



HAL
open science

Unsupervised amplitude and texture classification of SAR images with multinomial latent model

Koray Kayabol, Josiane Zerubia

► **To cite this version:**

Koray Kayabol, Josiane Zerubia. Unsupervised amplitude and texture classification of SAR images with multinomial latent model. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 2013, 22 (2), pp.561-572. 10.1109/TIP.2012.2219545 . hal-00745387

HAL Id: hal-00745387

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-00745387>

Submitted on 25 Oct 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Unsupervised amplitude and texture classification of SAR images with multinomial latent model

Koray Kayabol, *Member, IEEE*, and Josiane Zerubia, *Fellow Member, IEEE*,

Abstract—We combine both amplitude and texture statistics of the Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) images for model-based classification purpose. In a finite mixture model, we bring together the Nakagami densities to model the class amplitudes and a 2D Auto-Regressive texture model with t -distributed regression error to model the textures of the classes. A non-stationary Multinomial Logistic (MnL) latent class label model is used as a mixture density to obtain spatially smooth class segments. The Classification Expectation-Maximization (CEM) algorithm is performed to estimate the class parameters and to classify the pixels. We resort to Integrated Classification Likelihood (ICL) criterion to determine the number of classes in the model. We present our results on the classification of the land covers obtained in both supervised and unsupervised cases processing TerraSAR-X, as well as COSMO-SkyMed data.

Index Terms—High resolution SAR, TerraSAR-X, COSMO-SkyMed, classification, texture, multinomial logistic, Classification EM, Jensen-Shannon criterion

I. INTRODUCTION

THE aim of the pixel based image classification is to assign each pixel of the image to a class with regard to a feature space. These features can be the basic image properties as intensity or amplitude. Moreover, some more advance abstract image descriptors as textures can also be exploited as feature. In remote sensing, image classification finds many applications varying from crop and forest classification to urban area extraction and epidemiological surveillance. Radar images are preferred in remote sensing because the acquisition of the images are not affected by light and weather conditions. First use of the radar images can be found in vegetation classification [2], [3] for instances. By the technological developments, we are now able to work with high resolution SAR images. The scope of this study is high resolution SAR image classification and we follow the model-based classification approach. To model the statistics of SAR images, both empirical and theoretical probability density functions (pdfs) have been proposed [1]. The basic theoretical multi-look models are the Gamma and the Nakagami densities for intensity and amplitude images respectively. A recent

review on the densities used in intensity and amplitude based modelling can be found in [4]. In this study, we work with SAR image amplitudes and consequently use the Nakagami density in model-based classification.

Finite Mixture Models (FMMs) are a suitable statistical models to represent SAR image histograms and to perform a model-based classification [5]. One of the first uses of FMM in SAR image classification may be found in [6]. In [7] mixture of Gamma densities is used in SAR image processing. A combination of different probability density functions into a FMM has been used in [8] for medium resolution and in [9] for high resolution SAR images. In mixture models, generally, a single model density is used to represent only one feature of the data, e.g. in SAR images, mixture of Gamma densities models the intensity of the images. To exploit different features in order to increase the classification performance, we may combine different feature densities into a single classifier. There are some methods to combine the outcomes of the different and independent classifiers [32]. There are some feature selective mixture models [26], [27], [28] to combine different features in a FMM. In this study, rather than pixel-based mixture model, we use a block-based FMM which assembles both the SAR amplitudes and the texture statistics into a FMM simultaneously. In this approach, we factorize the density of the image block using the Bayes rule in two parts which are 1) the amplitude density based on the central pixel of the block and 2) texture density based on the conditional density of the surrounding pixels given the central pixel.

Several texture models are used in image processing. We can list some of them as follows: Correlated K -distributed noise is used to capture the texture information of the SAR images in [10]. In [11], Gray Level Co-occurrence Matrix (GLCM) [15] and semivariogram [16] textural features are resorted to classify very high resolution SAR images (in particular urban areas). Markov Random Fields (MRFs) are proposed for texture representation and classification in [17] and [18]. A Gaussian MRF model which is a particular 2D Auto-Regressive (AR) model with Gaussian regression error is proposed for texture classification in [19]. MRF based texture models are used in optical and SAR aerial images for urban area extraction [20], [21], [22]. In [23] and [24], Gaussian AR texture model is resorted for radar image segmentation. In this study, we use a non-Gaussian MRF based model for texture representation. In this AR model, we assume that the regression error is an independent and identically distributed (iid) Student's t -distribution. The t -distribution is a convenient model for robust regression and it has been used in inverse problems in image processing [25], [29], [30] and image

Manuscript received August 19, 2011; revised April 16, 2012; accepted September 6, 2012. Koray Kayabol carried out this work during the tenure of an ERCIM "Alain Bensoussan" Postdoctoral Fellowship Programme.

Copyright ©2012 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. However, permission to use this material for any other purposes must be obtained from the IEEE by sending a request to pubs-permissions@ieee.org.

K. Kayabol is with the Istanbul Technical University, 34469 Maslak, Istanbul, Turkey (e-mail: koray.kayabol@itu.edu.tr).

J. Zerubia is with the Ayin, INRIA Sophia Antipolis Mediterranee, 2004 route des Lucioles, BP93, 06902 Sophia Antipolis Cedex, France, (e-mail: josiane.zerubia@inria.fr).

segmentation [31] as a robust statistical model.

The secondary target in land cover classification from SAR images is to find spatially connected and smooth class label maps. To obtain smooth and segmented class label maps, a post-processing can be applied to roughly classified pixels, but a Bayesian approach allows us to include smoothing constraints to the classification problems. Potts-Markov image model is introduced in [33] for discrete intensity images. In [34] and [35], some Bayesian approaches are exploited for SAR image segmentation. Hidden Markov chains and random fields are used in [36] for radar image classification. [37] exploits a Potts-Markov model with MnL class densities in hyperspectral image segmentation. A double MRFs model is proposed in [23] for optical images to model the texture and the class labels as two different random fields. In [38], amplitude and texture characteristics are used in two successive and independent schemes for SAR multipolarization image segmentation. In our spatial smoothness model, we assign a binary class map for each class which indicates the pixels belonging to that class. We introduce the spatial interaction within each binary map adopting multinomial logistic model [39]. In our logistic regression model, the probability of a pixel label is proportional to the linear combination of the surrounding binary pixels. If we compare the Potts-Markov image model [33] with ours, we may say that we have K different probability density functions for each binary random field, instead of a single Gibbs distribution defined over a multi-level label map. The final density of the class labels is constituted by combining K probability densities into a multinomial density.

Defining a latent multinomial density function along with the amplitude and the texture models, we are able to incorporate both the class probabilities and the spatial smoothness into a single mixture model. Single models and algorithms may be preferred to avoid the propagation of the error between different models and algorithms.

Since our latent model is varying adaptively with respect to pixels, we obtain a non-stationary FMM. Non-stationary FMMs have been introduced for image classification in [40] and used for edge preserving image segmentation in [41], [42]. Using hidden MRFs model, a non-stationary latent class label model incorporated with finite mixture density is proposed in [43] for the segmentation of brain MR images. A non-stationary latent class label model is proposed in [44] by defining a Gaussian MRF over the parameters of the Dirichlet Compound Multinomial (DCM) mixture density and in [45] by defining a MRF over the mixture proportions. DCM density is also called multivariate Polya-Eggenberger density and the related process is called as Polya urn process [46], [47]. The Polya urn process is proposed to model the diffusion of a contagious disease over a population. The idea proposed in [46] has been already used in image segmentation [48] by assuming that each pixel label is related to an urn which contains all the neighbor labels of the central pixel. In this way, a non-parametric density estimation can be obtained for each pixel.

Besides the model-based classification approaches, there are also variational approaches proposed for optical [49], [50] and

SAR image classification [51]. These level set approaches are based on the well-known Mumford-Shah [52] formalism in which the image pixels are fitted to a multilevel piecewise constant function while penalizing the length of the region boundaries [53]. These approaches work well in the segmentation of the smooth images but may fail if the images contain some strong textures and noise.

Since we utilize a non-stationary FMM for SAR image classification, we resort to a type of EM algorithm to fit the mixture model to the data. The EM algorithm [54], [55] and its stochastic versions [56] have been used for parameter estimation in latent variable models. We use a computationally less expensive version of the EM algorithm, namely Classification EM (CEM) [57], for both parameter estimation and classification, using the advantage of categorical random variables. In classification step, CEM uses the Winner-Take-All principle to allocate each data pixel to the related class according to the posterior probability of latent class label. After the classification step, we estimate the parameters of the class densities using only the pixels belonging to that class.

Determining the necessary number of classes to represent the data and initialization are some drawbacks of the EM type algorithms. Running EM type algorithms several times for different model orders to determine the model order based on a criterion is a simple approach to find a parsimonious solution. In [58], a combination of hierarchical agglomeration [59], EM and Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) [60] is proposed to find necessary number of classes in the mixture model. [61] performs a similar strategy with Component-wise EM [62] and Minimum Message Length (MML) criterion [63], [64]. In this study, we combine hierarchical agglomeration, CEM and ICL [65], [66] criterion to get rid of the drawbacks of CEM.

In Section II, we introduce the MnL mixture model. The details of the hierarchical agglomeration and CEM based algorithm are given in III and IV. The simulation results are shown in Section V. Section VI presents the conclusion and future work.

II. MULTINOMIAL LOGISTIC MIXTURE OF AMPLITUDE AND TEXTURE DENSITIES

We assume that the observed amplitude $s_n \in \mathbb{R}^+$ at the n th pixel, where $n \in \mathcal{R} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ represents the lexicographically ordered pixel index, is free from any noise and instrumental degradation. We denote \mathbf{s} to be the vector representation of the entire image and \mathbf{s}_n to be the vector representation of the $d \times d$ image block located at n th pixel. Every pixel in the image has a latent class label. Denoting by K the number of classes, we encode the class label as a K dimensional categorical vector \mathbf{z}_n whose elements $z_{n,k}$, $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ have the following properties: 1) $z_{n,k} \in \{0, 1\}$ and 2) $\sum_{k=1}^K z_{n,k} = 1$. We may write the probability of \mathbf{s}_n as the marginalization of the joint probability density $p(\mathbf{s}_n, \mathbf{z}_n | \Theta, \boldsymbol{\pi}_n) = p(\mathbf{s}_n | \mathbf{z}_n, \Theta) p(\mathbf{z}_n | \boldsymbol{\pi}_n)$, [5], as

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{s}_n | \Theta, \boldsymbol{\pi}_n) &= \sum_{\mathbf{z}_n} p(\mathbf{s}_n | \mathbf{z}_n, \Theta) p(\mathbf{z}_n | \boldsymbol{\pi}_n) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{z}_n} \prod_{k=1}^K [p(\mathbf{s}_n | \theta_k) \pi_{n,k}]^{z_{n,k}} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\pi_{n,k}$ represent the mixture proportions and ensure that $\sum_{k=0}^K \pi_{n,k} = 1$. θ_k are the parameters of the class densities and $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K\}$ is the set of the parameters. By taking into account that \mathbf{z}_n is a categorical random vector distributed as a multinomial, and assuming that $\boldsymbol{\pi}_n = \{\pi_{n,1}, \dots, \pi_{n,K}\}$ is spatially invariant, (1) is reduced to classical FMM as follow

$$p(\mathbf{s}_n|\Theta) = \sum_{k=1}^K p(\mathbf{s}_n|\theta_k)\pi_{n,k} \quad (2)$$

We prefer to use the notation in (1) to show the contribution of the multinomial class label density, $p(\mathbf{z}_n|\boldsymbol{\pi}_n)$, to the finite mixture model more explicitly. We give the details of the class and the mixture densities in the following two sections.

A. Class Amplitude and Texture Densities

We may write the density of an image block as a joint density of the central pixel s_n and the surrounding pixels $\mathbf{s}_{\partial n}$ as $p(\mathbf{s}_n|\theta_k) = p(s_n, \mathbf{s}_{\partial n}|\theta_k)$. Using Bayes rule, we factorize the density of an image block as

$$p(\mathbf{s}_n|\theta_k) = p_A(s_n|\theta_k)p_T(\mathbf{s}_{\partial n}|s_n, \theta_k) \quad (3)$$

In this last expression, the first and the second terms represent the amplitude and the texture densities.

We model the class amplitudes using Nakagami density, which is a basic theoretical multi-look amplitude model for SAR images [1]. We express the class amplitude density as

$$p_A(s_n|\mu_k, \nu_k) = \frac{2}{\Gamma(\nu_k)} \left(\frac{\nu_k}{\mu_k}\right)^{\nu_k} s_n^{2\nu_k-1} e^{-\nu_k \frac{s_n^2}{\mu_k}}. \quad (4)$$

We introduce a 2D AR texture model to use the contextual information for classification. We write the AR texture model for the k th class using the neighbors of the pixel in $\mathcal{N}(n)$ as

$$s_n = \sum_{n' \in \mathcal{N}(n)} \alpha_{k,n'} s_{n'} + t_{k,n} \quad (5)$$

where $\alpha_{k,n'}$ are the auto-regression coefficients and the regression errors $t_{k,n}$ are an iid t -distributed zero-mean random variables with β_k degrees of freedom and scale parameters δ_k . In this way, we write the class texture density as a t -distribution such that

$$p_T(\mathbf{s}_{\partial n}|s_n, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k, \beta_k, \delta_k) = \frac{\Gamma((1 + \beta_k)/2)}{\Gamma(\beta_k/2)(\pi\beta_k\delta_k)^{1/2}} \times \left[1 + \frac{(s_n - \mathbf{s}_{\partial n}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k)^2}{\beta_k\delta_k}\right]^{-\frac{\beta_k+1}{2}} \quad (6)$$

where the vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k$ contains the regression coefficients $\alpha_{k,n'}$. The t -distribution can also be written in implicit form using both Gaussian and Gamma densities [71]

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{s}_{\partial n}|s_n, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k, \beta_k, \delta_k) &= \int p(\mathbf{s}_{\partial n}|s_n, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k, \tau_{n,k}, \delta_k) p(\tau_{n,k}|\beta_k) d\tau_{n,k} \\ &= \int \mathcal{N}\left(s_n \middle| \mathbf{s}_{\partial n}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k, \frac{\delta_k}{\tau_{n,k}}\right) \mathcal{G}\left(\tau_{n,k} \middle| \frac{\beta_k}{2}, \frac{\beta_k}{2}\right) d\tau_{n,k}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We use the representation in (7) for calculation of the parameters using EM method nested in CEM algorithm.

B. Mixture Density - Class Prior

The prior density $p(\mathbf{z}_n|\boldsymbol{\pi}_n)$ of the categorical random variable \mathbf{z}_n is naturally an iid multinomial density with parameters $\boldsymbol{\pi}_n$ as introduced in (1) as

$$p(\mathbf{z}_n|\boldsymbol{\pi}_n) = \text{Mult}(\mathbf{z}_n|\boldsymbol{\pi}_n) = \prod_{k=1}^K \pi_{n,k}^{z_{n,k}} \quad (8)$$

We are not able to obtain a smooth class label map if we use an iid multinomial. We need to use a density which models the spatial smoothness of the class labels. We can define a prior on $\boldsymbol{\pi}_n$ to introduce the spatial interaction. If we define a conjugate Dirichlet prior on $\boldsymbol{\pi}_n$ and integrate out $\boldsymbol{\pi}_n$ from the model, we reach the DCM density [48]. The DCM density is the density of the Polya urn process and gives us a non-parametric density estimation in a defined window. If the estimated probabilities are almost equal in that window, Polya urn model may fail to make a decision to classify the pixels. [44] proposes a MRF model over the spatially varying parameter of DCM density. We use a contrast function called Logistic function [39] which emphasizes the high probabilities while attenuating the low ones. The logistic function allows us to make an easier decision by discriminating the probabilities closed to each other.

We can introduce the spatial interactions of the categorical random field by defining a binary spatial auto-regression model for each binary class map (or mask). Consequently, the probability density function of this multiple binary class maps model is a Multinomial Logistic. If we replace the logistic model with $p(\mathbf{z}_n|\boldsymbol{\pi}_n)$ in (1), we obtain MnL density for the problem at hand as

$$p(\mathbf{z}_n|\mathbf{Z}_{\partial n}, \eta) = \prod_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{\exp(\eta v_k(z_{n,k}))}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(\eta v_j(z_{n,j}))} \right)^{z_{n,k}} \quad (9)$$

where η is the free parameter of the model and

$$v_k(z_{n,k}) = 1 + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}(n)} z_{m,k}. \quad (10)$$

and $\mathbf{Z}_{\partial n} = \{\mathbf{z}_m : m \in \mathcal{M}(n), m \neq n\}$ is the set which contains the neighbors of \mathbf{z}_n in a window $\mathcal{M}(n)$ defined around n . The function $v_k(z_{n,k})$ returns the number of labels which belong to class k in a given window. The mixture density in (9) is spatially-varying with given function $v_k(z_{n,k})$ in (10).

III. CLASSIFICATION EM ALGORITHM

Since our purpose is to cluster the observed image pixels by maximizing the marginal likelihood given in (1) such as

$$\hat{\Phi} = \max_{\Phi} \prod_{n=1}^N \sum_{\mathbf{z}_n} p(\mathbf{s}_n|\mathbf{z}_n, \Theta) p(\mathbf{z}_n|\mathbf{Z}_{\partial n}, \eta) \quad (11)$$

where $\Phi = \{\Theta, \eta\}$, we use an EM type algorithm to deal with the summation. The EM log-likelihood function is written as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{EM}(\Phi|\Phi^{t-1}) &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \log\{p(\mathbf{s}_n|z_{n,k}, \theta_k) p(z_{n,k}|\mathbf{Z}_{\partial n}, \eta)\} \\ &\quad \times p(z_{n,k}|\mathbf{s}_n, \mathbf{Z}_{\partial n}, \Phi^{t-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\theta_k = \{\alpha_k, \beta_k, \delta_k, \mu_k, \nu_k\}$.

If we used the exact EM algorithm to find the maximum of $Q(\Phi|\Phi^{t-1})$ with respect to Θ , we would need to maximize the parameters for each class given the expected value of the class labels. Instead of this, we use the advantage of working with categorical random variables and resort to Classification EM algorithm [57]. We can partition the pixel domain \mathcal{R} into K non-overlapped regions such that $\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{R}_k$ and $\mathcal{R}_k \cap \mathcal{R}_l = \emptyset, k \neq l$, and write the classification log-likelihood function as

$$Q_{CEM}(\Phi|\Phi^{t-1}) = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{m \in \mathcal{R}_k} \log \{p(\mathbf{s}_m | z_{m,k}, \theta_k) p(z_{m,k} | \mathbf{Z}_{\partial m}, \eta)\} \times p(z_{m,k} | \mathbf{s}_n, \mathbf{Z}_{\partial n}, \Phi^{t-1}) \quad (13)$$

The CEM algorithm incorporates a classification step between the E-step and the M-step which performs a simple Maximum-a-Posteriori (MAP) estimation to find the highest probability class label. Since the posterior $p(z_{n,k} | \mathbf{s}_n, \mathbf{Z}_{\partial n}, \Phi^{t-1})$ is a discrete probability density function of a finite number of classes, we can perform the MAP estimation by choosing the maximum class probability. We summarize the CEM algorithm for our problem as follows:

E-step: For $k = 1, \dots, K$ and $n = 1, \dots, N$, calculate the posterior probabilities

$$p(z_{n,k} | \mathbf{s}_n, \mathbf{Z}_{\partial n}, \Phi^{t-1}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{s}_n | \theta_k^{t-1})^{z_{n,k}} \exp(\eta^{t-1} \nu_k(z_{n,k}))}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(\eta^{t-1} \nu_j(z_{n,j}))} \quad (14)$$

given the previously estimated parameter set Θ^{t-1} using (4), (6) and (3).

C-step: For $n = 1, \dots, N$, classify the n th pixel to class j as $z_{n,j} = 1$ by choosing j which maximizes the posterior $p(z_{n,k} | \mathbf{s}_n, \mathbf{Z}_{\partial n}, \Phi^{t-1})$ over $k = 1, \dots, K$ as

$$j = \arg \max_k p(z_{n,k} | \mathbf{s}_n, \mathbf{Z}_{\partial n}, \Phi^{t-1}) \quad (15)$$

M-step: To find a Bayesian estimate, maximize the classification log-likelihood in (13) and the log-prior functions $\log p(\Theta)$ together with respect to Θ as

$$\Theta^{t-1} = \arg \max_{\Theta} \{Q_{CEM}(\Theta|\Theta^{t-1}) + \log p(\Theta)\} \quad (16)$$

To maximize this function, we alternate among the variables $\mu_k, \nu_k, \alpha_k, \beta_k$ and δ_k . We only define an inverse Gamma prior with mean 1 for $\beta_k \sim \mathcal{IG}(\beta_k | N_k, N_k)$ where N_k is the number of pixels in class k . We choose this prior among some positive densities by testing their performance in the simulations. We have obtained better results with small values of β_k . This prior ensures β_k to take a value around 1. We assume uniform priors for the other parameters. The functions of the amplitude parameters over all pixels are written as follows

$$Q(\mu_k; \Phi^{t-1}) = -N_k \nu_k \log \mu_k - \frac{\nu_k}{\mu_k} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{R}_k} s_n^2 \quad (17)$$

$$Q(\nu_k; \Phi^{t-1}) = \frac{N_k \nu_k \log \frac{\nu_k}{\mu_k} - N_k \log \Gamma(\nu_k) + (2\nu_k - 1) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{R}_k} \log s_n - \frac{\nu_k}{\mu_k} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{R}_k} s_n^2}{(18)}$$

We estimate the texture parameters using another sub-EM algorithm nested within CEM. The nested EM algorithm has already been studied in [70]. We can express the t -distribution as a Gaussian scale mixture of gamma distributed latent variables $\tau_{n,k}$. Thereby, the EM log-likelihood functions of the t -distribution in (6) are written as [71], [30]

$$Q(\alpha_k; \Phi^{t-1}) = - \sum_{n \in \mathcal{R}_k} \frac{(s_n - \mathbf{s}_{\partial n}^T \alpha_k)^2}{2\delta_k} \langle \tau_{n,k} \rangle \quad (19)$$

$$Q(\delta_k; \Phi^{t-1}) = -\frac{N_k}{2} \log \delta_k - \sum_{n \in \mathcal{R}_k} \frac{(s_n - \mathbf{s}_{\partial n}^T \alpha_k)^2}{2\delta_k} \langle \tau_{n,k} \rangle \quad (20)$$

$$Q(\beta_k; \Phi^{t-1}) = -N_k \log \Gamma\left(\frac{\beta_k}{2}\right) + \frac{N_k \beta_k}{2} \log \frac{\beta_k}{2} - \frac{N_k}{\beta_k} - \sum_{n \in \mathcal{R}_k} \frac{\langle \tau_{n,k} \rangle \beta_k}{2} \left(1 + \frac{(s_n - \mathbf{s}_{\partial n}^T \alpha_k)^2}{2\delta_k \beta_k}\right) + \sum_{n \in \mathcal{R}_k} \left(\frac{\beta_k}{2}\right) \langle \log \tau_{n,k} \rangle - (N_k + 1) \log \beta_k \quad (21)$$

where $\langle \tau_{n,k} \rangle$ is the posterior expectation of the gamma distributed latent variable and calculated as

$$\langle \tau_{n,k} \rangle = \frac{\beta_k + 1}{\beta_k} \left(1 + \frac{(s_n - \mathbf{s}_{\partial n}^T \alpha_k)^2}{\beta_k \delta_k}\right)^{-1} \quad (22)$$

For simplicity, we use $\langle \cdot \rangle$ to represent the posterior expectation $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\tau_{n,k} | \Theta^{t-1}}$. The solutions to (17), (19) and (20) can be easily found as

$$\mu_k = \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=1}^{N_k} s_n^2 \quad (23)$$

$$\alpha_k = (\mathbf{S}_{\partial}^T \mathbf{S}_{\partial})^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\partial}^T \mathbf{s} \quad (24)$$

$$\delta_k = \sum_{n=1}^{N_k} \frac{(s_n - \phi_n^T \alpha_k)^2}{N_k} \langle \tau_{n,k} \rangle \quad (25)$$

where \mathbf{S}_{∂} is $N \times d^2 - 1$ matrix whose columns are $\mathbf{s}_{\partial n}$'s. For (18) and (21), we use a zero finding method to determine their maximum [72] by setting their first derivatives to zero

$$\log \frac{\nu_k}{\mu_k} - \psi_1(\nu_k) + \frac{2}{N_k} \sum_{n=1}^{N_k} \log s_n = 0 \quad (26)$$

$$\log \frac{\beta_k}{2} - \psi_1\left(\frac{\beta_k}{2}\right) + 1 + \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=1}^{N_k} \langle \log \tau_{n,k} \rangle - \langle \tau_{n,k} \rangle - \frac{N_k + 1}{\beta_k} + \frac{N_k}{\beta_k^2} = 0 \quad (27)$$

The parameter η of the MnL class label is found by maximizing the following function

$$Q(\eta; \Phi^{t-1}) = \sum_{n=1}^N \left(\eta \nu_k(z_{n,k}) - \log \sum_{j=1}^K e^{\eta \nu_j(z_{n,j})} \right) \quad (28)$$

We use a Newton-Raphson iteration to fit η as

$$\eta^t = \eta^{t-1} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\nabla Q(\eta; \Phi^{t-1})}{\nabla^2 Q(\eta; \Phi^{t-1})} \quad (29)$$

where the operators $\nabla \cdot$ and $\nabla^2 \cdot$ represent the gradient and the Laplacian of the function with respect to η .

IV. ALGORITHM

In this section, we present the details of the unsupervised classification algorithm. Our strategy follows the same general philosophy as the one proposed in [59] and developed for mixture model in [58], [61]. We start the CEM algorithm with a large number of classes, $K = K_{max}$, and then we reduce the number of classes to $K \leftarrow K - 1$ by merging the weakest class in probability to the one that is most similar to it with respect to a distance measure. The weakest class may be found using the average probabilities of each class as

$$k_{weak} = \arg \min_k \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n \in R_k} p(z_{n,k} | \mathbf{s}_n, \mathbf{Z}_{\partial n}, \Phi^{t-1}) \quad (30)$$

Kullback-Leibler (KL) type divergence criterions are used in hierarchical texture segmentation for region merging [73]. We use a symmetric KL type distance measure called Jensen-Shannon divergence [74] which is defined between two probability density functions, i.e. $p_{k_{weak}}$ and p_k , $k \neq k_{weak}$, as

$$D_{JS}(k) = \frac{1}{2} D_{KL}(p_{k_{weak}} || q) + \frac{1}{2} D_{KL}(p_k || q) \quad (31)$$

where $q = 0.5p_{k_{weak}} + 0.5p_k$ and

$$D_{KL}(p || q) = \sum_k p(k) \log \frac{p(k)}{q(k)} \quad (32)$$

We find the closest class to k_{weak} as

$$l = \arg \min_k D_{JS}(k) \quad (33)$$

and merge these two classes to constitute a new class $\mathcal{R}_l \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_l \cup \mathcal{R}_{k_{weak}}$.

We repeat this procedure until we reach the predefined minimum number of classes K_{min} . We determine the necessary number of classes by observing the ICL criterion explained in Section IV-C. The details of the initialization and the stopping criterions of the algorithm are presented in Section IV-A and IV-B. The summary of the algorithm can be found in Table I

A. Initialization

The algorithm can be initialized by determining the class areas manually if there are a few number of classes. We suggest to use an initialization strategy for completely unsupervised classification. It removes the user intervention from the algorithm and enables to use the algorithm in case of large number of classes. First, we run the CEM algorithm for one global class. Using the cumulative distribution of the fitted Nakagami density $g = F_A(s_n | \mu_0, \nu_0)$ where $g \in [0, 1]$ and dividing $[0, 1]$ into K equal bins, we can find our initial class parameters as $\mu_k = F_A^{-1}(g_k | \mu_0, \nu_0)$, $k = 1, \dots, K$ where g_k 's are the centers of the bins. We initialize the other parameters using the estimated parameters of the global class. We reset the parameter η to a constant c for each time reducing the number of classes.

TABLE I
UNSUPERVISED CEM ALGORITHM FOR CLASSIFICATION OF AMPLITUDE AND TEXTURE BASED MIXTURE MODEL.

```

Initialize the classes defined in Section IV-A for  $K = K_{max}$ .
While  $K \geq K_{min}$ , do
   $\eta = c$ ,  $c \geq 0$ 
  While the number of changes  $> N \times 10^{-3}$ , do
    E-step: Calculate the posteriors in (14)
    C-step: Classify the pixels regarding to (15)
    M-step: Estimate the parameters of amplitude and texture
    densities using (22-27)
    Update the smoothness parameter  $\eta$  using (29)
  Find the weakest class using (30)
  Find the closest class to the weakest class using (31-33)
  Merge these two classes  $\mathcal{R}_l \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_l \cup \mathcal{R}_{k_{weak}}$ 
   $K \leftarrow K - 1$ 

```

B. Stopping Criterion

We observe the number of changes in the updated pixel labels after classification step to decide the convergence of the CEM algorithms. If the number of change is less than a threshold, i.e. $N \times 10^{-3}$, the CEM algorithm is stopped.

C. Choosing the Number of Class

The SAR images which we process have a small number of classes. We aim at validating our assumption on small number of classes using the Integrated Classification Likelihood (ICL) [66]. Even though BIC is the most used and the most practical criterion for large data sets, we prefer to use ICL because it is developed specifically for classification likelihood problem, [65], and we have obtained better results than BIC in the determination of the number of classes. In our problem, the ICL criterion can be written as

$$ICL(K) = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \log \{ p(\mathbf{s}_n | \hat{\theta}_k) \hat{z}_{n,k} p(\hat{z}_{n,k} | \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_{\partial n}, \hat{\eta}) \} - \frac{1}{2} d_K \log N + P(K) \quad (34)$$

where d_K is the number of free parameters. In our case, it is $d_K = 12 * K + 1$. The term $P(K)$ is formed by the logarithm of the prior distribution of the parameters. In our case, it is $P(K) = \sum_{k=1}^K \log \mathcal{IG}(\hat{\beta}_k | N_k, N_k)$. We also use the BIC criterion for comparison. It can be written as

$$BIC(K) = \sum_{n=1}^N \log \left(\sum_{k=1}^K p(\mathbf{s}_n | \hat{\theta}_k) p(z_{n,k} | \mathbf{Z}_{\partial n}, \hat{\eta}) \right) - \frac{1}{2} d_K \log N + P(K) \quad (35)$$

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

This section presents the high resolution SAR image classification results of the proposed method called ATML-CEM (Amplitude and Texture density mixtures of MnL with CEM), compared to the corresponding results obtained with other methods. The competitors are Dictionary-based Stochastic EM (DSEM) [9], Copulas-based DSEM with GLCM (CoDSEM-GLCM) [11], Multiphase Level Set (MLS) [67], [68] and K-MnL. We have also tested three different versions of ATML-CEM method. One of them is supervised ATML-CEM [69]

where training and testing sets are determined by selecting some spatially disjoint class regions in the image, and we run the algorithm twice for training and testing. We implement the other two versions by considering only Amplitude (AML-CEM) or only Texture (TML-CEM) statistics.

MLS method is based on the piecewise constant multiphase Chan-Vese model [53] and implemented by [67], [68]. In this method, we set the smoothness parameter to 2000 and step size to 0.0002 for all data sets. We tune the number of iteration to reach the best result. The K-MnL method is the sequential combination of K-means clustering for classification and Multinomial Logistic label model for segmentation to obtain a more fair comparison with K-means clustering since K-means does not provide a segmented map. The weak point of the K-means algorithm is that it does not converge to the same solution every time, since it starts with random seed. Therefore, we run the K-MnL method 20 times and select the best result among them.

We tested the algorithms on the following four SAR image patches:


- SYN: 200×200 pixels, synthetic image constituted by collating 4 different 100×100 patches from a TerraSAR-X image. The small patches are taken from water, urban, land and forest areas (see Fig. 2(a)).
- TSX1: 1200×1000 pixels, HH polarized TerraSAR-X Stripmap (6.5 m ground resolution) 2.66-look geocorrected image which was acquired over Sanchagang, China (see Fig. 4(a)). ©Infoterra.
- TSX2: 900×600 pixels, HH polarized, TerraSAR-X SpotLight (8.2 m ground resolution) 4-look image which was acquired over the city of Rosenheim in Germany (see Fig. 6(a)). ©Infoterra.
- CSK1: 672×947 pixels, HH polarized COSMO-SkyMed Stripmap (2.5 m ground resolution) single-look image which was acquired over Lombriasco, Italy (see Fig. 8(a)). ©ASI.

For all real SAR images (TSX1, TSX2 and CSK1) classified by ATML-CEM versions, we use the same setting for model and initialization. The sizes of the windows for texture and label models are selected to be 3×3 and 13×13 respectively by trial and error. For synthetic SAR image (SYN), we utilize a 21×21 window in MnL label model and a 3×3 window in texture model. We initialize the algorithm as described in Section IV-A and estimate all the parameters along the iterations.

We produce SYN image to test the performance of the unsupervised ATML-CEM algorithm in the estimation of the number of classes, because the real images may contain more classes than our expectations and choosing different classes by eyes to construct a ground-truth is very hard if the number of classes is high. From Fig. 1(a), we can see that the ICL and BIC plots have their first peaks at 4. The outcomes of the algorithm for different number of classes can be seen in Fig. 3. The numerical results are listed in Table II. For supervised case, we allocate 25% of the data for training and 75% for testing. The similar results of AML-CEM and ATML-CEM show that the contribution of texture information is very weak in this data set. From Fig. 2, we can see that the classification


TABLE II
ACCURACY (IN %) OF THE SUPERVISED (S), SEMI-SUPERVISED (SS) AND UNSUPERVISED (U) CLASSIFICATION OF SYN IMAGE FOR 4 CLASSES AND IN AVERAGE.

	water	urban	trees	land	average
ATML-CEM (S)	99.02	99.46	99.28	99.30	99.27
K-MnL (Ss)	96.58	80.18	99.60	90.32	91.92
MLS (Ss)	100.00	60.46	1.13	42.55	51.03
AML-CEM (U)	97.53	97.89	97.72	94.57	96.93
TML-CEM (U)	98.18	81.10	85.79	88.72	88.45
ATML-CEM (U)	97.74	97.61	97.73	94.81	96.97




(a) SYN image


(b) K-MnL



(c) MLS



(d) Supervised ATML-CEM



(e) Unsupervised ATML-CEM

Fig. 2. (a) SYN image, (b), (c) and (d) classification maps obtained by K-MnL, MLS, supervised and unsupervised ATML-CEM methods. Dark blue, light blue, yellow and red colors represent class 1 (water), class 2 (urban), class 3 (trees) and class 4 (land), respectively.

map of ATML-CEM is obviously better than those of K-MnL, MLS and TML-CEM.

For TSX1 image in Fig.4(a), the full ground-truth map (Courtesy of V. Krylov) is manually generated. Fig.4 shows the classification results where the red colored regions indicate the




Fig. 1. ICL and BIC values of the classified (a) SYN (b) TSX1, (c) TSX2 and (d) CSK1 images for several numbers of sources.




Fig. 3. Classification maps of SYN image obtained with unsupervised ATML-CEM method for different numbers of classes $K = \{3,4,5,10\}$.

misclassified parts according to 3-classes ground-truth map. We can see the plotted ICL and BIC values with respect to the number of classes in Fig. 1(b). The plots are increasing, but the increments in both ICL and BIC start to slow down at 3. Fig. 5 shows several classification maps found for different numbers of classes. Since we have the 3-classes ground-truth map, we compare our results numerically in the 3-classes case. The numerical accuracy results are given in Table III. While supervised ATML-CEM gives the better result in average, unsupervised ATML-CEM and supervised DSEM-MRF follow it. Among the semi-supervised and unsupervised methods, the performance of ATML-CEM is better than the others in average, but results of K-MnL and AML-CEM are close to its results.

From the experiment with TSX1 image, we realize that if the image does not have strong texture, we cannot benefit from including texture statistics into the model. To reveal the




Fig. 4. (a) TSX1 image, (b), (c) and (d) classification maps obtained by K-MnL, MLS, supervised and unsupervised ATML-CEM methods. Dark blue, light blue, yellow and red colors represent water, wet soil, dry soil and misclassified areas, respectively.




Fig. 6. (a) TSX2 image, (b), (c) and (d) classification maps obtained by K-MnL, MLS, supervised ATML-CEM and unsupervised ATML-CEM methods. Blue, red and green colors represent water, urban and land areas, respectively.




Fig. 5. Classification maps of TSX1 image obtained with unsupervised ATML-CEM method for different numbers of classes $K = \{2, 3, 5, 8\}$.

TABLE III
ACCURACY (IN %) OF THE SUPERVISED (S), SEMI-SUPERVISED (Ss) AND UNSUPERVISED (U) CLASSIFICATION OF TSX1 IMAGE IN WATER, WET SOIL AND DRY SOIL AREAS AND AVERAGE.

	water	wet soil	dry soil	average
DSEM-MRF (S)	90.00	69.93	91.28	83.74
ATML-CEM (S)	89.88	76.38	87.33	84.53
K-MnL (Ss)	89.71	86.13	72.42	82.92
MLS (Ss)	87.90	66.19	42.48	65.53
AML-CEM (U)	88.24	62.99	96.39	82.54
TML-CEM (U)	51.61	65.89	91.90	69.80
ATML-CEM (U)	87.93	65.58	95.55	83.02




Fig. 7. Classification maps of TSX2 image obtained with unsupervised ATML-CEM method for different numbers of classes $K = \{3, 5, 7, 12\}$.

TABLE IV

ACCURACY (IN %) OF THE SUPERVISED (S), SEMI-SUPERVISED (Ss) AND UNSUPERVISED (U) CLASSIFICATION OF TSX2 IMAGE IN WATER, URBAN AND LAND AREAS AND OVERALL.

	water	urban	land	average
CoDSEM-GLCM (S)	91.28	98.82	93.53	94.54
DSEM (S)	92.95	98.32	81.33	90.87
ATML-CEM (S)	98.60	97.56	94.78	96.98
K-MnL (Ss)	100.00	79.03	80.33	86.45
MLS (Ss)	89.47	35.62	84.71	69.93
AML-CEM (U)	92.36	98.29	80.97	90.54
TML-CEM (U)	89.88	96.18	72.32	86.12
ATML-CEM (U)	94.17	98.76	80.93	91.29

advantage of using texture model, we exploit the ATML-CEM algorithm for urban area extraction problem on TSX2 image in Fig. 6(a). Table IV lists the accuracy of the classification in water, urban and land areas and average according to a groundtruth class map (Courtesy of A. Voisin). We include the result of CoDSEM-GLCM [11] which is the extended version of the DSEM method by including texture information. In both supervised and unsupervised cases, ATML-CEM provides better results than the others. The combination of the amplitude and the texture features helps to increase the quality of classification in average. From Fig. 6, we can see that the MLS and K-MnL methods fail to classify the urban areas. MLS provides a noisy classification map. The classification map of ATML-CEM agglomerates the tree and hill areas into urban area, since their textures are more similar to urban texture than the others. Misclassification in water areas is caused by the dark shadowed regions. Fig. 1(c) shows the ICL and BIC values. From this plot, we can see that the necessary number of classes should be 3, since both plots are saturated after 3. Fig. 7 presents the classification maps for 3-, 5-, 7- and 12-classes cases.

We have tested ATML-CEM on another patch called CSK1 (see Fig. 8(a)). Table V lists the numerical results. Among the supervised methods, ATML-CEM is very successful. Since this SAR image is a single-look observation, the noise level is higher than those in the other test images. We can obtain some good unsupervised classification results after applying a denoising process. Among the Lee, Frost and Wiener filters, we prefer using a 2D adaptive Wiener filter with 3×3 window proposed in [75], because we obtain better classification results. In [76], showing the histogram of the intensity of the CSK1 image before and after denoising, we justify that our Nakagami/Gamma density assumption is still valid after denoising. ATML-CEM provides significantly better results in overall, see Fig. 8 and Table V. The results in Fig. 8 are found for 3-classes case, since we have the 3-classes ground-truth map. The optimum number of classes is found as 5 according to ICL criterion, see Fig. 1(d). Fig. 9 shows some classification maps for different numbers of classes.

The simulations were performed on MATLAB platform on a PC with Intel Xeon, Core 8, 2.40 GHz CPU. The number of iterations and total required time in minutes for the algorithm are shown in Table VI. We also present the required time in seconds for a single iteration in case of the number of

TABLE V

ACCURACY (IN %) OF THE SUPERVISED (S), SEMI-SUPERVISED (Ss) AND UNSUPERVISED (U) CLASSIFICATION OF CSK1 IMAGE IN WATER, URBAN AND LAND AREAS AND OVERALL. NOTE THAT UNSUPERVISED CLASSIFICATION RESULTS ARE OBTAINED AFTER DENOISING.

	water	urban	land	average
CoDSEM-GLCM (Sup.)	95.28	98.67	98.50	97.48
DSEM (Sup.)	97.74	98.90	81.80	92.82
ATML-CEM (Sup.)	99.76	99.96	99.62	99.78
K-MnL (Unsup.)	99.99	63.39	52.14	71.84
MLS (Semi-sup.)	99.97	26.04	80.42	68.81
AML-CEM (Unsup.)	99.06	47.08	27.66	57.93
TML-CEM (Unsup.)	98.88	96.69	77.84	91.14
ATML-CEM (Unsup.)	99.64	93.00	92.04	94.89




Fig. 9. Classification maps of CSK1 image obtained with unsupervised ATML-CEM method for different numbers of classes $K = \{3, 5, 6, 12\}$.

classes $K = \{3, 6, 9, 12\}$. The algorithm reaches a solution in a reasonable time, if we take into consideration that more or less a million of pixels are processed.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

We have proposed a Bayesian model which uses amplitude and texture features together in a FMM along with nonstationary latent class labels. Using these two features together in the model, we obtain better high resolution SAR image classification results, especially in the urban areas.

Furthermore, using an agglomerative type unsupervised classification method, we eliminate the negative effect of the latent class label initialization. According to our experiments, the larger number of classes we start the algorithm with, the more initial value independent results we obtain. Consequently, the computational cost is increased as a by-product. The ICL criterion which we prefer over BIC does not always indicate the number of classes noticeably. In some cases it has several peaks very close to each others. In these cases, since we search the smallest number of classes, we can observe the first peak of ICL to take a decision on the number of classes. More complicated approaches may be investigated for model order selection for a future study.




Fig. 8. (a) CSK1 image, (b), (c) and (d) classification maps obtained by K-MnL, supervised and unsupervised ATML-CEM methods. Blue, red and green colors represent water, urban and land areas, respectively.

TABLE VI

THE NUMBER OF PIXELS OF TSX1, TSX2 AND CSK1; CORRESPONDING REQUIRED TIME IN SECONDS FOR A SINGLE ITERATION IN CASE OF $K = \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$; TOTAL REQUIRED TIME IN MINUTES; AND TOTAL NUMBER OF ITERATIONS.

	# of pixels	$K = 8$	$K = 6$	$K = 4$	$K = 2$	Total [min.]	Total it.
TSX1	1200e+3	7.04	6.18	4.62	3.55	5.07	57
TSX2	540e+3	2.83	2.31	1.89	1.58	3.97	110
CSK1	636e+3	3.52	3.42	2.65	2.13	2.42	50

Variational Bayesian approach can be investigated defining some hyper-priors and tractable densities for the parameters of the Nakagami and t -distribution. Monte Carlo based non-parametric density estimation methods can be also exploited in order to determine the optimum number of classes.

The speckle type noise has impaired the algorithm especially in single-look observation case. The statistics of the speckle noise may be included to the proposed model in order to obtain better classification/segmentation in case of low signal to noise ratio.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank Aurélie Voisin and Vladimir Krylov (Ariana INRIA, France, <http://www-sop.inria.fr/ariana/en/index.php>) and Marie-Colette van Lieshout (PNA2, CWI, Netherlands) for several interesting discussions, Ismail Ben Ayed for providing MLS algorithm [67], [68] online and the Italian Space Agency (ASI) for providing the COSMO-SkyMed images. The TerraSAR-X images are provided from <http://www.infoterra.de/>.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Oliver, and S. Quegan, *Understanding Synthetic Aperture Radar Images*, 3rd ed. Norwood: Artech House, 1998.

- [2] F.T. Ulaby, R.Y. Li and K.S. Shanmugan, "Crop classification using airborne radar and landsat data", *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol.20, no.1, pp. 42–51, 1982.
- [3] P. Hoogeboom, "Classification of agricultural crops in radar images", *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol.21, no.3, pp. 329–336, 1983.
- [4] V.A. Krylov, G. Moser, S.B. Serpico and J. Zerubia, "Modeling the statistics of high resolution SAR images", Res. Rep. RR-6722, INRIA, France, Nov. 2008.
- [5] D. Titterton, A. Smith and A. Makov, *Statistical Analysis of Finite Mixture Distributions*, 3rd ed. Chichester (U.K.): John Wiley & Sons, 1992.
- [6] P. Masson and W. Pieczynski, "SEM algorithm and unsupervised statistical segmentation of satellite images", *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol.31, no.3, pp. 618–633, 1993.
- [7] J.M. Nicolas and F. Tupin "Gamma mixture modeled with "second kind statistics": application to SAR image processing", in *Int. Geosci. Rem. Sens. Symp. IGARSS'02*, pp. 2489–2491, Toronto, Canada, June 2002.
- [8] G. Moser, J. Zerubia, and S.B. Serpico, "Dictionary-based stochastic expectation-maximization for SAR amplitude probability density function estimation", *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol.44, no.1, pp. 188–199, 2006.
- [9] V.A. Krylov, G. Moser, S.B. Serpico and J. Zerubia, "Dictionary-based probability density function estimation for high resolution SAR data", in *IS&T/SPIE Electronic Imaging*, vol. 7246, pp. 72460S, San Jose, SPIE, Jan. 2009.
- [10] C.J. Oliver, "The interpretation and simulation of clutter textures in coherent images", *Inverse Problems*, vol.2, no.4, pp. 481–518, 1986.
- [11] A. Voisin, G. Moser, V.A. Krylov, S.B. Serpico and J. Zerubia "Classification of very high resolution SAR images of urban areas by dictionary-based mixture models, copulas and Markov random fields using textural

- features”, in *SPIE Symposium Remote Sensing*, vol.7830, pp. 783000, Toulouse, France, Sep. 2010.
- [12] F. Bovolo, L. Bruzzone and M. Marconcini “A novel context-sensitive SVM for classification of remote sensing images”, in *Int. Geosci. Rem. Sens. Symp. IGARSS’06*, pp. 2498-2501, Denver, Colorado, Aug. 2006.
- [13] J. Chanussot, J.A. Benediktsson and M. Vincent “Classification of remote sensing images from urban areas using a fuzzy model”, in *Int. Geosci. Rem. Sens. Symp. IGARSS’04*, vol.1, pp. 556-559, Anchorage, Alaska, Sep. 2004.
- [14] M.C. Dobson, L. Pierce, J. Kellndorfer and F. Ulaby “Use of SAR image texture in terrain classification”, in *Int. Geosci. Rem. Sens. Symp. IGARSS’97*, vol.3, pp. 1180-1183, Singapore, Aug. 1997.
- [15] R.M. Haralick, K. Shanmugam and I. Dinstein, “Textural features for image classification”, *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern.*, vol.3, no.6, pp. 610-621, 1973.
- [16] Q. Chen and P. Gong, “Automatic variogram parameter extraction for textural classification of the panchromatic IKINOS imagery”, *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol.42, no.5, pp. 1106-1115, 2004.
- [17] M. Hassner and J. Sklansky, “The use Markov random field as models of texture”, *Comput. Graphics Image Process.*, vol.12, no.4, pp. 357-370, 1980.
- [18] G.R. Cross and A.K. Jain, “Markov random field texture models”, *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, vol.5, no.1, pp. 25-39, 1983.
- [19] R. Chellappa and S. Chatterjee, “Classification of textures using Gaussian Markov random fields”, *IEEE Trans. Acoust. Speech Signal Process.*, vol.33, no. 4, pp. 959-963, Aug.1985.
- [20] A. Lorette, X. Descombes and J. Zerubia “Texture analysis through Markov random fields: Urban area extraction”, in *Int. Conf. Image Process. ICIP’99*, pp. 430-433, 1999.
- [21] G. Rellier, X. Descombes, J. Zerubia and F. Falzon “A Gauss-Markov model for hyperspectral texture analysis of urban areas”, in *Int. Conf. Pattern Recognition ICPR’02*, pp. 692-695, 2002.
- [22] G. Rellier, X. Descombes, F. Falzon and J. Zerubia, “Texture feature analysis using a Gauss-Markov model for hyperspectral image classification”, *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol.42, no.7, pp. 1543-1551, 2004.
- [23] D.E. Melas and S.P. Wilson, “Double Markov random fields and Bayesian image segmentation”, *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol.50, no.2, pp. 357-365, Feb. 2002.
- [24] S.P. Wilson and J. Zerubia, “Segmentation of textured satellite and aerial images by Bayesian inference and Markov random fields”, Res. Rep. RR-4336, INRIA, France, Dec. 2001.
- [25] D. Higdon, *Spatial Applications of Markov Chain Monte Carlo for Bayesian Inference*. PhD Thesis, University of Washington, USA, 1994.
- [26] L. Grim, “Multivariate statistical pattern recognition with nonreduced dimensionality”, *Kybernetika*, vol.22, no.2, pp. 142-157, 1986.
- [27] J. Novovicova, P. Pudil and J. Kittler, “Divergence based feature selection for multimodal class densities”, *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, vol.18, no.2, pp. 218-223, 1996.
- [28] M.H.C. Law, M.A.T. Figueiredo and A.K. Jain, “Simultaneous feature selection and clustering using mixture models”, *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, vol.26, no.9, pp. 1154-1166, 2004.
- [29] G. Chantas, N. Galatsanos, A. Likas, and M. Saunders, “Variational Bayesian image restoration based on a product of t-distributions image priors”, *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol.17, no.10, pp. 1795-1805, 2008.
- [30] K. Kayabol, E.E. Kuruoglu, J.L. Sanz, B. Sankur, E. Salerno, and D. Herranz, “Adaptive Langevin sampler for separation of t-distribution modelled astrophysical maps”, *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol.19, no.9, pp. 2357-2368, 2010.
- [31] G. Sfikas, C. Nikou and N. Galatsanos “Robust image segmentation with mixtures of Student’s t-distributions”, in *Int. Conf. Image Process. ICIP’07*, pp. 273-276, 2007.
- [32] J. Kittler, M. Hatef, R.P.W. Duin, and J. Matas, “On combining classifiers”, *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, vol.20, no.3, pp. 226-239, 1998.
- [33] S. Geman and D. Geman, “Stochastic relaxation, Gibbs distributions and the Bayesian restoration of images”, *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, vol.6, no.6, pp. 721-741, 1984.
- [34] H. Derin, H. Elliott, R. Cristi and D. Geman, “Bayes smoothing algorithms for segmentation of images modeled by Markov random fields”, in *Int. Conf. Acoust. Speech Signal Process., ICASSP’84*, vol.9, pp. 682-685, Mar. 1984.
- [35] H. Derin, H. Elliott, “Modeling and segmentation of noisy and textured images using Gibbs random fields”, *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, vol.9, no.1, pp. 39-55, 1987.
- [36] R. Fjortoft, Y. Delignon, W. Pieczynski, M. Sigelle and F. Tupin, “Unsupervised classification of radar using hidden Markov chains and hidden Markov random fields”, *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol.41, no.3, pp. 675-686, 2003.
- [37] J.S. Borges, J.M. Bioucas-Dias and A.R.S. Marcal, “Bayesian hyperspectral image segmentation with discriminative class learning”, *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol.49, no.6, pp. 2151-2164, 2011.
- [38] L. Du, and M.R. Grunes, “Unsupervised segmentation of multi-polarization SAR images based on amplitude and texture characteristic”, in *IEEE Geosci. Remote Sens. Sym., IGARSS’00*, pp. 1122-1124, 2000.
- [39] B. Krishnapuram, L. Carin, M.A.T. Figueiredo and A.J. Hartemink, “Sparse multinomial logistic regression: Fast algorithms and generalization bounds”, *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, vol.27, no.6, pp. 957-968, 2005.
- [40] S. Sanjay-Gopal, and T.J. Hebert, “Bayesian pixel classification using spatially variant finite mixtures and the generalized EM algorithm”, *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol.7, no.7, pp. 1014-1028, 1998.
- [41] G. Sfikas, C. Nikou, N. Galatsanos and C. Heinrich, “Spatially varying mixtures incorporating line processes for image segmentation”, *J. Math. Imag. Vis.*, vol.36, no.2, pp. 91-110, 2010.
- [42] A. Kanemura, S. Maeda, and S. Ishii “Edge-preserving Bayesian image superresolution based on compound Markov random fields”, in *Int. Conf. Artificial Neural Netw., ICANN’07*, Porto, Portugal, 2007.
- [43] Y. Zhang, M. Brady and S. Smith, “Segmentation of brain MR images through a hidden Markov random field model and the expectation-maximization algorithm”, *IEEE Trans. Medical Imaging*, vol.20, no.1, pp. 45-57, 2001.
- [44] C. Nikou, A.C. Likas and N.P. Galatsanos, “A Bayesian framework for image segmentation with spatially varying mixtures”, *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol.19, no.9, pp. 2278-2289, 2010.
- [45] A. Diplaros, N.A. Vlassis and T. Gevers, “A spatially constrained generative model and an EM algorithm for image segmentation”, *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw.*, vol.18, no.3, pp. 798-808, 2007.
- [46] F. Eggenberger and G. Polya, “Über die statistik verketteter vorgänge”, *Z. Angew. Math. Mech.*, vol.3, no.4, pp. 279-289, 1923.
- [47] B.A. Frigyk, A. Kapila and M.R. Gupta, “Introduction to the Dirichlet distribution and related processes”, Tech. Rep. UWEETR-2010-0006, University of Washington, USA, Dec. 2010.
- [48] A. Banerjee, P. Burlina and F. Alajaji, “Image segmentation and labeling using the Polya urn model”, *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol.8, no.9, pp. 1243-1253, 1999.
- [49] C. Samson, L. Blanc-Fraud, G. Aubert and J. Zerubia, “A level set model for image classification”, *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, vol.40, pp. 187-197, 2000.
- [50] I. Ben Ayed, N. Hennane and A. Mitiche, “Unsupervised variational image segmentation/classification using a Weibull observation model”, *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol.15, no.11, pp. 3431-3439, 2006.
- [51] I. Ben Ayed, A. Mitiche and Z. Belhadj, “Multiregion level set partitioning of synthetic aperture radar images”, *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, vol.27, no.5, pp. 793-800, 2005.
- [52] D. Mumford and J. Shah, “Optimal approximations by piecewise smooth functions and associated variational problems”, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, vol.XLII, no.4, pp. 577-685, 1989.
- [53] L. Vese and T. Chan, “A multiphase level set framework for image segmentation using the Mumford and Shah model”, *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, vol.50, no.3, pp. 271-293, 2002.
- [54] A.P. Dempster, N.M. Laird and D.B. Rubin, “Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm”, *J. R. Statist. Soc. B*, vol.39, pp. 1-22, 1977.
- [55] R.A. Redner and H.F. Walker, “Mixture densities, maximum likelihood and the EM algorithm”, *SIAM Review*, vol.26, no.2 pp. 195-239, 1984.
- [56] G. Celeux, D. Chauveau, and J. Diebolt, “On stochastic versions of the EM algorithm”, Res. Rep. RR-2514, INRIA, France, Mar. 1995.
- [57] G. Celeux and G. Govaert, “A classification EM algorithm for clustering and two stochastic versions”, *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.*, vol.14, pp. 315-332, 1992.
- [58] C. Fraley and A. Raftery, “Model-based clustering, discriminant analysis, and density estimation”, *J. Am. Statistical Assoc.*, vol.97, no.458, pp. 611-631, 2002.
- [59] J.H. Ward, “Hierarchical groupings to optimize an objective function”, *J. Am. Statistical Assoc.*, vol.58, no.301, pp. 236-244, 1963.
- [60] G. Schwarz, “Estimating the dimension of a model”, *Annals of Statistics*, vol.6, pp. 461-464, 1978.
- [61] M.A.T. Figueiredo and A.K. Jain, “Unsupervised learning of finite mixture models”, *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, vol.24, no.3, pp. 381-396, 2002.

- [62] G. Celeux, S. Chretien, F. Forbes and A. Mkhadri, "A component-wise EM algorithm for mixtures", Res. Rep. RR-3746, INRIA, France, Aug. 1999.
- [63] C.S. Wallace and D.M. Boulton, "An information measure for classification", *Comp. J.*, vol.11, pp. 185–194, 1968.
- [64] C.S. Wallace and P.R. Freeman, "Estimation and inference by compact coding", *J. R. Statist. Soc. B*, vol.49, no.3, pp. 240–265, 1987.
- [65] C. Biernacki and G. Govaert, "Using the classification likelihood to choose the number of clusters", *Computing Science Statistics*, vol.29, no.2, pp. 451–457, 1997.
- [66] C. Biernacki, G. Celeux and G. Govaert, "Assessing a mixture model for clustering with the integrated completed likelihood", *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, vol.22, no.7, pp. 719–725, 2000.
- [67] C. Vazquez, A. Mitiche and I. Ben Ayed, "Image segmentation as regularized clustering: a fully global curve evolution method", in *Int. Conf. Image Process. ICIP'04*, pp. 3467–3470, Singapore, Oct. 2004.
- [68] A. Mitiche and I. Ben Ayed, *Variational and Level Set Methods in Image Segmentation*, Heilderberg, Springer, 2010.
- [69] K. Kayabol, A. Voisin and J. Zerubia "SAR image classification with non-stationary multinomial logistic mixture of amplitude and texture densities", in *Int. Conf. Image Process. ICIP'11*, pp. 173–176, Brussels, Belgium, Sep. 2011.
- [70] D.A. van Dyk, "Nesting EM algorithms for computational efficiency", *Statistica Sinica*, vol.10, pp. 203–225, 2000.
- [71] C. Liu and D. B. Rubin, "ML estimation of the t distribution using EM and its extensions, ECM and ECME", *Statistica Sinica*, vol.5, pp. 19–39, 1995.
- [72] G.E. Forsythe, M.A. Malcolm and C.B. Moler, *Computer Methods for Mathematical Computations*, Norwood: Prentice-Hall, 1976.
- [73] G. Scarpa, R. Gaetano, M. Haindl and J. Zerubia, "Hierarchical multiple Markov chain model for unsupervised texture segmentation", *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol.18, no.8, pp. 1830–1843, 2009.
- [74] J. Lin, "Divergence measures based on the Shannon entropy", *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol.37, no.1, pp. 145–151, 1991.
- [75] J.S. Lim, *Two-Dimensional Signal and Image Processing*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.
- [76] K. Kayabol and J. Zerubia, "Unsupervised amplitude and texture based classification of SAR images with multinomial latent model", Res. Rep. RR-7700, INRIA, France, July 2011.

PLACE
PHOTO
HERE

Josiane Zerubia (S'78, M'81, SM'99, F'03) has been a permanent research scientist at INRIA since 1989, and director of research since July 1995. She was head of the PASTIS remote sensing laboratory (INRIA Sophia-Antipolis) from mid-1995 to 1997 and of the Ariana research group (INRIA/CNRS/University of Nice), which worked on inverse problems in remote sensing, from 1998 to 2011. Since January 2012, she has been head of Ayin research group (INRIA-SAM) dedicated to hierarchical and stochastic models for remote sensing and skincare imaging. She has been professor at SUPAERO (ISAE) in Toulouse since 1999. Before that, she was with the Signal and Image Processing Institute of the University of Southern California (USC) in Los-Angeles as a postdoc. She also worked as a researcher for the LASSY (University of Nice/CNRS) from 1984 to 1988 and in the Research Laboratory of Hewlett Packard in France and in Palo-Alto (CA) from 1982 to 1984. She received the MSc degree from the Department of Electrical Engineering at ENSIEG, Grenoble, France in 1981, and the Doctor of Engineering degree, her PhD, and her 'Habilitation', in 1986, 1988, and 1994 respectively, all from the University of Nice Sophia-Antipolis, France.

She is a Fellow of the IEEE. She is currently a member of the IEEE IVMSPTC and was a member of the IEEE BISP TC (SP Society) from 2004 till 2012. She was associate editor of IEEE Trans. on IP from 1998 to 2002; area editor of IEEE Trans. on IP from 2003 to 2006; guest co-editor of a special issue of IEEE Trans. on PAMI in 2003; and member-at-large of the Board of Governors of the IEEE SP Society from 2002 to 2004. She has also been a member of the editorial board of the French Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (SFPT) since 1998, of the International Journal of Computer Vision since 2004, and of the Foundation and Trends in Signal Processing since 2007. She has been associate editor of the on-line resource: Earthzine (IEEE CEO and GEOSS).

She was co-chair of two workshops on Energy Minimization Methods in Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (EMMCVPR'01, Sophia Antipolis, France, and EMMCVPR'03, Lisbon, Portugal); co-chair of a workshop on Image Processing and Related Mathematical Fields (IPRM'02, Moscow, Russia); technical program chair of a workshop on Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing for Urban Areas, Marne La Vallee, France, 2003; co-chair of the special sessions at IEEE ICASSP 2006 (Toulouse, France) and IEEE ISBI 2008 (Paris, France); and publicity chair of IEEE ICIP 2011 (Brussels, Belgium). She is currently a member of the organizing committee of a Workshop on Mathematics of the Planet Earth (MPE) 2013 (Mumbai, India) and tutorial co-chair of IEEE ICIP 2014 (Paris, France).

Her current research interests are in image processing using probabilistic models and variational methods. She also works on parameter estimation and optimization techniques.

PLACE
PHOTO
HERE

Koray Kayabol (S'03, M'09) was born in Turkey in 1977. He received the B.Sc., M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in electrical&electronics engineering from Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey in 1997, 2002 and 2008, respectively.

He was a research assistant in Electrical & Electronics Eng. Dept. at Istanbul University between 2001 and 2008. From 2008 to 2010, he was a ICTP Postdoctoral Fellow in the ISTI at CNR, Pisa, Italy. In 2010, he was awarded as an ERCIM Postdoctoral Fellow. Between September 2010 and April 2012,

he spent his ERCIM fellowship periods in the Ariana Research Group at INRIA, Sophia Antipolis, France and in the Probability and Stochastic Networks Group at CWI, Amsterdam, Netherlands. Since June 2012, he has been a TUBITAK returning scholar postdoctoral fellow in Electronics & Communications Eng. Dept. at Istanbul Technical University, Turkey. He is an associate editor of Digital Signal Processing since September 2011.

His research interests include Bayesian parametric and non-parametric inference, statistical image models, image classification/segmentation and blind source separation.