

## List of Tables

| <i>Table</i> | <i>Title</i>  | <i>page</i> |
|--------------|---|-------------|
| 4.1          | Performance accuracy of posture specific HMM  | 43          |
| 4.2          | Comparison of segmentation accuracy of concatenated HMM with traditional Viterbi and the proposed Viterbi Algorithm   | 43          |
| 4.3          | Performance accuracy of assessment framework in detecting jerks and inconsistent segments   | 43          |
| 5.1          | Performance accuracy for missed action notification (under tolerance of 25 frames)  | 51          |
| 5.2          | Performance accuracy for anomalous action notification (under tolerance of 25 frames)   | 51          |
| 5.3          | Number of Edit Operations of different test sequences with 5 templates of same expert   | 51          |
| 6.1          | Comparison of Rank Correlation and Mean Square Error of various techniques for Sun Salutation performance scoring   | 59          |
| 7.1          | Segmentation Accuracy: Community based approach outperforms even without knowledge of no. of actions  | 69          |
| 7.2          | Comparison of Rank Correlation and Mean Square Error of various techniques for Sun Salutation action scoring with Community Detection based encoding  | 70          |
| 7.3          | Segmentation results : Sun Salutation video segmentation in the presence of incorrect performances  | 71          |
| 8.1          | Data Splits. P: Positive pairs, N: Negative Pairs   | 81          |
| 8.2          | UNLV Diving Results - Comparison of Rank Correlation; C:C3D, L:LSTM, F: Final, I: Incremental, S: SVR. Dataset splits are as described in Section 8.5(A).   | 83          |
| 8.3          | UNLV Diving Results - Comparison of Mean Square Error; C:C3D, L:LSTM, F: Final, I: Incremental, S: SVR.   | 83          |
| 8.4          | Results of our model in comparison to the baseline works for various dive types. Dive-type specific results are averaged over the splits described in Section 8.5(A)  | 83          |
| 8.5          | UNLV Gymnastic Vaults - Comparison of Rank Correlation and Mean Square Error; C:C3D, L:LSTM, F: Final, I: Incremental, S: SVR, RGR: Reference Guided Regression   | 84          |
| 8.6          | Multitask AQA Dataset - Comparison of Rank Correlation and Mean Square Error; C:C3D, L:LSTM, F: Final, I: Incremental, S: SVR, RGR: Reference Guided Regression   | 84          |
| 8.7          | Impact of Metric Learning on final scoring  | 86          |
| 8.8          | Architecture variations   | 86          |
| 8.9          | Clip Level contribution to the final score  | 88          |
| 8.10         | Performance of feedback module on original videos and when the videos are misaligned; RGR_sX denotes the reference guided regression performed when we shift the candidate videos with X frames to create misalignments | 89          |
| 8.11         | Performance comparison our model with D2 embedding generated by including worst bias (WB), bias from performer of 50 and 75 percentile and expert bias (EB)   | 89          |
| 8.12         | Runtime of different methods  | 91          |

