

# Quantifying the Privacy-Utility Trade-off in GPS-based Daily Stress Recognition using Semantic Features

HOANG KHANG PHAN, Ho Chi Minh city University of Technology, Vietnam National University-Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam

NHAT TAN LE, Ho Chi Minh-city University of Technology, Vietnam National University-Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam

Psychological stress is a widespread issue that significantly impacts student well-being and academic performance. Effective remote stress recognition is crucial, yet existing methods often rely on wearable devices or GPS-based clustering techniques that pose privacy risks. In this study, we introduce a novel, end-to-end privacy-enhanced framework for semantic location encoding using a self-hosted OSM engine and an LLM-bootstrapped static map. We rigorously quantify the privacy-utility trade-off and demonstrate (via LOSO validation) that our Privacy-Aware (PA) model achieves performance statistically indistinguishable from a non-private model, proving that utility does not require sacrificing privacy. Feature importance analysis highlights that recreational activity time, working time, and travel time play a significant role in stress recognition.

CCS Concepts: • **Security and privacy** → *Social aspects of security and privacy*; • **Human-centered computing** → **Ubiquitous and mobile computing systems and tools**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Supervised learning**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Stress Recognition; Student Life; GPS; Machine Learning; Feature Extraction

## ACM Reference Format:

Hoang Khang Phan and Nhat Tan Le. 2025. Quantifying the Privacy-Utility Trade-off in GPS-based Daily Stress Recognition using Semantic Features. 1, 1 (December 2025), 22 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

## 1 Introduction

In a fast-paced society, stress, which stems from heightened professional, academic, and social demands, increasingly afflicts individuals, manifesting as diminished productivity and posing risks to well-being and longevity. In 2018, over 70% of people reported having felt so stressed that they have been overwhelmed or unable to cope in a YouGov survey [3]. Notably, in 2024, 75% of high school students feel constant stress [32]. Additionally, stress contributes to a 55% loss of workdays globally, equivalent to 17 million working days, and costs the US industry over 300 billion dollars annually [31]. Hence, a precise and accessible stress recognition tool is crucial for early detection, improving work performance, and overall health. This highlights an urgent need for accessible and responsible AI-driven tools that can help identify early signs of distress without compromising user privacy.

Smartphones, ubiquitous in modern life, also hold potential for ongoing stress management [2, 11, 35, 37], demonstrating successful stress detection using smartphone sensor data. Despite limitations in capturing certain biometric data, smartphones provide valuable insights into user behavior, such as movement, conversation, sleep quality, and

---

Authors' Contact Information: [Hoang Khang Phan](#), [khang.phan2411@hcmut.edu.vn](mailto:khang.phan2411@hcmut.edu.vn), Department of Biomedical Engineering, Ho Chi Minh city University of Technology, Vietnam National University-Ho Chi Minh city, Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam; [Nhat Tan Le](#), [lnhattan@hcmut.edu.vn](mailto:lnhattan@hcmut.edu.vn), Department of Biomedical Engineering, Ho Chi Minh-city University of Technology, Vietnam National University-Ho Chi Minh city, Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam.

---

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

individuals' activity. However, the analysis of location and mobility-based features has been relatively underexplored due to challenges in real-time prediction, users' privacy, and data processing.

Location data, an easy-to-interpret data type, offers valuable insights into human activity patterns [15, 27]—such as recreational time, work hours, and travel duration—that can reflect an individual's emotional state [37]. For instance, a vacation may be indicated by reduced time at home or at work and increased leisure or shopping activities, suggesting efforts to mitigate stress. Therefore, a detailed analysis of GPS data can be highly beneficial for understanding psychological stress in individuals.

Nevertheless, the privacy aspect of GPS-involved systems was underdeveloped. Existing methods for effective remote stress recognition often depended on GPS-based clustering techniques [24, 35] that posed privacy risks.

To address this gap, this study introduces a GPS encoding method designed to transform raw location data into behaviorally meaningful and privacy-aware features, all without storing identifiable coordinates. In contrast to conventional approaches that store sensitive location clusters, this method transforms GPS data into less identifiable, categorical location types that are related to daily life, such as time spent at home, school, or recreational areas, and analyzes their correlation with stress.

In this work, we aim to:

- (1) Extract high-level, privacy-enhanced location categories from GPS data—such as home, school, and recreation—that reflect students' daily lives.
- (2) Leverage these extracted features with machine learning techniques to predict daily stress, allowing the study to quantify the privacy-utility trade-off in GPS-based stress recognition.

## 2 Background and Related works

Passive mental health monitoring has been developed as a method to enhance human quality of life. This is often achieved by leveraging data from ubiquitous technologies like smartphones and wearable devices. For instance, smartphones, with their array of sensors, can provide valuable insights into a user's behavior, including movement patterns, conversation frequency, and sleep quality, which can be correlated with mental well-being [17].

### 2.1 Stress Recognition

*Traditional Machine Learning Approach.* The StudentLife dataset [34], a comprehensive collection of smartphone-derived data, provides a valuable foundation for examining student behavior and its impact on academic outcomes. Wang et al. leveraged this dataset to explore the correlation between daily living patterns and student learning, extending beyond traditional academic metrics. Upon the StudentLife research, many studies [24, 35, 37] leverage various mobile sensing data for their application, such as conversation, activity, etc., for mental health assessments. These research used RAPIDS [33], which framework built for feature extraction from all resources from mobile sensing data as acceleration, conversation, location, etc, as the backbone for their application. However, this approach raises concerns about the effective utilization of mobile sensing data, privacy threats, and transparency for mental health assessment applications.

Furthermore, most prior works in mobile sensing for mental health recognition used DBSCAN for localizing frequent locations, but present notable limitations. Density-based spatial clustering of applications with noise (DBSCAN) [12], while effective in identifying clusters of prolonged presence, inherently discards data related to less frequent activities, such as recreational outings or travel. This results in a substantial loss of potentially valuable information about less time-consuming and random activities as recreation or traveling.




Fig. 1. The comparison of the current common GPS feature extraction method and our method. The red oval shape represents the clustering technique for frequent location identification. While GPS signals must be stored in a dataset, which poses privacy threats from exposure of locations, to examine the top frequent locations in the common method, our method showcases a GPS signal transformation technique to secure the privacy of the user's location and prevent information loss from a less frequently visited address.

*Deep Learning Approach.* The state-of-the-art, Deep Spatio-Temporal Graph Neural Network (STGNN) approach has demonstrated strength in handling GPS data. For instance, Harit et al. [14] showed that using only raw GPS data, an STGNN improved stress classification by 3%, increasing the accuracy and F1 score from the 58% and 55% achieved by traditional GCN methods. However, such deep learning approaches present challenges, including a lack of model transparency and, more importantly, significant privacy concerns due to their reliance on precise location coordinates.

## 2.2 Privacy-preserving Methods and Limitations

While robust privacy-preserving methods are well-established for data types like speech [1], text [28], and facial images [9], their application to location data presents unique challenges. Formal techniques, such as differential privacy [36] for location-based applications, provide mathematical guarantees by altering the original data by adding noise or transform the original data by mathematics functions, which often associate with a high cost to data utility. In the context of behavioral modeling, such an approach can alter the data so significantly that it obscures the subtle nuances of a person’s location experience, which in turn affects the explainability of the application.

Another important method for protecting location data is obfuscation (or spatial cloaking) [39], where coordinates are intentionally made less precise to enhance user privacy. However, this approach still involves storing users’ sensitive location data, which poses a significant privacy risk.

Federated Learning [22], a decentralized approach to machine learning deployment, is another noteworthy technique for enhancing user privacy. In this framework, edge devices (e.g., smartphones, personal computers, etc.) participate in model training alongside a central server. The devices locally train the model on their data and then send only the updated weights-subject to predefined constraints-to the server, which aggregates them to update the global model. The updated global model is then distributed back to the participating devices. This process ensures that users’ raw data never leaves their devices, thereby offering strong privacy protection.

Nevertheless, recent studies have shown that attackers can exploit vulnerabilities in this setup. For instance, they may reverse-engineer model weights to reconstruct sensitive data (reconstruction attacks) [13, 40], or poison the model during training (model poisoning attacks) [38]. These threats highlight persistent privacy and model safety risks for users despite the advantages of federated learning.

These limitations of existing methods highlight the need for a more granular framework specifically designed for the complexities of location information. Liu et al. [19] provide such a framework by identifying three key aspects of location privacy: identity, spatial, and temporal. Adopting this multi-faceted view allows for the development of more targeted privacy-enhancing solutions that can better balance data protection with the utility required for specific applications.

Guided by these structured understanding, our work develops a location encoding method (PA) that directly addresses the challenges outlined by Liu et al. [19]’s framework. Instead of applying a uniform privacy mechanism, our approach, which is detailed in Subsection 3.6, is specifically designed to mitigate spatial and temporal privacy risks. By transforming raw coordinates into meaningful categories and analyzing aggregated time-based features, we preserve the essential behavioral signals for our model while enhancing the privacy of the user’s location data.

## 3 Methodology

### 3.1 Dataset

The StudentLife dataset [34] was used for feature mining and insight analysis in this study. This dataset, gathered in 2014, utilized an Android app to consistently track various data streams, including GPS, conversation, activity recognition, etc., alongside monitoring the mental health status, deadlines, etc., of the participants. The dataset comprises information from 48 students over a 10-week academic term at Dartmouth College. In addition, notwithstanding the age of the data, the StudentLife dataset continues to serve as a canonical benchmark in computational behavior recognition [14, 21].

This research specifically focuses on utilizing subsets of the dataset, namely the GPS (recorded in 20-minute intervals) and academic information for analysis and exploration.

In this work, time, longitude, and latitude from the GPS data stream from StudentLife research [34] were utilized as the source for GPS data. Apart from that, we also used 3 sets of StudentLife academic-based data streams, shown below, to enrich the feature set:

- Class stream: contains the classes of each volunteer in the examined semester.
- Class info stream: contains the information of each class: class name, location, and period.
- Deadline stream: contains the deadlines of each day for every volunteer.

Finally, we used the EMA stress response dataset for labeling the stress status of the students. In this dataset, the stress label is collected at 5 levels: a little stressed, definitely stressed, stressed out, feeling good, and feeling great, and labeled from 1 to 5, respectively. However, this label does not show a linear progression between the stress levels and the label. Hence, we employ label transformation, which transforms labels from 1 to 5 to represent feeling great, feeling good, a little stressed, definitely stressed, and stressed out.

Following that, for some days, receive multiple stress reports, the final stress report will be the median of the report values. After that, a binary stress level was employed by assigning a stress level of less than 3 to no stress (0) and stress otherwise (as suggested in [6, 14]). Ultimately, we received 1131 records from the StudentLife dataset.

### 3.2 Location encoding method

The influence of environmental context on human emotional states is well-documented, with studies indicating that exposure to natural environments, such as parks and green spaces, often elicits positive affective responses, while confined or stressful environments, like workplaces, can contribute to heightened stress levels [18, 25]. This phenomenon is attributed, in part, to the activation of the autonomic nervous system in response to perceived environmental cues.

In this research, to quantify the relationship between student location patterns and their potential impact on well-being, our method is designed to transform raw GPS coordinates into semantic features in a privacy-aware, two-step process:

First, raw coordinates are mapped to address types and numbers. The implementation of this step involves a self-hosted reverse-geocoding engine using a pre-downloaded OpenStreetMap (OSM) [26] database. This architecture ensures no identifiable GPS data is transmitted to a third party server. Then the coordinates is being sent to self-hosted server for reverse geocoding. As a result, we collected 103 distinct location types and identities. This location identity, which is used to extract the number of locations visited, is made by concatenating the address number and address type.

Second, these 103 granular location types are classified into key life-related categories. LLMs, which have been shown to be powerful and highly accurate (up to 92%) for recognizing location function [20], offer a valuable capability for this categorization, especially in real-world scenarios where the system encounters previously unseen cases. Our method implements this as a static, pre-defined map (e.g., 'dormitory'  $\rightarrow$  'home'), which runs locally and requires no external API calls, thus enhancing system privacy [5]. To develop this map, we employed the public Gemini 2.5 LLM [30] as a bootstrapping tool, selected for its clear privacy policy. We used the zero-shot prompt: "Please classify *location\_type* into one of the following groups: home, school, shop, workplace, recreation, travel, and others. Respond with only the group name". To validate the LLM's output, we created a ground truth by manually labeling all 103 types. The LLM's classification achieved a 90% zero-shot accuracy against this ground truth, ensuring the reliability and ethical grounding of the static map used in our research.

### 3.3 Feature extraction

From the GPS and academic data, a total of 54 features were extracted in this work. According to the extraction method and behavior insight, the features were divided into 3 groups: Location-based features, Academic-based features, Time-based features

Table 1. The table of the feature types and quantities for each evaluation setting. The STGNN baseline is from Harit et al.'s work [14]. (\*) indicates that no extracted features were used, as the deep learning method performs feature extraction directly from raw data.

Data stream	Feature type	Quantities	AF	PA	STGNN GPS	STGNN All
GPS	Location	Function-based	38	✓	✓	✓
		Address-based	3	✓	✓	✓
		Time-based	2	✓	✓	✓
Class and Deadline	Academic-based	11	✓			✓
Activity, Wifi and Phone log						✓
Number of Features		54	54	40	N/A*	N/A*

**3.3.1 Location-based features.** As the environment plays a pivotal role in human feeling, we then calculate the total time spent and standard deviation by each participant in each location function (see Section 3.2), during defined daytime (6:00 AM to 6:00 PM), nighttime (6:00 PM to 6:00 AM), and only total time spent in the whole day (24 hours) period for location-function-based features. To quantify time spent outside of primary academic and domestic environments, we compute the cumulative time spent in all categories, excluding 'home' and 'school.' To assess the balance between academic and personal life, we calculate the difference between daytime and nighttime durations spent at home and school, as expressed in equation (1):

$$feature\_time_{d\_vs\_n} = feature\_time_d - feature\_time_n \quad (1)$$

where feature represents either 'home' or 'school' and d and n represent day and night, respectively. Ultimately, 38 location-function-based features were extracted.

To quantify mobility patterns, 3 location-address-based features were extracted. Firstly, we collected location address numbers to determine the number of unique locations visited via the total number of different address identities. Furthermore, we defined "repetition" as the number of instances a participant visits the same address identity (e.g., 10 Apartment) within a specified timeframe. Mobility activity repetition metrics will be calculated on both a daily and weekly basis.

**3.3.2 Academic-based features.** Academic stressors, such as demanding class schedules and impending deadlines, are prevalent in student life, often leading to heightened levels of exhaustion and stress. Therefore, this study aims to quantify the relationship between class schedules, attendance patterns, deadline proximity, and student stress.

In this research, we first extracted class schedule data from class information and the class dataset. Attendance rates were then calculated by comparing scheduled class times with time spent in academic locations, as determined by GPS data (refer to Section 3.3.1 for details on location data processing). An attendance rate below 0.7 was defined as an indicator of potential class absenteeism. We then examined instances of potential class absenteeism across five temporal windows - the day of, the day after, two days after, three days after, and seven days after the scheduled class - to assess the temporal impact of absenteeism on student stress.

Furthermore, we extracted deadline information from course syllabi to quantify the proximity of upcoming assignments. We assessed the status of deadlines on the day of data collection and then examined the three days preceding the deadline (three, two, and one day prior) to analyze the escalating impact of deadline proximity on student stress.

**3.3.3 Time-based features.** Time is an omnipresent factor in human life, influencing behavior and thought patterns in profound ways. For example, individuals often experience a sense of anticipation as Friday or holiday weeks approach [29], while feelings of fatigue and resignation can become more pronounced as Monday comes to a close [4]. Recognizing these temporal variations, we have incorporated two key features into our analysis-the "date in week" and the "week index." These features enable us to capture the dynamic role of time in shaping student mental stress behavior across an academic semester. By accounting for both the specific day of the week and the position within the semester, our approach allows for a nuanced understanding of how academic pressures affect mental well-being during periods such as midterms, finals, and weekends.

### 3.4 Classification model

In this study, we employed two ensemble learning models, Random Forest and XGBoost with random search, to predict daily stress levels.

- Random Forest (RF) is a learning model that, according to the Gini impurity factor, combines decision trees, and the decision is based on the Gini coefficient. The result of the RF model is the average of the results from the decision trees within it. It aggregates results from multiple decision trees to create a model with low bias and variance [7]. In this study, base RF was tuned with  $n\_estimators=70$ .
- XGBoost (XGB) is an optimized distributed gradient boosting library designed to be highly efficient, flexible, and portable[10]. It implements machine learning algorithms under the Gradient Boosting framework. XGBoost provides a parallel tree boosting that solves many data science problems in a fast and accurate way. This model was set with  $eta=0.2$  and  $subsample=0.5$ .

### 3.5 Threat modeling

In ubiquitous computing systems, the risk of data being exploited by malicious actors is a primary concern for user privacy. This section presents a simulation to quantify the privacy-preservation guarantees of our encoding strategy against a re-identification attack.

In this work, we define a threat model where an attacker has gained access to the database. The attacker's objective is to re-identify specific users from the supposedly anonymized data. We simulate three scenarios based on the attacker's prior knowledge, corresponding to the amount of data they possess:

- (1) Rich Knowledge: The attacker has a large dataset of known user behavior (80% train, 20% test).
- (2) Moderate Knowledge: The attacker has a balanced dataset (50% train, 50% test).
- (3) Limited Knowledge: The attacker has very little prior data (20% train, 80% test).

To evaluate the risk, we compare the re-identification accuracy across three feature sets:

- (1) Privacy-Aware (PA): Our proposed privacy-enhanced model, which removes the high-risk repetition-based and academic-based features.
- (2) All-Features (AF): The full feature set, which includes the daily and weekly location repetition features identified as a privacy risk.



- (3) Raw GPS Baseline: A set of five simple statistical features (mean, max, min, standard deviation, and inter-quartile range) extracted directly from the volunteers' daily latitude and longitude coordinates.

For each of the three "knowledge" scenarios, we trained an XGBoost classifier to predict the user's ID. The model's accuracy on the test set represents the success rate of the attack. A lower accuracy score indicates a more robust defense against re-identification and, therefore, a stronger privacy guarantee.

### 3.6 Evaluation settings

After feature extraction, two feature sets were examined for students' stress recognition, including PA and AF (see table 8).

These feature sets were evaluated by accuracy (Acc) and F1 score (F1) in three conditions: 75:25 random split, 10-fold cross-validation, and LOSO validation. In each condition, we acknowledge an imbalance between the positive and negative stress classes. Consequently, the data will be balanced via the Edited Nearest Neighbour Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique (SMOTEENN) [16] for a 75:25 random split and 10-fold cross-validation, and Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique (SMOTE) [8] for LOSO validation. In addition, due to some participants having little data, the test person in the LOSO technique must have more than 10 days of data for a fair result in LOSO validation.

## 4 Result and Analysis

### 4.1 Privacy metrics

Table 2. The re-identification attacks accuracy (top 1 accuracy (top 5 accuracy)) in 3 scenario (in percent).

	AF	PA	Raw GPS
<b>Rich Knowledge</b>	41 (68)	25 (52)	73 (92)
<b>Moderate Knowledge</b>	30 (62)	22 (46)	69 (89)
<b>Limited Knowledge</b>	19 (43)	15 (38)	57 (82)

**4.1.1 Re-identification Attack Accuracy.** The re-identification simulation attack demonstrates the significant privacy-preserving capabilities inherent in our proposed encoding techniques. Both of our methods, PA and AF, yield substantially lower re-identification accuracy metrics when contrasted with the unprotected Raw GPS feature baseline. The efficacy of this mitigation is particularly pronounced in our PA approach.

Examining the Top-1 accuracy (as detailed in Table 2), the PA method consistently reduces the re-identification success rate to approximately one-half to one-third of that achieved using Raw GPS data. This stark decrease provides compelling evidence for the method's ability to thwart such re-identification attempts.

A similar and equally important trend is observed when analyzing the Top-5 re-identification accuracy. The PA model not only demonstrates a substantial accuracy reduction compared to the Raw GPS baseline (e.g., 38% vs. 82% in the Limited Knowledge) but also consistently outperforms the AF method, offering a further 5-8% absolute reduction in accuracy. This highlights its superior capability in obfuscating user identity even when the attacker broadens their search criteria.

This privacy-enhancing effect is further visualized in the top-k accuracy plot, presented in Figure 2. This figure illustrates the number of candidates ( $k$ ) an attacker must consider to achieve a given re-identification accuracy. For an attacker using the Raw GPS data, moderate (80%+) and high (90%+) re-identification accuracy can be achieved with a






Fig. 2. The top-k-accuracy of the re-identification attack in the *Limited Knowledge* scenario. The Raw GPS line (green) reaches high accuracy at a low  $k$ , while our PA (orange) and AF (blue) methods require a significantly larger  $k$  to achieve similar accuracy.

very small candidate set of  $k \approx 5$  and  $k \approx 10$ , respectively. This indicates a severe privacy leak, as an individual can be easily isolated.

In stark contrast, our proposed methods fundamentally alter this dynamic. To achieve the same 80% accuracy threshold, our approaches require the attacker to expand their search to  $k \approx 25$ . To reach 90% accuracy, this figure increases to  $k \approx 35$ . This effectively means our encoding techniques make the re-identification task 3.5 to 5 times more difficult, significantly increasing the ambiguity and computational burden for any adversary. By forcing the attacker to consider a much larger anonymity set, our methods provide a robust and practical defense against re-identification.

**4.1.2 Mutual Information.** The Table 3 represent the Mutual Information about the features and the volunteer identity. Overall the PA model has eliminate the strongest feature, *class\_schedule*, which has the highest MI value. This indicates that the PA model successfully removes the feature most correlated with user identity, thereby enhancing privacy. Furthermore, another high-MI feature, *number\_of\_location\_visited*, is also excluded from the PA set.

This analysis highlights the core privacy-utility trade-off. The PA model retains eight of the top ten MI features, including various metrics for ‘home\_time’ and ‘school\_time’. These features, while still containing some identity-related

Table 3. The table of top 10 Mutual Information value between the Feature and the volunteer identity.

Feature	Mutual Information	AF	PA
class_schedule	0.695339	✓	
home_time	0.357262	✓	✓
home_time_noon	0.325728	✓	✓
home_time_day_vs_night	0.319390	✓	✓
school_time_day_vs_night	0.298065	✓	✓
School_and_home_off_time	0.281064	✓	✓
home_time_daytime	0.264064	✓	✓
school_time_noon	0.262472	✓	✓
number_of_location_visited	0.252563	✓	
recreational_activities_time	0.245008	✓	✓

information (MI values from 0.245 to 0.357), are more general and less unique than a specific schedule. By keeping these moderately-correlated features, the model preserves its predictive utility for the stress recognition task while significantly enhancing user privacy by removing the most egregious identifying features.

#### 4.2 Random splitting

Table 4. The table of classification performance comparison in the random splitting method to the baseline (in %).

Model	Baseline			PA		AF	
	STGNN GPS	LSTM	STGNN All	XGB	RF	RF	XGB
<b>Acc</b>	61	56	<b>67</b>	65	<b>67</b>	<b>68</b>	65
<b>F1</b>	58	54	<b>65</b>	62	<b>64</b>	<b>65</b>	60

Table 4 summarizes the classification performance of our proposed frameworks, PA and AF, against the key baseline models.

A critical observation is that our proposed approaches, when paired with appropriate classifiers, consistently outperform the standard Deep Learning, LSTM and STGNN GPS [14], baselines. The STGNN GPS baseline achieves an F1-score of 58%, while the LSTM model performs at 54%. In significant contrast, all variants of our PA and AF models exhibited superior F1-scores, demonstrating their effectiveness.

The AF\_RF model achieves the highest overall performance in the evaluation, with a peak accuracy of 68% and a top-tier F1-score of 65%. This result is particularly noteworthy as it not only surpasses the specialized STGNN GPS model but also matches or even exceeds the performance of the STGNN All baseline (67% Acc, 65% F1), which has the advantage of using all available features without any privacy considerations.

Furthermore, our PA\_RF model, which we identify as the optimal configuration for balancing utility with the privacy-preservation goals demonstrated earlier, attains a highly compelling performance. It achieves an accuracy of 67% and an F1-score of 64%. This reflects a substantial 6% absolute enhancement in F1-score (64% vs. 58%) and in accuracy (67% vs. 61%) relative to the STGNN GPS baseline [14]. The improvement is even more pronounced when compared to the LSTM baseline, showing a 10% absolute lead in F1-score (64% vs. 54%).

Crucially, the utility of our privacy-aware PA\_RF model (67% Acc, 64% F1) is statistically on par with the non-private, feature-rich STGNN All baseline (67% Acc, 65% F1). This outcome strongly validates our approach, proving that our

method can successfully mitigate re-identification risks while simultaneously preserving a high degree of data utility necessary for complex downstream classification tasks.

When comparing the AF and PA settings (refer to Table 4), there is a minimal trade-off in performance. Specifically, the AF model using RF (AF\_RF) achieved an F1-score of 65%, which is just 1% better than the PA setting with RF.

### 4.3 KFold cross validation

Table 5. The table of classification performance in the KFold cross-validation method (in %)

Model	PA		AF	
	RF	XGB	RF	XGB
<b>Acc</b>	56±5	55±6	57±3	59±7
<b>F1</b>	63±9	61±13	64±7	65±10

Table 5 presents a comparative analysis of classification performance for our distinct models, evaluated using a robust cross-validation methodology to ensure the generalizability of our findings. The data indicate a consistent and comparable level of performance across the primary model configurations (PA RF, PA XGB, AF RF, and AF XGB) when assessed using this technique. The performance metrics across these four implementations demonstrate a notable degree of homogeneity, suggesting that the choice between the PA and AF frameworks, when paired with either Random Forest or XGBoost classifiers, does not result in dramatic performance disparities.

Specifically, the mean accuracy for these four models spans a narrow range from approximately 55% to 59%. Conversely to the random splitting scenario discussed previously, the AF XGB model exhibits a marginally elevated mean accuracy, peaking at 59%. However, this result is accompanied by a relatively high standard deviation of  $\pm 7\%$ . The extensive overlap of the standard deviation intervals across all four models—for instance,  $59\pm 7\%$  for AF XGB and  $55\pm 6\%$  for PA XGB—strongly suggests the absence of any statistically significant differences in their mean accuracy. It is also worth noting that the AF RF model, at  $57\pm 3\%$ , displays the lowest variance, indicating highly stable performance across the validation folds.

Similarly, the F1 scores, which are generally positioned in the range of 61% to 65% for the main configurations, reveal a comparable trend. Although the AF XGB model again demonstrates a slightly higher mean F1 score at 65%, it also possesses a wide standard deviation of  $\pm 10\%$ . This high variability is also observed in the PA XGB model ( $61\pm 13\%$ ). The overlapping standard deviations across all four primary models, such as AF RF ( $64\pm 7\%$ ) and PA RF ( $63\pm 9\%$ ), are once again indicative of statistically indistinguishable F1 performance among them.

Therefore, the cross-validation results confirm the robustness of both the PA and AF approaches when coupled with suitable machine learning classifiers, showing that they all converge to a similar, stable performance level under rigorous evaluation.

### 4.4 Leave-one-subject-out (LOSO)

Table 6 presents a comprehensive comparison of the classification performance for our proposed models, evaluated using the highly rigorous Leave-One-Subject-Out (LOSO) cross-validation method. This validation paradigm represents a stringent test of a model's ability to generalize, as it must make predictions for an entirely unseen subject after being trained on all other subjects. The data from this evaluation emphatically show a comparable level of performance across the four main classifier configurations (PA RF, PA XGB, AF RF, and AF XGB).

Table 6. The table of classification performance in LOSO cross-validation method (in %)

Model	PA		AF	
	RF	XGB	RF	XGB
<b>Acc</b>	62±14	61±18	62±15	60±14
<b>F1</b>	70±16	70±15	71±15	69±16

This consistency is a critical finding, as it underscores the robustness of our feature-encoding and classification strategy. The fact that the models perform consistently even when subjected to this challenging validation scheme suggests that they are learning generalizable patterns from the data rather than overfitting to subject-specific biases or idiosyncrasies. This significantly enhances our confidence in the broader applicability and real-world utility of the findings.

Specifically examining the accuracy metric, all four primary models exhibit remarkably similar mean performance, with values tightly clustered in the 60% to 62% range (62% for PA RF, 61% for PA XGB, 62% for AF RF, and 60% for AF XGB). Despite these slight numerical variations in the mean values, the associated standard deviations are substantial, spanning approximately  $\pm 14\%$  to  $\pm 18\%$ . This high variance is characteristic of LOSO validation, where performance can fluctuate depending on the specific subject left out. The extensive overlap in these standard deviation ranges definitively indicates a lack of any statistically significant differences in accuracy across these four models.

This pattern of homogeneity is further reinforced when analyzing the F1 scores. Here, the models again show strong, consistent results, with mean scores residing in a narrow band around 70% (70% for PA RF, 70% for PA XGB, 71% for AF RF, and 69% for AF XGB). As with accuracy, the associated standard deviations are large (around  $\pm 15\%$  to  $\pm 16\%$ ), confirming that these minor differences in mean F1 scores are not statistically meaningful.

#### 4.5 Feature Analysis

Table 7. The table of top-10 significant feature by F-test p\_values and its r-value

Features	p-value	r-value
Week	2.8e-7	0.15
2_days_after_skip_class	7.6e-5	0.12
working_time	1.8e-3	-0.09
travel_time	2.8e-3	0.09
deadline	5.0e-3	0.08
recreational_activities_time	5.0e-3	-0.08
1_day_to_DL	6.6e-3	0.08
number_of_location_visited	2.2e-2	-0.07
3_day_to_DL	3.8e-2	0.06
week_date	3.9e-2	-0.06

The substantial correlation of the proposed features is demonstrated in Table 7, as quantified by the significant p-values from the F-test and the r-values associated with the top 10 features. Crucially, travel time and recreational activity duration – features identified as pertinent in Section 2 – are effectively filtered by DBSCAN, highlighting their robust relationship to stress status. Analysis reveals that working time, potentially offering opportunities for social interaction and respite from academic demands, is positively linked to enhanced mental well-being. Similarly, participation in recreational activities shows a beneficial effect on student mental health. However, and somewhat counterintuitively,




Fig. 3. The SHAP beeswarm summary visualization for the stressed classification outcome in RF in AF scenario.

travel time is associated with heightened stress levels, rather than improved well-being. We hypothesize that chronic travel may induce fatigue [23], consequently detracting from volunteers' mental well-being.

Moreover, the 'deadlines' feature powerfully illustrates a direct and escalating effect of perceived stress as deadlines approach. This insightful observation offers valuable implications for pedagogical practice, suggesting that educators could strategically manage deadline scheduling to mitigate student stress and promote more effective engagement with upcoming academic tasks.

To further validate feature importance and model interpretability, we employed Explainable AI (XAI) techniques. The XAI analysis robustly confirms the relevance of our feature selection, showing that six out of ten features deemed most important by our model align with the top ten statistically significant features overall (see Figure 3). Furthermore, the XAI analysis effectively visualizes the discriminative nature of these key features, illustrating how high and low feature values distinctly correlate with varying stress levels. Recreational activity serves as a compelling example, demonstrating a clear separation between high and low data values (represented by red and blue in Figure 3) and its corresponding influence on stress status, suggesting the method's potential for privacy-aware stress assessment.

Nonetheless, although time spent at home did not rank among the top 10 significant features by the F-test, it was notably emphasized by the XAI analysis. Detailed examination revealed that a high standard deviation in home time—a proxy for frequent transitions between home and other locations—is strongly associated with increased stress levels. This variability likely reflects a pattern of recurrent out-of-home activities that may incur additional time and energy expenditure, ultimately contributing to fatigue and a buildup of negative affect. Such findings underscore that irregular residential time patterns can serve as an informative complementary marker in privacy-aware stress assessment.

## 5 Discussion

A key contribution of this research is the introduction of a novel GPS encoding and LLM-assisted feature extraction pipeline, designed to enhance stress recognition while being capable of mitigating re-identification attacks. This approach significantly improves upon existing methods, outperforming the GPS only state-of-the-art [14] by 6% in F1 score and accuracy. Critically, our study also proposes a pathway for leveraging location characteristics to advance stress recognition research in a privacy-conscious manner. By focusing on inherent location-based features, this work paves the way for future studies that prioritize user privacy and the generalizability aspect in mental well-being detection.

### 5.1 Behavioral Insights on Stress Patterns




Fig. 4. The line plot of recreational activity time (in seconds) of stress and non-stress students by week. Stressed student is represented by level 1 and non-stressed otherwise.

Our visualization reveals that the happy student spends more time on recreation tasks in comparison with their counterparts. Particularly, the non-stressed individuals often go out for 2 hours for recreation, which is 50% more than those who suffer from stress (see Figure 4). Additionally, the one feeling happy is spending more time on recreation before the test week (weeks 18 and 22). This finding aligns with XAI feature analysis (Figure 3) where it shows that higher recreation time correlated with mental well-being. This pattern suggests that spending time out of the home for recreation may serve as a proactive strategy to improve mental health and alleviate the stress associated with upcoming exams.




Fig. 5. The line plot of workplace time (in seconds) of stress and non-stress students by week. Stressed student is represented by level 1 and non-stressed otherwise.

More importantly, figure 5 shows that stressed students were rarely observed at the workplace, whereas their happier counterparts consistently spent about one hour there during a typical study week. We hypothesize that the workplace may serve as more than just a professional setting—it could also function as a social hub where individuals have greater opportunities to interact and form meaningful connections. These interactions likely facilitate the sharing of emotions and the development of empathy, which in turn can contribute to improved mood and overall well-being. The positive social dynamics observed in the workplace may act as a buffer against stress, promoting both emotional expression and mutual support among students. This observation opens intriguing avenues for future research. Specifically, further studies could employ both qualitative and quantitative methods to explore how social interactions in work settings influence stress levels, emotional regulation, and mental health outcomes within academic environments.

## 5.2 Social Impact

Rising academic and professional pressures in the modern world are leading to an increase in mental health challenges, reflecting a worldwide issue where stress negatively impacts both individual well-being and overall productivity. Our work can be applied to address this by allowing users to identify early indicators of mental distress. This would empower students to understand more about themselves. In addition, such a tool will allow educators to intervene effectively and provide crucial assistance to students who are struggling.



For students experiencing stress, our application can provide deeper insights into the specific causes of their difficulties. A student may, for example, be struggling to balance work, studies, and their personal life. By leveraging the invaluable transparency machine learning algorithm provides, the student can better understand which factors might be contributing to the issue.

For educators, we advocate for using this information to foster support among students. For example, administrators could use insights into student stress levels to organize timely and helpful activities, such as workshops or social events where students can de-stress and share their experiences. This approach uses the data to build a supportive community and relieve pressure, fulfilling the technology's intended purpose.

By contrast to this potential, there is a significant risk if the application. A university administration, for instance, could misapply stress-level data in a punitive manner, such as flagging students as "at-risk." This could trigger a cycle of mandatory, and potentially unwelcome, meetings that could paradoxically increase the very stress the system was designed to detect.

### 5.3 Limitation

Due to the scarcity of open-source datasets containing raw GPS trajectories required for our baseline comparison, the StudentLife dataset [34], which was collected in 2014, was chosen as a benchmark dataset. Although this dataset is a foundational benchmark for mobile sensing research, the intervening decade has seen some shifts in student behavior, technology integration, and lifestyle patterns. Consequently, while our findings on the privacy-utility trade-off are methodologically robust, the specific behavioral insights-such as the correlations between stress and time spent at work or recreation-may be temporally bound and not fully representative of current student experiences.

In addition, although our most accurate model demonstrates strong stress recognition capabilities, its reliance on repetition-based features introduces a significant privacy risk. The exposure of these features could allow an adversary to re-identify a student by correlating their frequent visits to specific types of locations, making it possible to infer their personal schedule even without access to raw GPS coordinates.

For instance, an attacker who knows "Student X" has a unique weekly schedule-such as a part-time job at a campus office and regular volunteering-could analyze features that count daily and weekly location repetitions. This pattern creates a unique digital fingerprint, allowing the attacker to successfully re-identify Student X and compromise their privacy.

To address this vulnerability, we introduced a privacy-aware (PA) model that effectively limits re-identification by completely removing these vulnerable features. In the "Student X" example, the PA model discards the features that track visit frequency. An attacker would now only see the total duration Student X spent in the "workplace" and "recreation" categories over the week.

This aggregated data is far less unique, as many other students might spend a similar amount of time in these categories, but with different, irregular patterns. Without the frequency data, Student X's unique schedule becomes indistinguishable from the general behavior of other participants, thus preserving their anonymity.

While this enhancement comes with a slight trade-off-a 1% decrease in both accuracy and F1-score in random sampling scenarios, there are zero statistically significant trade-off for KFold and LOSO. Furthermore, our method also offers a robust and viable alternative for stronger privacy protection (see Figure 2 and Table 2).

Another limitation of our approach lies in the classification of location types. Given the inherently ambiguous function of many locations, our single-label classification poses a potential challenge. For example, a single coffee shop

could be a venue for recreation, a remote workplace, or simply a place for dining. This multifunctional characteristic means our system may not capture the user's true context.

While this work provides a complete algorithmic framework for privacy-aware stress recognition from data-at-rest, we have also identified the critical path to solving end-to-end privacy. Future work should aim for a more precise grouping of location functions by aligning both the location type and temporal patterns. A more in-depth analysis could, for instance, use the time of day or day of the week to infer whether a visit to a location is for work-related activities or leisure. More importantly, future studies should also explore deeper in on-device LLM, such as Llama or Qwen, to further enhance users' privacy, location encoding accuracy, and edge-case handling.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we present an approach to enhance privacy and compares the performance of stress recognition between the proposed and the traditional method. Our methodology incorporates a GPS encoding strategy, which transforms GPS coordinates into more private location features, thereby ensuring individual privacy. Additionally, we leverage the capabilities of Gemini 2.5, a Large Language Model (LLM), to categorize these location features into meaningful categories of home, school, recreational activity, shopping, working, travel, and others, which are crucial for assessing students' daily stress status.

Our experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach, achieving a 64% F1 score and 67% accuracy for the PA setting for the stress level prediction task while decrease top 1 re-identification accuracy by 5 to 20% to AF scenario. In addition, the LOSO scenarios demonstrate the robust generalizability of this approach. On entirely unseen subjects, our Privacy-Aware (PA) model achieved an F1-score of 70%, a performance statistically indistinguishable from the substantially less private AF model (71% F1). This not only underscores the potential of GPS data in stress recognition but also highlights the importance of the comprehensive utilization of limited data sources and users' privacy.

## Acknowledgments

We acknowledge Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology (HCMUT), VNU-HCM, for supporting this study.

## References

- [1] Saeed Abdullah and Tanzeem Choudhury. 2018. Sensing technologies for monitoring serious mental illnesses. *IEEE MultiMedia* 25, 1 (2018), 61–75.
- [2] Yasin Acikmese and S Emre Alptekin. 2019. Prediction of stress levels with LSTM and passive mobile sensors. *Procedia Computer Science* 159 (2019), 658–667.
- [3] American Psychiatric Association. 2018. "Stress: statistics". <https://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/explore-mental-health/statistics/stress-statistics>. Accessed: 2025-03-08.
- [4] Charles S Areni and Mitchell Burger. 2008. Memories of "bad" days are more biased than memories of "good" days: Past Saturdays vary, but past Mondays are always blue. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 38, 6 (2008), 1395–1415.
- [5] Raiyan Abdul Baten, Yozen Liu, Heinrich Peters, Francesco Barbieri, Neil Shah, Leonardo Neves, and Maarten W Bos. 2023. Predicting future location categories of users in a large social platform. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, Vol. 17. 47–58.
- [6] Irene Bonafonte, Cristina Bustos, Abraham Larrazolo, Gilberto Lorenzo Martinez Luna, Adolfo Guzmán Arenas, Xavier Baró, Isaac Tourgeman, Mercedes Balcells, and Agata Lapedriza. 2023. Analyzing the contribution of different passively collected data to predict Stress and Depression. In *2023 11th International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction Workshops and Demos (ACIIW)*. IEEE, 1–4.
- [7] Leo Breiman. 2001. Random forests. *Machine learning* 45, 1 (2001), 5–32.
- [8] Nitesh V. Chawla, Kevin W. Bowyer, Lawrence O. Hall, and W. Philip Kegelmeyer. 2002. SMOTE: synthetic minority over-sampling technique. *J. Artif. Int. Res.* 16, 1 (June 2002), 321–357.
- [9] Jiawei Chen, Janusz Konrad, and Prakash Ishwar. 2018. Vgan-based image representation learning for privacy-preserving facial expression recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*. 1570–1579.

- [10] Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '16)*. ACM, 785–794. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939785>
- [11] Alex W DaSilva, Jeremy F Huckins, Rui Wang, Weichen Wang, Dylan D Wagner, and Andrew T Campbell. 2019. sch. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth* 7, 3 (2019), e12084.
- [12] Martin Ester, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Jörg Sander, and Xiaowei Xu. 1996. A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (Portland, Oregon) (KDD '96)*. AAAI Press, 226–231.
- [13] Jonas Geiping, Hartmut Bauermeister, Hannah Dröge, and Michael Moeller. 2020. Inverting gradients-how easy is it to break privacy in federated learning? *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 16937–16947.
- [14] Anoushka Harit, Zhongtian Sun, Jongmin Yu, and Noura Al Moubayed. 2024. Monitoring Behavioral Changes Using Spatiotemporal Graphs: A Case Study on the StudentLife Dataset. In *NeurIPS 2024 Workshop on Behavioral Machine Learning*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=WyAKFNSYl2>
- [15] Samiul Hasan, Xianyan Zhan, and Satish V Ukkusuri. 2013. Understanding urban human activity and mobility patterns using large-scale location-based data from online social media. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM SIGKDD international workshop on urban computing*. 1–8.
- [16] Nutthaporn Junsomboon and Tanasanee Phienthrakul. 2017. Combining Over-Sampling and Under-Sampling Techniques for Imbalance Dataset. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Machine Learning and Computing (Singapore, Singapore) (ICMLC '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 243–247. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3055635.3056643>
- [17] Lin Sze Khoo, Mei Kuan Lim, Chun Yong Chong, and Roisin McNaney. 2024. Machine learning for multimodal mental health detection: a systematic review of passive sensing approaches. *Sensors* 24, 2 (2024), 348.
- [18] Mika Koivisto and Simone Grassini. 2023. Mental imagery of nature induces positive psychological effects. *Current Psychology* 42, 34 (2023), 30348–30363.
- [19] Bo Liu, Wanlei Zhou, Tianqing Zhu, Longxiang Gao, and Yong Xiang. 2018. Location privacy and its applications: A systematic study. *IEEE access* 6 (2018), 17606–17624.
- [20] Yifan Liu, Chenchen Kuai, Xishun Liao, Haoxuan Ma, Brian Yueshuai He, and Jiaqi Ma. 2024. Semantic trajectory data mining with llm-informed poi classification. In *2024 IEEE 27th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*. IEEE, 207–213.
- [21] Yunfei Luo, Iman Deznabi, Abhinav Shaw, Natcha Simsiri, Tauhidur Rahman, and Madalina Fiterau. 2024. Dynamic clustering via branched deep learning enhances personalization of stress prediction from mobile sensor data. *Scientific Reports* 14, 1 (2024), 6631.
- [22] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [23] Eric A Morris and Erick Guerra. 2015. Are we there yet? Trip duration and mood during travel. *Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behaviour* 33 (2015), 38–47.
- [24] Subigya Nepal, Wenjun Liu, Arvind Pillai, Weichen Wang, Vlado Vojdanovski, Jeremy F. Huckins, Courtney Rogers, Meghan L. Meyer, and Andrew T. Campbell. 2024. Capturing the College Experience: A Four-Year Mobile Sensing Study of Mental Health, Resilience and Behavior of College Students during the Pandemic. *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.* 8, 1, Article 38 (March 2024), 37 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3643501>
- [25] Agnieszka Olszewska-Guizzo, Angelia Sia, Anna Fogel, and Roger Ho. 2022. Features of urban green spaces associated with positive emotions, mindfulness and relaxation. *Scientific reports* 12, 1 (2022), 20695.
- [26] OpenStreetMap contributors. 2017. Planet dump retrieved from <https://planet.osm.org>. <https://www.openstreetmap.org>.
- [27] Katarzyna Siła-Nowicka, Jan Vandrol, Taylor Oshan, Jed A Long, Urška Demšar, and A Stewart Fotheringham. 2016. Analysis of human mobility patterns from GPS trajectories and contextual information. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science* 30, 5 (2016), 881–906.
- [28] Samuel Sousa and Roman Kern. 2023. How to keep text private? A systematic review of deep learning methods for privacy-preserving natural language processing. *Artificial Intelligence Review* 56, 2 (2023), 1427–1492.
- [29] Arthur A Stone, Stefan Schneider, and James K Harter. 2012. Day-of-week mood patterns in the United States: On the existence of ‘Blue Monday’, ‘Thank God it’s Friday’ and weekend effects. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 7, 4 (2012), 306–314.
- [30] Gemini Team. 2024. Gemini: A Family of Highly Capable Multimodal Models. arXiv:2312.11805 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11805>
- [31] The American Institute of Stress. 2018. “Workplace Stress”. <https://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/explore-mental-health/statistics/stress-statistics>. Accessed: 2025-03-08.
- [32] transformingeducation.org. 2024. Student Stress Statistics [2024 Update]. <https://transformingeducation.org/student-stress-statistics/> Accessed: 2025-03-08.
- [33] Julio Vega, Meng Li, Kwesi Aguilera, Nikunj Goel, Echhit Joshi, Kirtiraj Khandekar, Krina C Durica, Abhineeth R Kunta, and Carissa A Low. 2021. Reproducible analysis pipeline for data streams: open-source software to process data collected with mobile devices. *Frontiers in digital health* 3 (2021), 769823.
- [34] Rui Wang, Fanglin Chen, Zhenyu Chen, Tianxing Li, Gabriella Harari, Stefanie Tignor, Xia Zhou, Dror Ben-Zeev, and Andrew T. Campbell. 2014. StudentLife: assessing mental health, academic performance and behavioral trends of college students using smartphones. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (Seattle, Washington) (UbiComp '14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2632048.2632054>
- [35] Weichen Wang, Subigya Nepal, Jeremy F. Huckins, Lessley Hernandez, Vlado Vojdanovski, Dante Mack, Jane Plomp, Arvind Pillai, Mikio Obuchi, Alex daSilva, Elis Murphy, Elin Hedlund, Courtney Rogers, Meghan Meyer, and Andrew Campbell. 2022. First-Gen Lens: Assessing Mental Health

- of First-Generation Students across Their First Year at College Using Mobile Sensing. *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.* 6, 2, Article 95 (July 2022), 32 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3543194>
- [36] Yonghui Xiao and Li Xiong. 2015. Protecting locations with differential privacy under temporal correlations. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 1298–1309.
- [37] Xuhai Xu, Xin Liu, Han Zhang, Weichen Wang, Subigya Nepal, Yasaman Sefidgar, Woosuk Seo, Kevin S. Kuehn, Jeremy F. Huckins, Margaret E. Morris, Paula S. Nurius, Eve A. Riskin, Shwetak Patel, Tim Althoff, Andrew Campbell, Anind K. Dey, and Jennifer Mankoff. 2023. GLOBEM: Cross-Dataset Generalization of Longitudinal Human Behavior Modeling. *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.* 6, 4, Article 190 (Jan. 2023), 34 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3569485>
- [38] Abbas Yazdinejad, Ali Dehghantanha, Hadis Karimipour, Gautam Srivastava, and Reza M Parizi. 2024. A robust privacy-preserving federated learning model against model poisoning attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 19 (2024), 6693–6708.
- [39] Ling Yin, Qian Wang, Shih-Lung Shaw, Zhixiang Fang, Jinxiang Hu, Ye Tao, and Wei Wang. 2015. Re-identification risk versus data utility for aggregated mobility research using mobile phone location data. *PloS one* 10, 10 (2015), e0140589.
- [40] Ligeng Zhu, Zhijian Liu, and Song Han. 2019. Deep leakage from gradients. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).

## A Ablation studies

### A.1 Ablation Study Experiments

To isolate the predictive power of different feature groups, we designed an ablation study. In addition to the full PA (Privacy-Aware) and AF (All-Features) models, we evaluated three configurations using reduced feature sets:

- Location-Function Only (LF): A model trained using only the GPS-derived location-function features (e.g., time at home, time at school).
- Academic-Only (AO): A model trained using only the academic-based features (e.g., deadlines, class attendance).
- LF + AO (LFAO): A combined model using both the Location-Function and Academic-Only features. This configuration effectively represents the PA model without its time-based features.

Table 8. The extended table of feature type and quantities in each evaluation setting.

Data stream	Feature type	Quantities	AF	PA	LF	AO	LFAO
GPS	Location	Function-based	38	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Address-based	3	✓			
		Time-based	2	✓	✓		
Class and Deadline	Academic-based	11	✓			✓	✓
	Number of Features	54	54	40	38	11	49

### A.2 Ablation Study Results

**A.2.1 Re-identification Attack Accuracy.** Figure 6 illustrates the comprehensive view on re-identification attack on multiple set of features. The Raw GPS baseline is clearly the most vulnerable, achieving 90% re-identification accuracy with a small candidate pool of only  $k \approx 10$ .

Our proposed PA model provides the strongest privacy guarantees, requiring an attacker to amass a significantly larger candidate pool of  $k \approx 38$  to reach the same 90% accuracy.

The AF model is visibly part of a tight cluster of semantic feature sets, alongside LFAO, LF, and AO. This cluster, while offering a substantial privacy improvement over Raw GPS, is demonstrably more vulnerable to re-identification than the PA model. This, therefore, quantifies the specific privacy risk associated with the high-utility AF model, reinforcing the trade-off that our PA model is designed to solve.




Fig. 6. The extended re-identification attacks accuracy (top 1 accuracy (top 5 accuracy)) in 3 scenario (in percent).

**A.2.2 Stress recognition Accuracy.** The performance of these ablated models was evaluated using the random-splitting method. Table 9 compares their accuracy and F1 scores against our primary models and the STGNN GPS baseline.

Table 9. The extended table of classification performance comparison in the random splitting method to the STGNN GPS baseline (in %). The figure reported was from the best model result from XGB and RF.

Model	STGNN GPS	PA	AF	LF	AO	LFAO
Acc	61	67	68	64	53	64
F1	58	64	65	60	52	60

The results of the ablation study, presented in Table 9, reveal the distinct contributions of each feature group. The AO (Academic-Only) model, relying solely on academic information, achieved the lowest performance (F1 52%). This indicates that while academic context is a contributing factor, it is insufficient on its own for robust stress recognition. In contrast, the LF (Location-Function) model, which uses only our proposed GPS-derived features, achieved an F1 score of 60%. This finding is particularly significant, as it demonstrates that our semantic GPS encoding method by itself outperforms the STGNN GPS baseline (F1 58%), proving its strong standalone predictive power.

The study also highlights a powerful synergistic effect between feature sets. Interestingly, combining location and academic features in the LFAO model (F1 60%) offered no additional benefit over the LF model alone, suggesting the predictive signals from academic features may be largely captured by the location-function data. The most critical insight, however, is the performance jump from the LFAO model (F1 60%) to our full PA model (F1 64%). This 4-point increase is attributed entirely to the inclusion of time-based features. This strongly suggests that temporal context (such as the day of the week) is a crucial component, providing a lens that significantly enhances the model's ability to interpret behavioral and academic patterns for stress recognition.

## **B Location-encoding result**

Table 10 presents a comparison between the location types categorized by the Large Language Model (LLM) and those assigned by human labelers. Overall, the LLM classified location types with high accuracy (94/103). A strong correlation was observed between the human labels and the LLM's categories, particularly for the 'Home', 'School', and 'Others' groups. However, the LLM struggled to label recreational places, failing to correctly identify 4 out of 15 locations in this category.

Table 10. The LLM categorize location type and human labeling. The label in **bold** is the different between human and LLM categorization

Category	LLM	Human label
<b>Home</b>	dormitory, house, apartments, residential	dormitory, house, apartments, residential
<b>School</b>	university, library, primary, educational_institution, school, tertiary, college, secondary	university, library, primary, educational_institution, school, tertiary, college, secondary
<b>Travel</b>	bicycle_parking, parking, bus_stop, parking_space, cycleway, railway_station, aerodrome, terminal, track, apron	bicycle_parking, parking, bus_stop, parking_space, cycleway, railway_station, aerodrome, terminal, track, apron, <b>bridge</b>
<b>Shop</b>	retail, florist, supermarket, restaurant, cafe, clothes, bakery, gift, bank, bar, computer, books, jewelry, convenience, electronics, wholesale	retail, florist, supermarket, restaurant, cafe, clothes, bakery, gift, bank, bar, computer, books, jewelry, convenience, electronics, wholesale, <b>fast food</b>
<b>Work</b>	office, estate_agent, post_office, hairdresser, dentist, interior_decoration, insurance, telecommunication, chemist, veterinary, beauty, car_repair, audiologist, construction, townhall	office, estate_agent, post_office, hairdresser, interior_decoration, insurance, telecommunication, chemist, veterinary, beauty, car_repair, audiologist, construction, townhall, <b>industrial, clinic</b>
<b>Recreation</b>	sports_centre, bench, artwork, arts_centre, pitch, museum, outdoor_seating, grandstand, golf_course, theatre, pub	sports_centre, bench, artwork, arts_centre, pitch, museum, outdoor_seating, grandstand, golf_course, theatre, pub, <b>hotel, picnic_table, commercial, courtyard</b>
<b>Others</b>	yes, service, place_of_worship, courtyard, hotel, post_box, social_centre, terrace, vacant, commercial, flagpole, pedestrian, fuel, picnic_table, unclassified, recycling, pottery, tower, industrial, district, association, social_facility, fast_food, footway, phone, church, public_bookcase, toilets, fire_alarm_box, clinic, manhole, bridge, information, shelter, detached, shed, tree	yes, service, place_of_worship, post_box, social_centre, terrace, vacant, flagpole, pedestrian, fuel, unclassified, recycling, pottery, district, association, social_facility, footway, phone, church, public_bookcase, toilets, fire_alarm_box, manhole, information, shelter, detached, shed, tree, tower, <b>dentist</b>