

# Funded by the European Union

# Multisource Remote Sensing Data Visualization using Machine Learning

Ioana Cristina Plajer<sup>\*,1</sup>, Alexandra Băicoianu<sup>2</sup>, Luciana Majercsik<sup>3</sup> and Mihai Ivanovici<sup>4</sup>

#### Abstract

With the availability of several remotely sensed data sources, the problem of efficiently visualizing the information from multisource data for improved Earth observation becomes an intriguing and challenging subject. Multispectral (MS) and hyperspectral (HS) images encompass a wealth of spectral data that standard RGB monitors cannot replicate directly. Thus, it is important to elaborate methods for accurately representing this information on conventional displays. These images, with tens to hundreds of spectral bands, contain relevant data about specific wavelengths that RGB channels cannot capture. Traditional visualization methods often use only a limited amount of the available spectral information, resulting in a significant loss of information. However, recent advances in artificial intelligence models have provided superior visualization techniques. These artificial intelligence (AI)-based methods allow for more realistic and visually appealing representations, which are important for the information interpretation and direct identification of areas of interest. The main goal of our study is to process aggregated datasets from various sources using a fully connected neural network (FCNN), while considering visualization as a secondary objective. Given that our data come from a variety of sources, a significant emphasis in our study was placed on the preprocessing stage. In order to achieve a consistent visualization across datasets from different sources, proper preprocessing by standardization or normalization procedures is essential. Our research comprises numerous experiments to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed technique for image visualization.

*Key words:* Remote sensing, multispectral (MS) and hyperspectral (HS) images, neural network, multisource, visualization, standardization, normalization.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1\*</sup> Corresponding author, Department of Mathematics and Informatics, Transilvania University of Braşov, Romania, e-mail: ioana.plajer@unitbv.ro

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics and Informatics, *Transilvania* University of Braşov, Romania, e-mail: a.baicoianu@unitbv.ro

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Department of Mathematics and Informatics, *Transilvania* University of Braşov, Romania, e-mail: luciana.carabaneanu@unitbv.ro

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Department of Electronics and Computers, *Transilvania* University of Braşov, Romania, e-mail: mihai.ivanovici@unitbv.ro

# **1** Introduction

The unique spectral properties of different types of materials determine variations in the way they absorb light, thus giving each material a distinct spectral fingerprint. Multispectral (MS) and hyperspectral (HS) sensors are capable of capturing a rich spectral information that can cover hundreds of spectral bands, allowing them to detect even the smallest changes in the reflectance or radiance of objects. The resulting images produced by MS and HS sensors include additional spectral information about the chemical composition of objects. This additional information makes them extremely useful in a series of applications in areas such as agriculture [1], [2], forestry [3], [4], environmental monitoring and ecology [5], [6], object detection [7], land cover classification [8], [9], as well as military and industrial fields.

In this context machine learning techniques allow for notable progress in a large range of application of remote sensing. Examples include a Siamese Transformer Network designed for HS image target detection [10] and some techniques for HS image denoising and anomaly detection [11, 12, 13, 14]. These advances highlight the growing ability of machine learning strategies to refine the understanding and interpretation of remote sensing data.

A first step in MS and HS interpretation is the visualization of the data in a comprehensive manner for human users. MS and HS images contain more spectral information than standard RGB channels can display, providing important data about specific wavelengths, beyond the RGB capabilities.

A realistically displayed spectral satellite image enables direct human interpretation and identification of areas of interest, but accurate visualization is challenging because of the need to compress information from numerous bands into three, while preserving essential spatial and spectral detail.

Several visualization techniques have been proposed in the scientific literature in order to generate realistic RGB images from spectral images. These include band selection [15], [16], independent component analysis (ICA) [17] and principal component analysis (PCA) [18], [19] based methods, linear and nonlinear methods [20], and, relatively recent, machine learning approaches [21], [22].

While the classical method based on band selection uses a very small part of the available information, disregarding the information available in the other unused bands, better results of visualization with AI models have already been reported in recent research papers [23]. Such methods, like the proposed one, allow for a more realistic rendering of colors and, in the same time, producing more appealing images (vivid colors, good contrast, large dynamic range, etc.) while showing the color as close to the real colors of the scene, as they would have been perceived by a human observer.

An accurate visualization of satellite images can facilitate a direct human interpretation for spotting pixels or areas affected by various degradation (e.g. in agriculture, spotting areas affected by diseases of the agricultural crops). Moreover, satellite images rendered in a more realistic manner can be used as a first step to verify the accuracy of different approaches, such as classification, which can be initially appreciated visually.

A major challenge in addressing different tasks on MS and HS images is the variability of the image data (spectral range, spatial resolution etc.) when obtained by different sensors. Thus the primary goal of our research, presented in this paper, is a method of processing such aggregated datasets, obtained from various sources, using a fully connected neural network (FCNN). Visualization is merely a secondary goal, as a test case specifically for this fusion.

Although research in the area of visualization is still limited, as already described in [24] and [23], a neural network trained on a set of MS images can be used successfully to visualize spectral images acquired by different sensors. Challenges in this field include limited labeled training data and spectral variability between different sensors, as they capture information at different spectral wavelengths. The spectral variability can make it difficult for a neural network to extract significant and meaningful features in a coherent manner, especially if the training data does not cover the full range of spectral variation.

The article explores different approaches to normaliziation respectively standardization of the data from different datasets and describes experiments with different preprocessing approaches. Our FCNN methodology efficiently handles both MS and HS images. It also addresses the challenges of band selection and spectral variability, making it a versatile and robust approach for different data settings. Furthermore, the architecture of the network and training hyperparameters are presented in detail.

The main advantages of our method lie in the generalization of the approach and adaptability to data of different spectral and spatial resolution. Furthermore by combining publicly-available datasets with appropriately labeled data for network training, we ensure a principled and accessible foundation for model learning.

Our proposed method also has the advantage of not requiring further image post-processing of the obtained RGB image, which leads to a more polished and refined output straight out of the model.

In the case of FCNN processing, information aggregation is quite beneficial, especially when public data is limited. Such aggregation increases the methodology's efficacy despite related limitations. The visualization results demonstrate potential even when dealing with datasets containing fewer bands, indicating the versatility and robustness of our methodology across various data configurations. Such a methodology eliminates any doubt regarding the selection criteria of the effective bands used.

The article is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the different MS and HS datasets used in our experiments, pointing out the challenges of working with multisource data. Section 3 presents the data preprocessing steps and the proposed FCNN model architecture, together with the model training process. The visual results of our experiments for the different strategies used are presented and discussed in Section 4, and their comparative quality assessment is outlined in Section 5, showing the potential of the new approach proposed in Section 4. Finally, the conclusions of this article and some limitations of our study, which became apparent after the completion of the research are emphasized in Section 6, together with future directions for our research.

# 2 Materials

## 2.1 Hyperspectral and Multispectral Imaging

MS and HS images are two types of remote sensing data that capture information about the Earth's surface by sensing electromagnetic radiation. As mentioned in the introduction, they are widely used in various fields, including agriculture and environmental monitoring. The key distinction between MS and HS images lies in their spectral resolution. HS images have a far higher spectral resolution, catching data in several narrow and contiguous bands, while MS images only capture data in a small number of discrete bands. This higher spectral resolution allows for a more detailed characterization of surface materials based on their spectral signatures. MS and HS images offer valuable insights into the Earth's surface, and the choice between them depends on the specific application requirements and the level of spectral and spatial detail needed for analysis.

Differences in sensor types used to capture MS and HS images can introduce specific challenges and variations in the data. Different sensors may have varying spectral band configurations, capturing data in different wavelength ranges or bandwidths. Multiple sources and sensor variety can result in inconsistency when comparing or combining data from different sensors. It is essential to carefully account for these differences to ensure accurate and meaningful analysis. Also, sensors used in MS and HS imaging require calibration to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the captured data. However, calibration procedures can vary between sensors and platforms. Inconsistencies in calibration methods can lead to differences in the radiometric or spectral accuracy of the acquired data. Proper calibration and validation techniques must address these issues and establish reliable and consistent data sets. Each sensor has its characteristics and limitations, such as spectral response functions, signal-to-noise ratios, and dynamic ranges. These characteristics can also affect the quality and reliability of the captured data. In spectral imaging, sensors can have different spatial resolutions, affecting the level of detail captured in the images. Combining or comparing red multisource sensor data with different spatial resolutions can introduce challenges, as the spatial variability may need to align better.

Additionally, researchers and analysts should be aware of the sensor-specific characteristics and limitations and consider them when interpreting and comparing data from different sources. Standardization efforts are also conducted to facilitate cross-sensor compatibility and consistency. While multisource sensor differences can introduce challenges and variations in the data, proper preprocessing and understanding of the sensor characteristics can be addressed to ensure accurate and meaningful MS and HS imagery analysis.

#### 2.2 Description of the Datasets

The availability of MS and HS imagery with high-resolution spectral information has redefined our understanding of environmental and ecosystem phenomena. These datasets are increasingly accessible for both scientific and practical purposes, and their analysis represents an initial step toward gaining a deeper comprehension of the aforementioned phenomena. Several datasets are recognized and used in this context.

This study selected the CAVE and UGR datasets for the model's training due to their well-established reputation in the literature. They offer a diverse range of colors, and the images were captured under various environmental conditions. Moreover, a corresponding RGB image is available for each image in these datasets, facilitating a comprehensive analysis.

For the testing phase, three HS images were used, two of them provided by the relatively recent PRISMA satellite and one acquired by the Reflective Optics System Imaging Spectrometer (ROSIS-3) over Pavia University in Italy.

## 2.2.1 CAVE Dataset

The CAVE dataset [25] comprises 32 MS images captured indoors under controlled illumination conditions. Each image has a resolution of  $512 \times 512$  pixels in the spatial domain. The spectral range is between 400 nm and 700 nm, with a sampling interval of 10 nm, resulting in a total of 31 spectral bands. A corresponding RGB image with the same spatial resolution is provided for each MS image. This dataset does not contain any natural scenes.

#### 2.2.2 UGR Dataset

The UGR dataset [26] contains 14 outdoor images of urban scenes. Most of these images possess a spatial resolution of  $1000 \times 900$  pixels. The spectral range spans from 400 nm to 1000 nm, with a sampling interval of 10 nm, resulting in 61 spectral bands, out of which 31 fall within the visible spectrum. Additionally, each MS image is accompanied by a corresponding RGB image, sharing the same spatial resolution.

As can be observed from the description, the CAVE and the UGR MS images have in common the first 31 wavelengths from the visual domain. This makes them suitable for using the same FCNN with 31 input neurons. From UGR images, we thus considered only the spectral bands in the visual range, as these are relevant for visualization.

### 2.2.3 PRISMA Images

The PRISMA images used for coloring in this study are obtained from the PRISMA hyperspectral satellite operated by the Italian Space Agency (ASI). Two specific images were captured, one on October 18, 2022, in the northern region of Brasov county, Romania, and the other on March 24, 2023. The satellite's

hyperspectral sensors are capable of capturing images within a wide wavelength range of 239 spectral bands, spanning from 400 nm to 2500 nm. Among these bands, 66 falls within the Visible Near Infra-Red range (400 nm - 1010 nm), while 173 bands reside in the Short Wave Infra-Red range (920 nm - 2500 nm). The spectral sampling interval for the satellite's images is less than 12 nm. Regarding spatial characteristics, the images possess a resolution of  $1000 \times 1000$  pixels, with a ground sample distance of 30 m [27]. The spectral bands used for the experiments are in the visible domain, covering the range from 406 nm to 713 nm, with an approximate sampling interval of 8 nm.

### 2.2.4 Pavia University Dataset

The Pavia University dataset was made available by the Telecommunications and Remote Sensing Laboratory of Pavia University in 2001. This dataset was acquired using the Reflective Optics System Imaging Spectrometer (ROSIS) sensor during a flight campaign conducted over Pavia. The dataset comprises  $610 \times 610$ pixels and covers a wavelength range from 430 nm to 860 nm with 115 spectral bands. It has a spatial resolution of 1.3 meters and a spectral resolution of approximately 4 nm. However, some samples within the image do not contain any useful information and must be eliminated before analysis. Once the broken bands are removed, the 103 remaining bands can be used further in the investigation [28].

In order to test the PRISMA and the Pavia University images on the FCNN trained on the CAVE or the UGR dataset it is necessary to adapt these images to the network's input layer. As this input is calibrated to receive pixels with the spectral signature of CAVE images, each spectral pixel from the test image has to be mapped on the wavelengths of a CAVE image pixel. This has been done in this study by linear interpolation. For each wavelength of a test image (PRISMA or Pavia University), the value of a CAVE image channel is interpolated from the values of the two neighboring channels of the test image.

Fig. 1 represents the original HS pixel from a PRISMA image together with the interpolated values of this pixel.

It can be seen in Fig. 1, that by linearly interpolating the PRISMA HS image to fit the bands of the CAVE dataset, the changes in the data profile are negligible, thus justifying this approach.

#### 2.3 Prerequisites

In the context of machine learning experiments, standardization, and normalization are preprocessing techniques used to transform input data into a specific range or distribution. These techniques are commonly applied to improve the performance and convergence of machine learning models [29].

Standardization (z-score normalization or feature scaling) transforms the dataset's features into zero mean and unit variance. It entails dividing each data point by the standard deviation after taking the mean value of the feature out of each data point.



Figure 1: Original values of one HS pixel from the first PRISMA image (blue) and interpolated values (orange).

The formula for standardization is shown in the following equation:

$$z = \frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \tag{1}$$

where:

z is the standardized value,

x is the original value,

 $\mu$  is the mean of the feature,

 $\sigma$  is the standard deviation of the feature.

Standardization ensures that each feature has a similar scale and range, which is beneficial for algorithms that assume normally distributed data or when features have different scales. It centers the data around 0, with a standard deviation of 1.

Normalization (min-max scaling) transforms the dataset's features to a standard range - typically between 0 and 1. Still, the range depends on the specific normalization technique used and the requirements of the dataset. It involves subtracting the minimum value of the feature from each data point and then dividing it by the range.

The formula for normalization is shown in the following equation:

$$x' = \frac{x - \min(x)}{\max(x) - \min(x)} \tag{2}$$

where: x' is the normalized value, x is the original value, min(x) is the minimum value of the feature, max(x) is the maximum value of the feature.

Normalization preserves the shape of the distribution and is suitable when the absolute values of the features are not important but rather their relative values or ratios.

Both standardization and normalization help improve the performance of machine learning models by ensuring that features are on a similar scale and avoiding the dominance of certain features due to their larger magnitudes. It is important to note that the impact of standardization and normalization on performance can vary depending on the dataset and the specific machine learning algorithm used. Therefore, it is advisable to experiment with both techniques and evaluate their impact on the model's performance before finalizing the preprocessing approach.

# 3 Methods and Procedures

The objective of the next section is to discuss some elements crucial to the success of the tests conducted for this study. For the proposed visualization to perform, it is of great importance to comprehend the preprocessing steps and the model employed.

#### 3.1 Data Preprocessing Step

The preprocessing stage is essential to data preparation in machine learning and data analysis. Its main objective is to convert raw data into a format suitable for additional analysis or modeling.

Standardization and normalization are two of the many methods included in preprocessing. They seek to improve the performance and efficiency of various algorithms by bringing the data within a predictable and manageable range. Depending on the particular dataset, the type of issue, and the algorithms being applied, these preprocessing methods can change. It is advisable to test several transformation strategies and assess their effects on the model's performance to choose the best approach for a particular task.

In this study, various data preprocessing and transformation variations were tried precisely to study the feasible strategies and related results comprehensively. Thus, two strategies were highlighted in this paper:

- A strategy involving preprocessing on each file, concatenation of data from all the input files, shuffle, separation by train subset and test subset (respectively  $\frac{3}{4}$  and  $\frac{1}{4}$  of all existing pixels). We will further call this strategy *individual preprocessing*.
- A strategy involving concatenation without any preprocessing beforehand, shuffle, splitting into train and test (with the exact percentages as the previous strategy), and application on the training subset of one of the proposed preprocessing methodologies (standardization or normalization). After training, our learning algorithm has learned to deal with the data in

scaled form, so we have to normalize/standardize our test data with the normalizing/standardizing parameters used for training data. We will further call this strategy *global preprocessing*.

From a technical perspective, for both strategies, *StandardScaler()* [30] and *Min-MaxScaler()* [31] have been used for standardization/normalization, respectively.

## 3.2 The Proposed AI Model Architecture

The problem of consistent spectral image visualization is of significant importance, as it enables the users to visually interpret and understand the acquired data. For sensors like those of Landsat or Sentinel, with a small number of spectral bands overall and three bands in the visual range, the visualization problem is straightforward, as the three bans for red, green, and blue generate the corresponding RGB images. With the upcome of multisource modern MS and HS sensors with a wide range of spectral bands in the visual range, the problem of correct and accurate visualization gets more complex. Generally, classical methods like the ones mentioned in the introduction, often result in low-quality images and usually need adjustments.

Starting from the ideas in [23], a fully connected neural network was constructed and trained on a set of MS images, as mentioned in [24], in order to visualize spectral images acquired by different sensors. In the following section, the architecture of the network and the hyper-parameters used for training are described in detail.

#### 3.2.1 Model Description

Consistently mapping *n*-dimensional spectral pixel on a tridimensional RGB pixel can be considered a regression problem, and thus a FCNN is an appropriate model for learning this mapping. The model, illustrated in Fig. 2, consists of five layers: an input, an output layer, and three hidden layers.



Figure 2: Model pipeline.

The input layer consists of 31 neurons, as the number of channels of the CAVE images is 31, all in the visual range, and the number of spectral bands in the visual

range of the UGR images is also 31. The number of output neurons is 3, one for each RGB color.

In the hidden layer, the number of neurons was chosen to decrease from the size of the input towards the size of the output by a factor of 2. From this consideration and taking into account the computational advantage of data structured as the power of two, in the first hidden layer, we used 32 neurons, in the second 16, and in the third 8. The activation function on the hidden layers is the Exponential Linear Unit (ELU) [32], as we did not want to discard negative values.

Assessing machine learning models' performance is crucial for evaluating their effectiveness and suitability for specific assignments. Two commonly used loss functions are Mean Squared Error (MSE) and Mean Absolute Error (MAE). As MSE is very sensitive to outliers, while MAE reduces their impact almost completely, we chose the HuberLoss function, which combines both errors in an balanced way [33]. The Huber loss is defined as follows:

$$L_{\delta}(y, f(x)) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(y - f(x))^2, & |y - f(x)| \le \delta \\ \delta(|y - f(x)| - \frac{1}{2}\delta), & |y - f(x)| > \delta \end{cases}$$
(3)

where y is the true value, f(x) is the predicted value, and  $\delta$  is a parameter that determines the threshold for which, in the loss function, the MSE is replaced by MAE.

For the data points where the distance between the label and the predicted value is small, less than the threshold  $\delta$ , the function behaves like MSE. This makes it more robust to noise. However, for data points with larger differences, it switches to a linear loss. This makes it less sensitive to outliers and helps in providing a more stable estimation. If the outliers comprise 20–30% of the data, the MAE will ignore them entirely. However, Huber loss will create a balance if the outliers are significant and therefore it is a useful choice when dealing with datasets that may contain outliers or noise.

The selection of  $\delta$  plays a crucial role. In our case, the value  $\delta = 10.0$  parameter for the HuberLoss was selected empirically. We considered that a difference of 10 between two values (of a color channel) is acceptable for using the MSE, similar to JND (Just Noticeable Difference) corresponding to  $\Delta E = 3$  in CIELab.

#### 3.2.2 Model Training

After substantial testing, 150 epochs for training were determined to be adequate for accurate color mapping. The number of pixels in a batch was 2048 to shorten training time. In the backpropagation step, a common value for the learning rate  $\alpha = 0.005$  and the Adam optimizer provided by the Pytorch library was used.

The model was trained on Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-7700 CPU @ 3.60GHz server with 8 CPUs, and the duration of the training on 150 epochs on the UGR dataset was of approximately 2 hours.

The set used for training was preprocessed, as discussed in Section 4.1.2, by concatenating all the pixels from all the images, shuffling, partitioning them into train and test sets, and standardizing over the train set.

The training algorithm can be described as follows.

#### Model Training Steps

- 1. Load pixels from all the images of the dataset (CAVE or UGR), shuffle the pixels, and partition into train and test (75% versus 25%);
- 2. Preprocess data by standardization using scikit-learn StandardScaler [30];
- 3. Split set in random batches of 2048 pixels;
- 4. Train the model using HuberLoss.

In order to enhance clarity and facilitate a deeper understanding of the proposed methodology, pseudocode has been provided to describe key steps in detail in Algorithm 1.



Figure 3: The loss decay on the train and test sets when training the model with the CAVE dataset, respectively UGR dataset.

The graphic representation of the loss decay on the train and the test sets for the CAVE and UGR datasets are represented in Fig. 3. It can be seen from this figure, that on the train set, the loss decays very steeply during the first epochs and then gets stabilized, while to achieve similar results on the test set, the network needs more training.

**Algorithm 1** Pseudocode for the Training of the FCNN Require:  $path_dataset$ , model, lr = 0.005, epochs = 150

ne	quire: $pain_aaaset, moaet, tr = 0.005, epochs = 150$	
1:	$(data, labels) \leftarrow load_pixels(path_dataset)$	
2:	shuffle(data, labels)	
3:	$nr\_train\_data \leftarrow (\frac{3}{4}) * len(data)$	
4:	$nr\_test\_data \leftarrow len(data) - nr\_train\_data$	
5:	$train\_set \leftarrow (data.head(nr\_train\_data), labels.head(nr\_train\_data))$	
6:	$test\_set \leftarrow (data.tail(nr\_test\_data), labels.tail(nr\_test\_data))$	
7:	Initialize the StandardScaler and Standardize training data	
8:	Apply Scaler on test data	
9:	$batch\_size \leftarrow 2048$	
10:	Initialize weights of the model	
11:	$optimizer \leftarrow AdamOptimizer(lr, weight\_decay = 0.0008)$	
12:	$best\_loss \leftarrow maxValue$	
13:	$loss\_function \leftarrow HuberLoss(10.0)$	
14:	$train\_loss\_vec \leftarrow []$	
15:	$test\_loss\_vec \leftarrow []$	
16:	for $epoch \in (1, epochs)$ do	
17:	$train\_loss \leftarrow 0$	
18:	for $batch, (x, y) \in train\_set$ do	
19:	$y\_pred = model(x)$	
20:	$loss \leftarrow loss\_function(y, y\_pred)$	
21:	Backpropagation Step - backprop(loss)	
22:	$train_loss \leftarrow train_loss + loss.item()$	
23:	end for	
24:	$train\_loss \leftarrow train\_loss/(batch\_size)$	
25:	$train\_loss\_vec.append(train\_loss)$	
26:	if $train_{loss} < best_{loss}$ then	
27:	Save current weights	
28:	$best\_loss \leftarrow train\_loss$	
29:	else	
30:	end if	$\triangleright$ Now evaluate on test set
31:	$test\_loss \leftarrow 0$	
32:	for $batch, (x, y) \in test\_set$ do	
33:	$y\_pred \leftarrow model(x)$	
34:	$loss \leftarrow loss\_function(y, y\_pred)$	
35:	$test\_loss \leftarrow test\_loss + loss.item()$	
36:	end for	
37:	$test\_loss \leftarrow test\_loss/(batch\_size)$	
38:	$test\_loss\_vec.append(test\_loss)$	
39:	end for	
40:	Save current weights	
41:	$plot(train\_loss\_vec, test\_loss\_vec)$	



Figure 4: Visualization results of the experiments described in Section 4.1, in which global preprocessing was done on the datasets. In (a) one sample of CAVE respectively UGR datasets. The other subfigures show the results of the FCNN trained on CAVE (b) respectively UGR (c) with global normalization, and on CAVE (d), respectively UGR (e) with global standardization of the training set.

# 4 The Results for Different Strategies

## 4.1 Results with Global Preprocessing

In these experiments, the general strategy is that after splitting into the train and test subsets, normalization or standardization was performed on the entire training set, and then the results were applied to the test set. For inference, the chosen method is applied to the image being colored, using the parameters from the train.

#### 4.1.1 Global Preprocessing with Normalization

In Fig. 4b are presented the results of the FCNN trained on the CAVE dataset and in Fig. 4c the results when training the FCNN on the UGR dataset, on one sample image, see Fig. 4a, from each of these datasets. The data was preprocessed by min-max normalization on the respective training set using the MinMax scaler.

The results of the FCNN trained on the CAVE and UGR Datasets on the Pavia University image are presented in Fig. 6a, respectively in Fig. 6b. The results of the model on one of the images acquired by the PRISMA Satellite in both treating scenarios are presented in Fig. 7a and 7b. The Pavia University and the PRISMA spectral images were interpolated, to match the input spectral bands and were normalized using the parameters obtained on the respective training sets.

#### 4.1.2 Global Preprocessing with Standardisation

The results of the FCNN trained separately on the CAVE and, respectively the UGR dataset on one sample image of each of these datasets (Fig. 4a) are presented in Fig. 4d for the CAVE and in Fig. 4e for the UGR trained network. The standardisation in each case was done on the corresponding training dataset using the Standard Scaler.

The results of this method on the Pavia University image can be seen in Fig. 6c and Fig. 6d and the results on PRISMA HS image are presented in Fig. 7c and in Fig. 7d.



Figure 5: Visualization results of experiments described in section 4.2, in which preprocessing was done on each image of the datasets separately. In (a) one sample of CAVE respectively UGR datasets. The other subfigures show the results of the FCNN trained on CAVE (b) respectively UGR (c) with normalization, and on CAVE (d), respectively UGR (e) with standardization on each image of the training set.

## 4.2 Results with Individual Preprocessing

In these experiments, before concatenating all the images and separating them into train and test subsets, each image is taken and brought into the same range of values by normalizing/standardizing each one according to its own values.

#### 4.2.1 Individual Preprocessing by Normalization

Each image is considered separately, then normalized according to the min/max in the image, thus transforming all values into the range [0, 1]. All the images are then concatenated and the resulting pixel set is split into train and test subsets, respectively. At inference, an image is normalized and colored according to its associated min/max values.

In Fig. 5 are presented the results of the coloring using the FCNN trained on CAVE and respectively UGR datasets, normalizing each image before concatenating with the others.

In Fig. 6e and Fig. 6f are presented the coloring results on Pavia University and in Fig. 7e and Fig. 7f those on the PRISMA image, with the CAVE, respectively UGR trained FCNN, normalizing each image with respect to its own min-max values.



Figure 6: Visualization of the results on the Pavia University MS image using the FCNN trained in the described scenarios: on CAVE (a) respectively UGR (b) with global normalization and using for inference the same scaler as for the training set, on CAVE (c) respectively UGR (d) with global standardization and using for inference the same scaler as for the training set, on CAVE (e) respectively UGR (f) with normalization of each image with respect to its own min-max values and on CAVE (g) respectively UGR (h) with standardization of each image with respect to its own mean and standard deviation.

## 4.2.2 Individual Preprocessing by Standardisation

In this approach, each image is considered separately, then standardized according to the mean/average deviation in the image, so all values are brought into the standard range [-1, 1]. The processed images are then concatenated and the resulting pixel set is split into train and test subsets, respectively. At inference, an image is standardized and colored according to the distribution of values in the image.

In Fig. 5 are presented the results of the coloring using the FCNN trained on CAVE and respectively UGR datasets, standardizing each image before concatenating with the others, on samples of these datasets.

In Fig. 6g and Fig. 6h are presented the coloring results on Pavia University and PRISMA using the CAVE, respectively UGR trained FCNN, normalizing each image with respect to its own mean/std values. The visualization results of the FCNN on a PRISMA HS image are presented in Fig. 7g and Fig. 7h.



Figure 7: Visualization of the first PRISMA HS image using the FCNN trained in the described scenarios: on CAVE (a) respectively UGR (b) with global normalization and using for inference the same scaler as for the training set, on CAVE (c) respectively UGR (d) with global standardization and using for inference the same scaler as for the training set, on CAVE (e) respectively UGR (f) with normalization of each image with respect to its own min-max values and on CAVE (g) respectively UGR (h) with standardization of each image with respect to its own mean and standard deviation.

### 4.3 A Different Approach

The experiments interpreted from the previous figures show that the best coloring results on the CAVE and UGR datasets were obtained when normalizing or standardizing the training set (Global Preprocessing) and using the respective parameters on the test set. This strategy follows the standard practice in machine learning flows. On the other hand, the results were not acceptable on the Pavia University and the PRISMA images. This is not surprising, as these images are bound to have different distributions than the training sets.

In Fig. 8 are illustrated the distributions on the green channels (650 nm) for the CAVE (8a) and the UGR (8b) datasets, together with those of Pavia University (8c) and of the first PRISMA image (8d), both calculated after interpolation. We selected the green channel for illustration, but the observation is valid for any other 31 channels of the spectral images considered.

As we aimed to obtain a model that should be able to visualize images from different acquiring sources with different distributions and spectral signatures, we tried following a non-standard approach. We considered the FCNN model, with global preprocessing by standardization in the training stage. After training, to



Figure 8: Distributions on the green channel (considered at 550nm) for CAVE and UGR datasets and for Pavia University and PRISMA spectral images.

visualize Pavia University and PRISMA images, these were standardized concerning their own mean and standard deviation as to obtain for each channel the mean of 0 and the standard deviation of 1.

The following algorithm can express the inference step.

## Visualization Algorithm

- 1. Interpolate image to fit CAVE spectral range
- 2. Load the pixels of the interpolated image
- 3. Standardize the pixels with PyTorch StandardScaler relative to their mean and variance
- 4. Use the model to predict the corresponding (R, G, B) triplet for each interpolated image pixel
- 5. Construct the RGB image with respect to the original size of the input image.

This paper was submitted at TGRS 2024



(a) Region from image in Fig. 7g (b) Region from image in Fig. 7h

Figure 9: Illustrations of the artefacts in the PRISMA image in a region of interest.

To enhance clarity and promote a thorough understanding of the proposed methodology, we have incorporated pseudocode of Algorithm 2 to provide detailed descriptions of inference step.

Algorithm 2 Pseudocode for Visualization using the FCNN					
<b>Require:</b> <i>path_ms_image, model, input_freq, target_freq</i>					
1: $image \leftarrow load(path\_ms\_image)$					
2: $interpolated \leftarrow Interpolate(image, input_freq, target_freq)$					
3: Scale <i>interpolated</i> with StandardScaler					
4: $predicted \leftarrow model(interpolated)$					
5: Make RGB image from <i>predicted</i>					

The results of this approach are presented as follows: for the Pavia University image in Fig. 10a (CAVE trained FCNN) and Fig. 10d (UGR trained FCNN), for the first PRISMA image in Fig. 10b (CAVE trained FCNN) and Fig. 10e and for the second PRISMA image in Fig. 10c and respectively Fig. 12f.

# 5 Discussions and Comparisons

Various experiments have been carried out in this study, all aiming to better visualize the considered spectral images. And since we want to determine which of the discussed approaches is better, a variety of data from different types of sensors were used.

All the results to be commented on are presented in the figures from Fig. 4 to Fig. 13. We will comment on each experiment, in the same order in which they were performed.

Fig. 4 shows the results of the experiments in the case of global preprocessing by normalization over the whole training set. As can be noticed, visually, the results are quite similar in terms of colours. However, on closer inspection, it can be seen that there are also pairs with better contrast, in the sense that the colouring of an UGR image works better with a network trained with UGR images and similarly for CAVE images.



Figure 10: Visualization of the results on Pavia University and PRISMA, when standardizing those images according to their own distributions. In the top row the results were obtained using the FCNN trained on CAVE, and in the bottom row the FCNN trained on UGR.

Fig. 5 shows the results of the experiments when each image is normalized/standardized according to its own values. As can be seen, normalization works better than standardization, which makes sense because during the preprocessing by normalization each feature undergoes a transformation to fit within a new range, while preserving its original relationships with the other features in the data, meaning that all the relational properties within the data remain intact [34].

Following these tests, this type of preprocessing with normalization seems to be a consistent option. The alternative with standardization is not plausible because this transformation step tends to change the relationships between colors, which leads to artifacts, especially for images that are not part of the training dataset, see Fig. 9a and Fig. 9b.

Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 represent the results of tests performed on images obtained from different types of sensors and having different characteristics than the images in the training sets. To use the network on images such as Pavia University image or the images acquired by PRISMA, a mandatory step was the interpolation one, which is necessary to map the spectral bands of those images on the input with 31 channels of the model.

Regardless of the training data set, CAVE or UGR, if we normalize or standardize over the whole training set and at the inference step we use the scaler/properties from the training stage, the results for the images taken from other sensors are very bad in terms of brightness and contrast, on Pavia even worse than on PRISMA (see Fig. 6d - standardization on UGR vs. Fig. 7d).

Normalization on each image yields good results on Pavia (Fig. 6e and Fig. 6f) and acceptable on PRISMA (Fig. 7e and Fig. 7f). In contrast, standardization on each image generates significant artifacts, see Fig. 6g and Fig. 7g for the standardization on each image in CAVE, and Fig. 6h and Fig. 7h for the standardization on each image in UGR. These artefacts can be seen more clearly on a selected region in PRISMA image, as illustrated in Fig. 9.

In Fig. 10, we presented different experiments for visualisation of spectral images by means of a FCNN. As could be seen from all previous figures compared with Fig. 10, the best results on images that were acquired by other sensors than those used for the images in the training set and with another spectral signature, were obtained by using global preprocessing in the training step, but standardizing these images according to their own mean and standard deviation at inference.

We also compared our results with some conventional me-thods of spectral image visualization namely band selection and XYZ space [35] as well as two other methods: decolorization-based HSI visualization [36] and multichannel pulsecoupled neural network (MPCNN)-based HSI visualization [37]. In Fig. 12 and 13 are displayed the results of the visualization of the first PRISMA image and, respectively the second PRISMA image using these methods.

Moreover, we studied if our method favors certain wavelengths with respect to others, as is the case for band selection. By plotting the weights between the input and the first hidden layer, we found out, that all the bands contribute in a balanced manner to the final results. In figure Fig. 11, is displayed a selection of these weights. Each color represents the weights of one input neuron to the neurons on the next layer, while each input neuron corresponds to one wavelength.

In conclusion, the results of our tests are better than the results of conventional methods, at least on PRISMA, our use case, regardless of how the preprocessing stage is performed. Given the fact that the standardization for other types of images is done relative to their mean and variance, we believe that a network that has been trained on images with a good distribution of light and contrast will tend to produce images with good contrast and light, even if the original images are affected by the atmospheric conditions. These results justify using this type of approach in the case of satellite images.



Figure 11: Selection of neurons with highest absolute values on the first layer.

#### 5.1 Comparative Quality Assessment

In order to perform a numerical quality comparison between the results presented in Fig. 12 and Fig. 13, some no-reference image quality assessments [38, 39] like entropy, which estimates information quantity, fractal dimension, which estimates the complexity and standard deviation, which estimates non-uniformity, were used. These values were calculated using adequate scripts offered by [40], for entropy and [41, 42] for fractal dimension, and the Matlab *std2* function for the standard deviation of an image. The PRISMA images were correspondingly scaled as the scripts were calibrated for  $256 \times 256$ . For calculating the fractal dimension, the parameters used were  $LMAX \in \{41, 71, 101\}$ , representing the maximum size of the hypercubes and a threshold of 0.00001 for the standard deviation [43].

It is important to note that the actual entropy values of color images will depend on the specific content and distribution of pixel intensities in the image. Images with complex color patterns, a wide range of intensities, and diverse color distributions are likely to have higher entropy values. Hence, a higher value of the entropy indicates a higher informational content, and a higher value of the fractal dimension indicates higher complexity of the scene and is directly correlated with the contrast of the image. A larger variance is also characteristic of images with a larger variety, thus greater informational content.

When satellite land cover images include agricultural areas, as well as urban and non agricultural surfaces, as seen in the PRISMA images presented in this study, we expect a consistent visualization to exhibit large values for the entropy, the fractal dimension, and the variance.

The processed values for these measures in the case of the visualizations presented in Fig. 12 and Fig. 13 are displayed in Tables 1 and 2. It can be observer that the largest values for entropy and variance are obtained in the case of the MPCNN method, closely followed by the results provided by our FCNN. As the visualization results presented in Fig. 12d and Fig. 13d show, the MPCNN method provides images with large variability, but with completely unnatural colors, be-



Figure 12: Comparative results of classic and advanced visualization techniques with the new approach for the first PRISMA image. Band selection in (a), coloring with XYZ space in (b), decolorization based visualization in (c), MPCNN vizualization in (d), results with CAVE trained FCNN in (e) and UGR trained FCNN in (f).

Sample	Entropy	Standard	Fractal Dimension		
		Deviation	with $L_{max}$		
			41	71	101
FCNN / CAVE	15.6314	47.0056	3.7421	3.8271	3.8291
FCNN / UGR	15.8624	44.7105	3.7199	3.8064	3.7940
Band selection	12.6552	16.1236	2.7463	2.7484	2.8136
XYZ method	13.5262	20.4681	2.9795	2.9251	2.8930
Decolorization	14.0430	39.5901	2.9668	3.0568	3.1282
MPCNN	15.9284	48.0310	3.7245	3.9921	3.9566

Table 1: Comparative Quality Assessment for the First PRISMA Image

ing thus unusable in the case of the PRISMA images. Thus, the visualizations obtained by our method, exhibit the best visual results and almost the best quantitative ones. Consequently, it is evident that the FCNN visualizations yield the



Figure 13: Comparative results of classic and advanced visualization techniques with the new approach for the second PRISMA image. Band selection in (a), coloring with XYZ space in (b), decolorization based visualization in (c), MPCNN vizualization in (d), results with CAVE trained FCNN in (e) and UGR trained FCNN in (f).

Sample	Entropy	Standard	Fractal Dimension		
		Deviation	with $L_{max}$		
			41	71	101
FCNN / CAVE	14.9011	50.5844	3.1309	3.1925	3.2909
FCNN / UGR	15.5923	48.5822	3.0698	3.1678	3.2157
Band selection	14.2838	27.2990	2.4924	2.7755	3.1075
XYZ method	13.7575	20.7137	2.6343	2.7082	2.8104
Decolorization	12.9841	23.2493	2.6714	2.7646	2.8926
MPCNN	15.8832	53.4223	3.2908	3.4603	3.6736

Table 2: Comparative Quality Assessment for the Second PRISMA Image

best results for all the measures, with slightly greater contrast for the CAVE trained FCNN. These quantitative results further justify the approach proposed by the present paper.

# 6 Conclusions

Processing multisource spectral images is still challenging as more satellites with different sensor characteristics are launched, and their products are freely available for scientists and other users. The present paper aims to resolve part of the problems posed by a consistent and qualitative visualization of such images, using a FCNN trained on two of the most known public spectral datasets appropriate for this purpose.

Furthermore, we studied and performed several preprocessing procedures, which are very important in this FCNN approach to visualize multisource images exhibiting different spectral signatures.

The results we obtained were evaluated both visually and by conventional measures of information content. This evaluation has shown that the images generated by our method can provide a deeper understanding of various aspects, such as identifying agricultural patches and urban centers.

The visual and quantitative results indicate that the proposed methodology is a promising direction for a consistent and qualitative multisource spectral image visualization. There are still some limitation of this approach. For example, in cases where the source image exhibits minor variance, the application of standardization may compromise the realism of coloring. The reliance on labeled data for training limits our dataset choices to those that are annotated and publicly accessible. This limitation could affect the diversity and representativeness of the training data, hence further research is needed to address these issues. Additionally, when combining datasets, we must either interpolate or truncate information to balance the dataset differences, each option having its trade-offs.

Our future research efforts will be based on addressing some of these limitations. This preliminary work can prepare the ground for our next objective that is interpreting the data through the perspective of vegetation indices and other elements relevant to the agricultural sector, thus increasing the usefulness of our approach in this sector.

# Acknowledgments

Funded by the European Union. This work was funded from the AI4AGRI project entitled "Romanian Excellence Center on Artificial Intelligence on Earth Observation Data for Agriculture". The AI4AGRI project received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation program under the grant agreement no. 101079136. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

The hyperspectral image from the PRISMA satellite presented in this paper was kindly provided by the Italian Space Agency (ASI).

# References

- Marie Weiss, Frédéric Jacob, and Grgory Duveiller. Remote sensing for agricultural applications: A meta-review. *Remote sensing of environment*, 236:111402, 2020.
- [2] Telmo Adão, Jonáš Hruška, Luís Pádua, José Bessa, Emanuel Peres, Raul Morais, and Joaquim Joao Sousa. Hyperspectral imaging: A review on uavbased sensors, data processing and applications for agriculture and forestry. *Remote sensing*, 9(11):1110, 2017.
- [3] Pedro Rodríguez-Veiga, Shaun Quegan, Joao Carreiras, Henrik J Persson, Johan ES Fransson, Agata Hoscilo, Dariusz Ziółkowski, Krzysztof Stereńczak, Sandra Lohberger, Matthias Stängel, et al. Forest biomass retrieval approaches from earth observation in different biomes. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*, 77:53–68, 2019.
- [4] Elia Vangi, Giovanni D'Amico, Saverio Francini, Francesca Giannetti, Bruno Lasserre, Marco Marchetti, and Gherardo Chirici. The new hyperspectral satellite prisma: Imagery for forest types discrimination. *Sensors*, 21(4):1182, 2021.
- [5] Lingtong Du, Qingjiu Tian, Tao Yu, Qingyan Meng, Tamas Jancso, Peter Udvardy, and Yan Huang. A comprehensive drought monitoring method integrating modis and trmm data. *International Journal of Applied Earth* Observation and Geoinformation, 23:245–253, 2013.
- [6] Yi-Tung Chan, Shuenn-Jyi Wang, and Chung-Hsien Tsai. Real-time foreground detection approach based on adaptive ensemble learning with arbitrary algorithms for changing environments. *Information Fusion*, 39:154–167, 2018.
- [7] Xudong Kang, Xiangping Zhang, Shutao Li, Kenli Li, Jun Li, and Jón Atli Benediktsson. Hyperspectral anomaly detection with attribute and edgepreserving filters. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 55(10):5600–5611, 2017.
- [8] Gong Cheng, Junwei Han, and Xiaoqiang Lu. Remote sensing image scene classification: Benchmark and state of the art. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 105(10):1865–1883, 2017.
- [9] Maryam Mehmood, Ahsan Shahzad, Bushra Zafar, Amsa Shabbir, and Nouman Ali. Remote sensing image classification: A comprehensive review and applications. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2022:1–24, 2022.
- [10] Weiqiang Rao, Lianru Gao, Ying Qu, Xu Sun, and Jocelyn Chanussot. Siamese transformer network for hyperspectral image target detection. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 60:1–1, 01 2022.

- [11] Lina Zhuang, Lianru Gao, Bing Zhang, Xiyou Fu, and José M. Bioucas-Dias. Hyperspectral image denoising and anomaly detection based on low-rank and sparse representations. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 60:1–17, 2022.
- [12] Lianru Gao, Degang Wang, Lina Zhuang, Xu Sun, Min Huang, and Antonio Plaza. Bs3lnet: A new blind-spot self-supervised learning network for hyperspectral anomaly detection. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 61:1–18, 2023.
- [13] Lianru Gao, Xiaotong Sun, Xu Sun, Lina Zhuang, Qian Du, and Bing Zhang. Hyperspectral anomaly detection based on chessboard topology. *IEEE Trans*actions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 61:1–16, 2023.
- [14] Xiaotong Sun, Lina Zhuang, Lianru Gao, Hongmin Gao, Xu Sun, and Bing Zhang. Information retrieval with chessboard-shaped topology for hyperspectral target detection. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 61:1–15, 2023.
- [15] Steven Le Moan, Alamin Mansouri, Yvon Voisin, and Jon Y Hardeberg. A constrained band selection method based on information measures for spectral image color visualization. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 49(12):5104–5115, 2011.
- [16] Hongjun Su, Qian Du, and Peijun Du. Hyperspectral image visualization using band selection. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth* Observations and Remote Sensing, 7(6):2647–2658, 2013.
- [17] Yingxuan Zhu, Pramod K Varshney, and Hao Chen. Evaluation of ica based fusion of hyperspectral images for color display. In 2007 10th international conference on information fusion, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2007.
- [18] Vassilis Tsagaris, Vassilis Anastassopoulos, and George A Lampropoulos. Fusion of hyperspectral data using segmented pct for color representation and classification. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 43(10):2365–2375, 2005.
- [19] Haris Ahmad Khan, Muhammad Murtaza Khan, Khurram Khurshid, and Jocelyn Chanussot. Saliency based visualization of hyper-spectral images. In 2015 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS), pages 1096–1099. IEEE, 2015.
- [20] Danping Liao, Siyu Chen, and Yuntao Qian. Visualization of hyperspectral images using moving least squares. In 2018 24th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR), pages 2851–2856. IEEE, 2018.
- [21] Puhong Duan, Xudong Kang, and Shutao Li. Convolutional neural network for natural color visualization of hyperspectral images. In *IGARSS 2019-2019 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium*, pages 3372–3375. IEEE, 2019.

- [22] Rongxin Tang, Hualin Liu, Jingbo Wei, and Wenchao Tang. Supervised learning with convolutional neural networks for hyperspectral visualization. *Remote Sensing Letters*, 11(4):363–372, 2020.
- [23] Radu-Mihai Coliban, Maria Marincaş, Cosmin Hatfaludi, and Mihai Ivanovici. Linear and non-linear models for remotely-sensed hyperspectral image visualization. *Remote Sensing*, 12(15), 2020.
- [24] Ioana Cristina Plajer, Alexandra Baicoianu, and Luciana Majercsik. Ai-based visualization of remotely-sensed spectral images. (in press).
- [25] Fumihito Yasuma, Tomoo Mitsunaga, Daisuke Iso, and Shree K Nayar. Generalized assorted pixel camera: postcapture control of resolution, dynamic range, and spectrum. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 19(9):2241– 2253, 2010.
- [26] Jia Eckhard, Timo Eckhard, Eva M Valero, Juan Luis Nieves, and Estibaliz Garrote Contreras. Outdoor scene reflectance measurements using a bragg-grating-based hyperspectral imager. *Applied Optics*, 54(13):D15–D24, 2015.
- [27] ASI. Prisma Products Specification Document Issue 2.3, March 2020, [online] Available: https://prisma.asi.it/missionselect/docs/ PRISMA%20Product%20Specifications\_Is2\_3.pdf.
- [28] Manuel Garana, Miguel Angel Veganzones, and Borja Ayerdi. Hyperspectral remote sensing scenes. Available at https://www.ehu.eus/ccwintco/ index.php/Hyperspectral\_Remote\_Sensing\_Scenes (2023/03/05).
- [29] Sinan Ozdemir and Divya Susarla. Feature Engineering Made Easy: Identify unique features from your dataset in order to build powerful machine learning systems. Packt Publishing Ltd, 2018.
- [30] Standard Scaler, June 2023, [online] Available: https://scikit-learn. org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.preprocessing. StandardScaler.html.
- [31] MinMax Scaler, May 2023, [online] Available: https://scikit-learn. org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.preprocessing. MinMaxScaler.html.
- [32] Saurabh Singh. ELU as an Activation Function in Neural Networks, February 2023, [online] Available: https://deeplearninguniversity.com/ elu-as-an-activation-function-in-neural-networks/.
- [33] Alexander Jung. Machine learning: The basics, 2022.
- [34] Gokhan Aksu, Cem Oktay Güzeller, and Mehmet Taha Eser. The effect of the normalization method used in different sample sizes on the success of

artificial neural network model. International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education, 2019.

- [35] Magnus Magnusson, Jakob Sigurdsson, Sveinn Eirikur Armansson, Magnus O Ulfarsson, Hilda Deborah, and Johannes R Sveinsson. Creating rgb images from hyperspectral images using a color matching function. In *IGARSS 2020-2020 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium*, pages 2045–2048. IEEE, 2020.
- [36] Xudong Kang, Puhong Duan, Shutao Li, and Jón Atli Benediktsson. Decolorization-based hyperspectral image visualization. *IEEE Transactions* on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 56(8):4346–4360, 2018.
- [37] Puhong Duan, Xudong Kang, Shutao Li, and Pedram Ghamisi. Multichannel pulse-coupled neural network-based hyperspectral image visualization. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 58(4):2444–2456, 2020.
- [38] Zhou Wang, A.C. Bovik, H.R. Sheikh, and E.P. Simoncelli. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE Transactions* on *Image Processing*, 13(4):600–612, 2004.
- [39] Stefan Winkler. Vision models and quality metrics for image processing applications. PhD thesis, 2001.
- [40] M Ivanovici and N Richard. Entropy versus fractal complexity for computergenerated color fractal images. In Proceedings of the 4th CIE Expert Symposium on Colour and Visual Appearance, Prague, Czech Republic, pages 6–7, 2016.
- [41] Mihai Ivanovici. Fractal dimension of color fractal images with correlated color components. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 29:8069–8082, 2020.
- [42] Alexandru Caliman, Mihai Ivanovici, and Noel Richard. Colour fractal dimension for psoriasis image analysis. Signal Processing and Applied Mathematics for Electronics and Communications, 2011.
- [43] Mihai Ivanovici and Noël Richard. Fractal dimension of color fractal images. IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, 20(1):227–235, 2011.