

Detection algorithm:

Check if speed > x

s = window of 256 3axis accel samples

f = high pass (s) --- show

peak = max(f[z])

peak_loc = index(max(f[z]),f[z])

if (peak > t1) // peak filter

 x_filt = f[z][peak_loc-40, peak_loc+40]

 x_max = max(x_filt)

 if (x_max / z_max > t2) //xz ratio

 if (zmax / speed > t3) //speed ratio

 if more than k detections at this location, emit pothole

Intuition behind stages:

high-pass -- to remove bias, and large accelerations due to dynamics of car -- potholes are short, sharp bumps lasting a few 10s of ms

z peak -- potholes mostly show in the axis

x/z ratio -- potholes should have significant x axis energy (a tilt to one side), unlike expansion joints and others

speed ratio -- lots of little bumps at higher speeds -- real potholes will be even bigger at high speeds

clustering (more than k detections) -- to remove spurious events

(Show code examples -- see pothole-demo.zip)

Note that these filters depend on various thresholds. Hand tuned the values of these thresholds (why not machine learning?), by sweeping parameters to find the most effective values.

Data collection:

Drove zipcars over a bunch of potholes (and other road anomalies), labelled by having a passenger mark each pothole / manhole / etc

"loosely labeled data", marked segments as "none/few/many" for each road anomaly

"wild" data -- just taxis driving to see if we can find new potholes

Results :

- slide 23 (page 48): showing overall performance with different steps on different classes of hand labeled data
 - ideally only pothole traces would find any potholes
 - note that expansion joints vs potholes are often confused
 - adding z/x filter and speed filter helps a lot

How well does it do?

About 7% of non-pothole labelled data samples are marked as potholes, and 93% of potholes are properly labelled

(No smooth road is marked as potholes)

We can't really know how many false positives there are on real roads, because training data is biased to have way more road anomalies than non-anomalies

We also can't really know how many potholes we are missing, since training data isn't exhaustive

We can estimate upper bound on false positives on real roads by looking at loosely labeled data where we think there are no potholes (show slide)

Real world data -- found a bunch of potholes, few confusions