiological signals capturing complementary information. While MUSE [27] and SWELL-KW [33] are also multimodal datasets recorded in similar conditions, they are very limited in size. On the contrary, with 65 subjects recorded *StressID* is one of the largest datasets designed for stress identification. Finally, although the size and modalities of the distracted driving dataset [54] are comparable to *StressID*, it relies on very environment-specific stressors, whereas *StressID* includes emotional video-clips, cognitive tasks, and social stressors based on public speaking, which represents a key aspect to guarantee the collection of a wide range of responses. To summarize, *StressID* is the first multimodal dataset for stress identification that is recorded on a large number of participants but also features a wide range of stimuli ensuring more versatility in deriving applications.

Table 1: Comparison of *StressID* to related datasets.

Dataset	#Subjects	Modalities	Stressors	Data annotations
SUS	35	Speech	Aircraft communication training	Stressor-based
SADVAW	-	Video	-	External annotations
DriveDB	9	EMG, EDA, ECG, HR, Respiration	Driving tasks	Stressor-based
WeSAD	15	ECG, EDA, EMG, BVP, Respiration, Temperature, Acceleration	TSST, Audiovisual	Stressor-based, PANAS [56], STAI [51], SAM [9]
CLAS	62	ECG, PPG, EDA, Acceleration	Cognitive load, Audiovisual	SAM
MuSE	28	EDA, HR, Breath rate, Temperature, Face and upper body video, Audio	Public speaking, Audiovisual	PSS [34], SAM, External annotations
SWELL-KW	25	ECG, EDA, Face and upper body video, Posture, Computer logging	Office work with interruptions and time pressure	NASA task load [24], SAM, Stress assessment
Distracted Driving dataset	68	EDA, HR signal, Respiration, Face video, Driving performances	Simulated driving with distractions	Stressor-based, NASA task load, SAM
<i>StressID</i>	<b>65</b>	<b>EDA, ECG, Respiration, Face video, Speech</b>	<b>Cognitive load, Public speaking, Audiovisual</b>	<b>SAM, Stress assessment</b>






Figure 2: Overview of the experimental protocol. The experiment consists of 11 tasks divided into four blocks: a guided breathing task, 2 emotional video clips, 7 interactive stressors, and a relaxation task.

### 3 StressID Dataset

StressID takes a step towards building more robust and reliable applications for automated stress identification by enabling the design of versatile and bias-free algorithms. To achieve this, StressID features responses to several categories of stress-inducing stimuli to account for the variability of responses from one individual to another, rather than focusing on a single task. In addition, the large number of participants of StressID enables analyses of the demographics associated with stress, based on factors such as gender or age, thus advancing towards reducing representation bias by integrating these differences in subsequent algorithms. Ultimately, the design of the StressID dataset supports a variety of learning pipelines, by offering possibilities for the analysis of subject-specific, task-specific and modality-specific responses to stress. We describe the design of StressID in Section 3.1. We then introduce the resulting dataset in Section 3.2 and outline our data annotation process in Section 3.3.

#### 3.1 Dataset Design

##### 3.1.1 Experimental Protocol

Figure 2 illustrates the experimental protocol used to collect StressID. It consists of 11 tasks separated by self-assessments and grouped into 4 blocks: guided breathing, watching emotional video clips, a sequence of interactive tasks, and a relaxation phase. Tasks have been designed to elicit 3 different categories of responses; 1) stimulate the audiovisual cortex of the participants, 2) increase the cognitive load by soliciting attention, comprehension, mental arithmetic or multi-tasking abilities, and 3) elicit psycho-social stress leveraging on public speaking as a stressor. All stimuli are easy to implement and do not require any special setup [5]. The full instructions given to participants are provided in Appendix D.2.

**Guided breathing.** The first block of the protocol consists of the single task of *Breathing*. The participants watch a guided breathing video of 3 minutes. It aims to relax and reset to neutral the emotional state of the subjects. This recording is used as a baseline for the non-verbal neutral state of each participant. After the breathing task, the participants count forward for 1 minute.

**Emotional video-clips.** This block consists in watching 2 emotional videos clips, retrieved from the FilmStim database [47]. These videos have been selected to elicit specific emotional responses.

- *Video1* : an extract from the movie *There’s something about Mary*, selected to elicit low arousal and positive valence in the participants.
- *Video2* : an extract from the movie *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade*, selected to elicit high arousal and negative valence.

**Interactive tasks.** This block consists of a sequence of 7 interactive stressors based on well-established clinical methods to induce stress [7]. All the tasks have a strict requirement for response in 1 minute and the order of the stressors is designed to be unexpected to the participants.

- *Counting1* : a Mental Arithmetic Task (MAT) designed to increase the participants' cognitive load through arithmetic operations with a varying range of difficulty. In this task, the participants receive the instructions to count backwards from 100 subtracting 3 as fast as they can.
- *Counting2* : another MAT of increased difficulty. Participants are asked to count backward from 1011 subtracting 7 as fast as they can.
- *Stroop* : a variant of the Stroop Color-Word Test [53], selected to increase the cognitive load by soliciting the attention and reactivity of the participants.
- *Speaking* : a Social Evaluative Task (SET), leveraging public speaking as a social stressor. The subjects are instructed to explain their strengths and weaknesses, emulating stressful job interview conditions.
- *Math* : a task designed to increase the mental workload. The participants are asked to resolve 20 mathematical problems in one minute.
- *Reading* : a task composed of 2 phases and designed as a TSST variation. Participants have to read a text, in the first step, and then explain what they read, in the next step, thus simultaneously soliciting comprehension abilities and using speaking as a stressor.
- *Counting3* : a MAT with added difficulty. Participants are instructed to count backwards from 1152 subtracting 3, as fast as they can, while repeating an independent hand movement. This task is designed to increase the mental workload by soliciting participants' multi-tasking abilities.

At the end of the third block, the participants are asked to designate the task perceived as most stressful.

**Relaxation.** The last block of the experimental protocol is solely composed of the *Relax* task. It consists of a 2 minute and 30 seconds long relaxation part, where participants are instructed to watch a relaxing video [23].

### 3.1.2 Sensors

Three different physiological signals are collected in *StressID*: electrocardiogram (ECG), electrodermal activity (EDA), and respiration signal. They are recorded using the BioSignalsPlux acquisition system<sup>\*</sup>. The BioSignalPlux kit consists of a 4-channel hub communicating via Bluetooth with the OpenSignals (R)evolution platform for data visualization and acquisition, connected to an ECG, EDA, and a respiration sensor. The hub ensures the synchronized recording of up to 4 sensors simultaneously. The ECG is acquired with 3 Ag/AgCl electrodes located on the ribs of the non-dominant side of the subjects. The EDA is measured with 2 Ag/AgCl electrodes attached to the palm of the non-dominant hand. The respiration is measured through a chest belt with an integrated piezoelectric sensing element. The selected devices have a high signal-to-noise ratio [42, 43, 44], and all physiological signals are acquired with a sampling rate of 500 Hz and resolution of 16 bits per sample.

The video and audio are acquired using a Logitech QuickCam Pro 9000 RGB camera with an integrated microphone. The video is acquired with a 720p resolution and a rate of 15 frames per second. The audio is recorded at a sampling rate of 32kHz and a resolution of 16 bits per sample.

## 3.2 Dataset Description

### 3.2.1 Recruitment and Recording

Most of the participants of *StressID* are Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) students and workers. In total, 65 healthy participants were recruited on a voluntary basis, without compensation. They included 18 women and 47 men of ages ranging between 21 and 55 years old (29y.o.  $\pm$  7). Among the participants, 32% were master students and interns, 20% PhD students, and the remaining 48% represented diverse tertiary professions. All subjects were required to have sufficient proficiency in English and they were requested to sign a consent form to participate.

---

\*biosignalsplux, PLUX wireless biosignals S.A. (Lisbon, Portugal)

The participants could either consent to, **Option A**: research use and public release of all their recorded data, including identifying data (i.e. physiological, audio, and video). **Option B**: research use of all their recorded data, but no public release of identifying data (i.e. only physiological and audio data, but no video). Among the 65 participants, 62 opted for option A and 3 opted for option B (2 women and 1 man).

Each participant was recorded in a single session, lasting approximately 35 minutes. They were instructed not to smoke, intake caffeine, or exercise 3 hours before the experiment. At the beginning of each session, they were introduced to the purpose and content of the study. The experiments are conducted entirely in English. The experimental protocol was identical for all participants, and the experimenter was always present in the room during the recording.

### 3.2.2 Dataset Composition

Following data collection, we split each recorded session into individual tasks: one 3 minutes breathing recording (block 1), 2 recordings corresponding to the watching of the video clips of respectively 2 and 3 minutes (block 2), 7 separate 1-minute recordings of the interactive tasks (block 3), and a 2 minute and 30 seconds long relaxation recording (block 4). As the guided breathing, the video clips and the relaxation parts do not carry meaningful audio, the audio part of the dataset consists of the 7 talking tasks only. During the acquisitions, due to camera malfunctions, 8 video and audio recordings were damaged. More information about the available tasks for each modality can be found in Appendix A.1. After splitting, `StressID` is composed of 711 distinct annotated recordings of the physiological modalities, 587 annotated videos, and 385 annotated audio recordings. In total, the final task-split dataset amounts to approximately 19 hours of annotated physiological data, 15 hours of annotated video data, and 6 hours of annotated audio data, thus amounting to more than 39 hours of data in total. Each task is identified in the dataset by `subjectname_task`, where the task names are as described in Section 3.1.1. This convention facilitates different types of analyses, whether subject-specific or task-specific.

### 3.3 Data Annotation

Each task is annotated using the answers to self-assessment questions. The first 2 questions establish the participants' perceived stress and relaxation levels on a 0-10 scale. Additionally, they answer the SAM [9] to assess their valence and arousal on a 0-10 scale. Research suggests relaxation and stress conditions can be described in different quadrants of the arousal-valence space. For instance, high arousal and negative valence are characteristics of emotional stress induced by threatening stimuli [15], while low arousal and positive valence are characteristics of a calm and relaxed state [37].

The distributions of the `StressID` self-assessments are reported in Figure 3. The analysis of the distributions highlights a positive correlation between stress and arousal, as well as relax and valence. This suggests that across subjects and tasks, a high arousal is associated with a higher level of stress, and a positive valence corresponds to a higher level of relaxation. In addition, the marginal distributions of stress and relax ratings (Figure 3) highlight a balance in the perceived stress and relaxation levels of the participants across the whole experiment, suggesting that the experimental protocol of `StressID` can arouse proportional instances of stress and relaxation. Furthermore, the distribution of arousal is significantly skewed towards a high rating across the dataset, while valence is centered around a neutral value, highlighting the ability of the protocol to create a high involvement in the participants and elicit strong responses. An extended analysis of the self-assessment distributions analyses can be found in Appendix E.

We propose 2 discrete labels that can be used to train supervised models: a 2-class label and a 3-class one. The 2-class label is computed using the stress self-assessment of each task by splitting the 0-10 scale at 5. Precisely, tasks with self-assessment of stress below 5 are considered **not stressed** (0) while tasks with self-assessment equal or above 5 are **stressed** (1). The 3-class label is based on the results outlined by [15, 37], which are in line with the observations drawn from Figure 3. It allows the prediction of **relaxed** vs. **neutral** vs. **stressed**. We considered a subject to be **relaxed** (0) for a task where they reported a valence rating above 5, an arousal rating below 5, and a perceived relaxation rating above 5. Similarly, we label tasks with arousal levels above 5, valence levels below 5, and perceived stress levels above 5 as **stressed** (2), and **neutral** (1) otherwise.




Figure 3: Distribution of the self-assessment answers. (left) Joint and marginal distributions of stress and arousal. (right) Joint and marginal distributions of the relax and valence ratings.

## 4 Baselines

We implement several unimodal and multimodal baselines combining features extracted from video, audio, and physiological inputs. We train the models to perform 2-class classification, i.e. binary discrimination between stressed and not stressed, as well as 3-class classification. In all the experiments, we generate 10 random splits, using 80% of the tasks for training, and 20% for testing for each split. The results are averaged over the 10 repetitions. To ensure robustness to potential imbalance resulting from the train-test splits, the results are assessed using the weighted F1-score and the balanced accuracy on the test data. The full list of extracted features, additional experiments, model hyperparameters, and training details are reported in Appendix F. The implementation of all the baselines can be found at <https://github.com/robustml-eurecom/stressID>.

### 4.1 Unimodal Baselines

Each unimodal baseline is trained and tested on all available tasks of the corresponding modality, i.e. 715, 587, and 385 tasks respectively for the physiological, video, and audio baseline. In the following, we describe the baselines for each modality. The obtained results are reported in Table 2.

**Physiological Signals.** In line with the literature on stress recognition from physiological signals [5, 20, 21], we propose a baseline including pre-processing of the signals, feature extraction, and classification. In a first step, the ECG, EDA, and respiration signals are filtered with Butterworth filters to reduce high-frequency noise and baseline wander. Then, 35 ECG features, 23 EDA, and 40 respiration features are extracted. These include HRV features in the time domain including the number of R to R intervals (RR) per minute, the standard deviation of all NN intervals (SDNN), the percentage of successive RR intervals that differ by more than 20ms and 50ms (pNN20 and pNN50), or the root mean square of successive RR interval differences (RMSSD), as well as frequency-domain, and non-linear HRV measures. We have extracted statistical features of the Skin Conductance Level (SCL) and Skin Conductance Response (SCR) components of the EDA, including the slope and dynamic range of the SCL, along with time domain features including the number of SCR peaks per minute, the average amplitude of the peaks, and average duration of SCR responses. In addition, we have extracted Respiration Rate Variability (RRV) features in the time and frequency domains. The resulting handcrafted (HC) features are then classified using classical Machine Learning (ML) algorithms: a Random Forests (RF) classifier, Support Vector Machines (SVM), and a Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) with hyperparameters chosen by Cross-Validation (CV).

Table 2: Performances of unimodal baselines for the classification of stress. Each baseline is trained and tested on all available tasks of the corresponding modality.

Baseline	2-class		3-class	
	F1-score	Accuracy	F1-score	Accuracy
Physio. HC features + RF	<b>0.73 ± 0.02</b>	<b>0.72 ± 0.03</b>	0.55 ± 0.04	0.56 ± 0.03
Physio. HC features + SVM	0.71 ± 0.02	0.71 ± 0.02	<b>0.59 ± 0.04</b>	<b>0.59 ± 0.03</b>
Physio. HC features + MLP	0.70 ± 0.03	0.70 ± 0.03	0.54 ± 0.04	0.53 ± 0.04
AUs + kNN	0.70 ± 0.04	0.69 ± 0.04	0.54 ± 0.05	0.53 ± 0.05
AUs + SVM	0.69 ± 0.04	0.69 ± 0.04	0.55 ± 0.05	0.54 ± 0.04
AUs + MLP	<b>0.70 ± 0.03</b>	<b>0.70 ± 0.03</b>	<b>0.55 ± 0.03</b>	<b>0.55 ± 0.03</b>
Audio HC features + kNN	0.67 ± 0.06	0.60 ± 0.05	0.53 ± 0.04	0.52 ± 0.04
Audio HC features + SVM	0.61 ± 0.06	0.54 ± 0.03	0.53 ± 0.08	0.48 ± 0.04
W2V 2.0 classifier	<b>0.70 ± 0.02</b>	<b>0.66 ± 0.03</b>	<b>0.56 ± 0.04</b>	<b>0.52 ± 0.04</b>

**Video Data.** We propose a baseline employing Action Units (AU) and eye gaze for the classification of stress. AUs are commonly used as features in stress recognition applications [22, 27, 2]. They are fine-grained facial muscle movements [18], each relating to a subset of extracted facial landmarks [40]. Each AU is described in two ways: presence, if the AU is visible in the face, and intensity, indicating how intense the AU is on a 5-point scale (minimal to maximal). After downsampling the recordings to 5 frames per second, we use the OpenFace library [8] to extract eye gaze and AUs from each video frame. We extract the following AUs: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 23, 25, 26, 28, and 45. As eye gaze features, we use two gaze direction vectors computed individually for each eye by detected pupil and eye location. The averages and standard deviations of each AU and eye gaze directions are computed across time frames. The resulting 84-component vector is used as input to several models: a k-Nearest Neighbors (kNN) algorithm, an SVM, and an MLP with 4 layers of width 256. In line with [27], the number of layers and layer width of the MLP are chosen by CV in {2,3,4} and {64, 128, 256} respectively. We use ReLU activation and the MLP is trained for 100 epochs with cross-entropy loss optimized using Adam [31] with an initial learning rate of  $1e-3$ .

**Audio Data.** We propose two baselines for speech signals: the first employs HC features and ML algorithms, and the second is built on the Wav2Vec 2.0 (W2V) model [49, 6]. Both techniques involve downsampling from the original 32 kHz audio to 16 kHz, and the application of amplitude-based voice activity detection (VAD) [32] prior to feature extraction to eliminate non-speech segments. The first baseline relies on a plethora of specific audio features [46, 4] widely used in the literature on emotion recognition from speech [1, 5, 35]. These include Mel Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (MFCCs) and their first and second derivatives, which characterize the short-term power spectrum and its dynamics. The spectral centroid, bandwidth, contrast, flatness, and roll-off, which together provide a rich statistical representation of the spectral shape. Harmonic and percussive components are also extracted, with tonal centroid features being computed for the harmonic component. The zero-crossing rate is a simple measure of the rate of sign changes; the rate of zero-crossings relates directly to the fundamental frequency of the speech signal. Last, we include tempogram ratio features [39] which represent local rhythmic information. We compute the mean and standard deviation over time for all features, thereby resulting in feature vectors for each, which are then concatenated to form a comprehensive feature vector of 140 components, and used as input for ML algorithms.

The second baseline employs a large, pre-trained W2V model. The W2V 2.0 model produces features capturing a wealth of information relevant to diverse tasks including emotion recognition [11, 50, 14]. Features are extracted every 20 ms and averaged over time to obtain a single 513-component embedding per utterance, and are then classified using a linear classification layer optimized with Adam, cross-entropy loss, and an initial learning rate of  $1e-3$ , until convergence.

## 4.2 Multimodal Baselines

Multimodal baselines that combine the features extracted from all 3 sources are evaluated on the tasks that feature all modalities only, i.e. 370 tasks, to avoid learning with severely missing values. This subset of `StressID` is composed of talking tasks exclusively, i.e. all tasks without the audio modality are excluded. In this setting, the dataset presents a strong imbalance in the labels (70%

Table 3: Performances of multimodal baselines for the classification of stress, compared to unimodal models. All baselines are trained and tested only on tasks featuring all modalities, i.e. 370 tasks.

Baseline	2-class		3-class	
	F1-score	Accuracy	F1-score	Accuracy
Physiological only	0.66 ± 0.05	0.58 ± 0.04	0.50 ± 0.05	0.48 ± 0.06
Video only	0.67 ± 0.03	0.62 ± 0.04	0.58 ± 0.05	0.56 ± 0.05
Audio only	0.67 ± 0.04	0.62 ± 0.04	0.56 ± 0.06	0.54 ± 0.06
Feature fusion + SVM	0.64 ± 0.09	0.56 ± 0.05	0.55 ± 0.06	0.51 ± 0.05
Feature fusion + MLP	0.66 ± 0.04	0.61 ± 0.03	0.51 ± 0.07	0.51 ± 0.07
Feature fusion + DBN	0.58 ± 0.06	0.52 ± 0.05	0.30 ± 0.09	0.32 ± 0.04
SVM + Sum rule fusion	<b>0.72 ± 0.05</b>	0.64 ± 0.05	0.62 ± 0.05	<b>0.58 ± 0.07</b>
SVM + Product rule fusion	0.71 ± 0.05	0.63 ± 0.05	0.61 ± 0.05	0.56 ± 0.07
<b>SVM + Average rule fusion</b>	<b>0.72 ± 0.05</b>	<b>0.65 ± 0.05</b>	<b>0.63 ± 0.05</b>	<b>0.58 ± 0.07</b>
SVM + Maximum rule fusion	<b>0.72 ± 0.05</b>	0.64 ± 0.05	0.61 ± 0.06	0.57 ± 0.07

stress). We use Minority Over-sampling Techniques (SMOTE) [13] to balance the training set in each of the 10 repetitions, and leave the test sets untouched.

We propose fusion models combining all features using the most prominent fusion methods in the literature: feature-level and decision-level fusion [1, 38]. For **feature-level fusion**, unimodal HC features are combined into a single high-dimensional feature vector, used as input for learning algorithms. Similarly to [28, 12], we evaluate feature-level fusion combined with SVM, MLP classifiers, and Deep Belief Networks (DBN). For **decision-level fusion**, following [57, 45], we train independent SVMs for each modality using the HC features as input, and integrate the results of the individual classifiers at the decision level, i.e. the results are combined into a single decision using ensemble rules. The results for all multimodal baselines for the 2-class and 3-class classification are reported in Table 3. To ensure fairness in the comparison, the multimodal baselines are evaluated against best-performing HC and ML-based unimodal baselines (Section 4.1), trained on the subset of the 370 tasks featuring all modalities. Additional results for all other modality combinations are reported in Appendix F.2.2.

## 5 Limitations

First, this dataset is recorded in a controlled environment specifically designed to elicit responses. Experiments conducted in laboratory settings do not take into consideration the external factors that contribute to the psychological mental state of participants and typically assume a stress reaction is an isolated occurrence. In reality, human emotions are complex and are influenced by combinations of factors. In addition, the process of attaching electrodes to the participants may be stressful in itself. Therefore, the signals recorded in this setting are not necessarily representative of real-life situations. In consequence, although models built on the StressID dataset can learn to reliably recognize a response to stress-inducing stimuli, the discrimination between positive and negative, or short-term and long-term stress is a more sensitive task. Second, relying on self-assessed scales for data annotation is a participant-subjective process, and can lead to bias in subsequent analyses. Perception of stress and relaxation can vary a lot from one participant to another. Nevertheless, analyses described in Section 3.3 highlight a coherent distribution of the self-reported annotations across participants and the whole experiment. Third, although all participants recruited for the study are proficient in English, the act of speaking English itself can be stress-inducing for non-native speakers. Fourth, the audio component of the dataset suffers from an uneven distribution of labels, as the verbal tasks are associated with higher levels of stress. Fifth, StressID suffers from missing modalities for some participants. Finally, StressID presents a gender imbalance representative of the female/male ratio in STEM studies and workforce [19]. This is a limitation StressID shares with competitor datasets [33, 54, 48, 36, 27], and a common issue in human data collection, in general [17, 41]. Additional experiments sensitising users to the effect of gender bias and demonstrating how StressID can effectively be used to build equitable applications, are reported in Appendix F.2.3.



## 6 Ethical Considerations and Dataset Accessibility

The recording and usage of human activity data are associated with ethical considerations. The *StressID* project is approved by the ethical committee of the Université Cote d’Azur (CER). The experiments have been conducted under agreement n° 2021-033 for data collection, and n° 2023-016 for the publication of the dataset. The participants explicitly consent to the recording of their session, the dataset creation, and its release for research purposes following General Data Protection Rules (GDPR). The personal information (sex, age, education), and the acquired physiological and audio signals are pseudonymized, and an alphanumeric code is given for each participant. Video data can not be anonymized and is treated as sensitive data.

Given the identifying nature of the facial videos, the dataset is made accessible through open credentialized access only, for research purposes. Users are required to sign an end-user license agreement to request the data. Once validated a secured set of credentials is granted to access to the dataset. The dataset uses a proprietary license for research purposes and it is hosted on Inria servers using storage intended for long-term availability. The code uses an open-source license. We are aware that despite all precautions, the dataset can be misused by bad-intentioned users. The data and the code for the baselines are available at <https://project.inria.fr/stressid/>.

Lastly, systems that use the dataset for modeling and understanding the mechanisms of human stress conditions need to be aware of the potential imbalance in representation in the dataset. Participants for the data collection were included in our dataset without restrictions on gender, race, age, or education level – instead favoring sample size.

## 7 Conclusion

We present *StressID*, a dataset for stress identification featuring three categories of data modalities and three different types of stimuli. The experimental protocol designed to collect the *StressID* dataset is easy to replicate and can be adapted to additional sensors or stressors. The equipment used for the data collection is affordable, and the selected devices guarantee low noise in the recordings.

The multimodal nature of *StressID* offers a large set of possible uses cases and applications. On one hand, diverse modalities carry complementary information that can be jointly exploited: video and audio capture the behavioural component of emotions, the reactions that are visible from outside, while the physiological signals capture valuable internal states not visible on camera such as cardiac activity, or skin sweating. By providing access to multiple synchronized modalities, *StressID* enables cross-modal analyses that have the potential to improve the understanding of the relationships between video, audio, and physiological responses to stress. On the other hand, the dataset design also offers the possibility to develop models of different natures, by focusing on a single modality. Moreover, it allows a wide range of applications, including subject-specific, or task-specific studies.

*StressID* dataset can contribute to advance research in multiple fields. First, it has the potential to improve the understanding of the sources, demographics, and both physical and physiological mechanisms of stress responses. It is designed for the development of reliable algorithms for stress identification that can improve the quality of life of our society by helping prevent stress-related issues. For instance, early stress recognition can be beneficial for people suffering from neurological or developmental disorders with emotion deregulation, such as autism, for whom the increase of stress can cause disruptive behaviors. Second, *StressID* can help improve affect understanding, as it offers the possibility to analyze and understand the correlation patterns between the distributions of perceived stress and emotion, how these correlations relate to different categories of stimuli, or how they impact subsequent stress and emotion recognition algorithms. Finally, *StressID* is useful to the machine learning and deep learning communities as well, as it can be used to further evolve multimodal learning algorithms, to develop strategies for learning with unevenly represented modalities, or to study how to make algorithms learning with human data more reliable.

To foster reproducibility, *StressID* also offers a set of baseline experiments. Although the proposed models focus on predicting two discrete labels designed to illustrate the predictive potential of our dataset, they represent a good starting point for future work, to which researchers and developers can benchmark their work. In this context, a natural extension of this work would be the implementation of a web service that tracks and centralizes the performances of models developed using *StressID*.

## Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

HC, VS, FB and MAZ are supported by the French government, through the 3IA Côte d’Azur Investments in the Future project managed by the National Research Agency (ANR) (ANR-19-P3IA-0002). MP, NE and MT are supported by the ANR RESPECT Project (ANR-18-CE92-0024). LMF has been partially supported by the Ville de Nice and the French government, through the UCAJEDI Investments in the Future project managed by the ANR (ANR-15-IDEX-01) and by PNRR- Investment 1.5 Ecosystems of Innovation, Project Tuscany Health Ecosystem (THE), Spoke 3 “Advanced technologies, methods, materials and health analytics” CUP: I53C22000780001.

## References

- [1] Naveed Ahmed, Zaher Al Aghbari, and Shini Girija. A systematic survey on multimodal emotion recognition using learning algorithms. *Intelligent Systems with Applications*, 17:200171, 2023.
- [2] Jonathan Aigrain, Michel Spodenkiewicz, Severine Dubuisson, Marcin Detyniecki, David Cohen, and Mohamed Chetouani. Multimodal stress detection from multiple assessments. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 9(4):491–506, 2016.
- [3] Andrew P Allen, Paul J Kennedy, Samantha Dockray, John F Cryan, Timothy G Dinan, and Gerard Clarke. The trier social stress test: principles and practice. *Neurobiology of stress*, 6:113–126, 2017.
- [4] Alo Allik, György Fazekas, and Mark B. Sandler. An ontology for audio features. In *International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2016.
- [5] Aamir Arsalan, Syed Muhammad Anwar, and Muhammad Majid. Mental stress detection using data from wearable and non-wearable sensors: a review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.03033*, 2022.
- [6] Alexei Baevski, Yuhao Zhou, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and Michael Auli. wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:12449–12460, 2020.
- [7] Anjana Bali and Amteshwar Singh Jaggi. Clinical experimental stress studies: methods and assessment. *Reviews in the Neurosciences*, 26(5):555–579, 2015.
- [8] Tadas Baltrušaitis, Amir Zadeh, Yao Chong Lim, and Louis-Philippe Morency. Openface 2.0: Facial behavior analysis toolkit. In *2018 13th IEEE international conference on automatic face & gesture recognition (FG 2018)*, pages 59–66. IEEE, 2018.
- [9] Margaret M Bradley and Peter J Lang. Measuring emotion: the self-assessment manikin and the semantic differential. *Journal of behavior therapy and experimental psychiatry*, 25(1):49–59, 1994.
- [10] J Douglas Bremner. Traumatic stress: effects on the brain. *Dialogues in clinical neuroscience*, 2022.
- [11] Fabio Catania. Speech emotion recognition in italian using wav2vec 2.0 and the novel crowd-sourced emotional speech corpus emozionalmente. 2023.
- [12] Valentina Chaparro, Alejandro Gomez, Alejandro Salgado, O Lucia Quintero, Natalia Lopez, and Luisa F Villa. Emotion recognition from eeg and facial expressions: a multimodal approach. In *2018 40th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*, pages 530–533. IEEE, 2018.
- [13] Nitesh V Chawla, Kevin W Bowyer, Lawrence O Hall, and W Philip Kegelmeyer. Smote: synthetic minority over-sampling technique. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 16:321–357, 2002.
- [14] Li-Wei Chen and Alexander Rudnicky. Exploring wav2vec 2.0 fine tuning for improved speech emotion recognition. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.

- [15] Sven-Åke Christianson. Emotional stress and eyewitness memory: a critical review. *Psychological bulletin*, 112(2):284, 1992.
- [16] Joel E Dimsdale. Psychological stress and cardiovascular disease. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 51(13):1237–1246, 2008.
- [17] Anila M D’Mello, Isabelle R Frosch, Cindy E Li, Annie L Cardinaux, and John DE Gabrieli. Exclusion of females in autism research: Empirical evidence for a “leaky” recruitment-to-research pipeline. *Autism Research*, 15(10):1929–1940, 2022.
- [18] Paul Ekman and Wallace V Friesen. Facial action coding system. *Environmental Psychology & Nonverbal Behavior*, 1978.
- [19] UNESCO Institute for Statistics. Women in science: Fact sheet no. 55. <https://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/fs55-women-in-science-2019-en.pdf>, 2019. Accessed: 2023-10-19.
- [20] Shruti Gedam and Sanchita Paul. A review on mental stress detection using wearable sensors and machine learning techniques. *IEEE Access*, 9:84045–84066, 2021.
- [21] Giorgos Giannakakis, Dimitris Grigoriadis, Katerina Giannakaki, Olympia Simantiraki, Alexandros Roniotis, and Manolis Tsiknakis. Review on psychological stress detection using biosignals. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 13(1):440–460, 2019.
- [22] Giorgos Giannakakis, Mohammad Rami Koujan, Anastasios Roussos, and Kostas Marias. Automatic stress detection evaluating models of facial action units. In *2020 15th IEEE international conference on automatic face and gesture recognition (FG 2020)*, pages 728–733. IEEE, 2020.
- [23] Auriane Gros, Emmanuelle Chapoulie, Remy Ramadour, Vincent Robert, Julie de Stoutz, Stephane Guetin, Damoun Chaïma, Emeline Wyckaert, Valeria Manera, Philippe Robert, et al. Rel@ x: Sensory and virtual immersion to reduce the anxiety of patients consulting for the first time in nice memory center. *Alzheimer’s and Dementia*, 13(7):P609–P610, 2017.
- [24] Sandra G Hart. Nasa task load index (tlx). 1986.
- [25] Jennifer Anne Healey. *Wearable and automotive systems for affect recognition from physiology*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2000.
- [26] Yu Huang, Chenzhuang Du, Zihui Xue, Xuanyao Chen, Hang Zhao, and Longbo Huang. What makes multi-modal learning better than single (provably). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:10944–10956, 2021.
- [27] Mimansa Jaiswal, Cristian-Paul Bara, Yuanhang Luo, Mihai Burzo, Rada Mihalcea, and Emily Mower Provost. Muse: a multimodal dataset of stressed emotion. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 1499–1510, 2020.
- [28] Apichart Jaratrotkamjorn and Anant Choksuriwong. Bimodal emotion recognition using deep belief network. In *2019 23rd International Computer Science and Engineering Conference (ICSEC)*, pages 103–109. IEEE, 2019.
- [29] Tzyy-Ping Jung, Terrence J Sejnowski, et al. Utilizing deep learning towards multi-modal bio-sensing and vision-based affective computing. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 13(1):96–107, 2019.
- [30] Hye-Geum Kim, Eun-Jin Cheon, Dai-Seg Bai, Young Hwan Lee, and Bon-Hoon Koo. Stress and heart rate variability: a meta-analysis and review of the literature. *Psychiatry investigation*, 15(3):235, 2018.
- [31] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2015.
- [32] Tomi Kinnunen and Haizhou Li. An overview of text-independent speaker recognition: From features to supervectors. *Speech communication*, 52(1):12–40, 2010.

- [33] Saskia Koldijk, Maya Sappelli, Suzan Verberne, Mark A Neerincx, and Wessel Kraaij. The swell knowledge work dataset for stress and user modeling research. In *Proceedings of the 16th international conference on multimodal interaction*, pages 291–298, 2014.
- [34] Eun-Hyun Lee. Review of the psychometric evidence of the perceived stress scale. *Asian nursing research*, 6(4):121–127, 2012.
- [35] Surendra Malla, Abeer Alsadoon, and Simi Kamini Bajaj. A dfc taxonomy of speech emotion recognition based on convolutional neural network from speech signal. In *2020 5th International Conference on Innovative Technologies in Intelligent Systems and Industrial Applications (CITISIA)*, pages 1–10, 2020.
- [36] Valentina Markova, Todor Ganchev, and Kalin Kalinkov. Clas: A database for cognitive load, affect and stress recognition. In *2019 International Conference on Biomedical Innovations and Applications (BIA)*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2019.
- [37] Maria D McManus, Jason T Siegel, and Jeanne Nakamura. The predictive power of low-arousal positive affect. *Motivation and Emotion*, 43:130–144, 2019.
- [38] Asif Iqbal Middy, Baibhav Nag, and Sarbani Roy. Deep learning based multimodal emotion recognition using model-level fusion of audio–visual modalities. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 244:108580, 2022.
- [39] Geoffroy Peeters. Rhythm Classification using spectral rhythm patterns. In *ISMIR*, pages –, London, United Kingdom, September 2005. cote interne IRCAM: Peeters05b.
- [40] Nazil Perveen and Chalavadi Krishna Mohan. Configural representation of facial action units for spontaneous facial expression recognition in the wild. In *VISIGRAPP (4: VISAPP)*, pages 93–102, 2020.
- [41] Ana-Catarina Pinho-Gomes, Jessica Gong, Katie Harris, Mark Woodward, and Cheryl Carcel. Dementia clinical trials over the past decade: are women fairly represented? *BMJ Neurology Open*, 4(2), 2022.
- [42] PLUX wireless biosignals S.A. *Electrocardiography (ECG) Sensor User Manual*, 2020.
- [43] PLUX wireless biosignals S.A. *Electrodermal Activity (EDA) Sensor Datasheet*, 2021.
- [44] PLUX wireless biosignals S.A. *Respiration (PZT) Sensor User Manual*, 2021.
- [45] K Prasada Rao, MVP Chandra Sekhara Rao, and N Hemanth Chowdary. An integrated approach to emotion recognition and gender classification. *Journal of Visual Communication and Image Representation*, 60:339–345, 2019.
- [46] Md. Sahidullah, Tomi Kinnunen, and Cemal Hanilçi. A comparison of features for synthetic speech detection. In *INTERSPEECH 2015, 16th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Dresden, Germany, September 6-10, 2015*, pages 2087–2091. ISCA, 2015.
- [47] Alexandre Schaefer, Frédéric Nils, Xavier Sanchez, and Pierre Philippot. Assessing the effectiveness of a large database of emotion-eliciting films: A new tool for emotion researchers. *Cognition and emotion*, 24(7):1153–1172, 2010.
- [48] Philip Schmidt, Attila Reiss, Robert Duerichen, Claus Marberger, and Kristof Van Laerhoven. Introducing wesad, a multimodal dataset for wearable stress and affect detection. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM international conference on multimodal interaction*, pages 400–408, 2018.
- [49] Steffen Schneider, Alexei Baeovski, Ronan Collobert, and Michael Auli. wav2vec: Unsupervised pre-training for speech recognition, 2019.
- [50] Mayank Sharma. Multi-lingual multi-task speech emotion recognition using wav2vec 2.0. In *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6907–6911. IEEE, 2022.

- [51] Charles D Spielberger, Fernando Gonzalez-Reigosa, Angel Martinez-Urrutia, Luiz FS Natalicio, and Diana S Natalicio. The state-trait anxiety inventory. *Revista Interamericana de Psicologia/Interamerican journal of psychology*, 5(3 & 4), 1971.
- [52] Herman JM Steeneken and John HL Hansen. Speech under stress conditions: overview of the effect on speech production and on system performance. In *1999 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing. Proceedings. ICASSP99 (Cat. No. 99CH36258)*, volume 4, pages 2079–2082. IEEE, 1999.
- [53] J Ridley Stroop. Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. *Journal of experimental psychology*, 18(6):643, 1935.
- [54] Salah Taamneh, Panagiotis Tsiamyrtzis, Malcolm Dcosta, Pradeep Buddharaju, Ashik Khatri, Michael Manser, Thomas Ferris, Robert Wunderlich, and Ioannis Pavlidis. A multimodal dataset for various forms of distracted driving. *Scientific data*, 4(1):1–21, 2017.
- [55] Thi-Dung Tran, Junghee Kim, Ngoc-Huynh Ho, Hyung-Jeong Yang, Sudarshan Pant, Soo-Hyung Kim, and Guee-Sang Lee. Stress analysis with dimensions of valence and arousal in the wild. *Applied Sciences*, 11(11):5194, 2021.
- [56] David Watson, Lee Anna Clark, and Auke Tellegen. Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the panas scales. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 54(6):1063, 1988.
- [57] Fen Xu and Zhe Wang. Emotion recognition research based on integration of facial expression and voice. In *2018 11th International Congress on Image and Signal Processing, BioMedical Engineering and Informatics (CISP-BMEI)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2018.

---

# StressID: a Multimodal Dataset for Stress Identification

---

Hava Chaptoukaev<sup>1</sup> Valeriya Strizhkova<sup>2</sup> Michele Panariello<sup>1</sup> Bianca D’Alpaos<sup>1</sup>  
Aglind Reka<sup>2</sup> Valeria Manera<sup>3</sup> Susanne Thümmel<sup>3</sup>  
Esma Ismailova<sup>3,4</sup> Nicholas Evans<sup>1</sup> François Bremond<sup>2,3</sup>  
Massimiliano Todisco<sup>1</sup> Maria A. Zuluaga<sup>1\*</sup> Laura M. Ferrari<sup>2,5\*</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>EURECOM, Sophia Antipolis, France  
<sup>2</sup>Inria, Valbonne, France  
<sup>3</sup>CoBTek, Université Cote d’Azur, Nice, France  
<sup>4</sup>Mines Saint-Etienne, Centre CMP, Gardanne, France  
<sup>5</sup>The Biorobotics Institute, Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna, Pontedera, Italy  
{chaptouk,panariello,evans,todisco,zuluaga}@eurecom.fr  
{valeriya.strizhkova,francois.bremond,laura.ferrari}@inria.fr

## Supplementary Materials

<b>A Overview of Dataset Contents</b>	<b>2</b>
A.1 Dataset Size	2
A.2 Data Formats and Organization	4
<b>B Dataset Publishing and Usage</b>	<b>4</b>
B.1 Dataset Hosting and Licensing	4
B.2 Intended Uses and Ethical Considerations	5
<b>C Human Subjects Considerations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>D Experimental Protocol</b>	<b>6</b>
D.1 Preparation and Synchronisation of Sensors	6
D.2 Task Order and Instructions	7
D.3 Self-assessments	7
<b>E Annotation Contents Analysis</b>	<b>8</b>
E.1 Survey: Most Stressful Task	8
E.2 Participant-specific Distributions of StressID Annotations	8
E.3 Joint Distributions of StressID Annotations	9
<b>F Stress and Emotion Identification</b>	<b>9</b>
F.1 Pre-Processing, Feature Extraction, and Classification	10

---

\*Equal contribution.



F.2 Additional Experiments . . . . .	13
F.2.1 Emotion Recognition . . . . .	13
F.2.2 Multimodal Learning on Other Multimodal Combinations . . . . .	14
F.2.3 Investigating the Effect of Gender Imbalance . . . . .	15

## A Overview of Dataset Contents

The StressID dataset contains high-resolution synchronized data from a suite of wearable sensors and global sensors. The dataset provides answers to 4 self-assessment questions in terms of perceived stress, relaxation, arousal, and valence, for each task. These annotations can be used to create robust labels for supervised learning. Fig. 1 presents a summary of the dataset contents and size. The remainder of the supplementary materials provide all additional information about the StressID project.

### A.1 Dataset Size

StressID contains recordings of 65 subjects. Among the 65 participants, 62 agreed to the public release of all their data and 3 opted for the release of non-identifying data only, i.e. physiological and audio. During the acquisitions, due to anomalous camera malfunction, the video and/or audio recordings of 9 participants – including 1 participant who chose to not share the video data, were damaged. Consequently, the StressID dataset contains physiological recordings for 65 participants, video recordings for 54 participants, and audio for 55 participants.

Following data collection, each recorded session is split into individual tasks: one 3-minutes breathing recording, 2 recordings corresponding to the watching of the emotional video clips of respectively 3 and 2 minutes, 7 separate 1-minute recordings of interactive tasks, and a relaxation recording of 2 minutes and 30 seconds, resulting to up to 11 tasks per subject for the physiological and video modalities, and 7 tasks per subject for the audio component composed of verbal-tasks only. Besides the 9 recordings that do not have video or audio, 6 individual task recordings are removed from the public dataset due to technical issues during the execution of the task.

Ultimately, the entire StressID dataset consists of 711 tasks for the physiological data, 587 tasks for video data, and 385 tasks for audio data. In total, it represents approximately 1119 minutes of physiological signals recordings, 918 minutes of video recordings, and 385 minutes of audio. Table 1 summarizes the number of instances and total duration of the annotated tasks across the 65 participants, in each modality. More information about missing modalities or missing tasks is provided on the technical file available on the StressID webpage<sup>8</sup>.

Table 1: Counts and durations of each tasks, in each modality.

Task/Stressor	Count physiological (min)	Count video (min)	Count Audio (min)
Breathing	65 (195)	52 (156)	0 (0)
Video1	64 (185)	52 (150)	0 (0)
Video2	64 (126)	53 (104)	0 (0)
Counting1	65 (65)	54 (54)	55 (55)
Counting2	65 (65)	54 (54)	55 (55)
Stroop	65 (65)	54 (54)	55 (55)
Speaking	65 (65)	54 (54)	55 (55)
Math	65 (65)	54 (54)	55 (55)
Reading	65 (65)	54 (54)	55 (55)
Counting3	65 (65)	54 (54)	55 (55)
Relax	63 (158)	52 (130)	0 (0)
<b>Total</b>	<b>711 (1119)</b>	<b>587 (918)</b>	<b>385 (385)</b>

<sup>8</sup><https://project.inria.fr/stressid/dataset-composition-details/>

<h1>StressID Dataset Facts</h1>	
<b>Dataset</b> StressID	
Motivation	
<b>Summary</b> A multimodal dataset for stress identification from video, speech and physiological data from wearable sensors.	
<b>Example Use Cases</b>	Stress identification, emotion recognition, task classification
<b>Original Authors</b>	H. Chaptoukaev, V. Strizhkova, M. Panariello, B. D'Alpaos, A. Reka, V. Manera, S. Thümmeler, E. Ismailova, N. Evans, F. Bremond, M. Todisco, M. A. Zuluaga, L. M. Ferrari
Metadata	
<b>URL</b>	<a href="https://project.inria.fr/stressid/">https://project.inria.fr/stressid/</a>
<b>Keywords</b>	Stress recognition, multimodal, wearable sensors
<b>Format</b>	.csv, .txt, .mp4, .wav
<b>Ethical review</b>	Approved by CER/CERNI
<b>Licence</b>	Proprietary
<b>First release</b>	2023
Sensors	
<b>ECG</b>	BioSignalsPlux ECG sensor
<b>EDA</b>	BioSignalsPlux EDA sensor
<b>Respiration</b>	BioSignalsPlux Piezoelectric chest-belt
<b>RGB Camera</b>	Logitech QuickCam Pro 9000 RGB
<b>Audio</b>	QuickCam Pro 9000 integrated microphone
Data Annotations	
<b>Self-assessments</b>	Stress, relax, arousal, valence
<b>Labels</b> for supervised learning	Binary stress, 3-class stress
Annotated Tasks	
<b>Relaxing</b>	Guided breathing, relaxation
<b>Audiovisual</b>	Video clips
<b>Interactive stressors</b>	Cognitive tasks, public speaking, multi-tasking
Participants	
<b>Count</b>	65
<b>Gender</b>	72%Male, 28%Female
<b>Age</b>	29 ± 7 years
<b>Background</b>	32%Master students, 20%PhD students, 48%Tertiary
Dataset Size	
<b>Total size</b>	5.29GB
<b>Physiological</b> total duration across subjects and across tasks	1119 min
<b>Video</b> total duration across subjects and across tasks	918 min
<b>Audio</b> total duration across subjects and across tasks	385 min

Figure 1: A dataset summary card for StressID, constructed based on [2, 5].




Figure 2: Organisation of the StressID Dataset repository. The dataset is grouped by modality. In each modality repository, the tasks are grouped by subject in separate repositories.

## A.2 Data Formats and Organization

The organization of the dataset at download is illustrated in Fig. 2. Each individual task is identified in the dataset by `subjectname_task`. For each modality, all tasks are grouped by subject into separate repositories. Additionally, we provide 3 `.csv` files containing self-assessments and labels; the `self_assessments.csv` file gathers perceived levels of relaxation, stress, arousal and valence for each subject and each task, `labels.txt` corresponds to the labels used to compute the StressID baselines, and `labels_supplementary.txt` provides additional labels used in supplementary experiments described in F.

For each task, data from all wearable sensors is organized into a single `.txt` file, making it easily usable with any programming language including Python, Matlab, or C++. Each file contains 3 synchronized entries corresponding to the ECG, EDA, and respiration data respectively. All the physiological signals are sampled at 500Hz with a resolution of 16 bits per sample.

In a similar fashion, for each task, the video data from the Logitech QuickCam Pro 9000 RGB camera is contained in a `.mp4` generated video file. All videos are acquired at a 720p resolution and sampled at 5 frames per second. Audio data is recorded at 32kHz with 16 bits per sample. After cutting and processing, the signals are downsampled to 16kHz. The audio for each task is included in the dataset as an uncompressed `.wav` file.

## B Dataset Publishing and Usage

### B.1 Dataset Hosting and Licensing

The dataset and code are available for researchers. The dataset uses a custom non-commercial proprietary license for research purposes only. It is made accessible through credentialized access. Users are required to sign an end-user license agreement to request the data. Once validated, a link to the repository with a username and a password will be given to grant access. The StressID dataset represents 5.29 GB of data. It is hosted on Inria servers, using storage intended for long-term availability, and ensuring sufficient space to hold all collected data. This space is maintained by the INRIA infrastructure team. It is also easily accessible to the research team, allowing new data to be added as it is collected, or withdrawn if needed. This storage thus, allows the dataset to be both dynamic and persistent. The front-end website<sup>4</sup> describes the StressID project, access instructions for downloading the data, the adopted sensors, the recording framework, dataset composition details, and the baseline models. It is hosted on Inria servers intended for long-term persistent websites and also maintained by the infrastructure team. The website acts as a portal pointing to all relevant visualizations, data, code, and instructions. The code for the baselines and analyses uses an open-source 3-Clause BSD License<sup>5</sup>, and is available on GitHub<sup>6</sup>. It includes ReadMe files describing the

<sup>4</sup><https://project.inria.fr/stressid/>

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/robustml-eurecom/stressID>

code structure, installation, and usage. In addition, third-party services for archival code repositories will be explored.

## **B.2 Intended Uses and Ethical Considerations**

*StressID* is conceived to further develop research on automated stress recognition. The dataset is a resource of annotated synchronized physiological signals, videos, and audio data, captured while subjects are involved in tasks specifically designed to elicit stress reactions. Various use cases include extracting characteristics of stress from each modality, analyzing correlations between various modalities, analyzing how the modalities relate to specific tasks, training learning pipelines for the identification of stress in diverse verbal and non-verbal tasks, and training pipelines to discriminate between audiovisual stimuli, stressors designed to increase the cognitive load or stressors based on public speaking.

The dataset is made available for research purposes. All personal information about the participants including, sex, age, and background of participants, although not published, is pseudonymized. The acquired physiological and audio signals are also pseudonymized, while video data can not be anonymized. Although the participants explicitly consent to the recording of their session, the dataset creation, and its public release for research purposes, no attempts should be made to actively identify the subjects included in the dataset. The data should also not be modified or augmented in a way that further exposes the subjects' identities.

In general, recording and usage of human activity data is associated with high ethical implications, including privacy, bias, and impact on society. If new projects use the *StressID* experimental protocol to replicate the study, using similar sensors and identifying modalities, the privacy of any new subjects should be protected, and the implications of the project clearly described to the participants. In addition, future applications that use the *StressID* protocol and/or dataset for building and training new learning pipelines, should consider the societal implications of their work. *StressID* is designed as a resource for improving the monitoring, modeling, and understanding of the mechanisms of human stress conditions. All intended applications have the potential to improve the quality of life of the population by helping prevent stress-related issues. However, researchers need to be aware of potential representation bias in their analyses. Indeed, *StressID* and subsequent analysis may present an imbalance in gender, race, age, or background of the participants – which could lead to unanticipated consequences. Additional information is provided about the participants' demographics along with the dataset and should be taken into account when developing new applications based on the *StressID* dataset.

We are aware that despite all the precautions, the dataset can be misused by bad-intentioned users. The authors declare that they bear all responsibility in case of any violation of rights during the collection of the data or other work, and will take appropriate action when needed, e.g., by removing data with such issues.

## **C Human Subjects Considerations**

The *StressID* project was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Université Côte d'Azur, namely the Committee on Ethics for Non-Interventional Research (CERNI/CER). The project has been conducted under agreement n° 2021-033 for data collection, and n° 2023-016 for the publication of the dataset. Subjects were recruited by email, and word of mouth primarily. They are composed of 32% Master students, 20% PhD students. The other 48% represent tertiary professions. Before the start of the experiment, they were introduced to the purpose and contents of the project, and public release modalities and privacy concerns were described. Participants signed a recording consent form and a media release form. Each subject participated on a voluntary basis. Each experiment lasted approximately 50 minutes including preparing sensors, calibration, and the 35 minutes long experiment.

Safety risks include those associated with the wearable sensors used in *StressID*. Notably, the use of Ag/AgCl electrodes can cause discomfort or cutaneous irritations in subjects – however, using clinical grade electrodes during the data collection campaign, we did not encounter any issue of this type. In addition, the wearable devices used in *StressID* should not be used in patients with implanted electronic devices of any kind, including pacemakers, electronic infusion pumps,

stimulators, defibrillators, or similar. All subjects are made aware of this fact, and cannot participate in the experiment if they fall in any of the mentioned categories. The experiment presented no safety risks associated with tasks. Participants were informed they could stop the experiment at any time.

Given the identifying nature of the videos, privacy is a primary concern in this project. Therefore, the data collection protocol of StressID considered the privacy risks for the participants as much as possible. The goals and implications of publishing personally identifiable facial videos were clearly described to each participant, and a dedicated media release consent form was signed to acknowledge participants' willingness for their video to be part of the public release of the data. Ultimately, participants could select between two options: **Option A:** research use and public release of all their recorded data, including identifying data (i.e. facial videos), and **Option B:** research use of all their recorded data, but no public release of identifying data. The videos of the participants who selected option B are removed from the public version of the dataset.

The subjects are also informed that they can withdraw their consent at any time. In that case, the data collected prior to the creation of the database will be destroyed. If the database has already been created and the subjects have given consent to the use of physiological data or audio, as these are pseudo-anonymous, they cannot be deleted. Video data will not be shared with other people after the withdrawal request. However, data that has already been shared cannot be modified. Once the database has been shared with other authorized researchers, the subjects will no longer be able to exercise their right of withdrawal on that copy of the database.

## D Experimental Protocol

### D.1 Preparation and Synchronisation of Sensors

Calibration and synchronization of the devices are done using the Event Annotation functionality of the OpenSignals (R)evolution platform. Before starting, the subjects are instructed to take a comfortable sitting position.

First, the wearable sensors are prepared. The BioSignalsPlux<sup>®</sup> acquisition system is mounted with the ECG sensor, the EDA sensor, and the piezoelectric respiration belt. The experimenter starts by placing 3 Ag/AgCl electrodes on the ribcage of the subjects to capture the ECG signal. The BioSignalsPlux ECG sensor is designed to record single lead ECG signals using 3 derivation configurations. Then, 2 Ag/AgCl electrodes are attached to the palm of the non-dominant hand of the subject to acquire the EDA signal. Finally, the experimenter helps the subjects put on the respiration chest-belt, and adjust it to their morphology – making sure the participants are as comfortable as possible wearing the sensors.

After setting up the electrodes, the device is connected to the OpenSignals (R)evolution platform for recording and streaming the physiological data, thus allowing the experimenter to observe a real-time reading of the signals. The wearable sensors start recording during this procedure, but no video or audio is recorded since the camera is not set up yet. The wearables are installed first to enable good electrodes/skin interfacing, as the gel of the Ag/AgCl electrodes can take some minutes to correctly hydrate the skin. To ensure accurate and low-noise data, the experimenter checks the sensors' wires placement, as well as the posture and position of the subject before the start of the experiment. He adjusts and fixes the wires of the sensors using medical tape so that the presence of motion artifacts in the data during the collection is minimized.

Next, the Logitech QuickCam Pro 9000 RGB with integrated microphone is prepared. The camera is adjusted such that each subject is recorded in the middle of the frame with a neutral background. The participants sit approximately 50cm from the microphone. The start of the video/audio recording is marked on the OpenSignals (R)evolution platform using the event annotation plug-in.

Finally, once all devices are set up and the participants are installed, the experiment starts. The experiment instructions are displayed on a screen placed in front of the participants. The whole experiment is timed, i.e. each task and instruction are shown for a predetermined time, that is identical for all subjects. The beginning of the experiment is indicated by a beep sound. Another event annotation is added at the beep. This ensures the synchronization of the video, audio, and physiological signals for each task of the experiment.

---

\*biosignalsplux, PLUX wireless biosignals S.A. (Lisbon, Portugal)

## D.2 Task Order and Instructions

The experimental protocol of StressID was designed to have a total duration of 35 minutes while spanning a wide variety of tasks. It includes a 3-minute guided breathing task used as a non-verbal baseline, followed by a neutral verbal baseline, 2 emotional video clips, 7 interactive 1-minute tasks, and a 2-minute and 30-second relaxation task. The choice and design of stressors is based on several considerations described hereafter:

All stressors have been selected to elicit 3 different categories of responses; 1) stimulate the audiovisual cortex of the participants, 2) increase the cognitive load by soliciting attention, comprehension, mental arithmetic or multi-tasking abilities, and 3) elicit psycho-social stress leveraging on public speaking as a stressor.

Overall, the tasks of the experiment are short – which allows the participants to perform several tasks in a row without tiring or losing acuity by the end of the experiment.

All interactive tasks are designed to leverage time restriction as a stressor by having a strict requirement for a response in 1 minute – thus, after receiving instructions on the screen, the subjects see a ticking 1-minute clock during the execution of each task.

The order of the stressors is designed to be unexpected to the participants. Therefore the experiment alternates between subgroups of tasks (e.g. Counting3 does not come after Counting2).

The level of detail provided in the instructions as well as the duration of the instruction was also carefully thought to maximize levels of stress in the experiment, by preventing participants from preparing for the coming task. The exact text of instructions received by the subjects for each task is given below:

- **Breathing:** "Now breathe deeply and relax."
- **Baseline:** "Start counting *forward* from 1 for 1 minute out loud".
- **Video1:** "Watch the video"
- **Video2:** "Watch the video"
- **Counting1:** "Start counting *backward* from 100 subtracting 3 for 1 minute (as fast as you can)"
- **Counting2:** "Start counting *backward* from 1011 subtracting 7 for 1 minute (as fast as you can)"
- **Stroop:** "Say out loud as many font colors as you can in one minute"
- **Speaking:** "Explain what are your strengths and weaknesses in 1 minute"
- **Math:** "Answer to the following mental arithmetic questions in 1 minute"
- **Reading:** "Read the following text in 1 minute (you can read silently)", followed by: "Explain the text in details to us in 1 minute"
- **Counting3:** "Start counting *backward* from 1152 subtracting 3 for 1 minute while touching your thumb with your other fingers"
- **Relax:** "Watch the relaxing video"

Each of the 11 tasks is followed by self-assessment questions. The counting forward baseline section is not defined as a task, but is designed to keep the participants in a neutral affective state, therefore it is not coupled with any self-assessment. Additionally, participants answer a survey question at the end of the experiment and indicate the task they considered most stressful.

## D.3 Self-assessments

Each task is annotated using answers to 4 self-assessment questions. The first 2 questions establish the participant's perceived stress and relaxation levels on a 0-10 scale. The following 2 questions are based on the SAM [3], and establish the participants' valence and arousal on a 0-10 scale. Fig. 3 shows the self-assessment questions as presented to the participants during the experiment.






Figure 3: Illustration of the four self-assessment questions used in StressID.




Figure 4: Most stressful tasks as designated by participants of StressID.

## E Annotation Contents Analysis

### E.1 Survey: Most Stressful Task

We analyze the contents of the annotations of StressID. Fig. 4 shows the distribution of the answers to the question survey at the end of the experiment i.e. which task was perceived as most stressful for each subject. Approximately 30% of the participants of StressID designated the task **Counting2** as most stressful, 20% designated the task of public **Speaking**, 15% designated the task **Counting3**, while the remainder 35% chose between **Stroop**, **Math**, **Reading**, and **Counting1**. Although a majority of participants agreed on **Counting2** as the strongest stressor, this analysis highlights the advantages of relying on multiple and diverse stressors in an experimental protocol designed for stress identification. Perception of stress and relaxation can vary a lot from one participant to another – and more so, the effectiveness of a stressor can vary from one subject to another; while an arithmetic task can be a strong stressor for one individual, it can be an uneventful task for another.

### E.2 Participant-specific Distributions of StressID Annotations

We analyze the distributions of the stress, relaxation, arousal, and valence self-assessments for each participant of StressID. To have a global vision of the dataset, for each self-assessment question we represent on a single figure all subject-specific Kernel Density Estimate (KDE) plots in Fig. 5. The KDE plot, analogous to a histogram, represents the distribution of self-assessment data – only using a continuous probability density curve.

Several observations can be drawn from Fig. 5. First, for all 4 self-assessment questions, the participant-specific distributions are rather heavy-tailed, with the exception of a few subjects. This suggests that each participant of StressID gave a broad range of self-assessed scores across the experiment, highlighting the ability of the StressID protocol to elicit varied responses. Second, the perceived stress and relaxation levels of the participants across the experiment are well balanced, suggesting the experimental protocol enabled the creation of a dataset with proportional instances of stress and relaxation. Finally, we observe that the distribution of arousal scores is significantly skewed towards higher ratings across the dataset, highlighting the protocol’s ability to create a high involvement in the participants and elicit strong responses – whether stress or amusement.




Figure 5: Participant-specific KDE plots for each of the self-assessment questions.

### E.3 Joint Distributions of StressID Annotations

We analyze the pair-wise joint distributions of the StressID annotations in Fig. 6. The analysis highlights a linear relation between stress and relaxation levels. In our experimental protocol, the participants’ perceived levels of relaxation and stress associated with each task are mutually exclusive – globally, a subject cannot be both relaxed and stressed during a task. In addition, Fig. 6 highlights a positive correlation between stress and arousal, and a negative correlation between stress and valence – suggesting that across subjects and tasks, high arousal and low valence are associated with a higher level of stress. Similarly, relaxation is positively correlated to valence, and negatively correlated to arousal – suggesting low arousal and positive valence corresponds to higher levels of relaxation. These last observations are consistent with psychological studies [4, 10] describing stress on the circumplex model of affect [11], thus once again affirming the coherence of the StressID dataset.

## F Stress and Emotion Identification

We train modality-specific pipelines to perform various classification tasks, e.g. discriminate between stressed and not stressed. In all the experiments, we generate 8 random splits, using 90% of the subjects for training, and 10% for testing for each split. The reported results are averaged over the 8 repetitions. The performances of the models are assessed using the f1-score on the test data.




Figure 6: Joint distributions of pairs of self-assessment answers.

## F.1 Pre-Processing, Feature Extraction, and Classification

**Physiological Features.** In the first step, the ECG, EDA, and respiration signals are pre-processed to reduce high-frequency noise and baseline wander in the signals. Precisely, we use a 0.5 Hz high-pass Butterworth filter of order 5 for the ECG, a 5Hz low-pass Butterworth filter of order 4 for the EDA, and a 0.1-0.35 Hz bandpass Butterworth filter of order 2, followed by a constant detrending for the respiration signal. We use the `neurokit2` python package for all pre-processing. Then, 35 ECG features, 23 EDA, and 40 respiration features are extracted. These features include HRV measures, frequency features, and non-linear features. An exhaustive list of the features used in our baselines is provided in Table 2. Additionally, Fig. 7 illustrates an example of basic ECG, EDA, and respiration features visualized using `neurokit2`.




Figure 7: Example of features extracted from the ECG, EDA and respiration signals of StressID.

Table 2: Exhaustive list of physiological features extracted.

Domain	Features	Total
<b>ECG</b>		
<b>Time</b>	MeanHR, minHR, maxHR, stdHR, modeHR, nNN, meanNN, SDSD, CVNN, SDNN, pNN50, pNN20, RMSSD, medianNN, q20NN, q80NN, minNN, maxNN, triHRV	19
<b>Frequency</b>	Total power of the signal, LF, HF, LF/HF, ULF, VLF, VHF, rLF, rHF, peakLF, peakHF	11
<b>Non-linear</b>	SD1, SD2, SD1SD2, ApEn, SampEn	5
<b>EDA</b>		
<b>Statistical</b>	MinEDA, maxEDA, meanEDA, std, skewness, kurtosis, median, dynamical range, minSCR, maxSCR, meanSCR, stdSCR, minSCL, maxSCL, stdSCL, slopeSCL	15
<b>Time</b>	nSCRpeaks, area under SCR, mean amplitude SCR (meanAmp), maxAmp, mean response SCR (meanResp), sumAmp, sumResp	8
<b>Respiration</b>		
<b>Time</b>	MeanRR, minRR, maxRR, stdRR, nBB (breath to breath), meanBB, SDSD, SVNN, SDNN, RMSSD, minBB, maxBB, meanTT (trough to trough), SDTT, minTT, maxTT, meanBA (breath amplitude), SDBA, minBA, maxBA, meanBW (breath width), SDBW, minBW, maxBW	25
<b>Frequency</b>	Total power, LF, HF, VLF, VHF, LF/HF, rLF, rHF, peakLF, peakHF	10
<b>Non-linear</b>	SD1, SD2, SD1SD2, ApEn, SampEn	5

**Video Features.** We extract Action Units (AU) and eye gaze from each video frame using the OpenFace library [11]. The feature extraction from 587 videos is done in 3 hours 42 minutes using two Dual CPU Intel Xeon E5-2630 v4 processors. Fig. 8 is an example of AUs extracted on a subject of StressID.




Figure 8: Example of AUs extracted from a video extract of StressID.

**Audio Features.** In the first step, amplitude-based voice activity detection (VAD) [8] is applied to the audio signals prior to feature extraction to eliminate non-speech segments. We first extract handcrafted (HC) features, such as MFCCs, using the libROSA python package [9]. Fig. 9 is an example of MFCCs extracted on a subject of StressID. Additionally, DNN-based feature extraction is performed using a large pre-trained Wav2Vec (W2V) model [12]. Features are extracted every 20 ms and are averaged over time to obtain a single 513-component embedding per utterance. The extraction is done using a GeForce RTX 3090 graphic card.




Figure 9: Example of MFCCs features extracted from an audio data of StressID.

**Classification.** For all baselines, we have evaluated several combinations of feature selection algorithms and classifiers and selected the best-performing ones for our baseline results.

For feature selection, we evaluated a Recursive Feature Elimination (RFE) algorithm, an L1 regularisation, and Principal-Component Analysis (PCA) for dimension reduction, as well as no feature selection. For the classification models, we have considered a large range of classical classifiers with different hyper-parameterizations. The exhaustive list is reported in Table. [3](#)

## F.2 Additional Experiments

### F.2.1 Emotion Recognition.

We report here additional experiments performed with binary labels extracted from the 4 self-assessments. We evaluate our learning pipeline on 4 binary classification tasks; namely discriminate between stressed (1) vs not stressed (0), relaxed (1) vs not relaxed (0), high valence (1) vs low valence (0), and high arousal (1) vs low arousal (0).

**Labels.** Each continuous value of the self-assessment is split as follows; if *value* is less than 5 then the label is 0, and if *value* is equal or greater than 5, then the label is 1. The created **stress** label is balanced and composed of 48% and 52% of class 0 and 1 respectively. Similarly, the **relax** label is composed of 54% and 46% of 0 and 1 respectively, and the **valence** label consists of 50% of each class. On the other hand, the **arousal** label is severely imbalanced and consists of 71% of high arousal (1) and 29% of low arousal (0).

**Results and Discussion.** The classification performances for all modalities and each label are reported in Table [4](#). Our analysis confirms that the labels and the acquired data are coherent and meaningful, and the labels are predicted from the data with f1-scores well above the random.

Despite the different number of trials for each modality, some general observations can be highlighted. The valence appears here as the most difficult label to predict. This is especially true for audio and video, while physiological data seems to carry more useful information to discriminate between positive and negative valence. For the video, this can be related to the fact that a positive or negative valence in this set-up can be expressed with similar expressions. A person can smile because they are amused by the task or they can smile nervously. Recognizing a positive smile from a negative one is still a challenging task to this day in the field of emotion recognition.

On the other hand, the arousal is better predicted by the audio. This can be due to the fact that when people are more engaged in the task their tone of voice is incremented.



Table 3: List of tested classifiers and corresponding grid search of hyper-parameters.

Model	Hyper-parameters	Grid search values	
<b>Support Vector Machines</b>	kernel	'linear', 'rbf', 'sigmoid'	
	C	0.1, 1.0, 10.0	
	gamma	'scale', 'auto'	
<b>K-Nearest Neighbors</b>	n_neighbors	3, 5, 10, 20	
	weights	'uniform', 'distance'	
	algorithm	'auto', 'ball_tree', 'kd_tree', 'brute'	
<b>Random Forests</b>	n_estimators	100, 150, 200	
	criterion	'gini', 'entropy'	
	max_depth	3, 5, 7	
	min_samples_split	2, 4, 6	
	min_samples_leaf	1, 2, 3	
	max_features	'auto', 'sqrt', 'log2'	
	class_weight	None, 'balanced', 'balanced_subsample'	
<b>Multi Layer Perceptron</b> trained using a cross-entropy loss in combination with an Adam [7] optimizer and number of hidden layers in [2,3,4], layer width in [64, 128, 256]	activation	'logistic', 'tanh', 'relu'	
	alpha	0.0001, 0.001, 0.01	
	solver	'lbfgs', 'adam'	
	learning_rate	'constant', 'invscaling', 'adaptive'	
	shuffle	True, False	
	momentum	0.7, 0.8, 0.9	
	early_stopping	True, False	
<b>Logistic Regression</b>	penalty	11, 12	
	C	0.1, 1, 10	
	solver	'liblinear', 'saga'	
<b>Gradient Boosting Classifier</b>	loss	'deviance', 'exponential'	
	n_estimators	100, 150, 200	
	learning_rate	0.1, 0.5, 1.0	
	max_depth	3, 5, 7	
	min_samples_split	2, 4, 6	
	max_features	'sqrt', 'log2'	
<b>LGBM</b>	boosting_type	'gbdt', 'dart'	
	importance_type	'split', 'gain'	
	num_leaves	20, 30, 40	
	max_depth	5, 10, -1	
	learning_rate	0.1, 0.01	
	n_estimators	100, 200	
	objective	'binary', 'multiclass'	
	metric	'binary_logloss', 'multi_logloss'	
	colsample_bytree	0.8, 1.0	
	reg_lambda	0.5, 1.	
	reg_alpha	0.0, 0.5	
	<b>Ridge Classifier</b>	alpha	0.1, 1.0, 10.0
	<b>Decision Tree Classifier</b>	criterion	'gini', 'entropy'
max_depth		None, 3, 5, 7	
min_samples_split		2, 4, 6	
min_samples_leaf		1, 2, 3	
max_features		'auto', 'sqrt', 'log2'	

For the tasks of identifying stress and relaxation, the physiological signals appear as the most meaningful modality. Nonetheless, the results highlight good performances for all modalities, highlighting the strong correlations between the recorded data and the labels.

## F.2.2 Multimodal Learning on Other Multimodal Combinations

To further highlight the advantages of multimodal learning, we have evaluated multimodal baselines on all the possible modality combinations of the available data, i.e. physiological/video only, video/audio only, and physiological/audio only. Each baseline that combines the features extracted from different modalities is evaluated on all the data available in the subset of tasks featuring the said modalities. When the subset presents a strong imbalance in the labels, we use Minority Over-sampling

Table 4: Baseline f1-scores for different classification tasks. Each unimodal baseline is trained and tested on all available tasks of the corresponding modality (#tasks).

Data subset (#tasks)	Binary stress	Binary relax	Binary arousal	Binary valence
Physiological (711)	0.73 ± 0.04	0.67 ± 0.06	0.66 ± 0.06	0.64 ± 0.07
Video (587)	0.62 ± 0.04	0.62 ± 0.06	0.67 ± 0.10	0.54 ± 0.07
Audio-HC (385)	0.67 ± 0.04	0.62 ± 0.1	0.79 ± 0.09	0.55 ± 0.09

Table 5: Performances of multimodal baselines for the classification of stress, compared to unimodal models.

Modalities (subset size)	2-class		3-class	
	F1-score	Accuracy	F1-score	Accuracy
Physiological (711)	0.73 ± 0.02	0.72 ± 0.03	0.55 ± 0.04	0.56 ± 0.03
Video (587)	0.70 ± 0.03	0.70 ± 0.03	0.55 ± 0.03	0.55 ± 0.03
Audio (385)	0.70 ± 0.02	0.66 ± 0.03	0.56 ± 0.04	0.52 ± 0.04
Physiological + Video (587)	0.72 ± 0.04	<b>0.72 ± 0.04</b>	0.62 ± 0.05	0.52 ± 0.07
Video + Audio (370)	<b>0.76 ± 0.05</b>	0.68 ± 0.05	0.52 ± 0.06	0.45 ± 0.05
Physiological + Audio (385)	0.68 ± 0.08	0.62 ± 0.07	0.50 ± 0.07	0.41 ± 0.07
All modalities (370)	0.72 ± 0.05	0.65 ± 0.05	<b>0.63 ± 0.05</b>	<b>0.58 ± 0.07</b>

Techniques (SMOTE) to balance the training set in each of the 10 repetitions, and leave the test sets untouched.

The multimodal baselines are compared with the best-performing unimodal baselines, trained on all the available data of each modality. The results for all multimodal baselines for the 2-class and 3-class classification are reported in Table 5. As observed in the results of Section 4, multimodal models using decision-level fusion show considerable improvement over the performances of unimodal models. We, therefore, evaluate models based on SVMs merged with different decision rules (i.e. sum, product, average, or maximum rule) and report the best-performing ones here.

Despite the different subset sizes for each baseline, some conclusions can be drawn. First, the performances of unimodal baselines highlight that the physiological modality carries more information for the classification of 2-class stress. However, all 3 unimodal baselines achieve comparable results for the classification of 3-class stress. It can be noted that the baseline on the physiological modality shows slightly better performances in terms of accuracy, suggesting physiological data is more susceptible to carrying information allowing to discriminate between different emotional states.

Second, the multimodal baselines show that combining multiple modalities by merging the results of unimodal models using late voting on each modality (decision fusion), considerably improves classification performances. For 2-class prediction, the best performance is shown by the combination of video and audio features. However, for 3-class classification the best performance is achieved when combining all available modalities, highlighting the predictive potential of combining multiple complementary sources of data, and showing once more the importance of physiological data in the discrimination between a relaxed state and acute stress.

### F.2.3 Investigating the Effect of Gender Imbalance

A balanced dataset is crucial for performing bias-free analyses and minimizing the risk of bias in algorithm development. Potential imbalances in gender, race, age, or background of the participants can limit the development of fair and equitable applications, and researchers need to be aware of this aspect. To sensitize users to this issue, we have evaluated the predictive potential of our dataset on a subset of StressID presenting a balanced ratio of female and male subjects – using the previously introduced unimodal and multimodal baseline models. To create this subset, the recordings from the 18 female participants are kept untouched, and only 18 male participants are randomly selected, thus resulting in a subset composed of 36 subjects. The classification performances for unimodal and multimodal baselines for the 2-class classification are reported in Table 6. The results are averaged over 5 random balanced subsets built this way. All baselines are performed on tasks available for all

Table 6: Performances of unimodal and multimodal baselines for the 2-class classification of stress, using a gender balanced subset. The high variability in the results is explained by the use of different random subsets of the data across repetitions.

Modalities	F1-score	Accuracy
Physiological	$0.69 \pm 0.1$	$0.62 \pm 0.1$
Video	$0.73 \pm 0.07$	$0.65 \pm 0.08$
Audio	$0.69 \pm 0.07$	$0.64 \pm 0.07$
All modalities (370)	$0.73 \pm 0.07$	$0.64 \pm 0.07$

3 modalities. When the subset presents an imbalance in the labels, we use SMOTE to balance the training set, and leave the test sets untouched.

Two important conclusions can be drawn from the results observed in Table 6. First, several baselines built on balanced subsets outperform (or compare to) the baselines using all available data. This suggests more balanced datasets can improve the performances of subsequent models, and thus highlights potential bias induced by imbalanced representation in data. This is to be expected, as training on well-balanced data decreases the risk for a model to overfit – which in the case of gender imbalance can be translated as learning on male subjects mainly during the training phase and performing poorly during the testing phase on female subjects, less seen during training. With this experiment, we aim to increase the awareness of users to the effect of gender imbalance in particular, and we invite them to account for this possibility in their analyses.

Second, these results illustrate the possibility of developing algorithms achieving good classification performances on restricted parts of StressID. Indeed, our dataset offers the possibility to focus on particular subsets of the data while still ensuring good prediction scores, thanks to its large total population. For instance, the gender-balanced subset of our dataset represents 36 participants, while similar multimodal datasets collect data from less than 30 participants in total, without eliminating the limitation of gender imbalance – thus highlighting once more the advantages of StressID.

We strongly encourage users of StressID to anticipate possible consequences by taking the appropriate steps to build equitable systems before their use in real-life applications – this experiment provides a good starting point and example of how to proceed.

## References

- [1] Tadas Baltrušaitis, Amir Zadeh, Yao Chong Lim, and Louis-Philippe Morency. Openface 2.0: Facial behavior analysis toolkit. In *2018 13th IEEE international conference on automatic face & gesture recognition (FG 2018)*, pages 59–66. IEEE, 2018.
- [2] Jack Bandy and Nicholas Vincent. Nutrition label template for dataset documentation. <https://www.overleaf.com/latex/templates/nutrition-label-template-for-dataset-documentation/gxzbpfmncyfp>, 2021.
- [3] Margaret M Bradley and Peter J Lang. Measuring emotion: the self-assessment manikin and the semantic differential. *Journal of behavior therapy and experimental psychiatry*, 25(1):49–59, 1994.
- [4] Sven-Åke Christianson. Emotional stress and eyewitness memory: a critical review. *Psychological bulletin*, 112(2):284, 1992.
- [5] Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daumé III au2, and Kate Crawford. Datasheets for datasets. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1803.09010>, 2021.
- [6] Open Source Initiative. The 3-Clause BSD License. <https://opensource.org/licenses/bsd-3-clause/>, 2023.
- [7] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2015.

- [8] Tomi Kinnunen and Haizhou Li. An overview of text-independent speaker recognition: From features to supervectors. *Speech communication*, 52(1):12–40, 2010.
- [9] Brian McFee, Colin Raffel, Dawen Liang, Daniel PW Ellis, Matt McVicar, Eric Battenberg, and Oriol Nieto. librosa: Audio and music signal analysis in python. In *Proceedings of the 14th python in science conference*, volume 8, 2015.
- [10] Maria D McManus, Jason T Siegel, and Jeanne Nakamura. The predictive power of low-arousal positive affect. *Motivation and Emotion*, 43:130–144, 2019.
- [11] James A Russell. A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 39(6):1161, 1980.
- [12] Steffen Schneider, Alexei Baevski, Ronan Collobert, and Michael Auli. wav2vec: Unsupervised pre-training for speech recognition, 2019.