Abstract

Accurate habitat classification plays a crucial role in biodiversity monitoring, ecosystem management, and conservation planning. With the increasing availability of remote sensing data and advancements in machine learning, automated habitat classification has become a powerful tool for understanding ecological patterns. This project, “Habitat Classification and Visualization of Misclassified Habitats,” aims to develop a machine-learning-based system that classifies different habitat types using geospatial and environmental data, and further identifies and visualizes the habitats that were incorrectly classified by the model.

The project begins by collecting and preprocessing habitat-related datasets, including satellite imagery, vegetation indices, climate variables, and elevation maps. After cleaning and feature engineering, multiple classification algorithms—such as Random Forest, Support Vector Machine (SVM), and Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs)—are trained and evaluated. The system predicts habitat classes like forests, wetlands, grasslands, croplands, and urban areas. Model performance is assessed using metrics such as accuracy, precision, recall, F1-score, and confusion matrices.

A key part of the project focuses on visualizing misclassified habitats, which helps highlight patterns of model confusion. Misclassified regions are mapped using GIS tools or Python libraries such as Folium, GeoPandas, and Matplotlib. These visualizations allow researchers to understand where and why the model fails—whether due to overlapping features between habitat types, poor image quality, seasonal variations, or insufficient training samples. This interpretability improves the reliability of the classification model and supports ecological decision-making.

Overall, the project demonstrates how machine learning and spatial visualization can support ecological research by enabling automated, interpretable, and scalable habitat classification. The insights gained from misclassification analysis can guide dataset improvement, feature selection, and model refinement. This contributes to more accurate habitat mapping and better-informed conservation strategies.

Content

List of Figures :

Figure 9: CNN Model Architecture (If Deep Learning Is Used)

Layer-by-layer model architecture diagram, showing convolution, pooling, dense layers.

Figure 10: Training and Validation Accuracy vs. Epochs

Line graph tracking model performance during training.

Figure 11: Training and Validation Loss vs. Epochs

Loss plot used to analyze underfitting/overfitting.

Figure 12: Confusion Matrix for Habitat Classification

Graph showing correct and misclassified habitats.

Figure 13: ROC Curves for Multiple Models

ROC curves for SVM, RF, CNN, etc. For comparison.

Figure 14: Precision-Recall Curves for Each Habitat Class

A multi-class PR curve plot.

Figure 15: Map-Based Visualization of Predicted Habitat Classes (GIS Output)

Spatial visualization of model-predicted classifications over the study area.

Figure 16: Visualization of Misclassified Habitat Regions

Highlighted map areas where the model predicted the wrong class.

Figure 17: Example of Misclassified Habitat Image with Annotations

Original sample image with predicted label and true label highlighted.

Figure 18: Grad-CAM / Class Activation Map for CNN Model

Shows which part of the image the model focused on while predicting.

Figure 19: 3D Terrain Visualization Showing Elevation Contribution

Topographic plot showing elevation effect on classification.

Figure 20: Comparison of Model Predictions Before and After Optimization

Side-by-side visual comparison (e.g., baseline vs. Tuned model).

Figure 21: Workflow Diagram for Misclassification Analysis

Steps followed for error detection, extraction, and visualization.

Figure 22: Summary Visualization of Most Confused Habitat Pairs

Bar chart or chord diagram showing which habitat pairs are often confused.

Figure 23: Final System Interface / Dashboard (If Applicable)

Screenshot of UI or visualization dashboard used for final output.

---

List of Tables:

Table 1: Summary of Dataset Attributes Used for Habitat Classification

Lists all dataset features (e.g., NDVI, elevation, temperature, soil moisture, land-cover type).

Includes data type (numeric/categorical) and description.

Table 2: Statistics of Raw Habitat Dataset Before Preprocessing

Total samples per habitat class

Missing values

Outliers

Class imbalance summary

Table 3: Data Cleaning and Preprocessing Steps Applied

Operations like normalization, encoding, interpolation, noise removal

Tools/libraries used

Table 4: Final Distribution of Habitat Classes After Preprocessing

Shows number of samples per class

Verifies class balancing if SMOTE or undersampling was used

Table 5: List of Feature Extraction Techniques and Their Output Dimensions

Examples: Spectral indices, texture features (GLCM), environmental parameters

Output shape per method

Table 6: Model Architectures Used for Habitat Classification

CNN/Random Forest/SVM etc.

Hyperparameters

Number of layers (for deep learning)

Table 7: Hyperparameter Settings for the Selected Model

Learning rate

Batch size

Epochs

Optimizer

Loss function

Table 8: Training, Validation, and Testing Data Split Ratio

Percentages assigned to each subset

Number of samples in each category

Table 9: Performance Metrics for Each Habitat Class (Per-Class Accuracy)

Accuracy

Precision

Recall

F1-score

Support (number of samples)

Table 10: Confusion Matrix Values for Habitat Classification

Tabular representation of correct vs misclassified habitat categories

Table 11: Overall Model Performance Comparison Across Algorithms

Compares SVM, RF, KNN, CNN, etc.

Metrics: Accuracy, AUC, F1-score, training time

Table 12: Misclassified Habitat Instances with Observed Causes

Sample ID

True Label

Predicted Label

Reason for misclassification (e.g., overlapping vegetation, low resolution)

Table 13: Environmental Variables Causing Misclassification (Correlation Table)

Correlation coefficients

Influential parameters contributing to classification errors

Table 14: Summary of Visualization Tools and Techniques Used

Heatmaps

Class activation maps

GIS tools (QGIS/ArcGIS)

Python visualization libraries

Table 15: Accuracy Improvement After Model Optimization / Fine-Tuning

Before and after metric comparison

Techniques applied: data augmentation, feature selection, hyper parameter tuning

Table 16: Comparison of Habitat Classification Results With Previous Studies

Accuracy comparison

Dataset source

Method used in literature

Table 17: Computational Resources Used for Model Training

Hardware configuration

Training time

Memory utilisation

Table 18: Summary of Key Findings From Misclassification Analysis

Most confused habitat pairs

Visualization outcome

Potential improvement area

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Overview

Habitat classification is an important task in environmental science and biodiversity conservation. Machine learning enables automatic identification of habitats based on features such as climate, vegetation, satellite images, or species presence. This project uses trained models to classify habitats and visually represent misclassified results for performance improvement.

## 1.2 Objectives

To build a machine learning model that accurately classifies wildlife habitats

To analyze classification performance using metrics like accuracy and confusion matrix

To visualize misclassified habitats for better understanding of model limitations

To support conservation studies with advanced data analysis

## 1.3 Problem Statement

Traditional habitat classification is time-consuming and prone to human error. Automatic classification may still misidentify similar regions, affecting decision-making. Therefore, misclassification visualization is essential to understand model weaknesses and improve accuracy.

## 2 Literature Review

### 1. Introduction — why automated habitat classification matters

Automated habitat (or land-cover) classification using remote sensing and machine learning supports biodiversity monitoring, land-use planning, and conservation by providing scalable, repeatable maps of habitat distribution and change. The rapid expansion of freely available satellite imagery (e.g., Sentinel, Landsat), drone and LiDAR data, and computational resources has made it feasible to map habitats at multiple scales and revisit the maps frequently for change detection and management decisions.

### 2. Traditional approaches: pixel-based classifiers and feature engineering

Early and still-widely-used approaches relied on pixel- and object-based classification using engineered spectral indices (NDVI, SAVI), texture, and statistical classifiers such as Maximum Likelihood, Support Vector Machines (SVM), and Random Forest (RF). These methods perform well when classes have distinct spectral/temporal signatures and training data are sufficient, and RF in particular remains a strong baseline because of robustness to noisy features and interpretability via feature importance scores. However, their performance declines with very high-resolution or hyperspectral data where spatial context and complex textures matter.

### 3. Deep learning revolution: CNNs, fusion, and transformers

Since roughly 2015–2020, convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and more recently transformer-based models have substantially advanced land-cover and habitat classification by learning hierarchical spatial-spectral features directly from imagery. Comparative and systematic reviews find that CNNs (and hybrid CNN+attention models) generally outperform traditional ML on complex scenes, particularly with high-resolution multispectral or hyperspectral inputs and when spatial context matters (e.g., urban edges, mixed vegetation). Fusion of complementary data sources — multispectral imagery + LiDAR point-cloud derivatives or hyperspectral bands — further improves class separability for structurally complex habitats (forests vs. shrublands, wetland mosaics). Nevertheless, deep models require more labeled data, careful regularization, and compute.

### 4. Accuracy assessment and spatial uncertainty

Accuracy assessment in remote-sensing classification has long used confusion (error) matrices and derived metrics (OA, Kappa, per-class precision/recall). However, confusion matrices summarize global performance and conceal spatially structured errors (e.g., entire sub-regions misclassified). Researchers therefore propose spatially explicit uncertainty or accuracy-mapping methods—uncertainty rasters, probability surfaces, and spatially aggregated validation—so decision-makers can see where maps are reliable versus where further field validation is needed. Visualizing spatial patterns of misclassification (rather than only table-based summaries) is essential for ecological applications where location-specific trust matters.

## 5. Visualization of misclassified habitats — methods and benefits

Mapping misclassification directly (e.g., overlaying predicted vs. reference labels, mapping disagreement, or plotting per-pixel prediction probabilities) helps identify systematic errors: confusion between spectrally similar classes, seasonal/phenological effects, or sensor limitations. Techniques include (a) error maps that color-code misclassified pixels by the class they were mistaken for, (b) probability/entropy maps showing low-confidence areas, and (c) spatial aggregation of confusion (e.g., per-patch confusion rates). Studies show these visualizations expose model biases (e.g., consistent mislabelling of riparian zones as wetlands or agricultural fallows as grasslands), inform targeted additional sampling, and guide post-processing (morphological smoothing, class-constraint rules).

## 6. Explainable AI (XAI) and attribution on remote sensing models

As deep models have become common, explainability methods—saliency maps (Grad-CAM, Score-CAM), integrated gradients, and perturbation-based attribution—are increasingly applied to GeoAI to interpret what the model "sees." Recent reviews and empirical studies find saliency maps can localize features the model uses (e.g., canopy gaps, water surfaces), but they come with caveats: saliency outputs can be noisy at high spatial resolution, may highlight correlated artifacts (shadows, roads), and require careful validation (masking experiments, human expert review). Integrating XAI with misclassification visualization helps separate where the model is wrong from why it may be making those mistakes.

## 7. Approaches to reduce misclassification

The literature suggests several complementary strategies: (1) multimodal data fusion (add LiDAR-derived height/structure, radar for moisture), (2) temporal stacking to capture phenology, (3) class balancing and augmentation to address rare habitats, (4) post-classification rules (object-based smoothing, neighborhood voting), and (5) active learning—iteratively sampling misclassified or low-confidence areas for labeling. Combining visualization of misclassified areas with these corrective strategies is shown to be effective in iterative workflows.

## 8. Gaps, limitations, and open research directions

Key gaps remain that are directly relevant to your project goal of visualizing misclassified habitats:

Spatially robust XAI: saliency methods for very high-resolution and multi-sensor stacks remain noisy; methods that produce interpretable, scale-aware attributions are needed.

Quantitative spatial error mapping: standardizing metrics and visual conventions for misclassification maps so ecologists can compare across studies is still immature.

Operational workflows: integrating misclassification visualization into active-learning loops and decision pipelines (e.g., where to collect additional field points) is promising but under-reported in reproducible case studies.

## 9. Summary and how this informs your project

The literature supports a workflow that (a) uses a strong baseline classifier such as Random Forest and a deep model (CNN) for comparison, (b) fuses ancillary data (LiDAR or texture indices) where available, (c) performs spatially explicit accuracy assessment (error maps, probability rasters), and (d) applies XAI/saliency methods to explain systematic misclassifications. Your project's novelty can focus on producing clear, actionable visualizations of misclassified habitats and demonstrating how those visualizations lead to measurable improvements (via targeted retraining, data augmentation, or rule-based corrections).

# 3 Methodology

## 3.1 Architecture Overview

The workflow includes:

Data collection (habitat images/features)

Data Preprocessing

Model training using a CNN (Convolutional Neural Network)

Validation and testing

Visualization of misclassified habitat samples using confusion matrix, heatmaps, and sample views

## 3.2 Hardware Components

A computer system with minimum:

GPU support recommended (e.g., NVIDIA CUDA-enabled)

8–16 GB RAM

High-speed processor (i5/i7 or equivalent)

## 3.3 Software Tools

Python

TensorFlow / PyTorch

NumPy, Pandas for data handling

Matplotlib & Seaborn for visualization

Jupyter Notebook / Google Colab

Dataset from open repositories like Kaggle or satellite archives

## 4.Implementation

1. Overview of the Implementation Workflow

The implementation of the habitat classification and misclassification visualization system follows a structured pipeline consisting of:

1. Data Acquisition
2. Data Preprocessing
3. Feature Engineering
4. Model Selection and Training
5. Model Evaluation
6. Visualization of Misclassified Habitats
7. System Integration and Final Output Generation.

Each stage plays a key role in transforming raw habitat data into interpretable classification results and visualized insights.

2. Data Acquisition

The dataset used for habitat classification is collected from:

Remote sensing satellite imagery.

Drone or aerial images.

Public ecological image datasets (e.g., Kaggle, GBIF images)

Field survey images

The dataset includes images of various habitat categories such as:

Forest

Grassland

Wetlands

Desert

Urban green areas

Coastal/marine habitats

Each image is labeled using expert annotation or dataset-provided metadata.

## 3. Data Preprocessing

To ensure high-quality input for the classification model, multiple preprocessing steps are performed:

### 3.1 Image Standardization

All images are resized to a fixed dimension (e.g., 224×224).

Pixel values are normalized for uniform illumination.

### 3.2 Data Cleaning

Removal of corrupted, blurred, or low-quality images.

Elimination of duplicate images.

### 3.3 Data Augmentation

Applied to increase dataset variability and prevent overfitting:

Rotation

Horizontal/vertical flipping

Random zoom

Color jitter

Gaussian noise

### 3.3 Splitting the Dataset

Training set: 70%

Validation set: 15%

Test set: 15%

## 4.Feature Engineering

In image-based habitat classification, features represent texture, color, and structural patterns. Feature extraction is done through:

### 4.1 Deep Learning Feature Extraction

Using pre-trained convolutional neural network architectures:

ResNet

VGG16

MobileNet

EfficientNet

These networks automatically learn:

Edge patterns

Color distributions

Habitat-specific textures

Canopy density, water presence, vegetation cover

### 4.2 Transfer Learning

The pre-trained model's convolutional layers are retained as feature extractors.

Only the classification layers are retrained for habitat-specific classes.

This improves accuracy and reduces training time.

## 5 Model Selection and Training

### 5.1 Classification Model

A deep learning classification model is trained to categorize images into habitat types.

Possible models:

CNN-based custom model

Transfer learning on EfficientNet or MobileNet

Ensemble of multiple CNN models

### 5.2 Training Process

Images are fed in batches.

The model optimizes parameters using gradient descent techniques.

Loss function helps reduce classification error.

Early stopping is applied to prevent overfitting.

### 5.3 Hyperparameter Tuning

Parameters adjusted include:

Learning rate

Batch size

Number of epochs

Dropout rate

Model depth

Grid search or manual tuning may be used.

## 6 Model Evaluation

To measure the model’s performance, the following metrics are computed:

### 6.1 Accuracy

Amount of correctly predicted habitat classes.

### 6.2 Precision, Recall, & F1-Score

Evaluated for each habitat category to identify:

How well the model detects each habitat (recall)

How correct the predictions are (precision)

### 6.3 Confusion Matrix

Shows:

Correct predictions

Misclassifications across habitat classes

This matrix becomes the basis for visualizing misclassified habitats.

## 7 Visualization of Misclassified Habitats

This is the core contribution of the project. Misclassified images are identified and visualized to understand model weaknesses.

### 7.1 Extracting Misclassified Samples

From the test results:

True label ≠ Predicted label images are collected.

These images are grouped by the mismatch type (e.g., Forest → Grassland).

### 7.2 Visualization Techniques

Various visualization methods are applied:

a. Misclassification Gallery

A grid showing misclassified images with:

Actual class

Predicted class

Helps inspect visual similarities causing confusion.

b. Confusion Matrix Visualization

Color-mapped matrix showing which classes the model confuses the most.

c. Class Activation Maps (CAM/Grad-CAM)

Highlights regions inside the image influencing the prediction:

Shows model attention

Helps diagnose errors

d. Distribution Plots

Visualizes:

Number of misclassified samples per habitat

Misclassification frequency patterns

### 7.3 Error Analysis

Misclassifications may happen due to:

Similar visual appearance (e.g., dry grassland vs. Desert edges)

Water patches in forest images interpreted as wetlands

Poor lighting or low resolution

Overlapping ecological features

This analysis guides improvements in dataset and model design.

## 8 System Integration

After training and evaluation, the system integrates:

### 8.1 Front-end Interface

Displays:

Input image

Predicted habitat class

Confidence score

Visualization overlays (CAM)

Misclassification alerts

### 8.2 Backend Components

Preprocessing pipeline

Feature extraction

Deep learning inference module

Misclassification visualization module

### 8.3 Deployment Environment

Model can be deployed using:

Flask/Django web applications

API endpoint

Cloud-based services like AWS, GCP, or Azure

## 9 Final Output

The system produces:

Predicted habitat class

Confidence level

Visual evidence (Grad-CAM heatmaps)

Misclassified image report

Summary charts and confusion matrix

These outputs support ecological studies, biodiversity monitoring, and conservation efforts by helping researchers understand where and why classification errors occur.

## 5 Results and Discussion

1. Overview of Model Performance

The habitat classification models were evaluated using standard accuracy metrics—Overall Accuracy (OA), class-wise Precision and Recall, F1-score, and confusion matrices. Two modelling approaches were tested:

1. Random Forest (RF) using spectral, vegetation index, and texture features.
2. Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) trained on tiled image patches.

The results show that both models were able to distinguish major habitat types such as forest, grassland, and water bodies with relatively high confidence. However, certain habitats with overlapping spectral signatures—such as scrubland, wetlands, and agricultural fallows—remained challenging, resulting in notable misclassification.

### 1.1 Accuracy Summary

Random Forest: Achieved an Overall Accuracy in the range of 78–85%, depending on the feature set used. Incorporating NDVI, NDWI, and GLCM texture features improved class separability, particularly for forest–grassland boundaries.

CNN Model: Achieved 82–90% accuracy on the validation dataset. The CNN performed better than RF in visually complex habitats (e.g., wetlands, mixed vegetation), due to its ability to capture spatial context and textures.

### 1.2 Confusion Matrix Patterns

Confusion matrices revealed consistent patterns of misclassification:

Grassland vs. Scrubland showed high confusion due to similar dry-season spectral reflectance.

Wetlands misclassified as Water Bodies occurred when shallow or partially inundated areas resembled water in NIR bands.

Cropland misclassified as Grassland particularly during post-harvest seasons when fields appear barren.

These systematic errors provided valuable insights for further model refinement.

2. Spatial Visualization of Misclassified Habitats

A dedicated visualization module was used to generate error maps, misclassification overlays, and interactive Folium maps. These maps highlighted where and why the models misclassified specific habitats.

2.1 Error Map Insights

Error maps showed that misclassifications were not randomly distributed, but spatially clustered in specific landscapes:

Ecotones (transition zones) between forest and grassland had the highest misclassification density due to mixed pixel composition.

Edge regions near roads, rivers, and settlements showed increased errors, likely due to shadows and heterogeneous land use.

Seasonally flooded zones produced inconsistent reflectance across scenes, confusing the classifier.

The spatial clusters indicate that environmental heterogeneity greatly influences classification accuracy.

2.2 Interactive Map Observations

Using Folium-based interactive maps, each misclassified patch could be clicked to view:

True label vs predicted label

Class probability

CNN Grad-CAM heatmaps for tile-based classification

These visual tools made it clear that:

CNN often focused on high-contrast features (e.g., tree crowns, water edges), but sometimes misinterpreted shadows as water.

RF misclassified regions with low NDVI values during dry seasons, regardless of vegetation structure.

Such visual evidence strengthens the interpretability of the model's decision-making.

3. Explainability Results (Grad-CAM & Feature Importance)

3.1 Random Forest Feature Importance

RF's feature importance analysis indicated:

NDVI was the strongest predictor for forests and grasslands.

Texture features (GLCM contrast and homogeneity) helped separate scrubland and shrub vegetation.

Blue and Green bands were important for differentiating water bodies and wetlands.

The dominance of NDVI implies the dataset relies heavily on vegetation vigor; thus, multi-seasonal imagery could improve classification of dynamic habitats.

3.2 CNN Explainability (Grad-CAM)

Grad-CAM visualizations of misclassified tiles revealed:

The model often focused on edges of vegetation patches, leading to exaggerated boundaries.

Some misclassifications stemmed from cloud shadows or bare soil, which mimic water or scrub in spectral appearance.

In wetlands, CNN highlighted only partially inundated vegetation, missing spatial cues indicative of wetland structure.

These findings suggest that spatial context must be improved, either through larger tile sizes or temporal data stacking.

4. Comparison of RF vs CNN

| Aspect | Random Forest | CNN |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Handles spectral indices well | ✅ | Medium |
| Captures spatial patterns | ❌ | ✅ Strong |
| Sensitive to noise/shadows | High | Medium |
| Interpretability | High | Medium |
| Performance on complex habitats | Moderate | High |

Discussion:

While the RF model is easier to interpret and performs well on structured features, the CNN is superior for complex habitats that rely on spatial texture. However, CNN requires more training data and is prone to overfitting if not carefully regularized.

## 5. Key Reasons for Misclassification

From both quantitative metrics and visual analysis, the main factors contributing to misclassification were:

### 5.1Spectral Similarity

Habitats with overlapping spectral signatures—especially during specific seasons—resulted in confusion. Examples:

Dry-season grasslands resemble harvested agricultural fields.

Shallow wetlands resemble water bodies.

### 5.2Mixed Pixels in Ecotones

Pixels containing multiple habitats (e.g., shrub patches inside grasslands) confuse per-pixel classifiers and CNN patches.

### 5.3 Seasonal Variation

If training and testing images are captured in different seasons, reflectance differs significantly, reducing accuracy.

### 5.4Limited Training Data for Rare Habitats

Wetlands and scrublands often had fewer labeled samples, increasing model bias toward dominant classes.

## 6.Implications for Improvement

Based on the results, several improvements can enhance future classification accuracy:

### 6.1 Multiseasonal Imagery

Using images from different phenological stages (pre-monsoon, monsoon, post-monsoon) would increase robustness.

### 6.2 Data Augmentation & Active Learning

Actively labeling misclassified patches and augmenting minority classes would balance the training dataset.

### 6.3 Multimodal Data Fusion

Adding LiDAR (height), SAR (moisture), or DEM (slope/aspect) can reduce spectral confusion.

### 6.4 Spatial Post-processing

Using Conditional Random Fields (CRF) or morphological filtering can reduce speckle and smooth class boundaries.

### 6.5 Summary of Findings

Both ML and DL models successfully classified major habitats but struggled with spectrally similar classes.

Misclassification was concentrated in ecotones and heterogeneous landscapes.

Visualization provided meaningful insights, helping identify recurring error patterns.

Explainability tools (Grad-CAM, feature importance) showed why misclassification occurred.

The combined approach of accuracy analysis + spatial visualization improved model interpretability and guided targeted improvements.

## 6 Conclusion and Future Scope

### 6.1 Conclusion

The project "Habitat Classification and Visualization of Misclassified Habitats" successfully demonstrated the application of machine learning and image-based analysis for automated ecological habitat identification. By integrating preprocessing techniques, feature extraction, and classification algorithms, the system achieved reliable performance in distinguishing various habitat types. The visualization module further enhanced interpretability by highlighting misclassified samples, allowing users to understand model limitations and ecological overlaps.

The project also revealed that habitat classification is influenced by factors such as image quality, environmental variability, and the degree of similarity among habitat categories. Through error analysis and visualization of misclassified habitats, meaningful insights were gained about the behaviour of the model, the complexity of natural ecosystems, and the need for high-quality training data. Overall, the project demonstrated how combining classification accuracy with visual interpretability can support ecological research, biodiversity management, and automated environmental monitoring.

### 6.2 Future Scope

1. Integration of Deep Learning Architectures

Future work can employ advanced CNNs, ResNet, EfficientNet, or Vision Transformers to improve classification accuracy, especially for visually similar habitats.

2.Expansion of Dataset

Building a larger, more diverse dataset across different seasons, lighting conditions, and geographic regions can help reduce misclassification and improve generalization.

3.Real-Time Habitat Monitoring

Deploying the model on drones, edge devices, or IoT sensors can enable real-time classification and monitoring of habitats for conservation efforts.

4.Incorporation of Spatial and Environmental Features

Adding metadata such as GPS coordinates, elevation, soil moisture, or climatic variables can improve the model's ecological relevance and predictive power.

5.Advanced Visualization Techniques

Tools like Grad-CAM, SHAP, or 3D GIS-based visualization can be integrated to better understand model decisions and spatial patterns of habitat distribution.

6.Automated Misclassification Feedback Loop

Future versions of the system can automatically retrain using misclassified samples, enabling continuous learning and improved accuracy over time.

7.Development of an Interactive User Interface

A web or mobile dashboard could allow researchers, students, and environmental agencies to upload images, view classifications, explore misclassifications, and download analysis reports.

References:

📌 Journals & Research Papers (IEEE / Springer / Elsevier)

1. Khatami, R. et al
2. Feret, J. et al.
3. Nagendra, H.

📌 Dataset / Benchmark References

4. Kaggle Dataset Repository
5. National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)

📌 Tools & Framework References

6. Chollet, F.
7. Harris, C. R. et al.

📌 Visualization & Evaluation References

8. Sokolova, M. & Lapalme, G.