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ANNOUNCEMENTS

As of April 4, 2024, Surdex, surdex.com, has officially joined Bowman. Bowman is a leading national professional services firm offering multi-disciplinary engineering, planning, surveying, geomatics, construction management, environmental consulting, landscape architecture, and right-of-way acquisition. This change provides a strong foundation for our firms to merge our comprehensive skillsets while offering the same level of commitment to deliver outstanding project results, build long-lasting relationships and leverage the growth of our organization to serve the ever-changing needs of our clients.

“The acquisition of Surdex will align well with our strategic objectives of expanding our geospatial service offerings, growing our public sector market presence, and increasing the average size of our acquisitions,” said Gary Bowman, chairman and CEO of Bowman. “Surdex’s portfolio of high-resolution image capture, orthoimage processing, and digital mapping services provides tremendous revenue synergy opportunities with our customers. Adding state-of-the-art, high-altitude services to Bowman’s extensive array of terrestrial and low-altitude capabilities will create a compelling suite of full-service geospatial solutions. From the outset, the Surdex operation will realize savings by utilizing Bowman’s current survey resources and Bowman will experience cost savings by accessing Surdex’s high-volume image processing resources. We believe this acquisition will be transformational for our geospatial business and look forward to quickly integrating our teams and capabilities.”

“Bowman’s size and access to the broader engineering services market is what attracted us to this transaction,” said Ron Hoffmann, president of Surdex. “We have been a family business for almost 70 years and because of that, we were very selective about who we would entrust with this transition. Over the past several months, we have become extremely confident in our conclusion that partnering with Bowman is the right decision for our business, our employees, and our customers.”

Industry leaders in the architecture, engineering, and construction (AEC) sectors are increasingly relying on the interoperability of geographic information systems (GIS) and building information modeling (BIM) to reduce costs and boost efficiency across construction projects. In support of AEC organizations, Esri, www.esri.com, and Autodesk, are expanding their strategic alliance.

“Esri is proud to bring this new integration to Autodesk users, empowering them with enhanced visibility of existing conditions for better-informed design decisions that reduce environmental impacts,” said Kathleen Kewley, Esri director for AEC global business development.

The integration of ArcGIS Basemaps with Civil 3D and AutoCAD provides AEC professionals with detailed geospatial data and mapping capabilities. The new integrations further unify GIS and BIM, delivering real business value to architects, engineers, planners, and contractors.

“Unleashing the power of ArcGIS Basemaps in Civil 3D and AutoCAD provides users with an unparalleled geograph-
to the growth opportunities available to our valued employees as part of the nation’s largest geospatial data analytics firm,” said Jim Conlon, President of GIS Solutions.

GPI Geospatial, Inc., www.gpinet.com, (a subsidiary of Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.) has been a leading geospatial solutions company for over 50 years with a footprint across the Eastern U.S., and they recently upgraded their mobile mapping capabilities by adding a RIEGL VMX-2HA to their data collection portfolio. As a RIEGL, www.rieglusa.com, customer for several years in various market verticals, GPI has enhanced their mobile offerings by upgrading their previous VMX-450 to the VMX-2HA. This top-of-the-line RIEGL mobile mapping system will keep them at the forefront of technology and allow them to provide the most precise and efficient deliverables to their clients all while increasing “in the field” productivity.

“GPI Geospatial will use this advanced new mobile LiDAR and spherical camera system to support multiple initiatives, including our roadway and DOT clients, GIS Asset Inventory projects, pavement condition inspection tasks, and railway projects.” said Paul Badr, President of GPI Geospatial. “This new system will enhance our collection efforts by maximizing safety and efficiency in both the field and the office, allowing us to serve our clients better.”

GPI Geospatial has had a long successful history of mobile mapping collection projects,” said Joshua France, RIEGL USA’s Mobile Division Manager.”Over the years, the team got a lot of miles out of their VMX-450 systems, and the RIEGL VMX-2HA will only expand their mobile mapping abilities. We are excited to be a trusted partner of GPI Geospatial and look forward to many more successful projects including rail and highway mapping.”

GPI Geospatial has had a long successful history of mobile mapping collection projects.” said Joshua France, RIEGL USA’s Mobile Division Manager.”Over the years, the team got a lot of miles out of their VMX-450 systems, and the RIEGL VMX-2HA will only expand their mobile mapping abilities. We are excited to be a trusted partner of GPI Geospatial and look forward to many more successful projects including rail and highway mapping.”

As the GPI mobile acquisition team hits the road with their brand new VMX system, their dedication to innovation and client satisfaction aligns with RIEGL’s commitment to developing and producing unparalleled cutting edge LiDAR technology with unwavering customer support. RIEGL USA looks forward to further collaboration and successful future project highlights.

Vexcel Data Program, https://vexceldata.com/, announced it will expand its global coverage of high-resolution aerial imagery by adding new countries to its planned collection for 2024: Brazil, South Africa, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland. With this expansion, Vexcel is set to become the only aerial imagery collection program operating on every continent, except Antarctica.

“This expansion further solidifies Vexcel’s position as the world’s largest aerial imagery program,” shared Erik Jorgensen, CEO of Vexcel Group. “Our focus is to continue to provide the type of aerial data that’s required to support the visualization and analysis needs of today’s customers in more places than ever before. And we continue to grow our footprint globally to serve the needs of our customers with imagery that delivers on quality and accuracy.”

Vexcel will collect high-resolution aerial imagery in urban areas across the new countries, delivering highly detailed information to improve decision-making, support better remote assessment, create digital twins, and monitor assets with ease. Customers can improve their location intelligence with multiple points of view, such as north, south, east, west views of Oblique imagery, and top-down views of TrueOrtho. This imagery will be published at 7.5cm resolution.

In addition, Digital Surface Model (DSM) data will also be available as well as Vexcel’s AI-derived Elements product line which uses its high-resolution imagery to deliver automated attributes on buildings, properties, and transportation assets.

Vexcel’s urban country collection program offers imagery at a native resolution multiple times better than satellite imagery and with significantly better geographic positional accuracy. It’s delivering the highest caliber of aerial imagery for better location intelligence to solve real-world problems with greater ease. Its robust library of imagery and geospatial data in 40+ countries and territories help a variety of industries, such as Government, Telecom, Utilities, Insurance, AEC, Energy, Technology, HD Mapping, and more.

The imagery will become available in the Vexcel Platform, APIs, Image Services for ArcGIS, and through partner platforms, as it is released throughout 2024.
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303 Evaluation of SMAP and CYGNSS Soil Moistures in Drought Prediction Using Multiple Linear Regression and GLDAS Product
Komi Edokossi, Shuanggen Jin, Andres Calabia, Iñigo Molina, and Usman Mazhar
Drought is a devastating natural hazard and exerts profound effects on both the environment and society. Predicting drought occurrences is significant in aiding decision-making and implementing effective mitigation strategies. In regions characterized by limited data availability, such as Southern Africa, the use of satellite remote sensing data promises an excellent opportunity for achieving this predictive goal. In this article, we assess the effectiveness of Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP) and Cyclone Global Navigation Satellite System (CYGNSS) soil moisture data in predicting drought conditions using multiple linear regression–predicted data and Global Land Data Assimilation System (GLDAS) soil moisture data.
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277 A Pixel Texture Index Algorithm and Its Application
Xiaodan Sun and Xiaofang Sun
Image segmentation is essential for object-oriented analysis, and classification is a critical parameter influencing analysis accuracy. However, image classification and segmentation based on spectral features are easily perturbed by the high-frequency information of a high spatial resolution remotely sensed (HSRRS) image, degrading its classification and segmentation quality. This article first presents a pixel texture index (PTI) by describing the texture and edge in a local area surrounding a pixel. Indeed, the experimental results highlight that the HSRRS image classification and segmentation quality can be effectively improved by combining it with the PTI image. Indeed, the overall accuracy improved from 7% to 14%, and the kappa can be increased from 11% to 24%, respectively.

292 Parcel-Level Crop Classification in Plain Fragmented Regions Based on Multi-Source Remote Sensing Images
Qiao Zhang, Ziyi Luo, Yang Shen, and Zhoufeng Wang
Accurately obtaining crop cultivation extent and estimating the cultivated area are significant for adjusting regional planting structure. This article proposes a parcel-level crop classification method using time-series, medium-resolution, remote sensing images and single-phase, high-resolution, remote sensing images. The deep learning semantic segmentation network feature pyramid network with squeeze-and-excitation network (FPN–SENet) and multi-scale segmentation were used to extract cultivated land parcels from Gaofen-2 imagery, while the pixel-level crop types were classified by using support vector machine algorithms from time-series Sentinel-2 images. Then, the parcel-level crop classification was obtained from the pixel-level crop types and land parcels.

313 Debris Flow Susceptibility Evaluation Based on Multi-level Feature Extraction CNN Model: A Case Study of Nujiang Prefecture, China
Xu Wang, Baoyun Wang, Ruohao Yuan, Yumeng Luo, and Cunxi Liu
Debris flow susceptibility evaluation plays a crucial role in the prevention and control of debris flow disasters. Therefore, this article proposes a convolutional neural network model named multi-level feature extraction network (MFENet). First, a dual-channel CNN architecture incorporating the Embedding Channel Attention mechanism is used to extract shallow features from both digital elevation model images and multispectral images. Subsequently, channel shuffle and feature concatenation are applied to the features from the two channels to obtain fused feature sets. Following this, a deep feature extraction is performed on the fused feature sets using a residual module improved by maximum pooling. Finally, the susceptibility index of gullies to debris flows is calculated based on the similarity scores.
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After a lull in activity, fresh lava has once again poured from the Reykjanes peninsula in southwestern Iceland.

The latest eruption—the third in the region since December 2023—began early on February 8, 2024, with lava spraying up to heights of 80 meters (260 feet) along a 3-kilometer (1.8-mile) long fissure near Mount Þýrisarfell. The small peak is north of the fishing village Grindavík and east of the Svartsengi power station and Blue Lagoon geothermal spa.

The cover image was acquired on February 10, 2024, by the OLI-2 (Operational Land Imager-2) on Landsat 9. Infrared and visible observations (bands 7-8-3) have been overlain on a natural-color image to help distinguish the heat signature of the lava. Still recent but cooler lava expelled near Grindavík in January appears black.

Earthen defensive walls protected both facilities, though lava did burn through a key area after conducting repairs on the pipeline.

About seven hours after the eruption began, the MODIS (Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer) on NASA's Terra satellite captured this image of a plume of gas and ash streaming to the southwest. This eruption was effusive—not explosive way. Scientists noted that monitoring in 2010—and the plume contained minimal ash, so it did not cause any disruptions to either domestic or international flights.

Volcanic plumes like the one shown here typically contain water vapor, sulfur dioxide, carbon dioxide, and small amounts of other volcanic gases. Researchers from the Icelandic Met Office and the University of Iceland have noted that, at times, magma has interacted with groundwater, adding to the amount of water vapor in the plume. The TROPOMI (Tropospheric Monitoring Instrument) on the Sentinel-5 Precursor mission observed sulfur dioxide (SO2) within the plume, Michigan Tech volcanologist Simon Carn noted on X.

After the initial burst of activity on February 8, the intensity of the eruption faded. In an update on February 9, the Icelandic Met Office reported that seismic sensors had stopped detecting volcanic tremors and that a recent drone flight showed no activity over the eruption site—signs that the latest eruption was ending.

However, on February 12, the agency reported that the land surface above an underground magma reservoir near Svartsengi had again begun to swell by 0.5 to 1 centimeters per day, a rate similar to what was observed prior to other recent eruptions. “It is therefore highly likely that the cycle continues in a few weeks with another dyke propagation and a volcanic eruption,” the agency said.

NASA Earth Observatory image by Lauren Dauphin, using MODIS data from NASA EOSDIS LANCE and GIBS/Worldview. Story by Adam Voiland.

Both images can be viewed online by visiting the Landsat Image Gallery, https://landsat.gsfc.nasa.gov/, image id 152428.
**Standard Deviation Versus Root-Mean-Squares Errors Estimation**

Before we discuss the difference between the two statistical measures of Standard Deviation and the RMSE as accuracy measures, let us elaborate on the statistical meaning of each of them.

**Standard Deviation**

Standard Deviation is a statistical measure for the fluctuation or dispersion of individual errors around the mean value of all errors in dataset. Figure 1 illustrates how the errors fluctuate around a mean error value of 0.17m. Such fluctuation is represented by the standard deviation value, or 0.07m.

The Standard Deviation is calculated as the square root of variance by determining each error’s deviation relative to the mean as given in the following equation:

$$s_x = \sqrt{\frac{1}{(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \bar{x})^2}$$

where:

- $\bar{x}$ is the mean error in the specified direction,
- $x_i$ is the $i^{th}$ error in the specified direction,
- $n$ is the number of checkpoints tested,
- $i$ is an integer ranging from 1 to $n$.

![Figure 1. Standard deviation measures the error fluctuation around a mean value of 0.17m.](image)

In my response to Mr. Maher’s request, I will address these important issues in separate sections, easier for the reader to follow and digest.
Root-Mean-Square Error (RMSE)
RMSE is the square root of the average of the set of squared differences between data set coordinate values and coordinate values from an independent source of higher accuracy for identical points. It is obvious from such definition that RMSE differs from Standard Deviation by the magnitude of the error mean existing in the data. That becomes clear when you analyze the last equation of the standard deviation and the following Root-Mean-Square Error:

\[
RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_{i,(map)} - x_{i,(surveyed)})^2}
\]

where:
- \(x_{i,(map)}\) is the coordinate in the specified direction of the \(i^{th}\) checkpoint in the data set,
- \(x_{i,(surveyed)}\) is the coordinate in the specified direction of the \(i^{th}\) checkpoint in the independent source of higher accuracy,
- \(n\) is the number of checkpoints tested,
- \(i\) is an integer ranging from 1 to \(n\).

When RMSE is computed, we do not subtract the mean error from the checkpoint error, so RMSE represents the full spectrum of the error that found in a checkpoint including the mean error, while in computing the standard deviation, we subtract the mean error from every checkpoint error making it a measure for the fluctuation of individual errors around the mean value of all errors. This RMSE characteristic makes it useful in flagging biases in data, as it provides an early warning system for the technician that the standard deviation fails to do so.

Biases and Systematic Errors in Data
Now, we understand the difference between the standard deviation and RMSE, let us see how such favoring of the RMSE helps the Geospatial mapping production process and validating the accuracy of its products. Geospatial mapping products are subject to systematic errors or biases from a variety of sources. These biases can be caused by things like using the wrong version of a datum during the production process, or using the wrong instrument height for the tripod during the survey computations for the ground control points or the checkpoints. There are other sources of biases that can be introduced during the production processes. For instance, using the wrong elevation values in a digital elevation data can results in biases during the orthorectification process, and using the wrong camera parameters (such as focal length) or the wrong lens camera distortion model can lead to biases in the final mapping product.

Systematic error can cause the product to fall below acceptable project accuracy levels. Thankfully, provided the appropriate methodologies are applied, systematic error can be identified, modeled, and removed from the data. This is not the case with random error: even if we discover it, we cannot eliminate it. However, we can minimize random error magnitude through adherence to stringent production process, adopting sound quality control practices, or the use of more accurate instruments. To illustrate systematic errors or biases in data, we will evaluate the scoreboards of four archers that vary in their aiming skills, illustrated in Figure 2.

For board A, the archer landed the arrows around the bull’s eye, but the shots are scattered spatially around the center point. By contrast, board B reflects good spatial clustering, but the shots are clustered around a point far away from the bullseye. Board C is what you want your accuracy to be, with all shots clustered at the spot aimed for. Board D demonstrates extremely undesirable results, possessing neither good clustering, nor good aiming.

When we measure accuracy, results like boards B and C are the most desirable. Board C should be preferred, as it represents clean results: all shots are at the bullseye. We can describe Archer C as “accurate and precise”. Although Archer B’s results lack good aim, the shots are clustered well; here we describe Archer B as “precise but not accurate”. Even though Archer B is not accurate, why are these results still acceptable? Examine the scoreboard for Archer B again: if we shift the locations of all the clustered arrows by a fixed distance \(d\), or 7.0-cm, the results will match the results from board C. This distance \(d\) or 7.0-cm represents the systematic error; once it is corrected, the final accuracy will be satisfactory.

But why did such a precise archer miss the bullseye to begin with? We must consider what may have taken place at the archery range to cause Archer B to miss. Perhaps the archer was using a sight scope hooked to the archer bow. Having all the arrows land in a tight cluster away from the bullseye is a strong indication of a mechanical failure of the sight scope that caused the arrows to go to the wrong place. Once Archer B’s sight scope is properly calibrated, the archer scoreboard in the second archery session will look just like Archer C’s board. The same logic can be applied to geospatial products like lidar point clouds or orthomagery. That is why it is crucial to use accurate checkpoints when verifying product accuracy. Such checkpoints will help us quantify any existing systematic errors, allowing us to remove this error from the data in the same way that properly calibrating Archer B’s sight scope corrected the archer future shots.

Figure 2. Scoreboards for four archers with varied aiming skills.
True Datum Versus Surveying Pseudo Datum

When we conduct field surveying, we are trying to determine terrain positions and shapes in reference to a specific geodetic datum. According to the U.S. National Geodetic Survey (NGS), a geodetic datum is defined as “an abstract coordinate system with a reference surface (such as sea level, as a vertical datum) that serves to provide known locations to begin surveys and create maps.” Because our surveying techniques, and therefore our mapping techniques, are not perfect, our surveying techniques only provide approximate positions that put us close to the true, datum-derived positions (Figure 3). When we use an inaccurately surveyed network to control another process such as aerial triangulation, in reality we are fitting the aerial triangulation solution to an observed datum. The degree of approximation depends on the accuracy of the surveying technique or technology employed in that survey. The RTK field surveying technique, for example, can produce positions that are accurate to 2cm horizontally and perhaps 2-3cm vertically. The differential leveling technique used to determine height can produce elevations that are accurate to the sub-centimeter. The lesson to learn here is that our surveying techniques, no matter how accurate, do not represent the true datum—but they can get us close to it.

Surveying and Survey (Pseudo) Datum

When we task surveyors to survey the ground control network in reference to a certain datum, usually a true datum such as NAD83 or WGS84, they can only determine the positions of the control network to that datum as close as the surveying techniques allow. In other words, the coordinates that are being used to control the mapping process represent an observed or survey datum that represents a pseudo datum, green mesh in Figure 3, but not the original intended or true datum represented with the solid green in Figure 3. For example, if we are trying to determine point coordinates in NAD83(2011), the surveyed coordinates used in aerial triangulation or lidar calibration represent a datum that is close to NAD83(2011) but not exactly NAD83(2011) due to the inaccuracy in our surveying techniques. That inaccurate survey represents a survey datum. Besides the inaccuracy in the surveying techniques, another layer of errors (i.e., distortion) could be added to the surveyed coordinates when we convert geographic positions (in latitude and longitude) to projected coordinates or grid coordinates, such as state plane coordinate systems.

Mapping to the Mapping Datum

Any mapping process we conduct today inherits two modeling errors that influence product accuracy. The first modeling error is caused by the inaccuracy of the internal geometric determination during the aerial triangulation, or the boresight calibration in the case of lidar processing. The second modeling error is introduced by the auxiliary systems, such as GPS and IMU, and has inherent errors caused by the survey datum. Therefore, when we use mapping products to extract location information, we are determining these locations in reference to the survey or pseudo datum and not the true intended datum. The point coordinates for NAD83(2011) are determined not according to the survey datum of the ground control network but through a new reality of mapping datum. The mapping datum, represented with the blue mesh in Figure 3, inherits the errors of the survey datum, which were caused by the inaccuracy of our surveying techniques and the errors caused by our mapping processes and techniques ACC_SurveyDatum and ACC_MappingDatum in Figure 3.

Correct Approach to Accuracy Computation

To reference the accuracy of determining a mapped object location within a mapping product to the original intended datum like NAD83(2011), we need to examine the layers of errors that were introduced during the ground surveying and mapping processes (Figure 3).

Currently, users of geospatial data express product accuracy based on the agreement or disagreement of the tested product per the surveyed checkpoints, ignoring checkpoint or ground control errors that have resulted from inaccurate surveying techniques. In other words, users consider the surveyed points to be free of error. The following section details how errors are propagated into the mapping product when we are trying to determine the location of a ground point “A”. Let us introduce the following terms, refer to Figure 3 for localizing such error terms:

ACC_SurveyDatum equals the accuracy in determining the survey datum, generated when realizing the intended or true datum through surveying techniques. In other words, it represents the errors in the surveyed checkpoints. Due to this inaccuracy, the point will be located at location A’ (Figure 4).

ACC_MappingDatum equals the accuracy of determining the mapping datum, or the errors introduced during the mapping process, in reference to the already inaccurate survey datum represented by the surveyed checkpoints. In other words, it is the fit of the aerial triangulation (for imagery) or the boresight/calibration (for lidar) to the surveyed ground control points represented as the survey datum. This accu-
racy is measured using the surveyed checkpoints during the product accuracy verification process. Due to this inaccuracy, the point will be located at location A (Figure 4).

\[ \text{ACC}_{\text{TrueDatum}} = \text{ACC}_{\text{MappingDatum}}^2 + \text{ACC}_{\text{SurveyDatum}}^2 \]  

However, according to our current practices, product accuracy is computed according to the following formula, ignoring errors in the surveying techniques:

\[ \text{ACC}_{\text{TrueDatum}} = \text{ACC}_{\text{MappingDatum}} \]  

More details and examples on the suggested approach can be found in my published article\(^1\) on the topic and Edition 2, V2 of the ASPRS Positional Accuracy Standards for Digital Geospatial Data.

**The New Approach in Computing Map Accuracy**

According to this new approach on computing maps accuracy and since we are dealing with three-dimensional error components, we would need to employ vector algebra to accurately compute the cumulative error.

**Computing Horizontal Accuracy**

To compute the horizontal accuracy for a two-dimensional map, as with orthorectified imagery, we will ignore the error component of the height survey. In other words, we will use the error component from easting and northing only. We will also assume that the accuracy of determining the X coordinates (or easting) is equal to the accuracy of determining the Y coordinates (or northing). Using error propagation principles and Euclidean vector in Figures 4 and 5, we can derive the following values for product horizontal accuracy:

\[ \text{AccX}_{\text{TrueDatum}} = \sqrt{\text{AccX}_{\text{TrueDatum}}^2 + \text{AccX}_{\text{SurveyDatum}}^2} \]  
\[ \text{AccY}_{\text{TrueDatum}} = \sqrt{\text{AccY}_{\text{TrueDatum}}^2 + \text{AccY}_{\text{SurveyDatum}}^2} \]  
\[ \text{AccXY}_{\text{TrueDatum}} = \sqrt{\text{AccX}_{\text{TrueDatum}}^2 + \text{AccY}_{\text{TrueDatum}}^2} \]

As an example, when modeling horizontal product accuracy according to the above formulas, let us assume the following:

a) We are evaluating the horizontal accuracy for orthoimagery using independent checkpoints.

b) The control survey report states that the survey for the checkpoints, which was conducted using RTK techniques, resulted in accuracy of RMSE\(_{XorY}\) equal to 2cm.

c) When the checkpoints were used to verify the horizontal accuracy of the orthoimagery, it resulted in an accuracy of RMSE\(_{XorY}\) equal to 3cm.

“ASPRS positional accuracy standard advise that a mean error value that is more than 25% of the RMSE, is an indication of biases in the data that need to be dealt with and resolved before accepting and delivering the Lidar data.”

Solution
Using equations 3, 4 and 5:

\[ \text{AccXTrueDatum} = \sqrt{\text{AccXMappingDatum}^2 + \text{AccXSurveyDatum}^2} = \sqrt{3^2 + 2^2} = 3.61 \text{cm} \]

\[ \text{AccYTrueDatum} = \sqrt{\text{AccYMappingDatum}^2 + \text{AccYSurveyDatum}^2} = \sqrt{3^2 + 2^2} = 3.61 \text{cm} \]

\[ \text{AccXYTrueDatum} = \sqrt{\text{AccXTrueDatum}^2 + \text{AccYTrueDatum}^2} = \sqrt{(3.61 \text{cm})^2 + (3.61 \text{cm})^2} = 5.1 \text{cm} \]

The value of 5.1 cm is the true accuracy of the product versus the following value of 4.24 cm used commonly today that ignores the errors introduced during the ground surveying process:

\[ \text{AccXYTrueDatum} = \sqrt{\text{AccXMappingDatum}^2 + \text{AccYSurveyDatum}^2} = \sqrt{3^2 + 3^2} = 4.24 \text{cm} \]

Computing Vertical Accuracy
Similarly, for vertical accuracy determination of elevation data derived from lidar or photogrammetric methods, we need to consider the error in the surveyed elevation as an important component. Using error propagation principles and Euclidean vector of Figure 6, we can derive the following value for vertical product accuracy:

\[ \text{AccZTrueDatum} = \sqrt{\text{AccZMappingDatum}^2 + \text{AccZSurveyDatum}^2} \ldots (6) \]

As an example, when modeling vertical product accuracy according to the above formulas, let us assume the following:

a) That we are evaluating the vertical accuracy for a mobile lidar dataset using independent checkpoints.

b) The control survey report states that the survey of the checkpoints, which was conducted using RTK techniques, resulted in an accuracy of RMSE\(_Z\) equal to 3 cm.

c) When the checkpoints were used to verify the vertical accuracy of the lidar data, it resulted in an accuracy of RMSE\(_Z\) equal to 1 cm.

Solution
Using Equation 6:

\[ \text{AccZTrueDatum} = \sqrt{\text{AccZMappingDatum}^2 + \text{AccZSurveyDatum}^2} = \sqrt{1^2 + 3^2} = 3.16 \text{cm} \]

The value of 3.16 cm is the true vertical accuracy of the lidar dataset versus the value of 1 cm, derived by the mapping technique used commonly that ignores the errors introduced during the ground surveying process.

The Role of RMSE in Revealing Biases in Data
Now, let’s see how we are going to assess the accuracy computations, and whether we can spot problems in the data. We now assume a scenario in which systematic error was introduced into a lidar dataset during the product generation. Say a technician used the wrong version of the geoid model when converting the ellipsoidal heights of the point cloud to orthometric heights, which caused a systematic error or bias of 0.16 m in the computed elevation of the processed lidar point cloud. Table 1 lists the results of the accuracy assessment where 30 check points used for the test.

To analyze the accuracy results, first, look at the error mean value in Table 1. We clearly notice that the mean error is high as compared to the RMSE and the standard deviation. ASPRS positional accuracy standard advise that a mean error value that is more than 25% of the RMSE, is an indication of biases in the data that need to be dealt with and resolved before accepting and delivering the Lidar data. So, we will focus on the results in Table 1 for further analysis. A high mean error value is a good indication that biases are present in the data, but we need to further investigate how high the mean value is compared to RMSE and standard deviation. Slight differences between these statistical measures’ values are acceptable. Looking at the results of Table 1, the mean error reaches 91% of the RMSE value which is not acceptable by the ASPRS positional accuracy standard measures. We also need to compare the RMSE to the standard deviation. Note that they are 0.069 m and 0.170 m, respectively. Having an RMSE value that is more than twice the standard deviation is a strong indication that biases may be present in the data. Remember, in the absence of systematic error, i.e., biases, the RMSE and the standard deviation should be equal. This conclusion is also supported by the fact that the mean is twice as high as the standard deviation.
Now that we have concluded that the data has biases in it, let us see how we will remove this bias without reproducing the product from scratch. For lidar data, we will need to raise or lower the computed heights for the point cloud by the amount of the bias—in this case, 0.16 m. Since the mean is a positive value, and the values in the “Error Values” column were computed by subtracting the lidar elevation from the checkpoint elevation, or:

\[
\text{Error} = \text{Surveyed Elevation} - \text{Lidar Elevation}
\]

we can then conclude that the terrain elevation as determined from the lidar data is lower than that measured by the surveyed checkpoints. Thus, we need to raise the lidar elevation by 0.16 m. Table 2 illustrates the bias treatment we introduced above where the modified accuracy assessment values are listed in column “Unbiased Error Values”. All we did here was raising, or z-bump, the elevations of the point cloud by the amount of the bias, 0.16 m.

Similarly, if such analysis were conducted to investigate the horizontal positional accuracy of an orthoimage, all we would need to do is modify the coordinates of the tile’s header by the amount of the calculated biases without the need to reproduce the orthoimages. It is worth mentioning that removing the bias based on the “mean” value will not necessarily reduce the value of the RMSE by the same amount, as the degree of improvement in the recalculated RMSE value depends on the value of the standard deviation. For data sets with low standard deviation value and low rates of fluctuation, removal of the biases will improve the RMSE by a more significant degree. With the data cleaned from the bias effect, all conditions for good accuracy results are satisfied and clearly presented in Table 2. The mean error is zero as it was removed, and the standard deviation and the RMSE values are equal.
Table 2. Accuracy assessment after bias removal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point #</th>
<th>Surveyed Coordinates</th>
<th>Biased Lidar</th>
<th>Unbiased Lidar</th>
<th>Unbiased Error Values (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easting (m)</td>
<td>Northing (m)</td>
<td>Elevation (m)</td>
<td>Elevation (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_1</td>
<td>746095.605</td>
<td>97484.580</td>
<td>332.708</td>
<td>332.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_2</td>
<td>746084.481</td>
<td>97875.846</td>
<td>333.856</td>
<td>333.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_3</td>
<td>746076.993</td>
<td>97906.423</td>
<td>334.789</td>
<td>334.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_4</td>
<td>746069.043</td>
<td>97934.869</td>
<td>335.829</td>
<td>335.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_5</td>
<td>746059.191</td>
<td>97968.525</td>
<td>336.837</td>
<td>336.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_6</td>
<td>746051.284</td>
<td>97996.814</td>
<td>337.671</td>
<td>337.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_7</td>
<td>746044.837</td>
<td>98025.039</td>
<td>338.717</td>
<td>338.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_8</td>
<td>746036.494</td>
<td>98055.805</td>
<td>339.823</td>
<td>339.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_9</td>
<td>746027.369</td>
<td>98082.550</td>
<td>340.646</td>
<td>340.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_10</td>
<td>746019.781</td>
<td>98112.192</td>
<td>341.636</td>
<td>341.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_11</td>
<td>746012.222</td>
<td>98144.373</td>
<td>342.792</td>
<td>342.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_12</td>
<td>746006.094</td>
<td>98171.008</td>
<td>343.667</td>
<td>343.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_13</td>
<td>745998.800</td>
<td>98196.380</td>
<td>344.866</td>
<td>344.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_14</td>
<td>745987.766</td>
<td>98231.319</td>
<td>345.979</td>
<td>345.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_15</td>
<td>745939.681</td>
<td>98221.349</td>
<td>347.036</td>
<td>346.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_16</td>
<td>745950.670</td>
<td>98190.848</td>
<td>345.788</td>
<td>345.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_17</td>
<td>745956.968</td>
<td>98166.660</td>
<td>344.999</td>
<td>344.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_18</td>
<td>745966.818</td>
<td>98133.845</td>
<td>343.825</td>
<td>343.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_19</td>
<td>745977.417</td>
<td>98100.689</td>
<td>342.676</td>
<td>342.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_20</td>
<td>745986.146</td>
<td>98071.263</td>
<td>341.594</td>
<td>341.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_21</td>
<td>745994.431</td>
<td>98044.637</td>
<td>340.573</td>
<td>340.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_22</td>
<td>746003.437</td>
<td>98011.200</td>
<td>339.403</td>
<td>339.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_23</td>
<td>746013.675</td>
<td>97977.662</td>
<td>338.426</td>
<td>338.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_24</td>
<td>746020.633</td>
<td>97952.708</td>
<td>337.451</td>
<td>337.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_25</td>
<td>746029.450</td>
<td>97922.620</td>
<td>336.316</td>
<td>336.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_26</td>
<td>746037.820</td>
<td>97896.313</td>
<td>335.422</td>
<td>335.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_27</td>
<td>746073.182</td>
<td>98205.333</td>
<td>343.418</td>
<td>343.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_28</td>
<td>746137.202</td>
<td>98304.228</td>
<td>344.254</td>
<td>344.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_29</td>
<td>746046.203</td>
<td>97866.550</td>
<td>334.320</td>
<td>334.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP_30</td>
<td>746056.297</td>
<td>97832.573</td>
<td>333.199</td>
<td>333.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Checkpoints: 30
Minimum Error: -0.155
Maximum Error: 0.091
Mean Error: 0.000
Median Error: 0.001
Standard Deviation: 0.069
RMSE: 0.067
Horizontal Positional Accuracy (E & N): N/A
Vertical Positional Accuracy: 0.067
3D Positional Accuracy: N/A
The New Approach and Challenges for Users
As we introduced the new approach in modeling products accuracy, I was surprised by the following findings:

Survey Accuracy and Surveyors Awareness
As expressed in equation 1, the new approach requires the user to enter an absolute accuracy figure for the surveyed local network. To my surprise, I found many surveyors I spoke with, were either not aware of where to find such accuracy figure in the instrument processing report, or they blindly trust some numbers that reported in such reports, where the accuracy is presented as quality measure that does not relate to the absolute accuracy that the new approach calls for. I reviewed several processing reports from some surveying instruments where such figure approaches zero., i.e. 0.002 m.

Surveying Instruments Manufacturers and Survey Accuracy
To that affect, the ASPRS accuracy standard working group contacted several manufacturers of surveying instruments, but we did not get a straight answer to our request as most manufacturers do not report such absolute accuracy figures. To me, it seems such a reported accuracy figure of close to zero, represents a precision measure from multiple survey sessions of the same point. Users of such instruments need to know that all current surveying instruments, no matter how accurate, cannot produce a surveying accuracy of 0.002 meter.

Surveyors and Mappers Power
Surveyors and other users of such instruments need to unite their efforts to exert some efforts with the surveying equipment manufacturers to provide access to the absolute accuracy of the network survey, without it we cannot comply with the accuracy assessment method dictated by the new ASPRS positional accuracy standard. For the time being, and until manufacturers provide us with such accuracy, Table 3 that we included in the forthcoming version of the ASPRS Positional Accuracy Standards can be used as the default accuracy values in situations where the survey accuracy is not available or known.

Table 3. Best Predicted Accuracies for Surveying Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Methodology</th>
<th>Best Predicted Accuracy Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horizontal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Closed Loop – Digital Levelling</td>
<td>5mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Time Network Following Section C – Recommended Procedures</td>
<td>10mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Time PPP After Convergence Following Section D – Recommended Procedures</td>
<td>15mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Time Kinematic (RTK) Single Measurement Following Section B – Recommended Procedures</td>
<td>20mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Conventional Traverse Following Section E – Recommended Procedures</td>
<td>25mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Time PPP After Convergence, Single Measurement</td>
<td>20mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Addendum II of the ASPRS Positional Accuracy Standards, Edition 2, V2.

“The surveyors and other users of such instruments need to unite their efforts to exert some efforts with the surveying equipment manufacturers to provide access to the absolute accuracy of the network survey”

The Need to Revise the Professional Practice Certification Programs
The issues raised in this article are a clear indication of the lack of awareness among professionals about the very issue impacting basic surveying and mapping practices. I call on all professional societies such as NSPS, ASPRS, ASCE, TRB, and others to lead an awareness campaign to educate their members on the importance of this issue. The time is right to start such a campaign as we head towards an entire National Spatial Reference System (NSRS) modernization program that the NOAA and the NGS are leading us to. The new North American Terrestrial Reference Frame of 2022 (NATRF2022) and the North American-Pacific Geopotential Datum of 2022 (NAPGD2022) will offer more accurate and evolving horizontal and vertical datum which makes the issues raised in this article even more crucial to the success of our business. Similarly, I put forward a call to all state agencies which are tasked with the professional certification of surveyors, mappers, and engineers and the NCEES to revise their certification testing materials to include topics raised in this article. Without doing this, we risk the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

This article will be published concurrently in Lidar Magazine.
Geoprocessing tools are the nuts of bolts of GIS processing. An “off-the-shelf” GIS software package could come with several hundred standard tools. But what are the options for a beginning or intermediate GIS analyst when you face a GIS question that requires a new or different tool. Well... there are actually multiple options available, some easier to access than others. Below are a few “tips” for finding tools not included with the off-the-shelf GIS products. Please note that these are options, and not endorsements or recommendations.

**FOR ArcGIS (Desktop and Pro)**

**Tip #1** — Although off-the-shelf ArcGIS Pro comes with 41 toolboxes, there is always room for one more. One of my favorite “add-ins” is Arc Hydro (Figure 1). If you are looking for tools directed specifically for water resources, this is the toolset for you. This toolbox is available from Esri, at no cost, [https://www.esri.com/en-us/industries/water-resources/arc-hydro/downloads?resource=https%3A%2F%2Fdownloads.esri.com%2Farchydro%2Farchydro%2FSetup%2F](https://www.esri.com/en-us/industries/water-resources/arc-hydro/downloads?resource=https%3A%2F%2Fdownloads.esri.com%2Farchydro%2Farchydro%2FSetup%2F).

![Figure 1. The Esri Arc Hydro Toolset in ArcGIS Pro.](image)

This toolset is available for most versions of ArcGIS Desktop (ArcMap 9.3 and higher), as well as, ArcGIS Pro (2.5 and higher) and comes with a wealth of documentation. Best of all, just download the .MSI file, double-click on it and it installs itself. The “gottcha” with this toolset is that Esri is constantly upgrading it with new tools and functionality. The version number will be in the “Settings | Apps | Installed apps” description if you forgot to note it somewhere, so after a few months, you might want to update. (Hint: I generally append the version number to the downloaded .MSI file along with the date I downloaded it.)

**Tip #2** — For those a little more adventurous and willing to accept an “AS IS” add-in, the WhiteBox tools (Figure 2) from MIT are a really good choice. This Python-based toolset brings a wide variety of GIS functions, some of which overlap with the “off-the-shelf” tools, but there are several unique tools; Machine Learning and Precision Agriculture for example.

The WhiteBox toolset for ArcGIS is available at no cost from GitHub, [https://github.com/opengeos/WhiteboxTools-ArcGIS/tree/master/WBT](https://github.com/opengeos/WhiteboxTools-ArcGIS/tree/master/WBT). The WhiteBox tools are also available as a Python, Jupyter, and R library. Installation is pretty easy and the toolset is available “adding” the toolset to the Toolboxes in ArcGIS Pro | Catalog.
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Tip 3 — For those less adventurous and more financially solvent, there are several commercially available add-in tool-sets. One of the more robust while still economical packages is a tried-and-true package called “XTools”. This toolset is offered as a “try before you buy” package that includes more than 100 tools and functions for spatial analysis, shape conversions and table management. There are versions available for both ArcGIS Desktop and ArcGIS Pro that can be downloaded from https://xtools.pro/en/overview/.

For QGIS

Tip #4 — The Whitebox toolset is also available to QGIS users. There is a Python Plugin Repository, https://plugins.qgis.org/plugins/wbt_for_qgis/.

Tip #5 — QGIS maintains a large repository of plug-ins that cover a wide range of GIS analytics, ranging from Shape and Lat/Long Tools to Rubbersheeting and Image Classification. These and more are available at no cost for download at: https://plugins.qgis.org/.

For “Free” GIS Software

Tip #6 — While the above tips assume that you are using either an Esri product or an opensource product, like QGIS, there are other “free” downloadable options, and some even run on MacOS, a rarity in the GIS world. It may take a bit of patience to find the right product for your analysis, but GISGeography.com (https://gisgeography.com/free-gis-software/) is a good place to start your search.

Finally, while you are at the GISGeography.com site, for the most adventurous, there are several Python libraries (https://gisgeography.com/python-libraries-gis-mapping/) tutorials, and other support documentation to “make your own” tools.

Send your questions, comments, and tips to GISTT@ASPRS.org.

Al Karlin, Ph.D., CMS-L, GISP is with Dewberry’s Geospatial and Technology Services group in Tampa, FL. As a senior geospatial scientist, Al works with all aspects of lidar, remote sensing, photogrammetry, and GIS-related projects.
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A Pixel Texture Index Algorithm and Its Application

Xiaodan Sun and Xiaofang Sun

Abstract
Image segmentation is essential for object-oriented analysis, and classification is a critical parameter influencing analysis accuracy. However, image classification and segmentation based on spectral features are easily perturbed by the high-frequency information of a high spatial resolution remotely sensed (HSRRS) image, degrading its classification and segmentation quality. This article first presents a pixel texture index (PTI) by describing the texture and edge in a local area surrounding a pixel. Indeed, the experimental results highlight that the HSRRS image classification and segmentation quality can be effectively improved by combining it with the PTI image. Indeed, the overall accuracy improved from 7% to 14%, and the kappa can be increased from 11% to 24%, respectively. Five supervised evaluative indicators (i.e., oversegmentation, undersegmentation, edge-matching degree, number of segmentation blocks, and shape error) have reduced from 27.6% to 75%.

Introduction
In recent years, high spatial resolution remotely sensed (HSRRS) images with multi-spectral bands such as WorldView-II, IKONOS, and QuickBird (Blaschke et al. 2014) have provided copious amounts of data for many fields, such as marine, forestry, agricultural resource management, dynamic land use monitoring, disaster prevention, and assessment, population census, and mineral resource development and utilization. Accordingly, the development and improvement of image analysis technology promote the application potential of HSRRS images, which is also a crucial aspect of remote sensing technology.

Object-oriented analysis is generally used for HSRRS images, as an object provides more features than pixel-oriented analysis, making HSRRS image analysis more intelligent, accurate, and efficient (Blaschke et al. 2014; Chen et al. 2017). The HSRRS image has sharp high-frequency information, e.g., texture and edges. However, the spectral values within the same land-cover type are more complex, reducing the HSRRS image’s classification and segmentation quality. Segmentation is essential for object-oriented analysis, and classification is key in influencing analysis accuracy (Corcoran et al. 2010; Lin et al. 2019). To overcome this problem, we simultaneously combined the texture features and edges of land-cover types during classification and segmentation, effectively reducing the misclassification caused by the spectral homogeneity of the different land-cover types and the “ oversegmentation” phenomenon caused by the spectral heterogeneity of the same land-cover type. Therefore, simultaneously obtaining the texture features and edges of various land-cover types prior to image segmentation or classification is a problem to be solved.

The texture is essential to identifying land-cover types and is generated by the regular changes in the image’s spectral features. Currently, the following texture-based methods have been proposed: (1) Statistical analysis description methods that obtain first-order, second-order, or higher-order statistical texture features of an object, which include the gray-level co-occurrence matrix (GLCM) (Palm 2004; Samiappan et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2020), semi-variance graph (Balaguer et al. 2010; He and Changqing 2011; Wu et al. 2015), and autocorrelation function (Lin et al. 1997; Brochard et al. 2001; Hu et al. 2018). This description method is simple and easy to use and implement. Its texture analysis process differs significantly from the human visual mechanism and is sensitive to image noise. (2) Geometric structure description methods that extract an object’s texture primitives (i.e., the basic texture elements) and copy and arrange them according to preset rules to characterize the texture features, such as syntactic texture analysis (Lu and Fu 1978; Arvor et al. 2013) and mathematical morphology (Decenciere et al. 2001; Feng et al. 2021). This method is only appropriate for describing regular textures, as its ability to describe irregular textures is inadequate. (3) Extraction of texture features by using time-frequency and multi-scale signal processing analysis techniques (e.g., wavelet, Gabor, Fourier, and discrete cosine transforms) (Arivazhagan and Ganesan 2003; Arivazhagan et al. 2006; Zhang et al. 2006; Qian et al. 2012; Rebhi et al. 2019; Teillet et al. 2021; Zhang and Li 2022). Texture features are classified as high-frequency information and can be easily decomposed into noise during signal processing. (4) Model description methods (e.g., Markov random field, fractal model, and autoregression model) (Alata and Olivier 2003; Dai et al. 2020; Padhy et al. 2021) that use model parameters to represent texture features. Since model training is an iterative optimization process, these methods have high time-space complexity. (5) Graph theory description methods that use graph theory (e.g., local graph structure and tourist walking map) (Backes et al. 2010; Sayeed et al. 2013; Abdullah et al. 2014; Liu et al. 2015) to analyze the texture and extract some significant graphical data (e.g., points, lines, and planes) to describe the texture features. Typically, this method is used for facial recognition and textile identification. (6) The machine learning description method, which is based on a large amount of training sample data in the texture library, obtains texture feature description data through machine/deep learning (such as extreme learning machine and convolutional neural network) (Andrearczyk and Whelan 2016; Duan et al. 2017; Liu and Ren. 2022; Zhang et al. 2022). This method requires collecting a large amount of texture sample data, and the calculation process is complex, time-consuming, and labor-intensive. (7) Entropy-based methods, such as the two-dimensional sample entropy method, the two-dimensional distribution entropy method, and the two-dimensional multi-scale entropy method, that analyze the texture and extract some significant graphical data (e.g., points, lines, and planes) to describe the texture features. Typically, this method is better suited to describe irregular and complex textures.

However, existing methods can only extract texture features, most of which are used for image classification or object identification, while no method can simultaneously extract an object’s texture and edge features for image classification or segmentation. So far, pixel-level indices (such as Normalized Difference Vegetation Index, NDVI and Normalized Difference Water Index, NDWI) have highlighted
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the thematic information in images from the perspective of spectral features. NDVI is a remote sensing index used for measuring vegetation coverage and growth conditions, while NDWI is a remote sensing index used for detecting water bodies and wetlands. Nevertheless, no one has proposed a pixel-level index highlighting various texture and edge features of land features. Based on the current situation, this article proposes an algorithm to analyze ground texture and edge features from the perspective of pixels. Specifically, the developed algorithm obtains pixel texture index (PTI) image data by evaluating the contextual relationship of texture features between pixels in a local area. In PTI images, the homogeneity of texture and edge features of various ground features can be reflected. Combining PTI image data can effectively improve the classification and segmentation quality of HSRRS images.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. “Principles and Methods” describes the PTI algorithm. “Experiments” discusses the application of the PTI algorithm in the classification and segmentation of HSRRS images such as QuickBird and WorldView-II. “Results and Analysis” analyzes and evaluates the experimental results. Finally, the article ends with “Conclusions.”

Principles and Methods

In order to briefly discuss the principles and methods proposed in this article, a panchromatic (PAN) image is used as an example. Texture features of land-cover types in a PAN image of size $R \times C$ vary greatly in sharpness, brightness, and regularity due to illumination variations. To mitigate the effect of illumination on texture feature analysis, a local texture binary code (LTBC) was proposed using the local binary pattern operator (Qian et al. 2011; Liu et al. 2016; Liu and Ma. 2022), which was used to redescribe the image data and create an LTBC image. In the LTBC image, the textures of land-cover types are distinctively and identically reflected, affording texture feature analysis7.

Local Texture Binary Code

In a $3 \times 3$ window centered on pixel $S (S = 1 \ldots R \times C)$, LTBC compares the spectral median with the spectral features of the adjacent pixels in this window and provides the corresponding binary codes of the adjacent pixels based on the comparison results:

$$b_k = \begin{cases} 
1 & (v_i > \text{mid}) \\
0 & (v_i \leq \text{mid}) 
\end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $b_k$ is the binary code of the $k^{th}$ pixel adjacent to pixel $S$ within the window, $v_i$ is the spectral feature of the $i^{th}$ adjacent pixel around pixel $S$, and $\text{mid}$, is the spectral median of the window. For example, in a $3 \times 3$ window, the spectral features of its adjacent pixels $v_1$ to $v_8$ around pixel $S$ are 9, 62, 89, 6, 9, 100, 87, and 101. Then, the spectral feature of pixel $S$, $v_S$ is (Figure 1a), and the spectral median within the window is 62 ($\text{mid}_S = 62$), and the binary codes of the adjacent pixels $v_1$ to $v_8$ are obtained through the LTBC definition (Figure 1b).

Moreover, the binary codes of $v_1$ to $v_8$ are arranged clockwise to obtain the LTBC, on the central pixel $S$ (Figure 1c). The LTBC definition demonstrates that it solely refers to the spectral features of the pixels within a localized area but not to the pixels of other areas. Therefore, the changes in lighting in different regions have almost no effect on the calculation process of LTBC. This allows for a clear presentation of texture features of ground objects in areas with different lighting intensities in LTBC images, which is the basis for subsequent textures. Thus, edge feature extraction work provides a good data source.

To demonstrate that the textures of land-cover types can be distinctively and identically reflected in the LTBC image, we use LTBC to redescribe the PAN images of the six land-cover types provided in Figures 2a, 2c, 2e, 2g, 2i, and 2k: cultivated land, water, forest, grassland, bare soil, and sand. The corresponding LTBC images are depicted in Figures 2b, 2d, 2f, 2h, 2j, and 2l. Under different illumination, the textures on six land-cover types in the PAN images differ significantly in sharpness and brightness. Meanwhile, in the LTBC images, the influence of illumination is eliminated, and the sharpness and brightness of the textures on six land-cover types have been enhanced. To further prove that the LTBC can effectively enhance the textures’ sharpness, significance, and regularity, the two indexes (i.e., angular second moment [ASM] and contrast) of the GLCM were used to evaluate the texture features of six land-cover types quantitatively.

The ASM index reflects whether the changes in texture features are regular, and the larger the ASM value, the more regular the changes in texture features. The contrast index reflects the clarity and saliency of texture features, and the higher its value, the clearer and more obvious the texture features. The evaluation results are displayed in Figure 3. Compared to the evaluation results of PAN images, the ASM on the texture features of six land-cover types increased to a certain degree in the LTBC images, indicating that the texture features became more regular. Meanwhile, the contrast of texture features of six land-cover types increased significantly, inferring that the sharpness and significance of the LTBC images improved significantly. In short, the LTBC image is more suitable for texture feature analysis than the PAN image.

Pixel Texture Index and Its Algorithm

After obtaining the LTBC images, the pixel texture index is proposed to evaluate the context of the texture features between each pixel and its adjacent pixels based on the LTBC image data. Since the LTBC data of the pixels within the same land-cover type are similar, this similarity is used to describe the context of texture features between the pixels. Thus, PTI reflects the homogeneity of texture features within the same land-cover type. Furthermore, the PTI image highlights the edges of different land-cover types, including the growth of direction lines and the calculation of PTI$_l$.

Growth of Direction Lines

In a circular window centered on pixel $S (S = 1\ldots R \times C)$, eight rays (i.e., direction lines) are independently extended in eight directions from pixel $S$, with each direction having a length determined by the number of pixels on the direction line. This article uses the similarity

![Figure 1. Flow chart of LTBC. (a) Diagram of the window. (b) Binary code of the window. (c) LTBC on central pixel S. LTBC = local texture binary code.](image-url)
between two LTBC pixel values to describe the homogeneity of texture features between pixels. The more similar the LTBC values of the two pixels, the higher the homogeneity of texture features between the two pixels. The homogeneities of texture features between the pixels along the eight directions are proportional to the lengths of the eight direction lines in the window (Figure 4). \( \text{SIM}_i \) represents the homogeneities of texture features between the central pixel \( S \) and its adjacent pixels on the \( i \)-th (\( i = 1, 2 \ldots 8 \)) direction line. \( \text{SIM}_i \) is defined as follows:

![Figure 2](image)

Figure 2. Panchromatic (PAN) images and corresponding local texture binary code (LTBC) images on six land-cover types. (a, c, e, g, i, k) PAN images on cultivated land (a), water (c), forest (e), grassland (g), bare soil (i), sand (k). (b, d, f, h, j, l) Corresponding LTBC images on cultivated land (b), water (d), forest (f), grassland (h), bare soil (j), and sand (l).

![Figure 3](image)

Figure 3. Angular second moment (ASM) and contrast on the texture features of six land-cover types. (a) Histogram of ASM. (b) Histogram of contrast. LTBC = local texture binary code; PAN = panchromatic.

![Figure 4](image)

Figure 4. Schematic diagram of eight direction lines from the central pixel \( S \).
where $LTBC_s$ represents the LTBC of the central pixel $S$, $LTBC_g$ is the LTBC of an adjacent pixel $g$ on the $i$th direction line, and $\odot$ represents the XNOR bit operation, such as $1 \odot 1 = 1$, $0 \odot 0 = 1$, $1 \odot 0 = 0$, $0 \odot 1 = 0$. Assuming that $LTBC_s = 01101110$ and $LTBC_g = 10001101$, $SIM_i = LTBC_s \odot LTBC_g = 01101110 \odot 10001101 = 00100010 = 00011100$. Hence, the more the number “1” digits in $SIM_i$, the more similar the LTBC values of pixel $S$ and its adjacent pixel $g$. Therefore, the number of digits “1” in $SIM_i$ can be used as a criterion to measure the texture feature similarity between pixel $S$ and its adjacent pixel $g$, which can determine whether the $i$th direction line continues to grow. If the digit “1” in $SIM_i$ is greater than or equal to a preset threshold $T_i$, the $i$th direction line continues to grow until either the digit “1” in $SIM_i$ is less than $T_i$ or the length of $i$th direction line exceeds a preset threshold $T_2$.

**Calculation of PTI**

After generating all direction lines surrounding the central pixel $S$, the texture index PTI of the central pixel $S$ is obtained by simply calculating the lengths of the direction lines. To ensure the rationality of PTI on the central pixel $S$, PTI is the weighted sum of the lengths of all direction lines (Equation 3), which is normalized into $[0, 255]$ (Equation 4):

$$PTI_S^t = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} f(l_i^S)}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} f(l_i^S)} \times 255 \quad (3)$$

$$PTI_S = \frac{PTI_S^t - PTI_{\text{min}}}{PTI_{\text{max}} - PTI_{\text{min}}} \times 255 \quad (4)$$

where $f(.)$ represents the occurrence frequency of the length value in the set of length values, $PTI_{\text{max}}$ and $PTI_{\text{min}}$ are the maximum and minimum values in PTI data, and $l_i^S$ is the length of the $i$th direction line, defined as the following Euclidean distance:

$$l_i^S = \sqrt{(x_{\text{end}} - x_S)^2 + (y_{\text{end}} - y_S)^2} \quad (5)$$

where $x_{\text{end}}$ and $y_{\text{end}}$ represent the horizontal and vertical coordinates of the pixel at the end of the $i$th direction line, and $x_S$ and $y_S$ represent the horizontal and vertical coordinates of the central pixel $S$. Specifically, if the $i$th direction line does not grow, $l_i^S = 0$. The PTI process is formally presented in Algorithm 1.

When using the PTI algorithm to describe texture features in LTBC images from the perspective of pixels, the threshold $T_2(T_2 \geq 2)$ determines the maximum length of each directional line. Threshold $T_1(1 \leq T_1 \leq 8)$ determines whether the central pixel and its adjacent pixels have similar texture features and whether each direction line continues to expand. Therefore, whether the settings of $T_1$ and $T_2$ are reasonable and will directly affect the quality of PTI image data should be explored further.

**Settings of Thresholds $T_1$ and $T_2$**

In order to propose a reasonable method for setting thresholds $T_1$ and $T_2$, we select a PAN image of IKONOS as the experimental area (Figure 5a). The experimental area image has a size of 281 255 pixels and a spatial resolution of 1 m, depicting water, bare soil, forest, and cultivated land. However, we redescribe the experimental area using LTBC to eliminate the illumination influence on the texture feature analysis, in which the corresponding LTBC image (Figure 5b) presents high-resolution texture features of different land-cover types. Subsequently, it is very important to determine reasonable thresholds $T_1$ and $T_2$ before the PTI image is obtained based on the LTBC image (Figure 5b) using the PTI algorithm (see “Calculation of PTI”). Due to the noncorrelation between thresholds $T_1$ and $T_2$, the argumentation process regarding the reasonable values of $T_1$ and $T_2$ can be discussed separately and independently.

![Figure 5. Panchromatic (PAN) image and experimental data of the experimental area.](image-url)
In the PTI image, if the PTI of different land-cover types is more discrete and the PTI of the same land-cover type is more cohesive, then the PTI image is more suitable for image segmentation. Hence, the indicator $I_{PTI}$ is proposed, which is directly proportional to the dispersion of PTI about interclass pixels and inversely proportional to the dispersion of PTI about intraclass pixels. The higher the $I_{PTI}$ value, the better the quality of PTI image data. The sum of the absolute values of the difference in the mean values about PTI of each land-cover type sample represents the dispersion of PTI about interclass pixels. The sum of the absolute values of the difference between the PTI of each sample pixel and the mean value about PTI of the sample pixels in the same land-cover type represents the dispersion of PTI about intraclass pixels. The calculation formula is as follows:

$$I_{PTI} = \left( \frac{\sum_{k=1,k\neq j}^{N} |\mu_j - \mu_k|}{\sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{M} |PTI_i - \mu_j|} \right)$$

where $N$ is the total of land-cover types in the image, $M$ is the total of sample pixels in each land-cover type, $\mu_j$ represents the mean value about PTI of the sample pixels in the $j$th land-cover type, $\mu_k (k \neq j)$ represents the mean value of PTI of the sample pixels in the $k$th land-cover type, and $PTI_j$ represents the PTI of the $j$th sample pixel in the $j$th land-cover type.

**Settings of $T_1$ and $T_2$**

From the image in Figure 5a, 50 sample pixels were collected from each land-cover type using random sampling. Assuming threshold $T_3$ was temporarily set to 10, we calculated the corresponding $I_{PTI}$ when $T_1$ increased from 1 to 8. The line chart of Figure 6a reflects the relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_1$, highlighting that when $T_1 = 6$, $I_{PTI}$ maximizes; thus, $T_1 = 6$ is reasonable.

When $T_1 = 6$, the corresponding $I_{PTI}$ was calculated when $T_2$ increased from 2 to 20. The line chart of Figure 6b reflects the relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_2$ (when $T_1 = 6$), revealing that for $T_2 = 5$, $I_{PTI}$ maximizes, and therefore $T_2 = 5$ is a reasonable value.

Based on the above experimental results, $T_1$ is set to 6, and $T_2$ is set to 5. Based on the LTBC image (Figure 5b), the PTI algorithm (see “Calculation of PTI”) is used to obtain the PTI image (Figure 7a). Finally, the image of the experimental area is segmented using Definiens Developer software, with the segmental scale set to 60. The other segmentation parameters use the default values. Compared with the segmental result of the PAN image (Figure 7b), the “oversegmentation” and “undersegmentation” phenomena are significantly reduced by combining PAN and PTI images (Figure 7c), thus improving the segmentation quality, almost reflecting the land use situation.

**Experiments**

To avoid the contingency in the abovementioned experiments and verify the superiority and robustness of the proposed PTI algorithm, two experimental areas were selected from two distinct types of HSRRS images. Figure 8 depicts the experimental procedure, with the corresponding experiments demonstrating that the PTI image can effectively improve the image classification and segmentation quality. The first experimental area was selected from the QuickBird, with Figure 9 depicting the original and the corresponding LTBC images of all bands. The multi-spectral (i.e., blue [450 to 520 nm], green [520 to 600 nm], red [630 to 690 nm], and near-infrared [NIR, 760 to 900 nm]) images of this experimental area are 211 × 181 pixels, and the spatial resolution is 2.44 m. The PAN (610 to 720 nm) image of this

![Figure 6. Calculation results of $I_{PTI}$. (a) Relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_1$(when $T_2=10$). (b) Relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_2$ (when $T_1=6$. PTI = pixel texture index.](image)

![Figure 7. Panchromatic (PAN) image and experimental data of the experimental area. (a) Pixel texture index (PTI) image. (b) Segmental result based on PAN image. (c) Segmental result by combining PAN image with PTI image.](image)
The experimental area is 792 × 734 pixels, and the spatial resolution is 0.61 m, presenting artificial land-cover types and noise (such as shadow).

The second experimental area was selected from the WorldView-II. The Coastal-band (400 to 450 nm), yellow (585 to 625 nm), red-edge (705 to 745 nm), and NIR-II (860 to 1040 nm) images provided by WorldView-II are specifically used for vegetation identification and analysis. The images of the four bands were selected for this experiment because vegetation is the main land-cover type of the second experimental area. The original and corresponding LTBC images of all bands are illustrated in Figure 10. The multi-spectral images of this experimental area are 141 × 131 pixels, and the spatial resolution is 1.8 m. The PAN (450 to 800 nm) image of this experimental area

Figure 8. Flow chart of the experimental procedure. HSRRS = high spatial resolution remotely sensed; LTBC = local texture binary code; PTI = pixel texture index.

Figure 9. High spatial resolution remotely sensed (HSRRS) images and the corresponding local texture binary code (LTBC) images of the first experimental area. (a) Blue image and corresponding LTBC image. (b) Green image and corresponding LTBC image. (c) Red image and corresponding LTBC image. (d) Near-infrared (NIR) image and corresponding LTBC image. (e) PAN image and corresponding LTBC image.
image is 561 × 524 pixels with a spatial resolution of 0.5 m, presenting cultivated land, forest, water, and bare soil. The two experimental areas reflect two distinct land use situations.

Since multi-spectral images have multi-dimensional spectral features, these images are suitable for classification experiment. Specifically, it is suitable for segmental experiment based on a single spectral feature provided by PAN image. This article verifies the PTI algorithm’s superiority and robustness from classification of multi-spectral images and segmentation of PAN images.

Classifications of Multi-spectral Images
Firstly, classification experiments of multi-spectral images were performed. Before deriving the PTI images, the \( I_{PTI} \) (see “\( I_{PTI} \) Index”) was used to determine the reasonable values of the thresholds \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \). Using random sampling, 40 sample pixels were collected from each land-cover type of the two experimental areas. The threshold \( T_2 \) of the first experimental area was temporarily set to 15, the threshold \( T_2 \) of the second experimental area was temporarily set to 10, and the corresponding \( I_{PTI} \) (Equation 6) was calculated when \( T_1 \) increased from 1 to 8. Figures 11a and 12a illustrate the relationship between \( I_{PTI} \) and \( T_1 \) about the two experimental areas. In Figure 11a, due to the high

![Diagram of \( I_{PTI} \) and threshold \( T_1 \) (when \( T_2 = 15 \)](image)

![Diagram of \( I_{PTI} \) and threshold \( T_2 \) (when \( T_1 = 6 \)](image)
correlation of the data between visual bands (i.e., blue, green, red), the trends of $I_{PTI}$ about the sample points in visual bands are similar. However, the correlation between the NIR band and visible bands is not high, so there is a significant difference in the trend of $I_{PTI}$ about the sample points in NIR bands compared to the former. When $T_1 = 6$, $I_{PTI}$ maximizes, and therefore, the reasonable value of $T_1$ is 6 for the first experimental area. In Figure 12a, due to the high correlation between Coastal-band and yellow, the trends of $I_{PTI}$ about the sample points in the two bands are similar. The correlation between red-edge and NIR-II is relatively high, so the trends of $I_{PTI}$ about the sample points in the two bands are similar. When $T_1 = 7$, $I_{PTI}$ maximizes, and therefore, the reasonable value of $T_1$ is 7 for the second experimental area.

For the first experimental area, we considered $T_1 = 6$, and the corresponding $I_{PTI}$ was calculated while $T_2$ increased from 15 to 70. Figure 11b depicts the relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_2$, suggesting that when $T_2 = 35, 46, 63$, and 45, $I_{PTI}$ in blue, green, red, and NIR maximizes, respectively. When $T_2$ exceeds these values, $I_{PTI}$ decreases and then tends to stabilize. Therefore, the reasonable values of $T_2$ in four bands are 35, 46, 63, and 45. Based on the thresholds $T_1$ and $T_2$ calculated above, we derived PTI images (Figure 13) from the LTBC images (Figure 9a–d) using the PTI algorithm (see “Calculation of PTI”). For the second experimental area $T_1 = 7$, and the corresponding $I_{PTI}$ was calculated, while $T_2$ increased from 5 to 33. Figure 12b depicts the relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_2$, suggesting that when $T_2 = 24, 25, 26, I_{PTI}$ in Coastal-band, yellow, red-edge, and NIR-II maximizes, respectively. When $T_2$ exceeds these values, $I_{PTI}$ slightly decreases and tends to stabilize finally. Therefore, the reasonable values of $T_2$ in four bands are 24, 25, 24, 25, and 26. Based on the $T_1$ and $T_2$ thresholds calculated above, we derived PTI images (Figure 14) from the LTBC images (Figure 10a–d) using the PTI algorithm (see “Calculation of PTI”). The homogeneity of each land-cover type’s texture features and each land-cover type’s edges is presented in the PTI images of all bands.

Correlation analysis was performed between the multi-spectral and PTI images of the two experimental areas to obtain the correlation coefficient matrices. Tables 1 and 2 highlight that the correlation between PTI images and the multi-spectral images is very low. This statistic indicates that the information redundancy between PTI and multi-spectral images is very low. It describes the various land-cover types’ high frequency, which increases the dimension of the image classification feature space and provides effective data support for improving classification accuracy.
In order to verify the effect of PTI image data on image classification, a simple supervised classification technique was adopted to classify the land-cover types of the two experimental areas into five categories. The classification of each experimental area was performed twice. The first classification was executed based on multi-spectral images, referred to as data 1. The second classification was executed by combining low-correlation multi-spectral images and PTI images, referred to as data 2. Data 2 of the first experimental area included red, NIR, PTI\textsuperscript{Red\_edge}, PTI\textsuperscript{NIR}, and Data 2 of the second experimental area included yellow, red-edge, NIR-II, PTI\textsuperscript{Coastal-band}, PTI\textsuperscript{Red\_edge}, PTI\textsuperscript{NIR-II}.

Additionally, to evaluate the classification results, the PAN images of the experimental area were used as references; combined with the actual land use situation, manual mapping was used to obtain the correct classification results (Figures 15a and 16a). The classification results of the two experimental areas are depicted in Figures 15b, 15c, 16b, and 16c.

### Segments of PAN Images

Subsequently, segmental experiments of PAN images were performed. Specifically, using random sampling, 70 sample pixels were collected from each land-cover type for the first experimental area. The threshold $T_2$ was temporarily set to 60, and the corresponding $I_{PTI}$ (Equation 1).

#### Table 1. Correlation coefficient matrix of the eight bands about the first experimental area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Blue</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>NIR</th>
<th>PTI\textsuperscript{Blue}</th>
<th>PTI\textsuperscript{Coastal-band}</th>
<th>PTI\textsuperscript{Red_edge}</th>
<th>PTI\textsuperscript{NIR}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>−0.003</td>
<td>−0.003</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>−0.002</td>
<td>−0.003</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>−0.114</td>
<td>−0.100</td>
<td>−0.062</td>
<td>−0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI\textsuperscript{Blue}</td>
<td>−0.003</td>
<td>−0.002</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>−0.114</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI\textsuperscript{Green}</td>
<td>−0.003</td>
<td>−0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>−0.100</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI\textsuperscript{Red_edge}</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>−0.062</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI\textsuperscript{NIR}</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>−0.247</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NIR = near-infrared; PTI = pixel texture index.

#### Table 2. Correlation coefficient matrix of the eight bands about the second experimental area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Coastal-band</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Red-edge</th>
<th>NIR-II</th>
<th>PTI\textsuperscript{Coastal-band}</th>
<th>PTI\textsuperscript{Yellow}</th>
<th>PTI\textsuperscript{Red_edge}</th>
<th>PTI\textsuperscript{NIR-II}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal-band</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>−0.333</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>−0.376</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-edge</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>−0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIR-II</td>
<td>−0.333</td>
<td>−0.376</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>−0.079</td>
<td>−0.115</td>
<td>−0.071</td>
<td>−0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI\textsuperscript{Coastal-band}</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>−0.079</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI\textsuperscript{Red_edge}</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>−0.115</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI\textsuperscript{NIR-II}</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>−0.071</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI\textsuperscript{NIR-II}</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>−0.004</td>
<td>−0.132</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 15.

Experimental results of the first experimental area about multi-spectral images. (a) Manually corrected classification result. (b) Classification result based on data 1. (c) Classification result based on data 2.

### Figure 16.

Experimental results of the second experimental area about multi-spectral images. (a) Manually corrected classification result. (b) Classification result based on data 1. (c) Classification result based on data 2.
6) was calculated when $T_1$ increased from 1 to 8. Figure 17a illustrates the relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_1$, revealing that when $T_1 = 6$, $I_{PTI}$ maximizes, and therefore, the reasonable value of $T_1$ is 6. Then, for $T_1 = 6$ the corresponding $I_{PTI}$ was calculated, while $T_2$ increased from 50 to 60. Figure 17b depicts the relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_2$, suggesting that when $T_2 = 57$, $I_{PTI}$ maximizes, and therefore, the reasonable value of $T_2$ is 57.

Second, using random sampling, 60 sample pixels were collected from each land-cover type for the second experimental area. The threshold $T_2$ was temporarily set to 10. The corresponding $I_{PTI}$ was calculated. When the threshold $T_1$ increased from 1 to 8, and a line chart was used to reflect the relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_1$ (Figure 18a). It showed that when $T_1 = 6$, the $I_{PTI}$ reached its maximum therefore the reasonable value of $T_1$ is 6. When $T_1 = 6$, the corresponding $I_{PTI}$ was calculated when the threshold $T_2$ increases from 2 to 10, and a line chart is used to reflect the relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_2$ (Figure 18b). It showed that when $T_2 = 4$, the $I_{PTI}$ reached its maximum; therefore the reasonable value of $T_2$ is 4.

Based on the thresholds $T_1$ and $T_2$ calculated above, we derived PTI images from the LTBC images (Figure 9b and 9d) using the PTI algorithm (see “Calculation of PTI”). The homogeneity of each land-cover type’s texture features and each land-cover type’s edges is presented in the PTI images (Figure 19).

![Figure 17](image17.png)

Figure 17. Calculation results of $I_{PTI}$ of the first experimental area about panchromatic (PAN) image. (a) Relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_1$ (when $T_2 = 60$). (b) Relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_2$ (when $T_1 = 6$). PTI = pixel texture index.

![Figure 18](image18.png)

Figure 18. Calculation results of $I_{PTI}$ of the second experimental area about panchromatic (PAN) image. (a) Relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_1$ (when $T_2 = 10$). (b) Relationship between $I_{PTI}$ and $T_2$ (when $T_1 = 6$). PTI = pixel texture index.

![Figure 19](image19.png)

Figure 19. Pixel texture index (PTI) images of two experimental areas about panchromatic (PAN) images. (a) PTI image of the first experimental area. (b) PTI image of the second experimental area.
The segmentation parameters for the first experiment are a segmentation scale of 150 and a shape factor of 0.3, while the other parameters are the default. Accordingly, the segmentation scale is set to 80 for the second experimental area, and the other parameters are the default. Based on the two data sets, the PAN images of the two experimental areas are segmented twice. The first set of data solely comprises a PAN image (Figures 9e and 10e), referred to as data 1, and the second set consists of PAN images (Figures 9e and 10e) and its PTI images (Figure 19a and 19b), referred to as data 2. The segmentation results are presented in Figure 20, where the blue lines represent the image segmentation-generated contour lines of the objects.

Results and Analysis

We first used manual visual interpretation to analyze and compare the experimental results to ensure the evaluation rationality. Then, we combined classification and segmentation metrics to evaluate the experimental results objectively.

Analysis of Classification Results

The classification results of the two experimental areas were evaluated using manual visual interpretation, the confusion matrix, overall accuracy, and the kappa coefficient.

Manual Visual Interpretation

First, by using manual visual interpretation, the classification results of the two experimental areas were compared. It was found that: (1) In the classification result based on data 1 of the first experimental area, many shadow pixels were misclassified as buildings, while some light-gray building pixels were misclassified as roads, resulting in low classification accuracy of these land-cover types. Meanwhile, due to the interference of traffic line pixels on classification, the completeness of the road was not high in the result. However, in the classification result based on data 2 of the experimental area, the misclassifications between building and shadow and between building and road were significantly reduced, and the completeness of the road was also improved. (2) In the classification result based on data 1 of the second experimental area, some forest pixels were misclassified as grassland, and some grassland pixels were misclassified as cultivated land. Meanwhile, because some bare soil areas are covered with a small amount of vegetation, some pixels were classified as grassland. In the classification result, the bare soil area was incomplete and inconsistent with the land use status. In the classification result based on data 2 of the experimental area, the misclassifications between forest and grassland and between grassland and cultivated land were reduced, and the completeness of the bare soil area significantly improved.

Figure 20. Experimental results of two experimental areas about PAN images. (a) Segmental result of the first experimental area based on data 1. (b) Segmental result of the first experimental area based on data 2. (c) Segmental result of the second experimental area based on data 1. (d) Segmental result of the second experimental area based on data 2.
Accuracy Verification
Secondly, the classification accuracy was verified using the confusion matrix, overall accuracy, and the kappa coefficient. Using the partition random sampling method, 90 validation pixels were extracted from each land-cover type in two experimental areas. Referring to the correct classification results by manually drawing the two experimental areas (Figures 15a and 16a), accuracy verification was carried out through human–computer interaction. The results are reported in Tables 3 and 4, revealing that the overall classification accuracy based on data 2 improved from 7% to 14%, and its kappa coefficient increased from 11% to 24%.

Analysis and Evaluation of Classification Results
Through manual visual interpretation and accuracy verification of the data, we found that the classification accuracy based on data 1 is inferior to the classification results based on data 2. This is because, first, for the first experimental area, the spectral values of the pixels of building shadow in blue, red, and green are close to those of the dark-gray buildings. There are significant differences between the spectral values of these pixels in NIR and PTI\textsubscript{NIR}. The spectral values of the pixels of light-gray buildings in blue, green, and

Table 3. Accuracy validation results of the first experimental area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>White Building</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Vegetation</th>
<th>Shadow</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White building</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall accuracy (%)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>White building</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Vegetation</th>
<th>Shadow</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall accuracy (%)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Accuracy validation results of the second experimental area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Forest Land</th>
<th>Grassland</th>
<th>Cultivated Land</th>
<th>Bare Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest land</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassland</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivated land</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare soil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall accuracy (%)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Forest Land</th>
<th>Grassland</th>
<th>Cultivated land</th>
<th>Bare Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest land</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivated land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare soil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall accuracy (%)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21. Comparison of spectral mean values of some pixels in the first experimental area about multi-spectral images. (a) Dark-gray building pixels versus shadow pixels. (b) Light-gray building pixels versus road pixels. (c) Road pixels versus traffic lines pixels. NIR = near-infrared; PTI = pixel texture index.
NIR are close to that of the road. In addition, there are significant differences between the spectral values of these pixels in red, PTI_red, and PTI_NIR (Figure 21b). Therefore, in the classification result based on data 1, many pixels of the building shadow were misclassified as buildings, and some light-gray buildings were misclassified as roads. The classification accuracy of these pixels significantly improved in the classification result based on data 2. Meanwhile, there are significant differences between the spectral values of traffic line pixels in blue, green, and red and the spectral values of road pixels (Figure 21c). After classification, these pixels were classified into nonroad, reducing the road’s integrity. However, the spectral values of traffic line pixels in NIR, PTI_red, and PTI_NIR are similar to that of the road. Therefore, in the classification result based on data 2, these pixels were classified as roads, improving the integrity of the road.

For the second experimental area, the spectral values of some light-green forest pixels in yellow and red-edge are relatively close to that of grassland pixels, and there are some differences between the spectral values of these pixels in the Coastal-band, NIR-II, PTI_red, PTI_NIR, and PTI_Coastal-band (Figure 22a). The spectral values of some grassland pixels in Coastal-band, yellow, and NIR-II are similar to that of cultivated land pixels, and there are some differences between the spectral values of these grassland pixels in red-edge, PTI_red, PTI_NIR, and PTI_Coastal-band, PTI_NIR, and that of cultivated land pixels (Figure 22b). The homogeneity of spectral values leads to some light-green forest pixels being misclassified as grasslands and some grassland pixels misclassified as cultivated land in the classification result based on data 1. However, the heterogeneity of spectral features enhances the classification accuracy of these pixels in the classification result based on data 2. The vegetation pixels covering bare soil have significant differences in the spectral values of Coastal-band, yellow, and NIR-II compared to those of bare soil pixels (Figure 22c). These pixels are divided into nonbare soil, which reduced the integrity of the bare soil in the classification result based on data 1. The spectral values of these vegetation pixels in Red-edge, PTI_red, PTI_NIR, and PTI_Coastal-band are very close to that of bare soil (Figure 22c). Therefore, most of the vegetation pixels covering bare soil were classified as bare soil, and the integrity of the bare soil was significantly improved in the classification result based on data 2.

Based on the analysis and discussion of the classification results based on two sets of data about two experimental areas, we conclude that PTI images contain texture and edge features that are completely different from spectral features. Combining such image data can expand the classification feature space’s dimension and improve the classification accuracy.

### Analysis of Segmental Results

To ensure the rationality of evaluation, we visually compared and quantitatively evaluated and analyzed the segmental results in two experimental areas.

#### Visual Comparison

Visually comparing the segmentation results of the first experimental area based on the two data sets reveals the following: (1) For the segmentation results based on data 1 (Figure 20a), due to the spectral heterogeneity within the same land-cover type, the buildings in white boxes ①, ②, ③, and ④ are oversegmented into many small objects, i.e., “oversegmentation,” and the boundaries of these polygons do not correspond to the actual edges of the buildings. However, in the white boxes of the segmentation results based on data 2 (Figure 20b), the oversegmentation phenomenon disappears. In addition, the contour lines of the objects are nearly consistent with the actual edges of buildings. (2) For the segmentation results based on data 1 (Figure 20a), due to the spectral heterogeneity within the same land-cover type, the shadow of the building in white boxes ⑤, ⑥, ⑦, and ⑧ is oversegmented. On the other hand, the shadow is segmented more accurately in the results of data 2 (Figure 20b). (3) During segmentation, spectral heterogeneity causes the vegetation in white boxes ⑨ and ⑩ to be oversegmented when considering data 1 (Figure 20a), while the segmentation integrity of vegetation improves when considering data 2 (Figure 20b).

Subsequently, visually comparing the segmentation results of the second experimental area based on the two sets of data reveals: (1) For the segmentation result based on data 1 (Figure 20c), due to the

![Figure 22. Comparison of the spectral mean values of some pixels in the second experimental area about multi-spectral images. (a) Light-green forestland pixels versus grassland pixels. (b) Grassland pixels versus cultivated-land pixels. (c) Vegetation on bare soil pixels versus bare soil pixels. NIRII = near-infrared II; PTI = pixel texture index.](image-url)
spectral heterogeneity within the same land-cover type, the woodland in white box ① is oversegmented into multiple objects, while the woodland in the segmental result based on data 2 (Figure 20d) is completely segmented. (2) In the segmentation results based on data 1 (Figure 20c), due to the spectral heterogeneity within the same land-cover type and of different land-cover types, the farmland in white box ② suffers from oversegmentation and undersegmentation. However, these phenomena disappear in the white box of the segmental result based on data 2 (Figure 20d). (3) For the segmentation results based on data 1 (Figure 20c), due to the spectral heterogeneity, bare soil in white box ③ is oversegmented, while in the segmentation results based on data 2 (Figure 20d), the oversegmentation problem was significantly improved. (4) Some edges of terraces in white box ④ are not displayed in the segmental result based on data 1 (Figure 20c), but they are shown in the segmental results based on data 2 (Figure 20d).

Quantitative Evaluation of Segmental Results
Opposing the unsuitable image classification evaluation indicators, i.e., overall accuracy and kappa coefficient, this article uses five supervised evaluative indicators: oversegmentation (OS), undersegmentation (US), edge matching degree (ED), number of segmentation blocks (FG), and shape error (SH), which evaluate the difference between the segmentation result and the ground truth segmentation to evaluate the segmentation quality quantitatively (Wu et al. 2013; Chen et al. 2017). All metrics have a range of [0, 1], and their values are inversely proportional to the difference between the segmentation result and the ground truth segmentation. The evaluation is conducted as follows: Based on the PAN image, the corrected segmental results for the two experimental areas are obtained by a manual drawing (Figures 23a and 24a). Then, according to the distributed proportion of each land-cover type, sample objects are randomly selected from different image regions. The sampling results are presented in Figures 23b, 23c, 24b, and 24c, and the sample objects are outlined in red. Eventually, the five evaluative indicators estimate the difference between sample objects and their respective ground truth segmentation (Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segmental Results</th>
<th>Supervised Evaluative Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segmental result based on data 1 of the first experimental area</td>
<td>OS = 0.1494, US = 0.0088, ED = 0.6469, FG = 0.8565, SH = 0.0779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmental result based on data 2 of the first experimental area</td>
<td>OS = 0.0623, US = 0.0047, ED = 0.3801, FG = 0.2135, SH = 0.0416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmental result based on data 1 of the second experimental area</td>
<td>OS = 0.7379, US = 0.1282, ED = 0.9477, FG = 0.9519, SH = 0.0896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmental result based on data 2 of the second experimental area</td>
<td>OS = 0.3256, US = 0.0773, ED = 0.5782, FG = 0.518, SH = 0.0648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ED = edge-matching degree; FG = number of segmentation blocks; OS = oversegmentation; SH = shape error; US = undersegmentation.

Analysis and Evaluation of Segmental Results
The values of five evaluation indicators (Wu et al. 2013) reveal the following: (1) Compared to the values of OS and US in data 1, the decline rates of OS and US values of the segmentation result based on data 2 about the first experimental area are 58.2% and 46.5%, respectively. The decline rates of OS and US values of the segmentation result based on data 2 about the second experimental area are 55.8% and 39.7%. The large decline rates of OS and US values about the segmentation results based on data 2 indicate that the oversegmentation and undersegmentation phenomena are effectively reduced by combining PTI and PAN images during segmentation. (2) Compared to the values of ED, FG, and SH for data 1, the decline rates of ED, FG, and SH values of the segmentation result based on data 2 about the first experimental area are 41.2%, 75%, and 46.5%. The decline rates of ED, FG, and SH values of the segmentation result based on data 2 about the second experimental area are 41.2%, 75%, and 46.5%. The decline rates of ED, FG, and SH values of the segmentation result based on data 2 about the second experimental area are 38.9%, 45.5%, and 27.6%. The decline rates of ED, FG, and SH values about the segmentation results based on data 2 indicate that

Figure 23. Manually corrected segmental results and sample objects of the first experimental area about PAN image. (a) Manually corrected segmental result; (b) Sample objects of the segmental results based on data 1. (c) Sample objects of the segmental result based on data 2.

Figure 24. Manually corrected segmental results and sample objects of the second experimental area about PAN images. (a) Manually corrected segmental result. (b) Sample objects of the segmental results based on data 1. (c) Sample objects of the segmental results based on data 2.
the segmentation results based on data 2 are more similar to the ground truth segmentation than the segmentation result based on data 1.

Furthermore, the high-quality segmentation results based on data 2 indicate that PTI is a good texture descriptor. Indeed, it improves the homogeneity of texture features within the same land-cover type by using the context of the intrapixel texture features and ultimately highlighting the edges of the land-cover types. Meanwhile, the PTI image is obtained based on the LTBC image using the PTI algorithm (see “Calculation of PTI”), which can mitigate the effect of different illumination on PTI image data. Overall, we conclude that combining PTI and PAN images eliminates the interference of high-frequency information during the segmentation process and introduces texture and edge features to improve the segmentation quality.

Conclusions
This article proposes a PTI and its corresponding algorithm that mitigates the interference of different illumination to the analytical process of texture features without placing constraints regarding texture regularity. The experiments on three types of HSRRS images (i.e., IKONOS, QuickBird, and WorldView-II) prove that PTI simultaneously enhances the homogeneity of texture features within the same land-cover type and the edge features of different land-cover types. Combining this image data can expand the classification feature space’s dimension and improve the classification accuracy and quality. Indeed, accuracy improved from 7% to 14%, and the kappa increased from 11% to 24%. Additionally, the experiments prove that combining such features for image segmentation effectively reduces the oversegmentation and undersegmentation phenomena. Five supervised evaluative indicators are reduced from 27.6% to 75%.
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Parcel-Level Crop Classification in Plain Fragmented Regions Based on Multi-Source Remote Sensing Images

Qiao Zhang, Ziyi Luo, Yang Shen, and Zhoufeng Wang

Abstract
Accurately obtaining crop cultivation extent and estimating the cultivated area are significant for adjusting regional planting structure. This study proposes a parcel-level crop classification method using time-series, medium-resolution, remote sensing images and single-phase, high-spatial-resolution, remote sensing images. The deep learning semantic segmentation network feature pyramid network with squeeze-and-excitation network (FPN–SENet) and multi-scale segmentation were used to extract cultivated land parcels from Gaofen-2 imagery, while the pixel-level crop types were classified by using support vector machine algorithms from time-series Sentinel-2 images. Then, the parcel-level crop classification was obtained from the pixel-level crop types and land parcels. The proposed method was tested in southwestern China to extract main winter–spring crops and achieved a good performance. Specifically, the FPN–SENet model outperformed other models in cultivated land extraction, with an F1 score of 0.872. The crop classification overall accuracy is 0.910 and the kappa coefficient is 0.861. This study provides a technical reference for monitoring cultivated land and can be applied in other regions.

Introduction
By 2050, the worsening soil, land, and water resources on a global scale will present a huge challenge in meeting the food demands of over 10 billion people (United Nations 2017; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations FAO 2021). Food security is a pressing global concern, and the strictest protection policies should be implemented on cultivated land, the basis of food production. Therefore, accurately monitoring cultivated land is significant for adjusting regional planting structure, improving management of crops, and ensuring food security (Yan et al. 2015). As a new earth observation technology, remote sensing has the characteristics of excellent efficiency, wide range, and high accuracy. In recent years, with the continuous development of remote sensing technology, ground object identification based on remote sensing has gradually replaced the traditional manual field investigation and has been widely used in agriculture, such as crop classification and monitoring regional planting structure (Yan et al. 2015; Kong et al. 2016).

With the increase in available remote sensing images, such as those from Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS), Landsat, and Sentinel, it is found that a single-phase image cannot be universally applied in precise crop classification due to the limitations of resolution, cloud, and rain. Meanwhile, multi-temporal images are found to be able to achieve higher classification accuracy (Yang et al. 2019; Li et al. 2021). Since the multi-temporal images contain an enormous amount of vegetation phenological information, these images can show the unique phenological characteristics of the crops during the growth cycle (Xie et al. 2008; Chen and Liu 2023). Therefore, time-series images are widely used in current research (Zheng et al. 2015), among which the time-series medium-to-high resolution images are the main data source in mapping crops now (Du et al. 2019). Several methods like maximum likelihood (ML) (Ha et al. 2020), support vector machine (SVM) (Foody and Mathur 2004), random forest (RF) (Breiman 2001), and classification and regression tree (CART) (Loh 2011) were proposed for crop classification using time-series medium-to-high resolution images (Belgiu and Csilik 2018; Zhang et al. 2020).

However, due to the complex land cover situation, the accuracy of crop mapping is not very high with only phenological characteristics from time-series images during its growth cycle, especially in highly heterogeneous cultivated land and broken areas (Wu et al. 2017). For example, some regions, such as the Chengdu Plain in the Southwest of China, are mainly smallholder agriculture (Du et al. 2019), with fragmented cultivated land parcels and complex planting structures. If crops were mapped by time series medium-resolution images, there are 3 main challenges: over-or-under estimate of the crop areas caused by obvious mixed pixels at the edge of cultivated lands (Wu et al. 2017; Wen et al. 2023), a noticeable salt-and-pepper effect (Blaschke et al. 2000) caused by crops at various growing stages and the spatial heterogeneity (Chen and Liu 2023), and misidentified crop classification due to the similar phenological characteristics in areas with complex planting structure. These challenges make it difficult to meet practical needs with the mapping results. To address these problems, a good solution is to introduce the parcel edges as boundary constraints for the pixel-level crop classification.

High-spatial-resolution images can provide the necessary details to observe smallholder agriculture (Du et al. 2019), and some scholars have extracted cultivated land boundaries and parcels from such images (Xu et al. 2022). Yao et al. (2014) used the traditional object-based image classification (OBIC) method to extract the cultivated land from the RapidEye images. They also found that the segmentation technique can obtain objects with similar spectral-spatial characteristics, and the segmentation scheme determines the accuracy of classification results.

With the development of deep learning, it can extract cultivated land boundaries with high precision (Liu et al. 2022). Deep learning is a self-supervised feature learning method that simulates and learns how the human brain thinks by constructing neural networks (Hinton et al. 2006). Unlike other traditional classifiers, it can learn a deep nonlinear network structure, approximate complex functions to extract...
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Evaluation of SMAP and CYGNSS Soil Moistures in Drought Prediction Using Multiple Linear Regression and GLDAS Product

Komi Edokossi, Shuanggen Jin, Andres Calabia, Iñigo Molina, and Usman Mazhar

Abstract

Drought is a devastating natural hazard and exerts profound effects on both the environment and society. Predicting drought occurrences is significant in aiding decision-making and implementing effective mitigation strategies. In regions characterized by limited data availability, such as Southern Africa, the use of satellite remote sensing data promises an excellent opportunity for achieving this predictive goal. In this study, we assess the effectiveness of Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP) and Cyclone Global Navigation Satellite System (CYGNSS) soil moisture data in predicting drought conditions using multiple linear regression–predicted data and Global Land Data Assimilation System (GLDAS) soil moisture data. SMAP and CYGNSS data exhibit strong spatiotemporal congruence with the predicted soil moisture data. Pearson correlation coefficients further underscore this consistency, with correlations of \( r = 0.78 \) between GLDAS and SMAP, \( r = 0.61 \) between GLDAS and CYGNSS, and \( r = 0.84 \) between GLDAS and the estimated soil moisture. The proficient performance of SMAP and CYGNSS soil moisture data in tandem with other variables underscores their efficacy in predicting drought conditions.

Introduction

Drought constitutes a significant natural hazard characterized by prolonged periods of low precipitation and elevated temperatures, leading to heightened evapotranspiration rates (Jin and Zhang 2016; Huang and Jin 2020; Elameen et al. 2023). This climatic phenomenon directly impacts agricultural yields due to deficits in soil moisture (Marsh, 2007; Dai 2011). Within the context of the Southern Africa region, the effect of recent drought events, spanning from 2015–2016 to 2018–2020, has been particularly profound. These occurrences have exacted a heavy toll on both human livelihoods and crop yields. For instance, during the drought of 2015–2016, crop production underwent a precipitous decline of up to 66%, concurrently affecting over a quarter of the region’s population (Ainembabazi, 2018). During 2018–2019, the drought affected more than 40% of the population (Johannesburg Regional Bureau 2020), and the crop production was 10% below the average (World Food Program 2019).

The scientific literature commonly recognizes four distinct categories of drought (Mishra and Singh 2010): meteorological, agricultural, hydrological, and socioeconomic. Meteorological drought manifests as an insufficient occurrence of precipitation over a given time span—whether short or prolonged—resulting in a deficit of soil moisture that adversely affects plants, giving rise to what is termed agricultural drought. Hydrological drought materializes when there is an insufficiency in water availability across streams, reservoirs, and groundwater sources. In contrast, socioeconomic drought pertains to the inability of water supply to adequately meet demand (Mishra and Singh 2010).

The prediction of drought occurrences plays a pivotal role in facilitating early warnings and mitigating their subsequent effects. Over time, numerous methodologies and formulations have been developed and used to achieve this objective. The predominant approaches comprise statistical methods and dynamical methods, which harness climate and/or hydrologic models to simulate the intricate physical processes of the atmosphere, land, and oceans (Hao et al. 2018). Within the realm of statistical methods, a spectrum of techniques is embraced, including time series models, regression models, artificial intelligence models, Markov chain models, and conditional probability models. These methodologies stand out as extensively used avenues. In the context of statistical methodologies, the identification of appropriate predictors derived from atmospheric, terrestrial, and oceanic domains, as well as the determination of predictands for the target timeframe, is of paramount importance (Hao et al. 2018). For instance, the efficacy of time series models predominantly hinges on the persistence of certain indicators, which serves as the bedrock for achieving accurate predictions. The autoregressive integrated moving average technique emerges as an exceptionally apt choice for prediction within climatology and hydrology, as it effectively handles linear relationships between predictors and predictands, albeit without capturing nonlinearity. In the realm of statistical prediction, the conventional linear regression method finds applications in hydrology and climatology. This method establishes a linear connection between the predictand and suitable predictors, representing the simplest avenue for climatohydrological prediction. The modeling of the association between drought indices and predictors often uses the regression model (Barros and Bowden 2008; Liu and Juárez 2001; Panu and Sharma 2002; Sun et al. 2012). In scenarios in which nonlinear relationships are at play, the locally weighted polynomial regression offers a valuable alternative for modeling associations (Hwang and Carbone 2009; Liu and Hwang...
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Debris Flow Susceptibility Evaluation Based on Multi-level Feature Extraction CNN Model: A Case Study of Nujiang Prefecture, China

Xu Wang, Baoyun Wang, Ruohao Yuan, Yumeng Luo, and Cunxi Liu

Abstract
Debris flow susceptibility evaluation plays a crucial role in the prevention and control of debris flow disasters. Therefore, this paper proposes a convolutional neural network model named multi-level feature extraction network (MFENet). First, a dual-channel CNN architecture incorporating the Embedding Channel Attention mechanism is used to extract shallow features from both digital elevation model images and multispectral images. Subsequently, channel shuffle and feature concatenation are applied to the features from the two channels to obtain fused feature sets. Following this, a deep feature extraction is performed on the fused feature sets using a residual module improved by maximum pooling. Finally, the susceptibility index of gullies to debris flows is calculated based on the similarity scores. Experimental results demonstrate that the model exhibits favorable classification performance, with an accuracy of 73.45%. Furthermore, the percentage of debris flow valleys in high and very high susceptibility zones reaches 93.97%.

Introduction
Debris flows refer to a specific type of flood event characterized by the rapid transport of a significant amount of solid materials, such as mud, sand, rocks, and large boulders, triggered by heavy precipitation in mountain valleys or slopes. Debris flows are characterized by their sudden onset, high velocity, large discharge, substantial material capacity, and destructive potential. Incidents of debris flows often result in the destruction of transportation infrastructure, including roads and railways, as well as residential areas, leading to significant losses (Lopes et al. 2016). This prompts many researchers to evaluate debris flow susceptibility, aiming to prevent and control disasters (Musumeci et al. 2021).

Since the 1970s, the evaluation of debris flow susceptibility has gradually become an important research direction for disaster prevention and mitigation. The former Soviet Union published a national zoning map for debris flow-prone regions (Fleischmann 1985). Japanese experts determined debris flow susceptibility based on three aspects: landforms, morphology of debris flow, and rainfall (Li 1997; Takahashi 1991). Chinese researchers (Liu 1991) divided ten counties and cities in Zhaotong City, Yunnan Province, into four levels of hazard zones using a regional debris flow hazard determination method. During this stage of debris flow research, qualitative evaluation was the main approach, relying heavily on expert experience and field investigations, which were time-consuming, labor-intensive, inefficient, and carried certain risks. With the rapid development of remote sensing, geographic information systems, and global positioning systems (referred to as "3S" technologies) in the late 1990s, these technologies began to be applied in the investigation and monitoring of debris flows, promoting the development of quantitative evaluation in geological disaster research. Researchers started using 3S technologies and statistical methods for debris flow susceptibility evaluation (Zhang et al. 2019; Jamali et al. 2020; Li et al. 2022). Li (2019) used remote sensing imagery as data sources and selected the certainly factor model (CF) and CF-based multi-factor overlay weight method for debris flow susceptibility evaluation. Li et al. (2019) also used remote sensing and geographic information technologies, combined with three-dimensional visualization techniques, to extract debris flow information. They selected nine evaluation factors and used an improved analytic hierarchy process for susceptibility evaluation.

With the popularity of machine learning, researchers have found that it can capture the nonlinear relationship between debris flow susceptibility and evaluation factors more accurately. Various machine learning algorithms have been widely applied in debris flow susceptibility evaluation. Wang (2018), Liu and Qiao (2021), and Li et al. (2010) have established debris flow susceptibility models based on support vector machines. Wang Xin et al. (2022) used correlation analysis to select influential factor indicators and constructed a dynamic zoning model for debris flow susceptibility using a backpropagation neural network. Liu et al. (2018) built a debris flow susceptibility evaluation model by random forests. Machine learning algorithms have shown good performance in debris flow susceptibility evaluation. However, they require subjective selection of susceptibility factors through correlation analysis or other methods and involve significant human intervention, resulting in a lower degree of classification automation. Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) have significant advantages in image classification and other fields, avoiding the process of selecting susceptibility evaluation factors and simplifying the complexity of feature extraction and data reconstruction in the classification process. Che (2021) proposed a debris flow susceptibility evaluation method based on a CNN model, demonstrating the superiority of the model. Zhang (2021) established a multi-sequence residual network model based on the attention mechanism to predict debris flow velocity, demonstrating the coupling correlation between velocity and various triggering factors, with slope and bulk density significantly affecting velocity. However, there are still some issues to be addressed. Debris flow is a type of geological hazard in valleys, and it is crucial to construct a CNN model that can adequately represent the spatial...
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