

Land Cover Classification Schemes Using Remote Sensing Images: A Recent Survey

ABSTRACT

Economic development and growth in population have prompted rapid changes to earth's land cover over the last few decades, and there is every indication that the pace of these changes will accelerate in the future. Therefore, systematic evaluations of Earth's land cover must be repeated at a frequency that allows monitoring of both long term trends as well as inter-annual variability, and at a level of spatial detail to allow study of land use patterns. Land cover analysis can be done most effectively through remote sensing images of various spatial, spectral and temporal resolutions to improve the selection of areas designed for agricultural, urban and/or industrial areas of a region. Astute efforts have been made in developing advanced classification algorithms and techniques for improving the accuracy of land cover classification. Recent image classification approaches for land cover pattern analysis have been brought together with their pros and cons by reviewing literatures, books, manuals and other related documents. Suitable classification algorithms may be chosen based on their performance, type of image and application area. Through this survey, various aspects regarding, preprocessing, classification and accuracy assessment, new and unique land cover products may be generated which could not be produced by earlier techniques.

Keywords: Land use planning, land cover classification, remote sensing, image classification, Geographical Information Systems.

1. INTRODUCTION

Land is one of the most important natural resources on which human life and their developmental activities are centered on [Muthukrishnan. A et. al., 2013]. Land cover refers to the physical material at the surface of the earth it can be a region covered by snow, forests, wetlands, dry land, grass land, open water, impervious surfaces and agriculture land. Land use refers to how people use the landscape whether for development, conservation, or mixed uses [Bergmann, 2014].

Knowledge about land use and land cover is important for many planning and management activities and is considered an essential element for modeling and understanding the earth as a system [Thomas Lillesand et. al., 7th edition]. Information on land use and land cover also helps to overcome the problems of haphazard, uncontrolled development, deteriorating environmental quality, loss of prime agricultural lands, destruction of important wetlands, predict and assess impacts from floods and storm surges, loss of fish and wildlife habitat.

Remote sensing image classification techniques are essential in deriving land use land cover information for socio-economic planning and environmental applications [Miao Li et. al., 2014]. The technological innovation in the field of Remote Sensing (RS) and Geographic Information System (GIS) have opened a new dimension to address a wide range of scientific problems of land use land cover classification as they provide timely, precise, and quality information inputs to decision making, while making sustainable use of natural resources and improving conservation practices. A satellite image provides qualitative information of a large geographic area that reduces the intricacy of field work. A suitable remotely sensed data for image classification is chosen by analyzing the strength and limitation of different type of sensor data available.

Land Use/ Land cover classification can be determined by measuring, analyzing and interpreting the satellite images collected from satellite sensors. The five main resolution characteristics of a satellite's sensor system can be summarised into:

- Spectral coverage/resolution i.e., band locations/width
- Spectral dimensionality: number of bands
- Radiometric resolution: quantization
- Spatial resolution/instantaneous field of view
- Temporal resolution

Once the raw remote sensing digital data has been acquired, it is then processed into usable information. The changes made to remote sensing data involve two major operations which are preprocessing and post-processing.

- Preprocessing of image includes radiometric correction and geometric correction.
- Digital image post-processing include image enhancement, image classification, and change detection.

Figure1 shows analysing satellite image for land cover feature identification which includes selection of remotely sensed image, finding a suitable classification system, selection of training samples, image pre-processing, feature selection/ extraction, selection of suitable classification approaches, post-classification processing and accuracy assessment.




Figure 1: Satellite Image Analysis [Chandra Giri et. al., 2014]

These computerized process routines improve the image scene quality and aid in the data interpretation. Some of the major satellites which deliver images for precision agriculture are Indian Remote Sensing Satellite (IRS-1A, IRS-1C, IRS-1D), French SPOT, MODIS, ASTER, NOAA-AVHRR, LANDSAT TM/ETM, RADARSAT, ERS, RAPIDEYE, QUICKBIRD, IKONOS, ADEOS-II, CBERS-CCD and HJ-1 CCD etc.,

2. METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

The paper reviews recent technologies of land cover classification scheme using remotely sensing images to support precision farming. The review is prepared by referring to journals, conference papers, books, manuals/reports and other related documents. Over eight robust image classification schemes are discussed in this paper which are,

- (i) Based on pixel information and are classified as pre-pixel classification, sub-pixel classification, pre-field classification, contextual classification, knowledge based classification and combination of multiple classifications
- (ii) Based on use of training samples and are classified as supervised classification and unsupervised classification.

About 52 documents including papers from national and international journals/conferences, 2 books and 3 manuals/reports have been referred in this survey. Stress has been given for recent land cover classification techniques using remotely sensing images to support precision farming by referring to published international journals in 2014-2015. Their commercial viability, application, potential and future scope of the algorithm has been analyzed in detail. A clear representation showing a particular method, its advantages/benefits and limitation/short comings are given.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Remote sensing image classification is a commonly adopted method to obtain land cover information from Satellite images [Y. Gao et. al., 2008]. Digital image classification is the process of assigning pixels to meaningful classes. A pixel is assumed to be an individual unit which carries several spectral band values. The pixels of an image having comparable spectral values are assigned to one class. Classes are homogenous thus pixels of one class differ spectrally with the pixels of another class of the same image. These classes form regions on a map or an image, so that after classification digital image can be presented as a mosaic of consistent classes, each identified by a colour or symbol [Jawak.S.D et. al., 2015]. Land cover Image classification approaches can be done by either based on pixel information or based on use of training samples as shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Land Cover Image Classification Approaches [R.Ablin et. al., 2013]

3.1 Based on pixel information

Image can be classified based on pixel information into following classification approaches pre-pixel classification, sub-pixel classification, pre-field classification, contextual classification, knowledge based classification and combination of multiple classifications.

3.1.1 Per-pixel classification approach

Traditional Per-pixel classifiers typically develop a signature by combining the spectra of all training set pixels for a given feature. The resulting signature contains the contributions of all materials present in the training pixels, but ignores the impact of the mixed pixels. Per-pixel classification algorithms can be parametric or non-parametric [D. Lu et. al., 2007]. Commonly used Parametric Classifiers are Maximum likelihood classifier. Commonly used non-parametric classifiers are neural networks, Decision tree and Support Vector Machine. To improve performance in a non-parametric classification procedure, boosting, bagging or a hybrid of both techniques can be used [Geeta R. Gupta et. al., 2014]. Some of the per-pixel classifiers methods is described in Table1.

Table 1: Per-pixel classifiers methods

Category	Advanced Classifiers	Authors
Per-pixel classifiers	Two unsupervised classifications, algorithms based on RBF Neural Network and K-means	Rollet.R et. al.,1998
	Minimum Distance-to-Means Classifier	Atkinson.P.M, et. al., 2000
	Spectral angle Classifier	Sohn. Y et. al., 2002
	Decision tree classifier	Lawrence.R et. al., 2004
	Supervised classification was performed using the maximum likelihood algorithm and 25 classes.	David Barry Hester et. al., 2008
	Support Vector Machine	Marconcini.M et. al., 2009

3.1.2 Sub-pixel classification approach

Sub-pixel classification approaches have been developed to provide a more appropriate representation and accurate area estimation of land cover than per-pixel approaches, especially when coarse spatial resolution data are used [Foody et. al., 1994]. In sub-pixel classification each pixel is considered mixed, and the real proportion of each class is estimated. Some of the Sub-pixel classifiers are described in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Sub-pixel classifiers methods

Category	Advanced Classifiers	Authors
Sub-pixel classifiers	Rule-based machine-version approach	Foschi et. al., 1997
	Image Sub-pixel classifier	Huguenin. R.L et. al., 1997
	Neural Networks	Mannan.B et. al., 2003
	Regression modelling	Yang.X et. al., 2005
	Fuzzy-spectral mixture analysis	Tang.J et. al., 2007

3.1.3 Per-field classification approach

The Per-field classifier is designed to deal with the problem of environmental heterogeneity. The Per-field classifier averages out the noise by using land parcels (called 'fields') as individual units. The per-field classifications are often affected by such factors as the spectral and spatial properties of remotely sensed data, the size and shape of the fields, the definition of field boundaries and the land cover classes chosen [Janssen.L.F et. al., 1995]. Some of the pre-field classifiers are described in Table 3.

Table 3: Per-field classifiers methods

Category	Advanced Classifiers	Authors
Per-field classifiers	Per-field classification based on per-pixel or sub-pixel classified image	Aplin et. al., 2001
	Per-field or per-parcel classification	S. Wu, et. al., 2007
	Object-based classification	Volker Walter, 2003
		Mengistie Kindu et. al., 2013
		Thunig. H et. al., 2011

3.1.4 Contextual classification approach

Contextual classifier is an approach of classification based on contextual information in images. "Contextual" means this approach is focusing on the relationship of the nearby pixels, which is also called neighborhood. The goal of this approach is to classify the images by using the contextual information. Contextual classifiers were developed to overcome with the problem of intra-class spectral variations. Some of the contextual classifiers are described in Table 4.

Table 4: Contextual classification methods

Category	Advanced Classifiers	Authors
Contextual classifiers	Fuzzy contextual classifier	Binaghi.E, et. al., 1997
	Point-to-point contextual correction	Cortijo et. al.,1998
	Contextual classifier based on region-growth algorithm	Lira et. al.,2002
	Frequency-based contextual classifier	Xu.B et. al., 2003
	Extraction and Classification of Homogeneous Objects	Lu.D et. al., 2004

3.1.5 Knowledge-based classification approach

Knowledge based classifier is more suited to handle complex data. Different kinds of ancillary data, such as digital elevation model, housing, soil map and temperature are easily available; they may be integrated into a classification procedure in different ways [Geeta R. Gupta et. al., 2014]. Some of the Knowledge based classifier is described in Table 5.

Table 5: Knowledge based classifier methods

Category	Advanced Classifiers	Authors
Knowledge based classifier	Knowledge-based classification	Dobson.M.C et. al., 1996
		Schmidt.K.S et. al., 2004
		Hashimoto. S et. al., 2012
	Rule-based syntactical approach	Onsi 2003

3.1.6 Combination of multiple classification approach

Research have explored different techniques such as a production rule, a sum rule, stacked regression methods majority voting and thresholds to combine multiple classification results to provides improved classification accuracy compared to the use of a single classifier. Some of the Combination of multiple classifiers is described in Table 6.

Table 6: Combination of multiple classifiers methods

Category	Advanced Classifiers	Authors
Combination of multiple classifiers	Neural Network, Decision Tree Classifier and Evidential Reasoning	Huang et. al., 2004
	Maximum Likelihood Classifier (ML), Support Vector Machine (SVM), Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), Spectral Angle Mapper (SAM), Minimum Distance Classifier (MD) And Decision Tree Classifier (DTC)	Lijun Dai et. al.,2010
	Multiple Support Vector Machine (SVM) with the core of the Radial Based Function (RBF), SVM with the core of linear function, Neural Network (BP), decision tree of rough set, random forest, and K nearest neighbor	Jiahui Xu et. al.,2012

3.2 Based on use of training samples

3.2.1 Supervised classification

Supervised classification methods require input from an analyst. The input from analyst is known as training set. All the supervised classifications usually have a sequence of operations that must be followed [K.Perumal et. al., 2010].

- Defining of the Training Sites.
- Extraction of Signatures.
- Classification of the Image.

Training sample is the most important factor in the supervised satellite image classification methods. Accuracy of the methods highly depends on the samples taken for training. Training samples are two types, one used for classification and another for supervising classification accuracy. Most commonly used supervised classification approaches are:

- **Maximum likelihood:** Maximum likelihood decision rule is based on Gaussian estimate of the probability density function of each class. Maximum likelihood classifier evaluates both the variance and covariance of the spectral response patterns in classifying an unknown pixel. It assumes the distribution of the cloud of points forming the category training data to be normally distributed. Under this assumption, distribution of response pattern can be described by mean vector and the covariance matrix. From the given parameters the statistical probability of a given pixel value can be computed. By computing the probability of the pixel value, an undefined pixel can be classified. After evaluating the probability the pixel would be assigned to the one with highest probability value. One of the drawbacks in maximum likelihood classifier is large number of computation required to classify each pixel [R.Ablin et. al., 2013].
- **Artificial Neural Network (ANN):** ANN has become increasingly popular for classification of remote sensing data. ANN is a simple structure consisting a set of processing units, interconnected with each other by weighted channels similar to a biological neuron [Aleksander I,1990]. The major appeal of ANN lies in its higher tolerance to any noise in the data, distribution free assumption, its ability to weight the importance of variables in the analysis and its capability to perform adequately in the presence of small training data set [Benediktsson J.A et. al., 1990]. The feed forward BPNN learning algorithm is the most common algorithm used for remote sensing image classification [M. A. Ibrahim et. al., 2004]
- **Bayesian Network (BN):** Bayesian Network provide a very general and yet effective graphical language for factoring joint probability distributions which in turn make them very popular for classification. A BN is a graphical model represents variables (as nodes) and cause-effect relationships (as directed links) between variables. All geographical data has uncertainty associated with its attributes, a BN uses belief probabilities to represent these uncertainties in a mathematically sound way. The two major task in learning a BN are learning the graphical structure and then learning the parameters for that structure [A.R Khanteymoori et. al., 2008]
- **Decision tree:** Decision tree approach is a non-parametric classifier and an example of machine learning algorithm. It involves a recursive partitioning of the feature space, based on a set of rules that are learned by an analysis of the training set. A tree structure is developed where at each branching a specific decision rule is implemented, which may involve one or more combinations of the attribute inputs. A new input vector then “travels” from the root node down through successive branches until it is placed in a specific class. Decision tree has ability to handle missing and noisy data, and non-parametric nature. Decision trees are not constrained by any lack of knowledge of the class distributions. It can be trained quickly, takes less computational time [Uttam Kumar et. al., 2002]. C5.0 is flexible and is based on decision tree algorithm that is one of the most effective form of

inductive learning [Debasish Chaudhuri, 2008]. Combining Bayes method with inductive learning not only improves classification accuracy greatly, but also extends the classification by subdivide some classes with the discovered knowledge [Deren LI et. al., 2000].

- **Minimum Distance:** Minimum distance classifies image data on a database file using a set of 256 possible class signature segments as specified by signature parameter. Each segment specified in signature, for example, stores signature data pertaining to a particular class. Only the mean vector in each class signature segment is used. Other data, such as standard deviations and covariance matrices, are ignored (though the maximum likelihood classifier uses this). The result of the classification is a theme map directed to a specified database image channel. A theme map encodes each class with a unique gray level. The gray-level value used to encode a class is specified when the class signature is created. If the theme map is later transferred to the display, then pseudo-color table should be loaded so that each class is represented by a different colour [T. Sarath et. al.,2014]
- **Parallel piped:** In the parallelepiped decision rule, the data file values of the candidate pixel are compared to upper and lower limits. These limits can be either the minimum and maximum data file values of each band in the signature or the mean of each band, plus and minus a number of standard deviations, or any limits that you specify, based on your knowledge of the data and signatures. There are high and low limits for every signature in every band. When a pixel's data file values are between the limits for every band in a signature, then the pixel is assigned to that signature's class. Limitation of this approach is that since parallelepipeds have "corners", pixels may be classified which are actually quite far, spectrally, from the mean of the signature [Yousif Ali Hussin, 2005]
- **K-nearest Neighbor (KNN):** Nearest neighbor based algorithms are simple but effective methods used in statistical classification. Categorizing unlabeled samples is based on their distance from the samples in training dataset. KNN classification a set of k nearest neighbors is computed for an unlabeled sample instead of a single nearest neighbor. Then, the test sample is assigned to the class that occurs most frequently among the k-nearest training samples. If the ranges of the data in each dimension vary considerably, this can affect the accuracy of the nearest neighbour based classifications. Thus, both the training and testing data need be normalized [Debabrata Ghosh et. al., 2014]
- **Mahalanobis classification:** It is based on correlations between variables by which different patterns can be identified and analyzed. It gauges similarity of an unknown sample set to a known one. It differs from Euclidean distance. It takes into account the correlations of the data set and is scale-invariant. The author [V. Battsengel et. al.,2013] illustrate Mahalanobis classification algorithm that uses spatial thresholds defined from the local knowledge to extract the reliable urban land cover information from the selected optical and microwave data sets.
- **Object base classification:** Object-oriented classification pattern deals with image objects which share the similar attributes, such as Digital Number (DN) value, spectral characteristics, texture, size, shape, compactness, context information with adjacent image objects, etc (Blaschke and Hay,2001; Blaschke and Strobl, 2001). Hence in object-oriented classification pattern, image object is the aggregation of similar pixels by image segmentation method, so the formation of image objects is a weighed mean process and can reduce the influence of random noise point which decreases the limitations exist in the feature analysis in other classifiers [LIU Yongxue et. al.,2006]

3.2.2 Unsupervised classification

Unsupervised Classification technique uses clustering mechanisms to group satellite image pixels into unlabelled classes/clusters. Later analyst assigns meaningful labels to the clusters and

produces well classified satellite image. Unsupervised methods are usually very fast and computationally efficient. Most common unsupervised satellite image classifications are:

- **ISODATA (Iterative Self-Organizing Data Analysis Technique):** The ISODATA clustering method uses the minimum spectral distance formula to form clusters. It begins with either arbitrary cluster means or means of an existing signature set and each time the clustering repeats, the means of these clusters are shifted. The new cluster means are used for the next iteration. The ISODATA utility repeats the clustering of the image until either a maximum number of iterations has been performed or a maximum percentage of unchanged pixels have been reached between two iterations [Mohammed et. al., 2015]
- **Support Vector Machine (SVM):** The SVM formulation is based on the Structural Risk Minimization principle, which is an inductive principle for model selection that aims at providing a tradeoff between hypothesis space complexity and quality of fitting the training data. The SVM approach has excellent properties like, good generalization ability, high effectiveness in hyper dimensional feature space, learning phase associated with the minimization of a convex cost function that guarantees the uniqueness of the solution and the possibility to be implemented in a parallel architecture thus reducing the overall computational time by an adequate parallel processing [Francesca Bovolo et. al., 2010].
- **K-Means:** It is a popular statistics and data mining technique. It partitions n observations into k clusters based on Euclidean mean value. Advantages with the K-Means technique are simple to process and fast execution. Limitation with this method is analyst should know priori number of classes [Sunitha Abburu et. al., 2015].

3. CONCLUSION

Selection of a suitable classifier requires consideration of many factors, such as classification accuracy, algorithm performance, and computational resources. Classification algorithms can be per pixel, sub pixel, per field, contextual, knowledge based and combination of multiple classifiers. Classification approaches may vary with different types of remote-sensing data. Pixel-based image analysis is limited because the image pixels are not true geographical objects and the pixel topology is limited. Pixel based image analysis largely neglects the spatial photo-interpretive elements such as texture, context, and shape; the increased variability implicit within high spatial resolution imagery confuses traditional pixel-based classifiers resulting in lower classification accuracies. A per-field or object-oriented classification approach is most favourable for fine spatial resolution data as the impact of the shadow problem and the wide spectral variation within the land-cover classes is isolated. Sub-pixel classification methods can overcome the problem associated with mixed pixels in medium and coarse spatial resolution data. Contextual classification is developed to overcome the problem of intraclass spectral variation. Knowledge based classification approach is most suitable when dealing with multisource data such as combination of spectral signatures, texture and context information and ancillary data. Hybrid approaches of combining multiple classification schemes has been found to be helpful for improvement of classification accuracy which is based on the type of image obtained from remote sensors (multispectral image, superspectral image or hyperspectral image) and the application area.

REFERENCES

1. Muthukrishnan. A , Aruchamy.S and Jose Ravindraraj. B "Land use facet is indicator of coastal land management: A case study of tuticorin coast using geospatial techniques" International Journal of Advances in Remote Sensing and GIS, Vol. 1, No. 3, 2013.
2. Bergmann Associates 2014 (January), Mohawk River Watershed Regulatory Review & Analysis.
3. Thomas Lillesand, Ralph W. Kiefer and Jonathan Chipman "Remote Sensing and Image Interpretation" 7th edition, John Wiley & Sons

4. Miao Li , Shuying Zang, Bing Zhang, Shanshan Li and Changshan Wu "A Review of Remote Sensing Image Classification Techniques: the Role of Spatio-contextual Information" *European Journal of Remote Sensing* - 2014, 47: 389-411
5. Chandra Giri and Jordan Long "Land Cover Characterization and Mapping of South America for the Year 2010 Using Landsat 30 m Satellite Data" *Remote Sensing* 2014, 6, 9494-9510
6. Y. Gao and J.F. Mas "A Comparison of the Performance of Pixel Based and Object Based Classifications over Images with Various Spatial Resolutions" *Online Journal of Earth Sciences*, 2:27-35, 2008
7. Jawak S.D, Devliyal, P. and Luis, A.J. (2015) "A Comprehensive Review on Pixel Oriented and Object Oriented Methods for Information Extraction from Remotely Sensed Satellite Images with a Special Emphasis on Cryospheric Applications" *Advances in Remote Sensing*, 4, 177-195
8. R.Ablin and C.Helen Sulochana "A Survey of Hyperspectral Image Classification in Remote Sensing" *International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer and Communication Engineering* Vol. 2, Issue 8, August 2013
9. D. Lu and Q. Weng "A survey of image classification methods and techniques for improving classification performance, *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 28:5,823-870, 2007
10. Geeta R. Gupta and Prof. S. M. Kamalapur "Study of Classification of Remote Sensing Images using Particle Swarm Optimization based approach" *International Journal of Application or Innovation in Engineering & Management* Volume 3, Issue 10, October 2014
11. Rollet R., Benie G.B., Li W., Wang S., Boucher J.M. (1998) - Image Classification Algorithm based on the RBF Neural Network and K-means. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 19: 3003-3009. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/014311698214398>.
12. Atkinson P.M., Lewis P. (2000) - Geostatistical classification for remote sensing: an introduction. *Computers & Geosciences*, 26: 361-371. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0098-3004\(99\)00117-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0098-3004(99)00117-X).
13. Sohn, Y. and Rebello, N.S., 2002, Supervised and unsupervised spectral angle classifiers. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, 68, pp. 1271–1281.
14. Lawrence E. R., Bunn, A., Powell, S. and Zmabon, M., 2004, Classification of remotely sensed imagery using stochastic gradient boosting as a refinement of classification tree analysis. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 90, pp. 331–336.
15. David Barry Hester, Halil I. Cakir, Stacy A.C. Nelson, and Siamak Khorram "Per-pixel Classification of High Spatial Resolution Satellite Imagery for Urban Land-cover Mapping", *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing* Vol. 74, No. 4, April 2008, pp. 463–471.
16. Marconcini M., Camps-Valls G., Bruzzone L. (2009) - A Composite Semisupervised SVM for Classification of Hyperspectral Images. *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters*, 6:234-238. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/LGRS.2008.2009324>
17. Foody G.M, Cox D.P., (1994), Subpixel landcover composition estimation using a linear mixture model and fuzzy membership functions, *Int. Remote sensing*, 15, 619- 631
18. Foschi, P.G. and Smith, D.K., 1997, Detecting subpixel woody vegetation in digital imagery using two artificial intelligence approaches. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, 63, pp. 493–500
19. Huguenin, R.L., Karaska, M.A., Blaricom, D.V. and Jensen, J.R., 1997, Subpixel classification of Bald Cypress and Tupelo Gum trees in Thematic Mapper imagery. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, 63, pp. 717–725.
20. Mannan B., Ray A.K. (2003) - Crisp and Fuzzy Competitive Learning Networks for Supervised Classification of Multispectral IRS Scenes. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 24: 3491-3502. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0143116021000053805>.
21. Yang X., Liu Z. (2005) - Use of Satellite-derived Landscape Imperviousness Index to Characterize Urban Spatial Growth. *Computers, Environment, and Urban Systems*, 29:524-540. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2005.01.005>.
22. Tang J., Wang L., Myint S.W. (2007) - Improving Urban Classification through Fuzzy Supervised Classification and Spectral Mixture Analysis. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 28; 4047-4063. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01431160701227687>
23. Aplin, P. and Atkinson P.M., 2001, sub-pixel land cover mapping for per-field classification. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 22, pp. 2853–2858

24. S. Wu, J. Silvan-Cardenas and L.Wang "Per-field urban land use classification based on tax parcel boundaries" *International Journal of Remote Sensing* Vol. 28, No. 12, 20 June 2007, 2777–2800
25. Volker Walter, Object-based classification of remote sensing data for change detection *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry & Remote Sensing* 58 (2004) 225– 238
26. Mengistie Kindu , Thomas Schneider, Demel Teketay and Thomas Knoke Land Use/Land Cover Change Analysis Using Object-Based Classification Approach in Munessa-Shashemene Landscape of the Ethiopian Highlands *Remote Sens.* 2013, 5(5), 2411-2435; doi:10.3390/rs5052411
27. Thunig. H, Wolf,.N , Naumann.S, Siegmund.A,Jurgens.C, Uysal.C and Maktav.D "Land use/land cover classification for applied urban planning - the challenge of automation" *Urban Remote Sensing Event (JURSE)*, 2011
28. Binaghi, E., Madella, P., Montesano, M.G. and Rampinl, A., 1997, Fuzzy contextual classification of multisource remote sensing images. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 35, pp. 326–339.
29. Cortijo, F.J. and De La Blanca, N.P., 1998, Improving classical contextual classification. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 19, pp. 1591–1613.
30. Lira, J. and Maletti, G., 2002, A supervised contextual classifier based on a region-growth algorithm. *Computers and Geosciences*, 28, pp. 951–959.
31. Xu, B., Gong, P., Seto, E. and Spear, R., 2003, Comparison of gray-level reduction and different texture spectrum encoding methods for land-use classification using a panchromatic IKONOS image. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, 69, pp. 529–536.
32. Lu,D. and Weng, Q., 2004, Spectral mixture analysis of the urban landscapes in Indianapolis with Landsat ETM+ imagery. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, 70, pp. 1053–1062.
33. Dobson.M.C, Pierce.L.E, Ulaby. F.T, Knowledge-based land-cover classification using ERS-1/JERS-1 SAR composites,*Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, IEEE Transactions on Volume- 34 , Issue- 1 , 1996
34. Schmidt, K.S., Skidmore, A.K., Kloosterman, E.H., Van Oosten, H., Kumar, L. and Janssen, J.A.M., 2004, Mapping coastal vegetation using an expert system and hyperspectral imagery. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, 70, pp. 703–715.
35. Hashimoto.S, Tadono.T, Onosato.M, Hori.M Probabilistic land cover classification approach toward knowledge-based satellite data interpretations *Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS)*, IEEE International, 2012
36. Onsi.H.M., 2003, Designing a rule-based classifier using syntactical approach. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 24, pp. 637–647.
37. Huang, Z. and Lees, B.G., 2004, Combining non-parametric models for multisource predictive forest mapping. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, 70, pp.415–425.
38. Lijun Dai ,Chuang Liu, Multiple classifier combination for land cover classification of remote sensing image, *Information Science and Engineering (ICISE)*, 2nd International Conference, 2010
39. Jiahui Xu, Weimin Ju and Zhongwen Hu, Object-oriented land cover classification of HJ-1B CCD image through multiple classifier fusion, *Geoinformatics (GEOINFORMATICS)*, 20th International Conference 2012.
40. K.Perumal and R.Bhaskaran "Supervised classification performance of multispectral images" *Journal of Computing*, Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2010.
41. Aleksander I, and H. Morton, "An introduction to neural computing" Chapman and Hall, London, 1990.
42. Benediktsson J.A., P.H. Swain and O.K. Ersoy, "Neural network approaches versus statistical methods in classification of multiscore remote sensing data", *IEEE Transaction on Geosciences and Remote Sensing*, vol. 28, pp. 540-551, 1990.
43. M. A. Ibrahim, M. K. Arora, S. K. Ghosh, Hua-mei Chen "Approaches to Improve Accuracy of Neural Network Classification of Images Dominated by Mixed Pixels" *IEEE*, 0-7803-8742-2/2004

44. A.R Khanteymoori, M.M Homayounpour, M.B Menhaj “ A Bayesian network based approach for data classification using structural learning”, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg,2008
45. Uttam Kumar and Ramachandra,T.V “Evaluation of Algorithms for Land Cover Analysis using Hyperspectral Data” technical report, 2002
46. Debasish Chaudhuri "Hybrid Image Classification Technique for Land-cover Mapping in the Arctic ,tundra north slope, Alaska",UMI microform 3316328, 2008
47. Deren LI , Kaichang DI, Deyi LI “Land use classification of remote sensing image with GIS data based on spatial data mining techniques” International Archives of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing. Vol. XXXIII, Part B3. Amsterdam 2000.
48. T. Sarath, G. Nagalakshmi and S.Jyothi “A Study on Hyperspectral Remote Sensing Classifications” International Conference on Information and Communication Technologies (ICICT- 2014)
49. Yousif Ali Hussin “Remotely Sensed Image Classification” UNEP-ITC RS/GIS for Monitoring and Assessment of Iraqi Marshland, 6-10, 2005
50. Debabrata Ghosh and Naima Kaabouch “A Survey on Remote Sensing Scene Classification Algorithms” WSEAS Transactions on signal processing, Volume 10, 2014
51. V. Battengel, D. Amarsaikhan, Ts. Bat-Erdene, E. Egshiglen, A. Munkh-Erdene, M. Ganzorig “Advanced Classification of Lands at TM and Envisat Images of Mongolia” Advances in Remote Sensing Vol.2 No.2 (2013), Article ID:32872, 9 pages DOI:10.4236/ars.2013.22014
52. Blaschke T, Hay G J, 2001. Object-oriented image analysis and scale-space: theory and methods for modeling and evaluating multi-scale landscape structures. International Archives of Photogrammetry & Remote Sensing, 34(4/W5): 22–29.
53. Blaschke T, Strobl J, 2001. What's wrong with Pixels? Some recent developments interfacing remote sensing and GIS. *Geo- BIT/GIS*, 6: 12–17.
54. LIU Yongxue, LI Manchun, MAO Liang, XU Feifei, HUANG Shuo “Review of Remotely Sensed Imagery Classification Patterns Based on Object-oriented Image Analysis”, Chinese Geographical Science, 16(3) 282–288, 2006
55. Mohammed Karemuiddin and Dr. Shaik Rusthum “Producing Land Use Land Cover Using SatellitelImage and Image Processing Techniques A Case Study of The Somajiguda GHMC Ward” International Journal of Innovative Technology and Research, Volume No.3, Issue No.4, June 2015
56. Francesca Bovolo, Lorenzo Bruzzone and Lorenzo Carlin “A Novel Technique for Sub-pixel Image Classification Based on Support Vector Machine” IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, Vol. 19, pp. 2983-2999, 2010
57. Sunitha Abburu and Suresh Babu Golla “Satellite Image Classification Methods and Techniques: A Review” International Journal of Computer Applications (0975 – 8887), Volume 119 – No.8, June 2015.