# Answer to JSTAR reviewers’ comment

ID: JSTARS-2014-00192

Title: Scalar and Representative Observables, and Their Associated Statistical Models, for POLSAR data.

## Reviewer 1:

**Comment:**

**Overall it is an interesting paper but some elements are missing in order to ensure a good repeatability of the results.**

Answer:

The paper has been written with an aim to ensure good repeatability. The proposed PDF can be tested with both Monte Carlo simulations and real-life captured data. Several falsifiable test experiments are illustrated. In fact, readers are welcomed to retry these experiments on different datasets. The authors would be delighted if the reviewer can be specific on what elements can be added to increase the paper’s repeatability or if he had any specific difficulty in retrying these experiments.

**Comment:**

**I am a little bit sceptical about the derivation of the PDF for the ratio (21) in order to get (23). Are you just showing a ratio of chi-squared distributed random variables without actually computing the ratio PDF? Usually the derivation of the PDF of the ratio of independent random variables implies an integration using a Jacobian, therefore some details or reference would be appreciated.**

Answer:

The PDF derivation were prepared in the appendix, but were removed to keep the paper concise. Please find the appendix attached. It should be noted however: that the PDF derivation, as commented by the reviewer, is complex and is not done for every cases of dimension (d) and look (L) numbers. For simple cases, e.g. d=1 the PDFs are derived in the appendix and are presented in the paper in Eqns. (24) to (26).

**Comment:**

**The pdf[] notations could be removed on page 4, since we know that we are dealing with PDFs.**

Answer:

The pdf[] notation is used to differentiate the notation in Eqns. (21) to (23) also in page 4 where, as the Reviewer commented earlier, are not written in PDF format.

**Comment:**

**P4 L55, define the notation in ln(Q)! Is it the Wilk’s lambda distribution?**

Answer:

The notation in this paper stands for our so-called log-chi-squared distribution. It is defined as where is a random variable following the chi-squared distribution. Given that the PDF of chi-squared distribution is available , the PDF of log-chi-squared distribution is derived as: .

It is not the same with Wilk’s distribution. Even though they are probably related in the sense that:

1. If both random variables A&B follow Wishart distribution and can be considered as independent of each other, then
2. The derived observable follows Wilk’s distribution
3. In this paper we assert that and its log-transformed version (not presented here) follows fixed distributions.
4. Not shown in the submitted paper, but elsewhere TODO:CITE\_THESIS? It is shown that where stands for our so-called log-chi-squared distribution.

To avoid confusion this notation can be changed to in the revised version of this paper, or the equation for ln(Q) is removed from the paper.

**Comment:**

**I am a little surprised that the authors chose to look immediately at real data, I would have expected some Monte-Carlo simulations where the parameter values for various pdfs are perfectly known (in particular L which is estimated here) and uncertainty about sample homogeneity are also absent.**

Answer:

This step is carried out, in various different ways, in our detailed work. However we do not see much value of showing a mathematical Monte-Carlo simulation matching a theoretical model. Unfortunately, we do not have access to a physical POLSAR simulator. It would be nice to show that the model can be validated against some simulator. However, we felt, it is more important that this paper needs to validate the model against real-life practical data. Thus, this is kept out of this paper due to the space constraint of this paper.

**Comment:**

**The various histogram maybe easier to display in a log-probability axis especially for the tail behaviour.**

Answer:

Interestingly, our work does include a log-transformed version, which were again removed, in the interest of brevity / space constraint.

**Comment:**

**The various sample sizes should be given as well as the estimated L values.**

Answer:

The sample sizes for AIRSAR and RADARSAT datasets are 50x50 and 300x300 respectively. The computed L values are: TODO:SEARCH\_AND\_FOUND.

**Comment:**

**Section IV, in the multi-dimensional case, it is not clear what analytical relation similar to (26) was used to compute the model PDFs for (22) and (23).**

Answer:

The paper did not use (26) to compute (22) and (23). Rather, it shows that Eqns. (24) to (26) is a special case of Eqns. (17, (22) and (23), where d=1. Thus, the proposed models for POLSAR includes the traditional model for SAR as its special case.

## Reviewer 2:

**Comment:**

**The authors do not show that this parameter is any better than others, such as span, except in the sense that its pdf is defined completely, not just asymptotically.**

Reply:

Apparently the reviewer only see a small portion of the proposed advantages. The paper suggests that its proposed models for multi-dimensional POLSAR also includes the traditional model for SAR as its special case (d=1). Moreover, its scalar observable leads to consistent measures of distance, while other scalar observables, such as span, cannot. Even better are the properties of these proposed consistent measures of distance. First, compared to existing measures of distance (section II.B) the proposed pdf is, as the Reviewer noted, defined completely and not just asymptotically. Second, compared to the widely used intensity-ratio in SAR, the determinant-ratio can be considered as its natural extension in the multi-dimensional case!

**Comment:**

**They also do not acknowledge that much of the useful information in a polarimetric image is in the relationship between the terms of the scattering matrix.**

Answer:

The paper does acknowledge that the proposed model is NOT lossless (P7 L27). One of the thing that is lost may include this intra-relationship among the terms of the scattering matrix. The concerned paragraph will be rewritten (TODO:WRITE).

**Comment:**

**Other parameters they present … are ill-defined in how to put them to practical use.**

Answer:

The paper suggests that the proposed determinant, determinant-ratio or change-ratio models for POLSAR also includes the traditional models for SAR intensity, SAR intensity-ratio and SAR change-ratio. Thus their usage pattern can be learned from the practical use of these SAR models.

**Comment:**

**No comparisons with established procedures are made.**

Answer:

Since the paper did not propose new procedures / application, the authors feel that the ‘’comparison with established procedures” is not needed. The proposed models however are compared with existing models for both SAR and POLSAR and its advantages are shown. For practical application, the paper also includes a portion to illustrate how the proposed models can be useful. Even for this purpose, instead of normal “comparison with established procedures”, a higher-level approach is pursued. Since the proposed determinant, determinant-ratio or change-ratio models for POLSAR also includes the traditional models for SAR intensity, SAR intensity-ratio and SAR change-ratio, the paper shows how to adapt existing SAR data processing techniques towards POLSAR.

**Detail Comment:**

**P1/Col1/Para2: The authors state without citation that existing models are “complex and unintuitive”. This statement needs validation … justification.**

Answer

POLSAR is multidimensional and stochastic. There are several attempts to model all elements of the multidimensional POLSAR data. (Cite: LopezMartinez\_2003\_TGRS, Lee\_1994\_TGRS). Their derived models are evidently complex, especially when compared with our proposed model.

**Detail Comment**

**P2/Col1/L36-52: text is misleading. It says that 1-7 are statistical models, not parameters for which models have been proposed. p,q,r,s needs to be defined.**

Answer:

1-7 list out different univariate POLSAR observables, for which statistical models have been proposed in the cited publications. We feel that the grammar written in the text is correct, even though it may be a bit hard to decode. The text is rewritten in the revised paper. p,q,r,s are notation indicating any of the commonly used polarization combination (i.e. hh,vv,hv). The explanation will also be added in the text.

**Detail Comment:**

**P2/Col1/L56-60: have been shown by whom? Citation required, or is this the authors’ opinion.**

Answer:

The text reads: “… none of the underlying observables have been shown to meet the dual criteria of (i) resulting in statistically consistent discrimination measures and thus (ii) being representative of the complex POLSAR data”. This is shown by us, in the next section. The next section reviews all, to the best of our knowledge, widely used discrimination measures for POLSAR. Evidently none of the commonly used discrimination measures are based on the reviewed observables. Most of them actually are based on the determinant of the covariance matrix, which is our proposed model in this paper.

**Detail Comment:**

**P3/Col1/L10-15: While it may be nice for mathematical purity to have an exact distribution instead of an asymptotic one, it should be demonstrated that the asymptotic assumption is invalid for POLSAR data. Ultimately, it needs to be shown that better separation of regions may be obtained using the proposed distribution than with existing methods.**

Answer:

First, we feel that having an exact distribution instead of an asymptotic one is an obvious theoretical contribution. And while we show that the exact distribution is valid, that does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that the asymptotic assumption is invalid for POLSAR data. While we believe that better separation can be achieved with the proposed model, we feel that it is a relative different topic. Due to space constraints, one paper should focus on a single topic we believe. Evidently, this theoretical results need to be established first, before follow on techniques can be proposed. It should also be noted that the paper does include a section discussing the application of the proposed models.

**Detail Comment:**

**P3/Col1/L25: Incorrect nomenclature. Single pol transmit, dual-pol receive is “compact polarimetry”. Partially polarized signals contain both polarized and unpolarised power.**

Answer:

The term we used is “partial polarimetry” and is totally different from “partially polarized signals”. We are aware of the term “compact polarimetry” which were used by Souyris (TODO:CITE). In the cited paper, the proposed mode is 45 in Transmit. That fact is important because there is also another proposal by Raney, termed “hybrid polarimetry”, where circularly polarized signals are transmitted. By “partial polarimetry”, we try to indicate that our model works not only on “full polarimetric SAR” or “traditional SAR”, but also covers both the above mentioned case, and more. In fact, our paper validates the case where the horizontally polarized signal is transmitted.

**Detail Comment:**

**P3/Col2/Eqns 16, 17: Confusing notation or a typo? These are distributions. Is the exponent missing in the equations?**

Answer:

Yes, these are distributions. We felt that the notation and the text around it make a clear meaning. If readers feel that exponent is important, it is pretty trivial to add it in.

**Detail Comment:**

**P3/Col2/L43-48: This paragraph is a circular argument. SAR speckle noise is multiplicative. You use Goddman’s result to capture this, and Eqn 19 … also does. It is not an implication. Note the Eqns 18 and 19 break down for L<d, i.e. for single look imagery.**

Answer:

We are not quite sure what the reviewer means by circular argument. To clarify, our intention is to show that the determinant of POLSAR covariance matrix is not only multiplicative but also heteroskedastic. Subsequently we show that these properties are also similar to SAR intensity.

Concerning Eqns 18, 19, it is true that they are broken when L<d. It should be noted that L stands for Number-of-Looks and d is the dimension number. Thus when L<d, the determinant is also ill-defined, as is the Complex Wishart distribution (Eqn. 13).

**Detail Comment:**

**P3/Col2/Eqn 20: why would the underlying covariance ever be known a priori? It is what we are trying to estimate.**

Answer:

The underlying covariance matrix may not be known with absolute accuracy. It however, may be considered as known to some degree. In that sense Eqn 20 may be useful. This can also be considered as a purely logical advancement. In fact, in the next sentence, the case of unknown underlying covariance matrix is covered.

**Detail Comment:**

**P4/Col1/Eqn 21: for this equation to work, regions must be known to be homogeneous. Almost no natural regions are …. Consequently, this parameter, while formally satisfying, may be useless in practice.**

Answer:

The paper shows that when the two underlying covariance are the same, Eqn. 21 is theoretically satisfying. Its use in practice, however, is dependent on our imagination. One, for example, is 1) given two observable covariance matrix, Eqn. 21 can be used to test the null hypothesis of same underlying covariance. With some minor calibration, this technique can be applied in, for example, change detection applications.

**Detail Comment:**

**P4/Col1/Eqn 23: is wrong. With numerator and denominator the same, it has fixed values of Rc=1,2,6 for d=1,2,3**

Answer:

It should be noted that the Eqn. 23 indicates a stochastic process. The division of two stochastic variables having the same underlying distribution does not lead to a fixed number. It only leads to fixed distribution. When d=1,2,3, Rc follows fixed distribution with expected values 1,2,6 respectively.

**Detail Comment:**

**P4/Col1/L28-38: 1D SAR is not 3D SAR collapsed. Single pol is a single component of compact or full pol SAR.**

Answer:

We do not wish to say that 3D SAR can be physically collapsed into 1D SAR. What we meant in the paper is that the proposed generic mathematical models for multidimensional SAR (i.e. d=3 for full-pol SAR, d=2 for part-pol SAR) when collapsed into single-dimension (i.e. setting d=1 into these mathematical formula) results in the traditional model for SAR intensity! That is the multidimensional models proposed in this paper is generic and as such also include the traditional SAR intensity models!

**Detail Comment:**

**P4/Col1/last Eqn: you did not set d=1 here**

Answer:

Thanks for pointing out the glaring mistake. It is rectified in the revised paper.

**Detail Comment:**

**P4/Col2/top Eqn: Without clarification, I cannot figure out how the succeeding results are calculated.**

Answer:

A separate appendix is attached to show the mathematical derivation.

**Detail Comment:**

**P5/Col1/L40: A Radarsat2 image of what?**

Answer:

Updated in the revised paper: A Radarsat2 image of Murda Merbok (Malaysia)

**Detail Comment:**

**Anfinsen’s ENL is, in general, non-integer. How did you deal with that? Why did you not use the formal L values from the imagery (1,4 or 9).**

Answer:

The computed ENL did results in non-integer. There is no problem with that as Matlab can simulate Chi-Squared distribution with non-integer degrees of freedom. Thus the model plot can be plotted using Matlab simulations.

We did not use the formal L values from the imagery because the estimated ENL gives a better match. We decided not to discuss too much about this why the estimated ENL gives a better match, since the paper is already too long. Interested reader can refers to my thesis for further details.

**Detail Comment:**

**How did you determine that the regions you choose were truly homogeneous? How did you determine the theoretical determinant for the ratio test? Which other region was selected for the change test?**

Answer:

The determination of homogeneity is admittedly by experience. We choose the regions that are calm water surfaces as homogeneous. These are large lake or calm sea area.

Assuming the area is homogeneous, the theoretical determinant is the determinant of the region’s ensemble average. The change test is the same assumed homogeneous region, shifted by a few pixels.

**Detail Comment:**

**P6, 7/Section VII: You used Anfinsen’s ENL to compute the L value required to make the data appear homogeneous. It should result in an ENL image that is instructive. The ENL value should vary around the image, although the actual number of looks does not. Consequently, your noise images show no structure, because all the variance structure has been extracted sin the ENL computation.**

Answer:

We may not fully understand the reviewer’s point in this comment. To clarify, first ENL estimation is not applied in this section’s experiment. Second, we do not wish to show that the noise images show no structure. In fact, quite contrary, we wish to show that the residual image of 5x5 boxcar filter shows more recognizable structures than the 3x3 boxcar filter. The point in this section is to show that an existing technique in SAR can be readily extended to POLSAR using our proposed approach.