South Dakota State University

Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

2020

Vicarious Methodologies to Assess and Improve the Quality of the Optical Remote Sensing Images: A Critical Review

Sakib Kabir South Dakota State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd

Part of the Electrical and Computer Engineering Commons, and the Remote Sensing Commons

Recommended Citation

Kabir, Sakib, "Vicarious Methodologies to Assess and Improve the Quality of the Optical Remote Sensing Images: A Critical Review" (2020). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 5006. https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/5006

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. For more information, please contact michael.biondo@sdstate.edu.

VICARIOUS METHODOLOGIES TO ASSESS AND IMPROVE THE QUALITY

OF THE OPTICAL REMOTE SENSING IMAGES: A CRITICAL REVIEW

By SAKIB KABIR

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Master of Science Major in Electrical Engineering South Dakota State University

2020

THESIS ACCEPTANCE PAGE Sakib Kabir

This thesis is approved as a creditable and independent investigation by a candidate for the master's degree and is acceptable for meeting the thesis requirements for this degree. Acceptance of this does not imply that the conclusions reached by the candidate are necessarily the conclusions of the major department.

> Larry Leigh Advisor

Date

Siddharth Suryanarayanan Department Head

Date

Nicole Lounsbery, PhD Director, Graduate School

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Mr. Larry Leigh, for giving me the opportunity to work on this project. I appreciate his time, effort, and guidance to complete this thesis. I would also express my gratitude to Dr. Dennis Helder for guidance and encouragement to complete this task.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	V
INTRODUCTION	1
IMAGE QUALITY OF EARTH OBSERVING SATELLITE	4
QUALITY PARAMETERS AND METHODS	9
CONCLUSIONS	67
REFERENCES	68

ABSTRACT

VICARIOUS METHODOLOGIES TO ASSESS AND IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF THE OPTICAL REMOTE SENSING IMAGES: A CRITICAL REVIEW

SAKIB KABIR

2020

Over the past decade, number of optical Earth observing satellites performing remote sensing has increased substantially, dramatically increasing the capability to monitor the Earth. The quantity of remote sensing satellite increase is primarily driven by improved technology, miniaturization of components, reduced manufacturing, and launch cost. These satellites often lack on-board calibrators that a large satellite utilizes to ensure high quality (e.g., radiometric, geometric, spatial quality, etc.) scientific measurement. To address this issue, this work presents "best" vicarious image quality assessment and improvement techniques for those kinds of optical satellites which lacks on-board calibration system. In this article, image quality categories have been explored, and essential quality parameters (e.g., absolute and relative calibration, aliasing, etc.) have been identified. For each of the parameters, appropriate characterization methods are identified along with its specifications or requirements. In cases of multiple methods, recommendation has been made based-on the strengths and weaknesses of each method. Furthermore, processing steps have been presented, including examples. Essentially, this paper provides a comprehensive study of the criteria that needs to be assessed to evaluate remote sensing satellite data quality, and best vicarious methodologies to evaluate identified quality parameters such as coherent noise, ground sample distance, etc.

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past few decades, technological advancement dramatically reduced the size and cost of microelectronics. This drives commercial companies to build and launch a constellation of satellites (e.g., planet cubesat constellation, SkySat constellation, etc. [1,2]) that are capable of image the entire Earth in a single day. These satellites are not only playing an important role in monitoring global environmental change but also detecting disasters such as forest fires, volcanoes, earthquakes and oil spills [3,4]. To use the data from any Earth observing satellites, accurate radiometric and geometric calibration, and high spatial quality, in terms of minimal blurring, aliasing, etc., should be ensured. For instance, crop health observation, yield prediction and ocean color monitoring require accurate radiometric quantity such as radiance or reflectance, meanwhile object identification in remotely sensed image sometimes requires high spatial resolution. Additionally, high geometric accuracy, specifically multi-temporal image-to-image registration accuracy, is essential to monitor the physical changes (e.g., changes in shoreline, ice sheet, etc.) in the Earth surface. Prior to launching any Earth observing sensor, usually radiometric, geometric, spatial, spectral parameters are characterized and calibrated. But launch stress can change the calibration parameters, requiring on-obit calibration which is typically performed during commission period following launch. However, in harsh space environment radiation and energetic particles can change the instruments calibration parameters in every possible time scale. These necessitates frequent calibration and performance monitoring throughout the operating lifetime of an imaging sensor.

Typically, two approaches are used to calibrate and monitor remote sensing imaging system: on-board and vicarious approach (methods that utilizes Earth or celestial body imagery). On-board calibration systems are usually used by the large government systems (e.g. Landsat series, Sentinels, etc.). One of the primary advantages of having on-board calibrators is frequent calibration opportunity. But many remote sensing satellites (e.g., planetscope, gaofen-1, etc.) often lack on-board calibrators, such as solar diffuser panel, calibration lamp, etc. Consequently, these satellites rely on vicarious techniques to assess and improve the image quality [5,6]. Additionally, small satellites (such as planetscope) modulation transfer function, which is one of the spatial quality indicators, can be lower than the larger optical imaging sensor due to their small optical system, and geometric calibration might be difficult due to the less knowledge of spacecraft attitude [7]. These constraints can impact the image quality in multiple domains: geometry, radiometry, spatial, etc. Consequently, quality assessment and improvement should be performed in every possible domain to ensure science grade data product.

Previous attempts of the satellite image quality assessment and improvement underscored multiple aspects of data quality. For instance, in reference [8], Weaver proposes an analytical framework for appraising the efficacy of Earth observing satellite observations emphasizing on image quality criteria such as Signal-to-Noise Ratio, Modulation Transfer Function (MTF) and Ground Sampling Distance(GSD). Pagnutti et al. performed absolute and relative radiometric characterization of IKONOS sensor [9], and Helder et al. presented the geometric characterization of IKONOS using pre-marked artificial points [10]. In 2003, IKONOS spatial performance had been characterized through GSD and MTF analysis [11]. Three above mentioned work shows the image quality task by characterizing IKONOS sensor. But comprehensive image quality criteria and exhaustive list of vicarious techniques to assess and improve the images of optical Earth observing satellite are yet to be reported.

The main purpose of this article is to provide detail image quality criteria and best practice vicarious methodologies to assess and improve the quality of the optical Earth observing satellite images. This article is organized as follows. Section 1 presents a brief introduction of the topic, current state of the research and main goal of this work. Section 2 discusses the quality tasks and presents image quality categories. Section 3 provides radiometric quality parameters along with their corresponding methods, and prioritization of the methods and examples. Section 4 presents spatial quality parameters including vicarious techniques, and Section 5 delineates geometric quality parameters and methods. Finally, Section 6 concludes the article.

2. IMAGE QUALITY OF EARTH OBSERVING SATELLITE

In order to assess and improve the quality of remote sensing data, several aspects of the performance need to be examined while the satellite is operating inorbit. Those aspects can be divided into four categories: radiometry, spatial, spectral and geometry. Spectral response change (detector-to-detector) can induce striping, and also spectral calibration is necessary to perform accurate atmospheric correction for deriving surface product [12-14]. Spectral response is typically characterized prelaunch only; however, it not impossible to assess or monitor on-orbit [15]. As an example, Terra MODIS on-orbit spectral calibration (using on-board calibrator) can be seen in [16], which suggest excellent stability in spectral characteristics. Since vicarious techniques are not common for this task, spectral quality will not be considered in this article. Radiometric, spatial, and geometric quality should be assessed and improved periodically since harsh space environment can degrade instrument performance. Consequently, these three categories have been explored in this article, and with a further break down of individual quality parameters being investigated, and best practices approaches to evaluate each quality parameter's performance being presented. Figure 1 presents the outline of Earth observing satellite image quality task.



Figure 1. Outline of Earth observing satellite image quality

2.1. Quality categories

This section introduces radiometry, spatial and geometry quality categories, and corresponding quality parameters as shown in the figure 1.

2.1.1. Radiometry

"Radiometry is the science and technology of the measurement of radiation from all wavelengths within the optical spectrum" [17]. Remote sensing of Earth works based-on the propagated electromagnetic radiation to the remote sensing sensor. One aspect of remote sensing sensors performance is radiometric characteristics, which include: radiometric resolution or dynamic range, accuracy of radiometric quantity (reflectance or radiance) in absolute scale, radiometric response change over time, differentiable signal in presence of noise, etc. Radiometric resolution refers to the amount of information contains in each pixel, which is expressed in units of bits. In other words, radiometric resolution defines the sensitivity to the magnitude of the electromagnetic energy recorded by the imaging sensor, and it is decided prior to designing an imaging system. To understand the radiometric behavior of a spaceborne system, the following set of key parameters need to be characterized. These include: 1) signal-to-noise ratio; 2) absolute radiometric calibration; 3) relative radiometric calibration; 4) radiometric stability; 5) artifacts; 6) linearity of the response; and 7) polarization sensitivity [18]. Out of seven quality parameters, linearity of the response and polarization sensitivity are characterized pre-launch; typically specialized onboard calibrators are required for on-orbit assessment of these two parameters, while vicarious approaches can be hard [19]. As example, MODIS and Landsat 8 polarization sensitivity have been measured using polarized light source and sheet polarizer, which can be seen in [20,21]. The main challenge of measuring the polarization sensitivity of response will not be considered in this article. This paper, in Section 3, presents the details and best practices for determining: absolute radiometric calibration, radiometric stability, relative radiometric calibration, signal-to-noise ratio, and artifacts.

2.1.2. Spatial

Spatial quality of a remote sensing satellite system relies on several aspects of imaging system. Spatial performance can be expressed in terms of ground sample distance (GSD), modulation transfer function (MTF), aliasing, light rejection and internal scattering, and ghosting [22]. The GSD describes the spacing between adjacent pixel centers, and MTF provides information about the blurring amount that arises because of the imaging components non-ideal behavior. These two parameters define the spatial resolution of a remote sensing system. Spatial resolution is one of the most important parameters for remote sensing application since it determines the amount details an image can provide [23]. Consequently, GSD and MTF estimation is

necessary to assess the spatial quality of the remote sensing data product. Aliasing phenomena arises due to the insufficient sampling rate, which is unable to record high frequency scene features [24]. Aliasing appears as patterns in the imagery that not only degrades the visual quality of the image but also reduces the precision of remotely sensed data. For those reasons, aliasing detection and removal is essential from satellite imagery. Light rejection and internal scattering is another spatial performance indicator, which is system design depended [25]. Ghosting becomes evident when unexpected signals come from outside the field-of-view of the sensor, result in degraded spatial image quality [26]. In Section 4 of this article, three spatial quality assessment parameters, namely MTF, aliasing and GSD, have been explored and best way of evaluation has been presented.

2.1.3. Geometry

In remote sensing, geometry refers to the geometric precision which is measured by registration accuracy and geolocation accuracy which is also known as geodetic accuracy and cartographic registration [22,27,28]. Typically, two types of registration accuracy knowledge of an earth observing imaging system are realized; they are: band-to-band and image-to-image registration accuracy. The geolocation accuracy provides information about the geometric performance of the satellite inorbit. To clarify, it gives the positional offset between the actual position on the surface of the earth to the satellite determined position. Cartographic registration is known as geometric accuracy which is the measured positional offset between an actual location in the ground to that location in the geolocation corrected satellite image. In order to account for the geometric distortions, geometric calibration is performed prior to the launch of a spacecraft, but vibration during launch, moisture loss in vacuum and variation in thermal environment can change the calibration parameters, requiring frequent on-orbit geometric calibration [29]. High geometric accuracy is required in numerous applications such as change detection, multi-sensor data fusion, classification, etc. [30-32]. Therefore, on-orbit geometric calibration is necessary to obtain high geometric quality remote sensing observation. This paper (in Section 5) delineates best practices for determining: registration accuracy (band-to-band and image-to-image) and geodetic accuracy.

3. QUALITY PARAMETERS AND METHODS

This section presents radiometry (Section 3.1), spatial (Section 3.2) and geometry (Section 3.3) quality parameters, methods, and prioritization of the methods along with examples.

3.1. RADIOMETRIC QUALITY

This section presents radiometric quality parameters- absolute calibration (Subsection 3.1.1), radiometric stability (Subsection 3.1.2), relative calibration (Subsection 3.1.3), signal-to-noise ratio 165 (Subsection 3.1.4), artifacts (Subsection 3.1.5), including methods and prioritization of the methods 166 along with examples.

3.1.1. ABSOLUTE CALIBRATION

Absolute radiometric calibration allows conversion of image digital numbers (DN) to physical units such as radiances. Since DNs from different sensors have no meaningful relation, conversion of image DNs to spectral radiances is crucial in remote sensing as it enables comparison between measurements from different sensors. Consequently, absolute radiometric calibration is essential to the remote sensing data user community. A remote sensing imaging sensor is calibrated prior-to-launch in the laboratory and post-launch while satellite operating in-orbit. A spaceborn satellite systems calibration may subject to changes due to the degradation of the electronic instruments over time, variation in filter transmittance and spectral response, etc., requiring frequent post-launch radiometric calibration.

Numerous post-launch absolute calibration techniques have been developed over the past decades; they can be broadly classified as on-board and vicarious methods [33-43]. On-board absolute radiometric calibration technique relies on the calibration device such as calibration lamps. Vicarious absolute calibration approaches rest on Earth-imagery, lunar observations, imagery of dense clouds, etc. A few widely used vicarious absolute calibration methods are: Absolute Pseudo-Invariant Calibration Sites (APICS) models and/or Extended PICS Absolute Calibration (ExPAC) models, Radiometric Calibration Network (RadCalNet)/instrumented sites, cross-calibration, Traditional Reflectance-Based Vicarious Calibration (TRBVC), lunar observation-based absolute calibration, deep convective clouds.

On-board calibrators (OBCs) are common in large government sensors (usually more than 1000 kg mass) such as the Landsat series, Sentinel 2A and 2B, Terra and Aqua Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) sensor, etc. But, many satellites, especially small satellites, do not contain OBCs; accordingly, they rely on scene-based vicarious absolute calibration methods. Every aforementioned absolute calibration method has its strengths, weaknesses, and accuracies, which define the suitability of the method for a given sensor.

Table 1 provides the strengths, weaknesses and Système International (SI) traceability of six vicarious absolute calibration methods. The traceability of an absolute calibration method varies depending on the wavelength, atmospheric condition, number of observation used, etc. Typically, the traceability varies within the ranges shown in Table 1 (details can be seen in the associated references). Subsections 3.1.1 to 3.1.6. briefly describes the methods and their associated traceabilities, including examples and appropriateness for remote sensing satellite absolute calibration.

	Strengths	Weaknesses	Traceability
APICS and/or ExPAC Model [33,41]	Easy to implement Inexpensive Low atmospheric effect Stable Homogenous surface	Requires PICS and/or EPICS data	APICS – 2% to 3% accuracy and 1% to 2% precision ExPAC – 1% to 2% accuracy (Visible to Shortwave Infrared banda) and
			1% to 2% precision
RadCalNet [34,40]	Open data Spatially homogenous site High temporal resolution Quality controlled and processed TOA reflectance data	Fixed location Requires images of RadCalNet site BRDF effect not accounted for	Railroad Valley – 3% to 4% uncertainty La Crau – 2% to 6% uncertainty Gababeb – 3% to 4% uncertainty Baotou – 4% to 4.5% uncertainty
Cross- Calibration [35]	Inexpensive Open data from well calibrated sensor Multiple well calibrated sensors are on-orbit	Simultaneous nadir overpass (SNO) approach requires concurrent scenes with well calibrated sensor Near coincident observation (NCO) approach requires scenes over stable target, which	Uncertainty will vary depending on the "reference" sensor, number of observation, atmosphere, spectral response

 Table 1. Absolute Calibration Methods

can be harder to find in
the Earth surfacemismatch,
scene pairs
are SNO or
NCO, etc.

Traditional Reflectance- based Vicarious Calibration (TRBVC) [36,42]	Appropriately modeled atmospheric condition can give low uncertainty of measurement Independent method for calibrating satellite sensor (similar to instrumented RadCalNet approach but calibration can be performed over vegetative, desert, etc. target)	Expensive due to the requirement of experienced field personnel and instrument Requires good ground instrument and ability to measure atmospheric conditions accurately Lengthy process	1.5% to 2.5% uncertainty
Lunar Calibration [37]	Stable No Atmosphere	Imaging direction must be altered Satellite should be able to point the lunar surface and collect imagery	5% to 10% uncertainty of USGS lunar calibration model
Deep Convective Cloud (DCC)[38]	Near Lambertian Little Atmosphere	Difficult to find right type of cloudy image Works best for shorter wavelength channels	About 5% uncertainty

3.1.1.1. PICS Absolute Calibration Model

Stable spectral characteristics, high reflectance, and minimal atmospheric effect makes PICS popular for radiometric calibration. Moreover, PICS based

calibration is one of the least expensive calibration methods since it only requires PICS imagery acquired by the to-be-calibrated sensor. Consequently, researchers have been using PICS data to monitor the temporal stability and cross-calibrate satellite sensors for long period of time [44-47]. However, usage of PICS as an absolute radiometric calibration target for earth observing satellite had not been explored until 2013. In 2013, at South Dakota State University (SDSU), Helder et al. developed a Libya 4 PICS model based on Terra MODIS and Earth Observation-1 (EO-1) Hyperion observations to show the potential of PICS for absolute calibration [48]. In 2014, Mishra et al. reported improvements of Helder's Libya 4 PICS absolute calibration model [33]. The improved Libya 4 empirical model accuracy is between 2% to 3%, and precision is in between 1% to 2%. In 2019, Bipin et al. extended the work presented in [33] through applying the APICS model to five other PICS [49]. Results show that the model for Egypt 1, Libya 1 and Sudan 1 PICS has approximately 2% to 3% accuracy and 1% to 2% precision. However, Niger 1 and Niger 2 model are less accurate (approximately 7%) with similar precision. One major drawbacks of traditional APICS model is that it is restricted to limited viewing geometry of ± 20 degrees, in other words, limited BRDF capability.

Recently, PICS have been extended to cover vast portion of North Africa, and they are named as "clusters" [50]. At SDSU Image Processing Laboratory (SDSU IPLab), extended PICS absolute calibration (ExPAC) model has been developed for one of the clusters (namely cluster 13) with extensive BRDF capability that subdued the shortcomings of APICS model [41]. The ExPAC model shows around 4% accuracy in shorter wavelength bands (i.e., costal aerosol and blue band of Landsat 8) and 1% to 2% accuracy for higher wavelength bands (visible to shortwave infrared). Precision or random variability of ExPAC model are in the same order as accuracy. Therefore, depending on the absolute calibration accuracy and precision requirement, solar and viewing condition of sensor while collecting imagery, and ability of collecting imagery, Libya 4, Libya 1, Egypt 1, Sudan 1 APICS model and/or SDSU IPLab ExPAC model can be used to perform absolute radiometric calibration of a satellite sensor.

The APICS model, described in [33,49] by Mishra et al. and Bipin et al., was developed using Terra MODIS and Hyperion observations of PICS. Terra MODIS was selected as a source for absolute calibration because of being one of the best calibrated sensors with 2% uncertainty in Top-of-Atmosphere (TOA) reflectance scale [51], and Hyperion hyperspectral sensor was used as a source of hyperspectral profile due to its 3% to 5% accuracy and around 2% repeatability (prior to 2012 data) [52,53]. First step of developing the absolute calibration model is to cross-calibrate the Hyperion TOA reflectance to Terra MODIS TOA reflectance. The cross-calibration or scale factor was calculated with Hyperion and MODIS simultaneous nadir overpass scenes. An empirical BRDF model for solar zenith angle had been developed using nadir-looking Terra MODIS observations. As explained in [49], to account for the varying view zenith angle, a view zenith BRDF model was developed from spectrally cleaner (high transmittance and reflectance) Hyperion band.

Nischal et al. expressed the absolute calibration model as follows [33]:

$$\rho_{PICS}(\lambda, SZA, VZA) = \frac{k(\lambda) \times \rho_h(\lambda) \times f_A(t)}{1 - (SZA - 30^0) \times m_1(\lambda) - VZA(\lambda) \times m_2(\lambda) - VZA^2 \times m_3(\lambda)}$$
(1)

Here, ρ_{PICS} is the model predicted TOA reflectance. $\rho_h(\lambda)$ represents Hyperion TOA reflectance for the selected PICS. $k(\lambda)$ is the scaling factor to normalize the Hyperion spectrum $\rho_h(\lambda)$ to MODIS. $m_1(\lambda)$ represents the slope coefficient of the BRDF model for solar zenith angle normalization which is obtained from Terra MODIS observations. $m_2(\lambda)$ and $m_3(\lambda)$ are the linear and quadratic BRDF model coefficients derived from Hyperion data for view zenith angle normalization. SZA and VZA are the solar zenith and view zenith angle of the selected sensor, respectively. $f_A(t)$ represents the atmospheric model which can be ignored since its effect is negligible [54].

In order to present the comparison of the absolute calibration model predicted and measured reflectances of Landsat 8 Operational Land Imager (OLI) over Egypt 1, Bipin et al. illustrated the NIR band (Band 5 of Landsat 8 OLI) reflectance which can be seen in Figure 2. Figure 3 shows percentage difference between OLI measurements and model predictions along with the accuracy and precision of the model predicted TOA reflectances. The accuracy, which is described by Root-Mean-Squared-Error (RMSE), and precision, which is described by Standard Deviation, between measurements and predictions are about 0.88% and 0.87%, respectively. This results are within the accuracy (3%) and precision (2%) of Nischal's Libya-4 PICS model. Visual observation of Figure 2 shows that model predicted reflectances follow seasonal variations of actual measurement to a certain extent.



Figure 2. Egypt 1 model predicted (black asterisk) and Landsat 8 OLI observation

(magenta circle) [49].



Figure 3. Percentage difference of Egypt 1 model and Landsat 8 OLI observation [49].

Above explained Egypt 1 model accuracy depends on Terra MODIS and Hyperion calibration uncertainty as the model was developed from Terra MODIS and Hyperion observations, and Landsat 8 OLI calibration uncertainty. Atmosphere, instrument response deviation, and higher order BRDF could be the factors for 0.87% random uncertainty or precision between model prediction and Landsat 8 observation. This uncertainty cannot be eliminated but its effect can be reduced by taking multiple measurements. Typically, the precision or random uncertainty decreases by $1/\sqrt{N}$, N being the number of observation or measurement [55].

High absolute radiometric accuracy and precision of the APICS and ExPAC model makes them practical methods for absolute calibration of an in-orbit satellite sensor; accordingly, researchers have been using the APICS model for many years. For instance, Barsi et al. and Helder et al. used the Libya 4 APICS model for Sentinel 2A Multi Spectral Imager (MSI) and Landsat 8 OLI absolute radiometric calibration in recent years [54,56]. At this time, APICS and ExPAC models have been proven as compelling absolute calibration method for Earth observing satellite sensor. However, improved BRDF capability of ExPAC model over APICS model makes ExPAC model would be a better option for calibrating (in absolute radiometric scale) any space-borne remote sensing satellite.

3.1.1.2. Radiometric Calibration Network

The Radiometric Calibration Network (RadCalNet) is a network of instrumented radiometric calibration sites, which has been developed for calibrating multiple sensors to a common reference. The Committee on Earth Observation Satellites (CEOS) Working Group on Calibration and Validation (WGCV) Infrared and Visible Optical Sensors Subgroup (IVOS) implemented RadCalNet and publicly opened the data in June 2018 [57]. Currently, RadCalNet sites are located in Railroad Valley Playa in the US (RVUS), LaCrau in France (LCFR), Gobabeb in Namibia (GONA), and Baotou in China (BTCN). BTCN calibration site contains two categories of targets: artificial reflectance targets, which are suitable for high spatial resolution sensor (e.g. within 10m) and desert target, suitable for moderate spatial resolution satellites (e.g. Landsat satellite at 30 m) [58]. In RadCalNet, traditional refelectance-based vicarious calibration approach (details in Section 3.1.4) has been automated to obtain high temporal resolution calibration (compare to traditional vicarious approach). Automatic instrumentation of RadCalNet provides bottom-of-the-atmosphere (BOA) measurements and estimate of propagated TOA reflectance and their associated uncertainties. Among the sites, the RVUS and GONA site show high accuracies in TOA reflectance measurement with 3% to 4% uncertainties, whereas LCFR and BTCN site are less stable, and their respective uncertainty varies from 2% to 6% and 4% to 4.5% [34,39].

Open data, spatially homogenous sites, measurement every 30 minutes from 9:00 to 15:00 local standard time, frequent stability monitoring, quality controlled and processed TOA reflectance makes RadCalNet a suitable method for absolute radiometric calibration of an on-orbit satellite sensor viewing the sites. Hence, numerous satellites are being calibrated using publicly available RadCalNet dataset [59-62]. However, there is a reported limitation of how to use these data as they are provided only at nadir view, causing viewing angle effect on non-nadir viewing sensor [34]. To address this issue, Bouvet et al. suggested an approach based-on simulating off-nadir TOA reflectances for matching the viewing angle of the sensor of interest [40]. RadCalNet data can be obtained from this [63] web portal. Calibration of a sensor of interest using RadCalNet consists of following steps:

- RadCalNet TOA reflectance and uncertainties are extracted from the above-mentioned web portal for the same dates and times as the sensor of interest imaging the selected site.
- 2. Calculate test sensor TOA reflectance for the chosen site, including uncertainties.
- 3. Interpolate the RadCalNet TOA reflectances at sensor overpass time to account for the time differences between two measurements explained in step 1 and 2.
- In order to match the spectral resolution of the sensor to RadCalNet TOA reflectance, interpolate RadCalNet TOA reflectance (at 1 nm) to selected sensor TOA reflectance.
- 5. Normalize RadCalNet TOA reflectance to the corresponding multispectral value of the selected sensor for direct comparison:

$$\rho_R = \frac{\sum_{\lambda 1}^{\lambda_2} \rho_\lambda \times RSR_\lambda}{\sum_{\lambda 1}^{\lambda_2} RSR_\lambda} \tag{2}$$

where RSR_{λ} represents the relative spectral response function of the sensor of interest, ρ_{λ} is the hyperspectral TOA reflectance of RadCalNet site, λ_1 and λ_2 are the minimum and maximum wavelengths of the band at 10 nm steps. ρ_R is the RadCalNet-predicted TOA reflectance in the specific sensor band. Compare the output (step 2) from selected sensor and RadCalNet TOA Reflectance (step 5) and calculated associated uncertainties.

Jing et al. applied the above steps to compare the predicted TOA reflectance of three RadCalNet sites—RVUS, LCFR and GONA—with Landsat 7, Landsat 8, Sentinel 2A and 2B observation [34].

In conclusion, RadCalNet is very promising method for remote sensing satellite absolute radiometric calibration. This method of absolute calibration can be performed from one cloud free image of RadCalNet site acquired by the test sensor. But multiple images should be used to obtain lower calibration uncertainty as random uncertainty decreases with the increase of number of observations.

3.1.1.3. Cross-Calibration

Cross-calibration is one of the post-launch absolute calibration methods where a sensor is calibrated against a well-calibrated satellite sensor, which is typically referred as "reference" sensor. Currently, there are multiple well-calibrated sensors operating on orbit, Landsat 7, Landsat 8, Sentinel 2A and 2B, and MODIS, to name a few. Image data of all the mentioned sensors are free to use, which makes this method less expensive compared traditional reflectance-based vicarious approach (details are in Section 3.1.4). Primary weakness of this method can be the requirement of SNO or NCO scene pairs. Additionally, there will be multiple sources of uncertainty regardless of SNO or NCO approach, which has been delineated in forthcoming text. Despite of some inevitable drawbacks, possibility of calibrating a sensor against a well-calibrated sensor can be an option for absolute radiometric calibration when multiple wellcalibrated sensor offering open highly accurate (in radiometric scale) scientific observations.

A typical step to perform cross-calibration can be: i) reference sensor selection, ii) cross-calibration approach selection, and data selection based-on the approach, iii) spectral response mismatch correction, iv) cross-calibration gain and bias estimation, and v) uncertainty estimation.

First step of cross-calibration is to select a well calibrated reference sensor. In order to choose a reference sensor, a few parameters such as radiometric accuracy, spatial resolution, temporal resolution can be considered.

Satellite	Accuracy	Spatial Resolution	Temporal Resolution
MODIS	~ 2%	250m to 1000m	1 to 2 days
Sentinel 2A, 2B	< 3% to 5%	10m	5 days
Landsat 7	~ 5%	30m	16 days
Landsat 8	< 3%	30m	16 days

Table 2. Sensor characteristics and accuracy [51,64-66]

Table 2 provides radiometric accuracy in TOA reflectance scale, spatial resolution and temporal resolution of Landsat 7, Landsat 8, Sentinel 2A, Sentinel 2B and MODIS. The sensors are built to meet or exceed these accuracies; in most cases, they exceed these absolute radiometric accuracy specifications. Among the five sensors, MODIS appears to be the most radiometrically accurate, and it images the Earth every 1 to 2 days. However, the spatial resolution of MODIS is very low (250m to 1000m) which suggests the requirement of large regions of interest for cross-calibration. Two high spatial resolution Sentinel sensors each have revisit time of 10

days, but their absolute published radiometric accuracy is between 3% to 5%. Even though Landsat 7 and 8 images the Earth at same spatial and temporal resolution, Landsat 8 provides observation on the order of 3% or less published accuracy in TOA reflectance scale. Therefore, Landsat 8 and/or Sentinel sensors could be selected as "reference" sensor for cross-calibrating a satellite sensor.

Second step of cross-calibration can be the selection of approach to follow for performing cross-calibration between two sensors. Cross-calibration usually performed by two approaches: (i) using simultaneous nadir overpass observations, and/or (ii) using near-coincident observations, from to-be-calibrated and reference sensor.

3.1.1.3.1. Simultaneous Nadir Overpass (SNO) Approach

Simultaneous observations are referred as SNO event, which occurs when both the reference and to-be-calibrated sensor images a target at the same time. Since the observations are obtained simultaneously, direct comparison between the measurements (such as image digital number or radiometric quantity, e.g. reflectance, radiance) will give the absolute calibration parameters, gains and biases. Compare to NCO approach, this cross-calibration method introduces low absolute calibration uncertainty, due to the concurrent scene pair usage, resulting in consistent view and solar geometry between two sensors (details can be seen in Subsection 3.1.3.3). But SNO event between a well-calibrated sensor and to-be-calibrated sensor can be infrequent.

3.1.1.3.2. Near Coincident Observation (NCO) Approach

NCO approach of cross-calibration relies on observations acquired at different time (e.g., minutes, hours, days apart) by the reference and to-be-calibrated sensor. Different image acquisition time can arise multiple disparity which are independent of sensors inherent radiometric response difference. These disparities include atmospheric condition, solar geometry, target feature variation, etc. Consequently, in order to employ NCO approach, the calibration target should be stable in terms of radiometric response and atmospheric condition and should have nearly Lambertian nature to reduce the differences due to the sun position change. Desert sites accommodate some of these characteristics such as stable atmosphere and radiometric response, spatial uniformity, which make them suitable target for cross-calibration [67,68]. In order to perform radiometric stability monitoring (details are in Section 3.2) and absolute radiometric calibration, researchers have identified more than twenty such desert sites; they are popularly known as PICS [69-72]. These traditional PICS, usually referred as Libya 4, Sudan 1, Niger 1, Libya 1, etc., have been used in many studies to perform cross-calibration [35,73-75]. Recently, Shrestha et al. [76] crosscalibrated Landsat 8 OLI and Sentinel-2A MSI using coincident and near coincident scene pairs of cluster 13 (one of the EPICS). At SDSU IPLab, a novel technique of cross-calibration, namely trend-to-trend cross-calibration, has been developed that utilizes the near coincident observations over some portion or different portions of the EPICS [30]. Continental footprint of EPICS provides much more frequent possibility of near-simultaneous imaging by the reference and to-be-calibrated sensors, and hence higher NCO cross-calibration opportunity over EPICS compared to traditional PICS based cross-calibration.

Evidently, there will be higher possibility of near coincident observations than SNO event from a reference and to-be-calibrated sensor, but the aforementioned disparities in NCO approach can result in higher cross-calibration uncertainties (details can be seen in forthcoming text) compare to SNO event based approach.

3.1.1.3.3. Spectral Response Mismatch and Uncertainty of SNO and NCO Approach

For both the SNO and NCO approach, spectral response mismatch should be corrected that can be the third step of cross-calibration. Often spectral response function of to-be-calibrated sensor and reference sensor exhibit differences. This difference should be accounted for to compare the sensors radiometric response. The process of correcting the spectral response differences is known as spectral band adjustment factor (SBAF) correction. The details of performing SBAF correction can be seen in [46]. The next step (step iv) is to estimate cross-calibration gain and offset through regression analysis of reflectances/radiances or digital numbers. Usually uncertainty is estimated and reported with cross-calibration gain and offset, which can be the fifth step of cross-calibration.

Uncertainty arises in every cross-calibration step which contributes to the overall cross-calibration uncertainty. Few sources of uncertainties are inevitable, such as reference sensor calibration uncertainty, SBAF uncertainty, in both the SNO and NCO method of cross-calibration. Uncertainty due to site instability, solar and viewing geometry change (due to the time difference and/or positional difference of the sensors during image acquisition), atmospheric differences are the major sources of uncertainty in NCO method.

In order to explore the primary sources and major contributor/s of uncertainty of NCO based cross-calibration approach, over the years several researches had been carried out. For instance, Chander et al. investigated cross-calibration uncertainties due to different spectral response, spectral resolution, spectral filter shift, geometric misregistration, and spatial resolution; result shows that SBAF uncertainty is the dominant source of uncertainties [77]. In [78], Pinto et al. presented a way to evaluate SBAF's inherent uncertainties using Monte Carlo simulation method, which can be exploited to estimate the SBAF uncertainty. As an additional example, while crosscalibrating Sentinel 2A MSI with Landsat 8 OLI, Farhad delineates uncertainty analysis and shows that reference sensors calibration uncertainty, atmospheric variability, target non-uniformity and RSR difference are the major contributors to the overall uncertainty [73]. It is apparent that regardless of SNO event based or NCO based absolute cross-calibration, cross-calibration uncertainty would be greater than the reference sensors inherent uncertainty, and other sources of uncertainty will vary depending on the above mentioned factors and number of scene pairs used in crosscalibration. From the above discussion, it is evident that SNO approach could be the "best" method when expecting lowest possible cross-calibration uncertainty.

Li et al. presented cross-calibration of Sentinel 2 MSI with Landsat 8 OLI using NCO event over Saharan desert [79]. Figure 4 shows TOA reflectance comparison of Landsat 8 OLI and Sentinel-2 MSI after SBAF correction. Due to the scale issues cirrus band is shown at the bottom right corner. The black 1:1 line shows the agreement between OLI and MSI observations. The gains and offsets can be obtained through band-by-band linear regression. Details of the result is presented in [79]. Employing the above explained approach, cross-calibration can be performed from one cloud free image pair (SNO or NCO event). Multiple scene pairs can decrease the cross-calibration uncertainty since random uncertainty decreases by square-root of number of scene pairs as long as there are no systematic errors in either of the to-be-calibrated or reference sensor.



Figure 4. TOA reflectances of MSI and OLI. Cirrus band comparison is at lower right corner. [79]

3.1.1.4. Traditional Reflectance-Based Vicarious Calibration

Traditional Reflectance-Based Vicarious Calibration (TRBVC) is a postlaunch absolute calibration method that relies on in-situ measurements of surface reflectance and atmospheric condition while satellite images the calibration target. Possibility of low calibration uncertainty (upon appropriately modeled atmospheric condition and surface reflectance measurement), independent method for calibrating satellite sensor (similar to instrumented RadCalNet approach but TRBVC can be performed over vegetative, desert, etc. target) are some of the advantages of TRBVC method [80]. TRBVC approach not only requires ground instruments to measure target reflectance and atmospheric condition but also requires experienced field personal, which can be expensive and labor-intensive. Since this approach hinges on deploying field personal to take measurement, this method can be lengthy in contrast to the automated RadCalNet approach. Consequently, this method of absolute calibration is less attractive compare to APICS/ExPAC model, RadCalNet and cross-calibration for frequent monitoring a satellite system. However, frequent field campaign will give SI traceable knowledge (independent of on-board calibrators) of absolute radiometric accuracy, and hence a greater degree of comprehension about an in-orbit sensor. Therefore, traditional reflectance-based vicarious calibration is one of the options to monitor absolute calibration of an earth observing satellite.

Traditional reflectance-based vicarious calibration can be performed through following way [80,81]: i) surface bidirectional reflectance factor (BRF) calculation, ii) atmospheric measurements, and iii) TOA spectral radiance propagation. The surface reflectance is measured by transporting a portable hyperspectral spectroradiometer across the entire site in a predetermined pattern, and reference panel measurements are taken throughout entire site at predetermined points. Ratio of site measurement and reference panel measurement gives BRF of the site. In order to determine atmospheric transmission and radiance, an automated solar radiometer is used that tracks the sun throughout the day and measures the incoming solar irradiance extinction due to atmospheric absorption and scattering. Finally, surface BRF and atmospheric measurements are used as inputs to MODerate resolution atmospheric TRANsmission (MODTRAN) or Second Simulation of a Satellite Signal in the Solar Spectrum (6S) radiative transfer code. From the MODTRAN or 6S predicted TOA radiance or reflectance of the test sensor gain can be calculated as:

$$G_{L,\lambda} = \frac{\overline{DN_{\lambda}} - b_{\lambda}}{L_{\lambda}} \text{ or } G_{\rho,\lambda} = \frac{\overline{DN_{\lambda}} - b_{\lambda}}{\rho_{\lambda}}$$
 (3)

where $G_{L,\lambda}$ and $G_{\rho,\lambda}$ are the gains for a specific spectral band, L_{λ} and ρ_{λ} are the band-integrated MODTRAN or 6S predicted TOA radiance and reflectance, respectively, $\overline{DN_{\lambda}}$ represents average DN for all the pixels of the test site measured by the test sensor for a given band and b_{λ} is the average offset for a given band.

Czapla-Myers et al. presents results of Landsat 8 OLI reflectance-based vicarious calibration performed by University of Arizona (UA), South Dakota State University (SDSU) and NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) at test sites in Nevada, California, Arizona and South Dakota, USA [82]. In this study, both UA and GSFC used desert sites, whereas SDSU took measurements over vegetation target to obtain BRF. To show the consistency between OLI measurement and vicarious ground-based method, both reflectances and radiances have been calculated and percentage difference is obtained as: percent difference = (Measured – OLI)/OLI, where Measured represents ground-based TOA radiance/reflectance measurement and OLI is the Landsat 8 OLI TOA radiance/reflectance measurement. Figure 5 shows the percentage difference in TOA spectral radiance and reflectance of eight OLI spectral bands [82]. UA and SDSU results for coastal aerosol (443 nm) and blue band (483 nm) appears to be off by about 5% due to very low surface reflectance and atmospheric effects. However, band 3 to band 8 shows consistency between two types of sites, and OLI agrees within the uncertainties of vicarious calibration method, which are on the

order of 2.5% to 3.0%. The vertical bars associated to each point represents 1σ standard deviation of the measurements.



Figure 5: Percentage difference [82] (a) TOA spectral radiance (b) TOA spectral reflectance

The test site surface BRF calculation is one of the components of reflectancebased approach, and the uncertainty of BRF calculation is dominated by reference panel characterization. Uncertainty in atmospheric characterization, MODTRAN or 6S calculation, and solar zenith angle measurement are the other major contributors to the total uncertainty. The in-situ vicarious absolute calibration uncertainty can be between 1.5% and 2.5% depending on the wavelengths, measurement device, operators, etc. [42]. And precision of the reflectance-based vicarious approach in the mid-visible wavelength range is between 2.5% and 3.5% [83].

3.1.1.5. Lunar Calibration

The moon, our closest celestial neighbor, is an exceedingly stable reflector of sunlight, and its reflectivity observed by the on-orbit satellite depends on lunar angles and orientation. Collection of lunar imagery rest on the ability of an Earth overserving

satellite to change the imaging direction and pointing the moon surface from Earth orbit. The positional relationship between sun-moon-satellite also defines the capability of a satellite to capture moon image. Lack of atmosphere, similar dynamic range as Earth scenes, no maintenance requirement unlike RadCalNet or in-situ traditional vicarious calibration site, are a few of the advantages of moon as a radiometric calibration source [84]. In order to exploit the potential of moon as a calibration target, in 2005 at United States Geological Survey (USGS), Kieffer et al. developed a lunar irradiance model based on observations by the RObotic Lunar Observatory (ROLO) [85]. In spite of having numerous advantages of lunar calibration approach, it is not typically used for absolute calibration due to 5% to 10% model uncertainty in absolute scale [37]. Complex satellite-sun-moon positional relationship and orientation of the moon and its phase makes developing absolute calibration model (better than current accuracy level) very challenging. Currently, there are three projects on-going at National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), National Physics Laboratory (NPL) and NASA Langley Research Center to improve the absolute calibration accuracy significantly [86-88]. The low absolute accuracy of the current lunar model and requirement of changing earth imaging direction are the major constraints of using lunar calibration model. Therefore, development of new accurate lunar model will make this absolute calibration method a future viable option for Earth observing satellite.

3.1.1.6. Deep Convective Clouds

Extremely bright Deep Convective Clouds (DCC) have nearly Lambertian reflectance and are situated at the top of the atmosphere, specifically at the tropopause where atmospheric effect is minimal, which make them a potential target for
radiometric calibration [89]. Consequently, radiative transfer model or a reference sensor such as SCIAMACHY or MODIS have been used in the past to predict DCC reflectance and perform absolute calibration [90,91]. However, absolute calibration accuracy from DCC are at 5% level [38], and DCC are usually identified using thermal bands. Furthermore, this calibration method is typically used for low resolution larger footprint sensor. Many satellites do not have thermal bands, and many of them are medium-to-high spatial resolution sensors (less than 30m). Nonetheless, DCC method for satellite needs investigation to ascertain its suitability for absolute radiometric calibration.

3.1.2. Radiometric Stability

Radiometric stability of an imaging instrument is a measure of how the instrument's radiometric response changes over time. It is one of the important quality parameters since the radiometric stability of an imaging instrument defines the detectability of very small Earth surface change. In order to ensure sensors radiometric stability, numerous precautionary measures are taken in sensor development, launching, and space operation step. In spite of taking these necessary steps, in harsh space environment, radiometric response of an imaging sensor can change due to temperature variation, voltage level change, radiation in the space in every possible time scale, requiring on-orbit assessment. To assess the on-orbit sensor's radiometric stability performance, two different types of radiometric stability have been monitored in numerous studies; they are: i) short-term, and ii) long-term radiometric stability [66,92-95]. There is no clear definition of short-term stability and long-term stability.

Short-term stability can be referred as stability in radiometric response within a single orbit. Short-term stability is assessed exploiting on-board calibrators, specifically stimulation lamps [92,96,97]. Stability characterization in a single orbit from Earth or celestial scenes has not been reported yet. Thus, short-term stability of a satellite cannot be characterized from Earth/celestial scenes at this time. Long-term stability can be referred as stability in radiometric response beyond single orbit. Sometimes it is reported as sensor degradation or drift per year [22,94,98,99]. Longterm radiometric stability is typically monitored using OBCs, lunar and PICS observations [43,54,100,101]. In absence of OBCs, PICS image-based and lunar observation-based methods are the practical options for a remote sensing satellites long-term stability assessment. Next subsection explains the long-term stability characterization approaches for an Earth observing satellite.

3.1.2.1. Long-term stability

This subsection delineates three long-term radiometric stability assessment techniques, and their strengths and weaknesses.

3.1.2.1.1. Lunar observation-based method

As explained in Section 3.1.5, stable sunlight reflectivity and little-to-no atmospheric distortion between satellite orbit to moon makes lunar based stability assessment an attractive approach. Lunar irradiance measurement over time explains the temporal behavior of the imaging sensor. USGS lunar model is also used for stability monitoring due to better than 1% [85] relative precision for any phase angle within ± 90 degrees [102,103]. Thus, lunar based method can be utilized in absence of OBCs or as a secondary method to track OBCs degradation. As explained herein

[103], to perform lunar based stability assessment, a few corrections must be applied; they are: distance corrections, oversampling correction, phase angle corrections, libration corrections, and noise reduction correction. Lastly, lunar irradiance time series is calculated and assessed for radiometric stability. Over the years, this method of long-term stability assessment has been applied to several satellites such as Landsat 8, MODIS, SeaWiFS, PROBA-V [66,101-103]. These satellites have exploited different frequency of observations (for instance, once or twice in a lunar cycle). The required number of observations hinges on amount of trend to-be-detected over a time span (details are in the forthcoming texts). But, number of moon imagery collection is limited by the different lunar phases.

3.1.2.1.2. PICS Based Radiometric Stability Monitoring

Earth surfaces that exhibit minimal change over time are usually referred as invariant targets. Multi-temporal image data over those invariant targets explains the temporal behavior of the imaging sensor, i.e. the long-term radiometric stability of the sensor. For being a pseudo-invariant calibration site or PICS, according to several investigators [81,104-106], a target should have some properties such as: temporal stability, spatial uniformity, Lambertian nature, located away from waterbodies, urban and industrial areas. Even though Earth surfaces do not contain all the mentioned properties, a few Earth imaging targets exhibit some of the properties, allowing many researchers to use PICS for monitoring long-term radiometric stability of remote sensing satellite sensor. PICS based stability monitoring method is utilized as a standalone approach [44,107,108], or along with OBCs and lunar based method [95,100,109]. In harsh space environment, not only sensor can degrade but OBCs also can degrade over time, requiring another method to track the performance of both the

sensor and the on-board calibrator. Lunar approach is used sometimes as a secondary method; but to capture lunar image, imaging direction of the satellite system must be altered, many satellites do not have the capability to maneuver the instrument. However, PICS based method can be easy to implement and low cost since it requires collecting routine imagery of the target and expertise to analyze the observations. These makes PICS based method an attractive option, as a standalone approach or as a secondary method to OBCs, for assessing long-term stability of a spaceborne imaging system. Therefore, PICS can be used confidently for post-launch long-term radiometric stability assessment of a satellite sensor.

Over the past few decades numerous PICS have been used to monitor temporal degradation of on-orbit imaging sensor. Almost all the exploited PICS are from twenty North African and Saudi Arabian desert sites recommended by Cosnefroy et al. in 1996 [69]. A lot of research have been carried out in the past decades aiming to find new invariant calibration target/s, especially in global scale rather than Africa and Arabia [72,110,111]. As mentioned earlier, recently, Shrestha et al. extended PICS (EPICS) to all of north Africa through developing cluster approach [50], and Hasan et al. showed 3% temporal uncertainty of cluster 13, which shows the potential of cluster for long-term stability monitoring [112]. The key advantage of EPICS-based stability monitoring is the ability to assess radiometric stability from daily/near daily observation, but temporal uncertainty of EPICS can be higher than traditional PICS observation.

In 2019, Bacour et al. shows that twenty desert PICS identified by Cosnefroy et al. is still "optimal" [72]. At CEOS IVOS-19 meeting, six of the twenty PICS have been selected as pseudo-invariant standard "reference" calibration target [113]. They

are popularly known as [114]: Libya 4, Libya 1, Mauritania 1, Mauritania 2, Algeria 3, and Algeria 5. Details of these six PICS, including latitude and longitude, altitude, and climatological parameters, can be seen in [115]. For many years' numerous researchers are exploiting six CEOS endorsed PICS to monitor the calibration trend of remote sensing satellite. Among all the PICS, Libya 4 appears to be the most stable site, with 1% to 1.5% temporal uncertainty [116]. Consequently, Libya 4 is the most frequently used PICS. Out of six CEOS PICS, two of the Mauritania sites exhibited more than 3% temporal uncertainties in Landsat 7 ETM+ observations [33], which may be because of their closeness to the West African coast line [98]. Therefore, one must be cautious about selecting these two PICS for stability monitoring.

PICS based long-term stability assessment approach consists of few simple steps. The following steps of trending have been adopted from [44]:

- Site selection: depending on the requirements and constraints, such as temporal stability, amount of trend to-be-detected, Lambertian nature, etc., PICS should be selected.
- Region of Interest (ROI) selection: spatially homogenous ROI must be selected from the chosen PICS scenes. For example, six CEOS PICS ROI extent can be seen in [115], and SDSU IPLAB 'optimal' ROI coordinates (at Libya 4, Libya 1, Sudan 1, Egypt 1, Niger 1, Niger 2) are shown in [117].
- TOA reflectance or radiance calculation: at sensor reflectance or radiance should be calculated using calibration parameters.

- 4. Outlier rejection: cloud contaminated TOA reflectance or radiance must be ignored.
- 5. BRDF normalization: to remove the seasonality, BRDF normalization should be applied.
- 6. Trend detection: plotting BRDF normalized TOA reflectance or radiance and observing the change over time.

Barsi et al. applied the above mentioned steps to Libya 4, Algeria 3 and Sudan 1 PICS data from Sentinel-2A MSI, aiming to observe the stability of the sensor over time [54]. Figure 6 illustrates the lifetime trend of coastal aerosol band for the three PICS. At Libya 4 PICS, Sentinel-2A MSI coastal aerosol band shows - 0.14 ± 0.73 ($\pm 2\sigma$) %/year drift, which is displayed in figure 7. The slope over time for all the other bands is also calculated and presented in figure 7 to assess the temporal stability, and result shows general agreement among three sites within 2-sigma uncertainty in seven MSI bands.



Figure 6: The lifetime trend of Sentinel-2A MSI at three PICS [54].



Figure 7: The lifetime trend of 7 Sentinel-2A MSI bands at three PICS [54].

The amount of trend that can be detected rests on several factors such as time span of the dataset, temporal frequency of the data, temporal variability in the data, autocorrelation in the data, etc. [118-120]. These factors vary, to a certain extent, depending on the capability of the imaging sensor, atmospheric condition while collecting the imagery, length of the dataset at certain PICS. Natural variability of the target, which is attributed to temporal variability, impedes the ability to detect statistically significant trend. Only statistically significant calibration trend detection is possible when to-be-detected trend surpasses the natural variability of the PICS. Since all the aforementioned factors are atmospheric condition, temporal resolution and length of available dataset dependent, the minimum trend detectability will vary accordingly. This article presents the approach of detecting the minimum trend, considering 'known' temporal variability, autocorrelation, and length of the dataset. Alternatively, necessary minimum data record length can also be determined, knowing the amount of minimum trend to-be-detected. According to Weatherhead et al. [121,122], number of years (N) to detect a trend of magnitude ω_0 at the 95% confidence level and with 50% probability can be estimated by:

$$N = \left(\frac{2\sigma_N}{|\omega_0|} \sqrt{\frac{1+\phi}{1-\phi}}\right)^{2/3}$$
(4)

where, σ_N is the variability in the monthly averaged data time series and \emptyset is the 1-month lag autocorrelation in the monthly averaged data. This equation can be used to determine: (i) length of the data necessary to detect a trend of certain magnitude, and (ii) magnitude of the trend that can be detected by a specific time span of dataset. The unit of σ_N and ω_0 must be same; for instance, if one expect ω_0 in percentage, σ_N must be expressed in percentage, dividing it by the mean of the monthly averaged time series data.

The above explained approach has been applied by Bhatt et al. [123] to detect statistically significant minimum trend in VIIRS Libya 4 monthly observation. Recently, in 2019, Hasan et al. shows trend detection possibility using temporally rich cluster 13 and traditional Libya 4 PICS observations [112].

PICS based radiometric stability is a proven ability to monitor long-term stability of a remote sensing sensor through normal Earth observation-based trend detection. Therefore, for the sensors without on-board calibrators and capability to collect lunar imagery, PICS based long-term radiometric stability monitoring can be the primary approach.

3.1.3. Relative Radiometric Calibration

The process of quantifying radiometric response variation in each detector relative to each other is known as relative radiometric calibration. In an ideal situation, each detector of a camera system should give exactly same output when they are exposed to same amount of electromagnetic radiation. But ideal state does not exist due to minute variations in detector manufacturing, variability in electronic gain and offset, and differences in spectral and linear responses. Consequently, every detector in a linear array imaging system exhibits different behavior causing noticeable striping artifacts in collected imagery. In order to address the above-mentioned problems, imaging sensor is usually characterized in a simulated space environment prior to launch. But launch stress, ultraviolet radiation and temporal degradation are a few of the factors that can cause the non-uniformity in detector response while satellite is operating in-orbit. Hence, in-orbit relative radiometric calibration and correction must be performed to ensure high quality image data. Over the years, numerous methods have been employed to remove the detector level artifacts. They can be classified into two broad categories: i) on-board and ii) Earth scene-based method. On-board calibrators, such as lamps or diffuser panels, are used in several remote sensing system as a uniform radiance source for detector-to-detector non-uniformity characterization [51,66,124]. In absence of on-board calibrators or as a method to monitor on-board instrument degradation, Earth imagery-based methods are utilized to quantify detector-to-detector response variation. Yaw or side-slither maneuver and lifetime statistics are two of the popular vicarious approaches for on-orbit relative radiometric calibration of linear array imaging system from Earth scenes [125,126]. The strengths

and weaknesses of these two methods along with target type has been presented in table 3 (details can be seen in subsection 3.3.1 and 3.3.2).

Methods	Strengths	Weaknesses	Target Type
Yaw or Side- Slither Maneuver [125,127-129]	Can be time	Satellite should	Visible and near inferred band:
	efficient compare	have the capability	Greenland and
	to statistics approach	to maneuver	Dome C of Antarctica
	One cloud free acquisition may be enough	Loss of normal image data Requires uniform imaging target	SWIR band: Sahara Desert and Arabian Peninsula sites
Lifetime Statistics [126]	No need to maneuver	Requires substantial number	Any surface type
	scene-based approach	of images	

Table 3. Relative calibration methods

3.1.3.1. Yaw or Side-Slither Maneuver

The pushbroom imager, which is a linear detector array, scans the imaging target one row at a time during the movement of the spacecraft that forms an image with each column of the image is generated by a single detector. On the other hand, in side-slither maneuver process, the focal plane of the system is rotated ninety degrees on its yaw axis, and the imaging direction is parallel to the direction of the spacecraft rather than perpendicular normal pushbroom imaging operation. Thus, every detector of the array images the same area of the ground and measures the identical amount of electromagnetic radiation. But, obtaining ideal side-slither scan requires perfectly parallel spacecraft and array position, no optical distortion, etc. The roll, pitch and yaw

stability of the spacecraft should be maintained at a certain extent to minimize the ground variability of the projection of each detector [125]. More details of side-slither or yaw-axis maneuver technique can be seen herein [130].

Capability to maneuver, loss of normal image data, and uniform imaging target requirement are the primary constraints of collecting appropriate data for detector-todetector non-uniformity characterization. However, no-requirement of on-board hardware and more time efficient than some of the traditional methods are a few of the major strengths of side-slither technique for relative radiometric calibration [131]. The side-slither technique has been shown significant improvement in image quality for RapidEye [125], Landsat 8 [128], Quickbird [129] and Pleiades-HR [132] sensor. In 2014, Pesta et. al. presented comparable relative gain correction in Landsat 8 OLI image using diffuser based and side-slither approach [128]. Therefore, this method of relative calibration can be used without any reservation.

Radiometric and spatial uniformity, high signal-to-noise ratio, large enough area for sufficient amount of data are a few of the major criteria for side-slither imaging target selection for relative gain characterization. But all the bands are not bright in a single target, hence, different types of targets should be used for different band. For instance, visible and near inferred band can be calibrated using Greenland and Dome C of Antarctica [128], whereas Sahara Desert and Arabian Peninsula sites provide high enough spectral radiance for accurate relative gain characterization of SWIR band [125,127-129]. Theoretically one cloud free side-slither acquisition may be enough for relative calibration assuming sensor or detector is stable. Linearity in detector response and uniform radiances to each detector are two of the major assumptions that must be fulfilled for non-uniformity characterization. Detector linearity can be assessed by finding the relationship between input radiances to the focal plane and detector output from the imaging system. At an onset, in sideslither or "flat fielding" approach, homogenous flat-field areas are selected as appropriate target from bright images, and then each detector response is shifted to line up. Each of the detectors bias, which is calculated from dark images, is subtracted from the raw signal, and the relative gains are obtained by column averaging the bias eliminated side-slither collect and dividing by the average signal level of the scene [125]. Finally, these relative gains are applied to each detector's offset removed output, which results in corrected images.

Improvement due to relative gain correction should be assessed both qualitatively and quantitatively. Qualitative image enhancement can be evaluated by visual inspection, and quantitative improvement is usually apprised by calculating banding and streaking metrics. Banding is a phenomenon that appears due to the deviation of average array response from a group of detector's response. Streaking becomes apparent in an image when a single detector's response deviates strikingly from its neighboring detectors. These artifacts often become evident in fairly homogenous scenes at different radiance level. Banding and streaking requirements are usually established during the development phase of satellite system. Banding and streaking metric can be defined in multiple ways, QuickBird and Landsat 8 OLI banding and streaking equations are presented in [127,133].

Figure 8 shows an example of banding and streaking for the red band of a desert scene from QuickBird sensor [127]. Left figure presents radiometrically

corrected column averages which is used to calculate the banding, and right figure illustrates percentage streaking, which is less than 0.12%, for all the detectors in red band. The presented result for all the QuickBird bands met banding and streaking requirements.



Figure 8: Radiometrically corrected desert data and corresponding percent streaking [127].

From the above discussion, it is evident that side-slither maneuver is a welldefined and established method of relative calibration. Therefore, this method can be a suitable option for relative gain estimation of an Earth observing satellite. If the satellite system lacks on-board calibrator or maneuver mechanism, then lifetime statistics approach can be utilized for relative radiometric calibration.

3.1.3.2. Lifetime Image Statistics

Lifetime image statistics relative radiometric calibration method relies on the modification of histogram observed from each individual detector in an imaging system and is applicable to push broom, whisk broom and frame cameras. Histogram modification, which is an Earth imagery-based technique, is based on the assumption that all the detector sees the same image information in a statistical sense. This approach is valid for deriving the parameters (e.g., relative gains) from a single scene and application to an individual scene from whiskbroom sensors since it can be assumed that each detector of whiskbroom imaging sensor measures same signal levels in a statistical sense. The assumption might not be valid for a single scene from pushbroom sensors or frame cameras since every detector of a pushbroom instrument/frame imager does not see the same image information. However, this assumption can be used for pushbroom or frame sensors if the range of image data is extended over many scenes. Detector level non-uniformity characterization usually performed from multiple scenes over the course of the sensor's lifetime. Relative gains used to be characterized using all the available data [126], but non-uniformity characterization from a subset of images provided acceptable result [134]. One advantage of this is that it allows frequent relative gain characterization which will provide useful knowledge about sensor degradation. Nowadays any Earth observing sensor generally collects several hundreds of scenes each day which indicates sheer volume of data should be queried for scene statistics, and that can take substantial amount of time. However, no requirement of on-board instrument, no need to maneuver, and usage of normal earth scenes are the major strengths of this relative calibration method. Consequently, in absence of on-board calibrators and yaw axis maneuver capability, statistics method is an option for remote sensing satellite relative radiometric calibration.

Based on aforementioned assumption, Angal first presented relative gain characterization and correction of a pushbroom sensor called Advanced Land Imager (ALI) [126]. Application of relative gains derived from 20,000 ALI scenes showed significant improvement in image quality. In 2010, Shrestha developed a method to identify best type of images for lifetime statistics approach based on image mean and standard deviation [134]. High mean and high standard deviation (HMHSD) images provided best result to estimate the relative gains, and algorithm requires less HMHSD scenes than normal scenes to stabilize the relative gain. Additionally, relative gain estimates based on mean statistics performed better compare to standard deviation based approach. This work also presented an approach to determine number of required scenes with a few incomprehension which suggested the requirement of future work. In 2017, Anderson et al. described a procedure for estimating relative gains from normally acquired high mean and low standard deviation (HMLS) Earth scenes [135]. Moreover, a method to obtain number of required scenes is also presented based on Landsat 8 OLI data, and minimum of 1200 HMLS images was used as a threshold to calculate relative gains for all OLI bands. Finally, the scene statistics result has been compared with diffuser result which is obtained from Greenland images, and statistics results outperformed the diffuser result qualitatively and quantitatively. From the work presented by Anderson et al. [135], it is evident that the HMLS earth scenes will be appropriate, and number of scene required can be calculated based on the presented approach.

Relative radiometric calibration using statistics method can be performed in following way: i) detector-by-detector mean DN calculation and then bias subtraction for all the available scenes, ii) mean DN calculation for each detector from all the available scenes, iii) standard deviation calculation for each detector from all the available scenes, iv) global mean (from step 3) DN and global standard deviation (from step 3) computation, and v) calculate relative gain dividing either mean DN from step 2 by global mean (step 4) or dividing standard deviation from step 3 by global standard from step 4. Relative gain correction can be applied in two of the following steps: i) subtract mean bias from the raw image data for each detector and ii) multiply the reciprocal of each detector's relative gain by each of bias-corrected image pixel.

The above explained relative calibration steps are followed to obtain relative gains for each detector, and afterwards, correction has been applied to the ALI Arizona acquisition, and the original and corrected images are illustrated in Figure 9 [136]. The Figure 9a shows the band 7 original image along with the stretched Sensor Chip Assembly (SCA) 3 image at the bottom. The vertical stripping artifacts are evident in the shown images. Figure 9b and 9c presents calibrated images using pre-launch coefficients and using relative gains, respectively. Stretched regions (at the bottom) in two of the Figures clearly show the stripping reduction. Compare to pre-launch coefficient, relative gain approach apparently provided better correction of detector level non-uniformity.



Figure 9: Relative gain applied on ALI Arizona scene [136]

3.1.4. Signal-to-Noise Ratio

Signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) is defined as the ratio of signal to the random variability of the signal which is known as "noise" of a system. It is a measure of useful information obtained by an instrument. In remote sensing, SNR is an image quality assessment indicator, and it evaluates radiometric performance of an imaging system. Noise is an inevitable part of any instrument; remotes sensing satellites are no exception. Thus, SNR of a satellite should be estimated to assess the quality of the data product. Since SNR usually varies with signal level, it must be reported in such a way that it clearly signifies the imaging quality of a sensor. For instance, SNR of two imaging system can be estimated under same illumination condition i.e. same radiance level, which will allow to compare the SNR from one satellite to another. As an example, Landsat 7 and 8 reports the SNR at typical and maximum radiances, which can be seen in [92]. Several sensors SNR have been estimated exploiting their corresponding on-board calibrators [137-139]. Over the years numerous Earth

imagery-based SNR estimation methods have also been developed for remote sensing sensors. Some of the popular earth imagery based SNR estimation method are known as homogenous area (HA) [140], local means and local standard deviations (LMLSD) [141] method. Each of the above-mentioned method has its strengths and weaknesses (summary can be seen in the table 4), which have been presented in the forthcoming subsections along with its appropriateness for remote sensing satellite SNR estimation.

Methods	Strengths Weaknesse		Target Type
Homogenous Area [140,142]	Relatively easy to compute Normal Earth scene can be used	Almost impossible to find absolute homogenous surface in a satellite imagery	dry lake, desert, snow, dense vegetation
Local Mean and Local Standard Deviation [141]	Can be automated Does not require large homogenous areas but many small homogenous regions.	Noise must be mainly additive Image should contain many small homogenous area	Target with many small homogenous area

Table 4. SNR estimation methods

3.1.4.1. Homogenous Area Method

One of the simplest SNR estimation approach relies on the calculated mean and standard deviation within a manually selected homogenous area. The ratio of the mean and standard deviation gives an estimate of SNR. A few of the strengths of this method of SNR estimation are: i) it is relatively easy (compare to complex statistical approaches) to implement, ii) it requires normal Earth scenes with homogenous area, and iii) it gives SNR from directly computed parameters (mean and standard deviation) rather than from multiple steps of statistical outcomes. However, almost impossible to find absolute homogenous surface in a satellite imagery, inevitable atmospheric variability, manual selection of homogeneous region are the major weaknesses of HA method. Since manually selected homogenous area almost always contains image features, there is a possibility of SNR underestimation. But, as presented by Ren et. al. in [142], homogenous target such as dry lake, desert, snow, dense vegetation can give reasonable estimate of SNR. Moreover, river and forest have also been used to estimate SNR of different satellite sensor [143,144]. To report SNR at multiple signal level, several types of target should be used. The size of the homogenous area should not be very small since small homogenous area would not give the best estimate of SNR or too large because large area will increase surface and atmospheric variability, which will underestimate the SNR [142]. The accuracy of this method might vary depending on surface type used to estimate SNR. SNR of Landsat 8 reflective bands using HA method over dry lake, desert, snow, dense vegetation shows over estimation on the order of 50 to 250 SNR and underestimation on the order of 20 to 50 SNR (at Landsat 8 OLI typical radiances, mentioned earlier), which suggest the shortcomings of this method compare to on-board approach [142]. Nevertheless, this method can be an option for the satellite systems without OBCs.

3.1.4.2. Local Means and Local Standard Deviations Method

Local means and local standard deviations (LMLSD) is an earth imagerybased SNR estimation method which exploits the fact that remote sensing images usually contain numerous small homogenous areas. In 1993, Gao presented this method [141], and showed that estimated SNR by LMLSD is similar to the SNR estimated by HA method. This process of SNR estimation can be automated, and it does not require large homogenous areas but many small homogenous regions. However, this method had developed assuming that noise in the images are mainly additive, which must be investigated first before proceeding with this method. One way to inspect the assumption is to plot the calculated local means and local standard deviations within the small homogenous blocks. If majority of the local means are clustered around a single standard deviation, then it can be said that the noise is mainly additive.

As explained in [141,145,146], first step of this method is to divide an image into small blocks of 3×3 , 5×5 ,...., 21×21 pixels. Afterwards, local means (LMs) and standard deviations (LSDs) are calculated for each block. Ratio of those LMs and LSDs are the estimated SNR for each block size. Histogram of the estimated SNRs for each block contains the SNR information of the entire image. The SNR at the peak of the histograms (when most of the peaks converges to a single SNR value) represent the SNR estimate of the image. This approach of SNR estimation had been applied to Gaofen-1, Landsat 8 OLI, Landsat 7 ETM+, Terra/Aqua MODIS observation, and the results have been compared to assess the performance of Gaofen-1 [146]. The estimated SNR of Gaofen-1 red and NIR bands are approximately 75 and 35, respectively, which can be seen in the figure 10.

The accuracy of this method may be assessed from the estimated SNR of Landsat 8 OLI using LMLSD approach and OBC approach, assuming OBC approach represent actual SNR of Landsat 8 OLI. The LMLSD and OBC estimated SNR results presented in [146] and in [137] suggest that LMLSD method overestimated the SNR approximately by 50 to 100 at OLI typical radiances that is 14 to 40 W/(m2 sr μ m), ranging from costal to NIR band.

Since this method of SNR estimation does not require scenes with large homogenous area, and it can be automated, this method can be an option for earth observing satellite SNR estimation. However, if the assumption of mainly additive noise dominant image is not met, another block counting approach presented in [157] can be used, which works well when the image noise is mainly multiplicative.



Figure 10: SNR as a function of wavelength[146]

3.1.5. Artifacts

Since there were no clear standard definition of image artifacts, Roman-Gonzalez defined artifacts as "artificial structures that represent a structured perturbation of the signal"[147]. Image artifacts can be generated from design problem/s, detector saturation, on-board processing unit error. It can also arise during the image compression and data transmission. Morfitt et. al. presents some of the Landsat 8 OLI artifacts; they are: spectral cross-talk, stray light, bright target recovery, impulse noise, coherent noise and radiometric uniformity [92]. Since coherent noise and striping noise (caused by radiometric non-uniformity) are present in almost all imaging system, they have been addressed in forthcoming subsections.

3.1.5.1. Striping Noise

Striping noise is an anomaly in remote sensing images. It primarily occurs due to the inconsistent response of multiple detectors. As explained in Section 3.3, relative radiometric calibration and correction is performed to remove detector-to-detector non-uniformity, which result in reduced striping in the imagery. Even though relative gain correction reduces the striping artifacts, it is impossible to remove the striping completely due to the uncertainties in relative gain estimation method. Moreover, rapid space environment change affects the performance of the detector in-orbit that causes striping artifacts in the images. Since striping artifacts reduces data quality and limit the applications such as classification [148], object segmentation [149], and sparse unmixing [150], image should be de-striped before providing to the users. In order to identify or monitor the striping noise in the imagery, homogenous areas such as deserts, Greenland scenes or water bodies can be used. As mentioned earlier, relative calibration is not usually performed frequently, and it might leave a few degrees of striping. For that reason, an image de-striping algorithm can be applied to remove the striping artifacts. Based on the methodology, image de-striping algorithm can be divided into three categories; they are: i) statistics-based, ii) filter-based, and iii) variational de-striping method.

As mentioned in section 3.3.3., statistics methods cannot be used to derive the parameters (e.g., gains) from a single scene of pushbroom/frame imager, requiring many images to meet the assumption of "each detector sees the same image information in a statistical sense". Consequently, statistics method may not be appropriate for striping noise reduction since a frequently usable de-striping algorithm is expected. The filter-based methods are simple and computationally fast; but

sometimes image structures contain same frequency as stripes, thus filter-based method removes the scene contents which is the major disadvantage of this method [151]. Variational de-striping method reduces the limitation of filter-based method [152]. However, this method is not able to completely eliminate the limitation of scene content removal, and it might be complex and computationally slower than filter-based approach [153]. Therefore, simple and computationally faster (compare to variational de-stripping approach) filter-based method can be appropriate for striping noise removal even though it occasionally removes image content. An example of striping noise removal from Landsat 7 ETM+ imagery using filter-based approach can be seen in [154].

3.1.5.2. Coherent Noise

Multiple electromagnetic waves in any electronic instrument interfere with each other and create coherent noise. In remote sensing imagery, coherent noise (CN) appears as a periodic pattern at a frequency or at narrow frequency range. Figure 11 shows coherent noise in Landsat 7 ETM+ level 1 band 3 image and Landsat 5 Thematic Mapper (TM) level-1 band 5 image [155]. Coherent noise not only degrades visual image quality but also affects relative uncertainty of the data [92]. Moreover, presence of coherent noise causes error in atmospheric corrections when it performs using dark pixels [156] and in water quality study [157]. Consequently, coherent noise should be characterized and removed from the image data. Coherent noise magnitude varies instrument by instrument, and typically it is reported as zero-to-peak or peak-to-peak noise magnitude in DNs. For example, CN magnitude in Landsat 4 Multispectral Scanner (MSS), Landsat 5 TM, Landsat 7 ETM+ is measured about 0.6 DN (zero-to-peak), about 0.5 DN (zero-to-peak) and about 3 DN (peak-to-peak), respectively [158-160]. CN can also be reported in contrast level, which is the frequency domain noise amplitude normalized to the dynamic range of the image collected for CN characterization [92]. This type of noise is most visible in relatively homogenous areas of an image [159]. Therefore, night ocean scene, image of dark water bodies, shutter collect, or desert scenes would be appropriate to characterize coherent noise. Typically, periodic coherent noise is detected and removed in frequency domain. Finding the noise frequency/s is the first step of this process, and then an appropriate filter is used to remove the noise from the image [158].



Figure 11: Coherent noise is (a) Landsat 7 ETM+ band 3 (left), and (b) Landsat 5 TM

band 5 (right), level 1 data [155]

3.2. Spatial quality

This section presents spatial image quality parameters and vicarious techniques to estimate 939 modulation transfer function (Section 3.2.1), identify aliasing (Section 3.2.2) and calculate ground sampling distance (Section 3.2.3).

3.2.1. Modulation Transfer Function

Modulation Transfer Function (MTF) is a spatial image quality evaluation metric that measures sharpness of the image generated by a linear, shift-invariant imaging system. MTF characteristics typically estimated prior to the launch of a remote sensing satellite; however, vibrations during launch, transition from air to vacuum, varying thermal state of the sensor and/or changes in material properties over time may change the MTF characteristics of the sensor [161]. Consequently, MTF estimation is necessary while an imaging system is operating on-orbit. Over the years numerous MTF estimation methods have been developed, and they can be divided into artificial (human-made) target- or natural target-based methods. They can also be divided based-on the properties of the target such as edge [162], pulse or line [163,164], and impulse method [165]. In this article, MTF estimation methods have been classified based-on the target properties. Table 5 presents the summary of the strengths and weaknesses of each method, including target types. Following subsections delineate the methods along with the advantages and disadvantages, and provide recommendations on the methods for remote sensing satellite MTF estimation.

Methods	Strengths	Weaknesses	Target Type
		Edge profile should be homogenous	Artificial edge: painted checkerboard, tarp made, parking lot, etc.
Edge target can Edge [162] be found in the normal imagery	Edge should be straight otherwise edge alignment will be necessary	Natural edge: Agricultural field boundaries, moon, sea/icefield transition, etc.	
Pulse or Line [163,164]	Line spread function (LSF) can be obtained directly from the sensor output	Requires knowledge of target width Homogeneity must be maintained throughout the pulse	Bridges can be used as target for moderate spatial resolution sensor (10m to 60m)
Impulse [165]	Provide a full 2D estimate of Point Spread Function (PSF) Relatively easy to calculate MTF	Point target and surrounding area must be uniform Several point sources are needed to obtain full 2D PSF	Artificial target: convex mirror, spotlights, etc. Natural target: stars

Table 5. MTF estimation methods

3.2.1.1. Edge Method

_

Edge method exploits sharp edges in images acquired by a remote sensing sensor to estimate amount of blur in the imagery. Homogeneity in either side of the edge, to maintain low noise level, and high-contrast edge is expected to obtain reasonable estimate of MTF [166]. Moreover, edge should be straight to ensure that only system performance is estimated otherwise edge alignment will be necessary during data processing, and if possible, edge analysis in two directions (horizontal and vertical) from two perpendicular planes should be performed. Helder et. al. suggested that the width of the edge should be between 6 to 10 pixel, and height should be greater than 20 pixel [165]. Additional details of the edge target requirement can be seen in [167]. Edge target can either be natural such as moon [168], agricultural field boundaries [169], sea/icefield transitions [170] or artificial such as painted concreate often designed as checkerboard pattern (can be seen in Figure 13a), tarp-made [171] or parking lot. Natural or artificial MTF target is selected based-on the trade-offs between sensor GSD, uniformity in bright and dark region, and line sharpness. Usually low-resolution sensor's MTF is estimated using the edge of the moon as large MTF target is not available in Earth scene, and they are expensive to build [172-174]. Some of the artificial and natural MTF targets can be seen in the USGS test site webpage [175], however recent imagery (by looking at the Google Earth, Google maps, Bing maps) reveals that most of the artificial sites are not viable for MTF estimation at this time. Thus, in order to perform MTF estimation using edge method, one may have to construct an artificial target; the size of the MTF target will vary depending on the sensor GSD, and homogeneity in the bright and dark region and the line sharpness must be achieved for reasonable estimate of MTF.

Figure 12b illustrates the steps to estimate MTF from an edge-target system response [176], and as explained by Helder et. al in [177], obtained edge spread function (ESF) is differentiated to get the line spread function (LSF), and normalized magnitude of the Fourier transform of LSF result in MTF.



Figure 12: (a) Checkerboard edge target [178] (b) steps to estimate MTF [176]

3.2.1.2. Pulse or Line Method

Pulse method utilizes a target made up of a bright area surrounded by dark areas which appears as a step pulse. In this method, input to the system is a step pulse and sensor output is referred as pulse response function (PRF). Ratio of the magnitude of Fourier transform (FT) of PRF and magnitude of FT of step pulse gives MTF. This method is known as pulse method since system input is a step pulse; however, when the width of the pulse is extremely narrow, this method can be referred as line method [164]. As an artificial or "human-made" target, tarp-build pulse and bridges had been used in the past to estimate the MTF [163,179]. A few requirements of the pulse target as are: pulse target must maintain homogeneity throughout the pulse and edges, and width of the pulse must be chosen carefully so that zero crossing point of the sinc function (FT of input step pulse) does not occur at Nyquist frequency [11]. In order to avoid that, Helder et. al. in [165] suggested 3 GSD as optimal. More details of the pulse target requirements can be seen in [167]. Since the zero crossing points are present in sinc function, and there almost certainly be noise in the system, division in Fourier space will produce error in MTF estimate at certain frequencies. Hence, care must be taken while performing this method. Despite the advantage of getting LSF directly from the sensor output, this method would be difficult to utilize since targets

are expensive to build, and it must be deployed effectively which will require experienced personnel. As mentioned in the edge method section, the artificial pulse target should be developed based-on sensor GSD; and uniformity and high contrast or sharpness between dark and bright region should be ensured for reasonable MTF estimation. As a natural target, bridges can be used for moderate spatial resolution sensor's (10 meters to 60 meters GSD) MTF estimation [180].

3.2.1.3. Impulse Method

MTF of an imaging system can also be estimated from the impulse response of the system; in this method, the input to the system is an impulse (hence the name "impulse method"), and output is a point spread function (PSF). Ratio of the Fourier transform of impulse and PSF then normalized to obtain corresponding MTF. Full 2dimenational (2D) PSF estimate from the system output reduces the complexity and uncertainty of calculating MTF, which is the main advantage of this method over edge and pulse method. However, the obtained PSF almost certainly be noisy that limits the accuracy of estimated MTF [181]. Impulse targets are nothing but a point source, which can be either artificially built or natural (e.g., stars). As an artificial target, researchers have been used active sources such as spotlight [182,183] and passive sources such as convex mirrors [165] as inputs to the imaging satellite. Stars have been used as a natural point target for several satellite's MTF estimation [184-186], and MTF estimation using celestial targets has the advantage of lack of atmosphere and possibility of celestial scenes from any orbit. But locating the stars with appropriate spacing and changing the imaging direction of a satellite are the major constraints of using stars as point target. Even though artificial targets are expensive and time consuming to build, as shown by Rangaswamy [187] and Leger [182], these targets

are appropriate for high spatial resolution sensors MTF estimation. Compare to the edge and pulse method, impulse method can be advantageous since this method provide full 2-dimentional understanding of MTF, but several artificial point sources are needed to obtain full 2D MTF, which might be challenging task to accomplish. High spatial resolution satellites MTF can be estimated from either artificial or natural point target depending on the capability of the sensor and other factors such as cost and experienced personnel for target building.

3.2.2. Aliasing

Aliasing is one type of spatial artifacts that becomes evident due to low sampling rate. It can arise because of the under-sampling during analog-to-digital conversion and resampling. Insufficient sampling fails to capture high-frequency scene content: as a result, repeated patterns, such as jaggedness on line features, thin structures, edges, become prominent nearby high-frequency components [188,189]. These repeated patterns are known as aliasing artifacts, which reduces the image quality, and it affects every subsequent application that uses aliased data. For instance, impacts of spatial aliasing on data fusion are reported in [190], and sea-ice thickness measurement can be seen in [191]. Thus, in order to ensure high spatial quality data from Earth observing satellite, spatial aliasing should be detected and removed before giving the data to the user. Aliasing not only depends on spatial content of the scene but also sensor MTF [192]. Since aliasing hinges on image features, scenes that contains high frequency content i.e. numerous edges and lines will be appropriate to visually detect aliasing. However, there might be aliasing that is not visible in bare eye. In order to detect visible and invisible aliasing, Coulange et. al. proposed an algorithm based on suspicious colocalizations of Fourier transform coefficients [193]. This method detects aliasing from only one image and reduces aliasing preserving high-frequency image details, which are the major advantages of colocalization approach over other frequency domain aliasing detection and correction approach presented in [189,194,195].

3.2.3. Ground Sampling Distance

Ground Sampling Distance (GSD) is the center-to-center distance between adjacent pixels in an image. It is one of the most popular spatial quality indicators of a remote sensing sensor since it quantifies spatial resolution of an imaging system [196]. GSD provides information about the detectable objects in the imagery; just to clarify, low GSD will allow to see small objects in the images. Since all applications that make use of spatial image information require accurate information about GSD, GSD measurement is necessary for potential user of the data. GSD can be calculated from the relationship ($GSD = p \cdot H/f \cdot \cos \theta$) among detector pixel pitch "p", focal length of the instrument "f", altitude of the satellite, "H", and look angle " θ " [197]. If altitude of the satellite or any other parameter is not known, then GSD can be estimated from an image using the known distance between two points on the ground. Number of pixel between the two points should be counted, and ratio of the distance between two points and number of pixel will give the GSD estimate [198]. This section presents geometric quality parameters and vicarious techniques to assess registration accuracy (Section 3.3.1) and geodetic accuracy (Section 3.3.2).

3.3.1. Registration Accuracy

Registration accuracy of a spaceborne imaging system refers to closeness of intra-band and multi-temporal image-to-image pixel registration. Band-to-band and image-to-image misregistration create significant problem in change detection, spatiotemporal fusion, classification accuracy, etc. Change detection is sensitive to imageto-image registration error. In order to present the effect of image misregistration, Dai et al. showed that to attain less than 10% error in change detection, registration accuracy of less than one-fifth of a pixel is expected [30]. Over the years spatiotemporal fusion techniques gained popularity since they can address the problem of coarse spatial and temporal resolution [199]. Research in [31] showed that image-toimage registration error significantly impacts the spatio-temporal fusion accuracy between MODIS and Landsat 7 ETM+ images. Low band-to-band registration accuracy strikingly reduce image sharpness and leads to misclassification [32]. Impact of band-to-band misregistration in science data products is higher at non-homogenous area than the spatially homogenous target [200]. It is evident from the above discussion that the usage of remotely sensed data requires high band-to-band and image-to-image registration accuracy.

3.3.1.1. Band-to-Band Registration Accuracy

Band-to-band registration (BBR) accuracy is a measure of alignment among the bands of a scene acquired by an imaging sensor. As stated earlier, numerous applications require high BBR accuracy; consequently, BBR accuracy characterization is one of the important quality parameters for any remote sensing system. There are a few reported methods of band-to-band calibration for remote sensing sensor. For instance, on-board calibrator is exploited for Terra MODIS intraband calibration [201], and the result from on-board calibrator is validated using a ground scene approach [202]. Absolute BBR accuracy of these two methods have not been reported. The measured band alignment deviation between on-board and ground scene approach is found to be approximately 20m on average for visible to NIR band of Terra MODIS. On-board calibrators are not an attractive option for this task since it increases the cost and complexities in the system. And ground scene approach requires constructing specific dark areas over bright target, details can be seen in [202]. Another BBR accuracy assessment approach utilizes lunar observation; but, lunar approach is primarily used for assessing the stability of BBR [203]. Stability of BBR has been assessed from lunar observations of MODIS and Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite (VIIRS), and uncertainty of MODIS lunar based and onboard approaches are found to be in the same order (though actual uncertainty is unknown) [204,205]. Requirement of imaging direction change and correcting seasonal variations in moon's appearance are a few of the major constraints of using lunar method. Additionally, this method is usually used for low spatial resolution larger footprint sensor. For those reasons, lunar based method is not a practical option for Earth observing satellite.

Cross-correlation is an image feature-based BBR accuracy assessment approach. Easy to implement, computationally fast cross-correlation method works well for satellite images since satellite image patch contain sufficient signal without too much high frequency content [206]. Additionally, geometric, and radiometric distortions are usually kept minimum in remote sensing dataset which is a requirement for cross-correlation approach. Thus, this method is being used for high resolution remote sensing sensors BBR accuracy assessment for quite a few years [28,207,208]. Minimum inter-band spectral difference is one of the major preconditions of crosscorrelation method. Consequently, cloud-free acquisitions of desert sites with littleto-no vegetation are typically used for BBR accuracy assessment [207]. For instance, Landsat 8 OLI BBR accuracy had been measured using 18 cloud-free desert scenes [207], and Landsat 7 ETM+ BBR calibration had been performed from 27 Earth scenes scattered over several desert sites [208]. Based on the study in [207,208], it is obvious that quite a few cloud-free desert scenes are required to perform this method. Cross-correlation approach has been used to assess EO-1 ALI BBR performance and results have been compared with Landsat 7 ETM+ performance; the positional offset between ALI and ETM+ bands is found to be approximately 0.08 pixel (for 30m ALI and ETM+ bands) [28]. Absolute accuracy of cross-correlation approach has not been reported in any of the above-mentioned references. However, ALI and ETM+ comparison indicates the efficacy of cross-correlation approach. Therefore, crosscorrelation can be an approach for remote sensing satellites BBR accuracy assessment.

3.3.1.2. Image-to-Image Registration Accuracy

Image-to-image registration (IIR) accuracy is a measure of alignment among multi-temporal images of same target acquired by an imaging sensor. Image registration accuracy impacts every application that uses temporal remote sensing dataset. In order to improve the IIR accuracy, many methods of image registration have been developed over the past decades. They can be classified into two broad categories; they are: i) area-based and ii) feature-based method. Area-based approaches compare spatial patterns of the intensity label in small image subsets [209], whereas feature-based methods are reliant on identification of salient spatial features such as edges or unique shapes [210,211]. One of the major disadvantages of feature-based approach is that the target features might change over time which will lead to poor accuracy assessment. On the other hand, area-based method works without detecting prominent objects. Thus, it will not be affected by the change of image features. But area-based methods are computationally slower than feature-based approaches. Faster modern computers can overcome that problem. Therefore, one of the area-based methods such as image correlation [212] would be suitable for image registration accuracy assessment. Area-based image correlation approach is used to assess IIR accuracy of Landsat 7 ETM+ and Landsat 8 OLI; IIR accuracy of both the sensors are within 12m specification (for both the sensors), which might be an indication of the effectiveness of area-based method [207,208].

3.3.2. Geodetic Accuracy

Geodetic accuracy is usually referred in absolute scale, and it is a measure of geolocation accuracy of the image data created by the imaging system of a spacecraft [207]. Geolocation accuracy specifies the geometric performance of the satellite system operating in-orbit, and it is measured using highly accurate Ground Control Points (GCPs). These GCPs are located in the geometric calibration sites, and their actual coordinates are known. For instance, USGS EROS range in the city of Sioux Falls, South Dakota, USA has over 400 highly accurate GCPs which can be used to assess the geodetic accuracy of a space-borne imaging system [213]. Calibration site with highly accurate GCPs along with their coordinates and test image of that site from a satellite sensor are two of the requirements to assess geodetic accuracy. The steps to

measure the absolute geodetic accuracy is fairly simple which can be seen in [28]. Briefly, at first the GCPs should be identified in the test images, and locations of the identified GCPs are compared with their actual known locations. Then mean, rootmean-squared, and standard deviation along- and across-track errors can be calculated for each of the tested scenes to compare scene-by-scene performances. The uncertainty of the GCP based approach depends on the number of control points used for estimating geodetic accuracy; however, the quantitative impact of number of control points to uncertainty is unknown [28].

Another approach of absolute geodetic accuracy assessment uses the Global Land Survey (GLS) scenes that contains control points. The test sites with GCPs provides better accuracy compare to GLS control points. But test sites with highly accurate GCPs are not available in global scale. Consequently, GLS based approach can be an option to assess absolute geodetic performance of an Earth observing satellite. Landsat 8 absolute geodetic accuracy using GCP and GLS approach differs by about 30 meters; and GCP approach yields higher geodetic accuracy than GLS approach [207].

66

4. CONCLUSION
This article presents a critical review of image quality criteria and best vicarious methodologies to assess and improve the optical images of Earth observing satellite, exploring radiometric, geometric, and spatial quality categories. Knowledge of these quality categories is critical since the data user community expects to use radiometrically, geometrically and spatially accurate data. Signal-to-noise ratio, absolute calibration, relative calibration, radiometric stability, and image artifacts are found to be the primary on-orbit radiometry characterization parameters. Spatial quality of remote sensing images is defined by modulation transfer function, ground sampling distance and aliasing. Registration and geodetic accuracy are the geometric quality evaluation criteria for a spaceborne imaging system. Each of the parameters can be assessed or quantified by multiple methods. In this work, best quality assessment and improvement methods have been identified, including strengths, weaknesses, requirements such as type of images required, number of images required to perform the task, etc. Additionally, methods have been recommended based-on its strengths and weaknesses, and processing steps of the method are outlined along with example.

As mentioned throughout this article, quality of Earth observing satellite generated observation is essential for every subsequent application. Therefore, presented complete review of remote sensing image quality and best practices of methods will help satellite owners and operators to decide which method of quality they will rely on, and data users to know about different quality criteria so that they are aware of the quality of scientific observation.

REFERENCES

1. Ghuffar, S. DEM generation from multi satellite PlanetScope imagery. *Remote Sensing* **2018**, *10*, 1462.

- 2. Dinardj, A.; Anflo, K.; Friedhoff, P. On-Orbit Commissioning of High Performance Green Propulsion (HPGP) in the SkySat Constellation. **2017**.
- 3. Xue, Y.; Li, Y.; Guang, J.; Zhang, X.; Guo, J. Small satellite remote sensing and applications–history, current and future. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* **2008**, *29*, 4339-4372.
- 4. Kääb, A.; Altena, B.; Mascaro, J. Coseismic displacements of the 14 November 2016 Mw 7.8 Kaikoura, New Zealand, earthquake using the Planet optical cubesat constellation. *Natural hazards and earth system sciences* **2017**, *17*, 627-639.
- 5. Jumpasut, A.; Fukuzato, A.; Greenberg, J.; Wilson, N. Lunar radiometric calibration on Planet Dove satellites. **2017**.
- Feng, L.; Li, J.; Gong, W.; Zhao, X.; Chen, X.; Pang, X. Radiometric crosscalibration of Gaofen-1 WFV cameras using Landsat-8 OLI images: A solution for large view angle associated problems. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 2016, 174, 56-68.
- Helder, D.; Anderson, C.; Beckett, K.; Houborg, R.; Zuleta, I.; Boccia, V.; Clerc, S.; Kuester, M.; Markham, B.; Pagnutti, M. Observations and Recommendations for Coordinated Calibration Activities of Government and Commercial Optical Satellite Systems. *Remote Sensing* 2020, *12*, 2468.
- 8. Weaver, O.A. An Analytical Framework for Assessing the Efficacy of Small Satellites in Performing Novel Imaging Missions. **2015**.
- 9. Pagnutti, M.; Ryan, R.E.; Kelly, M.; Holekamp, K.; Zanoni, V.; Thome, K.; Schiller, S. Radiometric characterization of IKONOS multispectral imagery. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **2003**, *88*, 53-68.
- 10. Helder, D.; Coan, M.; Patrick, K.; Gaska, P. IKONOS geometric characterization. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **2003**, *88*, 69-79.
- Ryan, R.; Baldridge, B.; Schowengerdt, R.A.; Choi, T.; Helder, D.L.; Blonski, S. IKONOS spatial resolution and image interpretability characterization. *Remote sensing of environment* 2003, 88, 37-52.
- 12. Goetz, A.; Heidebrecht, K.; Chrien, T. High accuracy in-flight wavelength calibration of imaging spectrometry data. **1995**.
- Green, R.O. Spectral calibration requirement for Earth-looking imaging spectrometers in the solar-reflected spectrum. *Applied optics* 1998, *37*, 683-690.
- 14. Green, R.O. Radiative-transfer-based retrieval of reflectance from calibrated radiance imagery measured by an imaging spectrometer for lithological mapping of the Clark Mountains, California. In Proceedings of Imaging Spectroscopy of the Terrestrial Environment; pp. 213-221.
- 15. Barsi, J.A.; Lee, K.; Kvaran, G.; Markham, B.L.; Pedelty, J.A. The spectral response of the Landsat-8 operational land imager. *Remote Sensing* **2014**, *6*, 10232-10251.

- Xiong, X.; Che, N.; Barnes, W. Terra MODIS on-orbit spectral characterization and performance. *IEEE transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 2006, 44, 2198-2206.
- 17. Mazda, F. *Telecommunications engineer's reference book*; Butterworth-Heinemann: 2014.
- 18. Wyatt, C. *Radiometric calibration: theory and methods*; Elsevier: 2012.
- 19. Scaramuzza, P.L.; Markham, B.L.; Barsi, J.A.; Kaita, E. Landsat-7 ETM+ onorbit reflective-band radiometric characterization. *IEEE transactions on geoscience and remote sensing* **2004**, *42*, 2796-2809.
- 20. Sun, J.-Q.; Xiong, X. MODIS polarization-sensitivity analysis. *IEEE transactions on geoscience and remote sensing* **2007**, *45*, 2875-2885.
- 21. Knight, E.J.; Kvaran, G. Landsat-8 operational land imager design, characterization and performance. *Remote Sensing* **2014**, *6*, 10286-10305.
- 22. Operational, N.L.D.C.M. Land Imager Requirements Document–Revision E. NASA Goddard Space Flight Center: Greenbelt, MD, USA 2009.
- 23. Holst, G.C. Electro-optical imaging system performance.
- 24. Pratt, W.K. Digital image processing. 1978. Willy, New York 1995.
- 25. Pillet, V.M.; Aparicio, A.; Sánchez, F. *Payload and mission definition in space sciences*; Cambridge University Press: 2005.
- 26. Montanaro, M.; Gerace, A.; Lunsford, A.; Reuter, D. Stray light artifacts in imagery from the Landsat 8 Thermal Infrared Sensor. *Remote Sensing* **2014**, *6*, 10435-10456.
- Dechoz, C.; Languille, F.; Tremas, T.; Nosavan, J.; Petrucci, B.; Massera, S.; Gachet, R.; Martimort, P.; Isola, C. Sentinel 2: geometric calibration during commissioning phase. In Proceedings of Image and Signal Processing for Remote Sensing XX; p. 92440B.
- 28. Storey, J.C.; Choate, M.J.; Meyer, D.J. A geometric performance assessment of the EO-1 advanced land imager. *IEEE transactions on geoscience and remote sensing* **2004**, *42*, 602-607.
- 29. Mulawa, D. On-orbit geometric calibration of the OrbView-3 high resolution imaging satellite. *Int. Arch. Photogramm. Remote Sens. Spat. Inf. Sci* 2004, *35*, 1-6.
- 30. Dai, X.; Khorram, S. The effects of image misregistration on the accuracy of remotely sensed change detection. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote sensing* **1998**, *36*, 1566-1577.
- 31. Tang, Y.; Wang, Q.; Zhang, K.; Atkinson, P. Quantifying the Effect of Registration Error on Spatio-temporal Fusion. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing* **2020**.
- 32. Rao, P.N.; Roy, A.; Navalgund, R. Impact of intraband misregistration on image classification. *International Journal of Geoinformatics* **2005**, *1*.

- 33. Mishra, N.; Helder, D.; Angal, A.; Choi, J.; Xiong, X. Absolute calibration of optical satellite sensors using Libya 4 pseudo invariant calibration site. *Remote sensing* **2014**, *6*, 1327-1346.
- Jing, X.; Leigh, L.; Teixeira Pinto, C.; Helder, D. Evaluation of RadCalNet Output Data Using Landsat 7, Landsat 8, Sentinel 2A, and Sentinel 2B Sensors. *Remote Sensing* 2019, 11, 541.
- Mishra, N.; Haque, M.; Leigh, L.; Aaron, D.; Helder, D.; Markham, B. Radiometric cross calibration of Landsat 8 operational land imager (OLI) and Landsat 7 enhanced thematic mapper plus (ETM+). *Remote sensing* 2014, 6, 12619-12638.
- 36. Dinguirard, M.; Slater, P.N. Calibration of space-multispectral imaging sensors: A review. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **1999**, *68*, 194-205.
- Cramer, C. Workshop on Lunar Calibration for Satellite Remote Sensing. Journal of Research of the National Institute of Standards and Technology 2016, 121, 367-371.
- 38. Aumann, H.; Broberg, S.; Manning, E.; Overoye, K. Using deep convective clouds identified in 16 years of AIRS infrared data for the absolute calibration and stability evaluation of the AIRS 0.4 to 1.0 micron reflected light channels. In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems XXIV; p. 111271I.
- 39. Ma, L.; Zhao, Y.; Woolliams, E.R.; Liu, Y.; Wang, N.; Wang, X.; Dai, C.; Gao, C.; Li, C.; Tang, L. Uncertainty Analysis of the Automated Radiometric Calibration over Baotou Cal&Val Site in China. *Fifth recent advances in quantitative remote sensing* 2018, 211.
- Bouvet, M.; Thome, K.; Berthelot, B.; Bialek, A.; Czapla-Myers, J.; Fox, N.P.; Goryl, P.; Henry, P.; Ma, L.; Marcq, S. RadCalNet: A Radiometric Calibration Network for Earth Observing Imagers Operating in the Visible to Shortwave Infrared Spectral Range. *Remote Sensing* 2019, *11*, 2401.
- Leigh, L.; Shrestha, M.; Hasan, N.; Kaewmanee, M. Classification of North Africa for Use as an Extended Pseudo Invariant Calibration Site for Radiometric Calibration and Stability Monitoring of Optical Satellite Sensors. 2019.
- 42. Helder, D.; Thome, K.; Aaron, D.; Leigh, L.; Czapla-Myers, J.; Leisso, N.; Biggar, S.; Anderson, N. Recent surface reflectance measurement campaigns with emphasis on best practices, SI traceability and uncertainty estimation. *Metrologia* **2012**, *49*, S21.
- Markham, B.L.; Barsi, J.A.; Kaita, E.; Ong, L.; Morfitt, R.A.; Haque, M.O.
 Radiometric calibration and stability of the Landsat-8 Operational Land
 Imager (OLI). In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems XX; p. 96070N.
- 44. Chander, G.; Xiong, X.J.; Choi, T.J.; Angal, A. Monitoring on-orbit calibration stability of the Terra MODIS and Landsat 7 ETM+ sensors using pseudo-invariant test sites. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **2010**, *114*, 925-939.

- 45. Smith, D.L.; Mutlow, C.T.; Rao, C.N. Calibration monitoring of the visible and near-infrared channels of the Along-Track Scanning Radiometer-2 by use of stable terrestrial sites. *Applied optics* **2002**, *41*, 515-523.
- Chander, G.; Mishra, N.; Helder, D.L.; Aaron, D.B.; Angal, A.; Choi, T.; Xiong, X.; Doelling, D.R. Applications of spectral band adjustment factors (SBAF) for cross-calibration. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 2012, *51*, 1267-1281.
- 47. Bouvet, M. Radiometric comparison of multispectral imagers over a pseudoinvariant calibration site using a reference radiometric model. *Remote sensing of environment* **2014**, *140*, 141-154.
- Helder, D.; Thome, K.J.; Mishra, N.; Chander, G.; Xiong, X.; Angal, A.; Choi, T. Absolute radiometric calibration of Landsat using a pseudo invariant calibration site. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 2013, 51, 1360-1369.
- Raut, B.; Kaewmanee, M.; Angal, A.; Xiong, X.; Helder, D. Empirical Absolute Calibration Model for Multiple Pseudo-Invariant Calibration Sites. *Remote Sensing* 2019, 11, 1105.
- Shrestha, M.; Leigh, L.; Helder, D. Classification of North Africa for Use as an Extended Pseudo Invariant Calibration Sites (EPICS) for Radiometric Calibration and Stability Monitoring of Optical Satellite Sensors. *Remote Sensing* 2019, 11, 875.
- Xiong, X.; Sun, J.; Barnes, W.; Salomonson, V.; Esposito, J.; Erives, H.; Guenther, B. Multiyear on-orbit calibration and performance of Terra MODIS reflective solar bands. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 2007, 45, 879-889.
- 52. McCorkel, J.; Thome, K.; Ong, L. Vicarious calibration of EO-1 Hyperion. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing* **2012**, *6*, 400-407.
- 53. Campbell, P.K.E.; Middleton, E.M.; Thome, K.J.; Kokaly, R.F.; Huemmrich, K.F.; Lagomasino, D.; Novick, K.A.; Brunsell, N.A. EO-1 hyperion reflectance time series at calibration and validation sites: Stability and sensitivity to seasonal dynamics. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing* **2013**, *6*, 276-290.
- Barsi, J.A.; Alhammoud, B.; Czapla-Myers, J.; Gascon, F.; Haque, M.O.; Kaewmanee, M.; Leigh, L.; Markham, B.L. Sentinel-2A MSI and Landsat-8 OLI radiometric cross comparison over desert sites. *European Journal of Remote Sensing* 2018, *51*, 822-837.
- 55. Taylor, J.R. Error analysis. Univ. Science Books, Sausalito, California 1997.
- Helder, D.; Markham, B.; Morfitt, R.; Storey, J.; Barsi, J.; Gascon, F.; Clerc, S.; LaFrance, B.; Masek, J.; Roy, D. Observations and Recommendations for the Calibration of Landsat 8 OLI and Sentinel 2 MSI for improved data interoperability. *Remote Sensing* 2018, *10*, 1340.

- 57. Czapla-Myers, J.S.; Anderson, N.J. Intercomparison of Earth-Observing Sensors Using the Radiometric Calibration Test Site (RadCaTS). In Proceedings of IGARSS 2018-2018 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium; pp. 4336-4338.
- 58. Liu, Y.-K.; Ma, L.-L.; Wang, N.; Qian, Y.-G.; Zhao, Y.-G.; Qiu, S.; Gao, C.-X.; Long, X.-X.; Li, C.-R. On-orbit radiometric calibration of the optical sensors on-board SuperView-1 satellite using three independent methods. *Optics Express* 2020, 28, 11085-11105.
- Alonso, K.; Bachmann, M.; Burch, K.; Carmona, E.; Cerra, D.; de los Reyes, R.; Dietrich, D.; Heiden, U.; Hölderlin, A.; Ickes, J. Data Products, Quality and Validation of the DLR Earth Sensing Imaging Spectrometer (DESIS). *Sensors* 2019, 19, 4471.
- Sterckx, S.; Wolters, E. Radiometric Top-of-Atmosphere Reflectance Consistency Assessment for Landsat 8/OLI, Sentinel-2/MSI, PROBA-V, and DEIMOS-1 over Libya-4 and RadCalNet Calibration Sites. *Remote Sensing* 2019, 11, 2253.
- Alhammoud, B.; Jackson, J.; Clerc, S.; Arias, M.; Bouzinac, C.; Gascon, F.; Cadau, E.G.; Iannone, R.Q.; Boccia, V. Sentinel-2 Level-1 Radiometry Assessment Using Vicarious Methods From DIMITRI Toolbox and Field Measurements From RadCalNet Database. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing* 2019, *12*, 3470-3479.
- 62. Czapla-Myers, J.S.; Anderson, N.J. Intercomparison of the GOES-16 and-17 Advanced Baseline Imager with low-Earth orbit sensors. In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems XXIV; p. 111271N.
- 63. RadCalNet. RadCalNet Portal. Availabe online: <u>www.radcalnet.org</u> (accessed on 20 December).
- 64. Chander, G.; Meyer, D.J.; Helder, D.L. Cross calibration of the Landsat-7 ETM+ and EO-1 ALI sensor. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* **2004**, *42*, 2821-2831.
- Revel, C.; Lonjou, V.; Marcq, S.; Desjardins, C.; Fougnie, B.; Coppolani-Delle Luche, C.; Guilleminot, N.; Lacamp, A.-S.; Lourme, E.; Miquel, C. Sentinel-2A and 2B absolute calibration monitoring. *European Journal of Remote Sensing* 2019, 52, 122-137.
- 66. Markham, B.; Barsi, J.; Kvaran, G.; Ong, L.; Kaita, E.; Biggar, S.; Czapla-Myers, J.; Mishra, N.; Helder, D. Landsat-8 operational land imager radiometric calibration and stability. *Remote Sensing* **2014**, *6*, 12275-12308.
- Henry, P.J.; Dinguirard, M.C.; Bodilis, M. SPOT multitemporal calibration over stable desert areas. In Proceedings of Recent Advances in Sensors, Radiometric Calibration, and Processing of Remotely Sensed Data; pp. 67-76.
- 68. Cabor, F.; Hagolle, O.; Cosnefroy, H.; Briottet, X. Inter-calibration using desertic sites as a reference target. In Proceedings of IGARSS'98. Sensing and

Managing the Environment. 1998 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing. Symposium Proceedings.(Cat. No. 98CH36174); pp. 2713-2715.

- 69. Cosnefroy, H.; Leroy, M.; Briottet, X. Selection and characterization of Saharan and Arabian desert sites for the calibration of optical satellite sensors. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **1996**, *58*, 101-114.
- Lacherade, S.; Fougnie, B.; Henry, P.; Gamet, P. Cross calibration over desert sites: Description, methodology, and operational implementation. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 2013, *51*, 1098-1113.
- 71. Thenkabail, P.S. *Remote Sensing Handbook; Volume 1: Remotely Sensed Data Characterization, Classification, and Accuracies;* Taylor & Francis: 2016.
- 72. Bacour, C.; Briottet, X.; Bréon, F.-M.; Viallefont-Robinet, F.; Bouvet, M. Revisiting Pseudo Invariant Calibration Sites (PICS) over sand deserts for vicarious calibration of optical imagers at 20 km and 100 km scales. *Remote Sensing* 2019, 11, 1166.
- Farhad, M. Cross Calibration and Validation of Landsat 8 OLI and Sentinel 2A MSI. 2018.
- 74. Pakat, A.; Hui, D.; Kaewmanee, M.; Helder, D.; Puangjaktha, P. Cross calibration Thaichote and Landsat 8 over Libya4 using pseudo invariant calibration sites (PICS). In Proceedings of 2017 International Conference on Applied System Innovation (ICASI); pp. 834-837.
- 75. Teillet, P.; Markham, B.; Irish, R.R. Landsat cross-calibration based on near simultaneous imaging of common ground targets. *Remote sensing of environment* **2006**, *102*, 264-270.
- 76. Shrestha, M.; Hasan, M.; Leigh, L.; Helder, D. Extended Pseudo Invariant Calibration Sites (EPICS) for the Cross-Calibration of Optical Satellite Sensors. *Remote Sensing* 2019, 11, 1676.
- Chander, G.; Helder, D.L.; Aaron, D.; Mishra, N.; Shrestha, A.K. Assessment of spectral, misregistration, and spatial uncertainties inherent in the crosscalibration study. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 2012, 51, 1282-1296.
- Pinto, C.T.; Ponzoni, F.J.; Castro, R.M.; Leigh, L.; Kaewmanee, M.; Aaron, D.; Helder, D. Evaluation of the uncertainty in the spectral band adjustment factor (SBAF) for cross-calibration using Monte Carlo simulation. *Remote sensing letters* 2016, 7, 837-846.
- Li, S.; Ganguly, S.; Dungan, J.L.; Wang, W.; Nemani, R.R. Sentinel-2 MSI radiometric characterization and cross-calibration with Landsat-8 OLI. *Advances in Remote Sensing* 2017, *6*, 147.
- 80. Thome, K.J.; Helder, D.L.; Aaron, D.; Dewald, J.D. Landsat-5 TM and Landsat-7 ETM+ absolute radiometric calibration using the reflectance-based method. *IEEE Transactions on geoscience and remote sensing* **2004**, *42*, 2777-2785.

- 81. Thome, K. Absolute radiometric calibration of Landsat 7 ETM+ using the reflectance-based method. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **2001**, *78*, 27-38.
- Czapla-Myers, J.; McCorkel, J.; Anderson, N.; Thome, K.; Biggar, S.; Helder, D.; Aaron, D.; Leigh, L.; Mishra, N. The ground-based absolute radiometric calibration of Landsat 8 OLI. *Remote Sensing* 2015, *7*, 600-626.
- Thome, K.; Cattrall, C.; D'Amico, J.; Geis, J. Ground-reference calibration results for Landsat-7 ETM+. In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems X; p. 58820B.
- Helder, D.; Doelling, D.; Bhatt, R.; Choi, T.; Barsi, J. Calibrating Geosynchronous and Polar Orbiting Satellites: Sharing Best Practices. *Remote Sensing* 2020, *12*, 2786.
- 85. Kieffer, H.H.; Stone, T.C. The spectral irradiance of the Moon. *The Astronomical Journal* **2005**, *129*, 2887.
- 86. Lunar spectral irradiance and radiance (LUSI). Availabe online: <u>https://www.nist.gov/programs-projects/lunar-spectral-irradiance-and-radiance-lusi</u> (accessed on December 27).
- 87. al., S.A.e. Lunar irradiance measurement and modelling. Availabe online: http://gsics.atmos.umd.edu/pub/Development/AnnualMeeting2019/4g_Adriae nsen_Lunar_Calibration_Measurements_Modelling.pptx (accessed on December 31).
- Stone, T.C. Lunar Observations Planning for CLARREO. Available online: https://clarreo.larc.nasa.gov/2016-05STM/Wednesday/Stone_CLARREO_SDT_Spring2016.pdf (accessed on December 27).
- 89. Doelling, D.R.; Morstad, D.; Scarino, B.R.; Bhatt, R.; Gopalan, A. The characterization of deep convective clouds as an invariant calibration target and as a visible calibration technique. *IEEE transactions on Geoscience and remote Sensing* **2012**, *51*, 1147-1159.
- 90. Sohn, B.; Ham, S.-H.; Yang, P. Possibility of the visible-channel calibration using deep convective clouds overshooting the TTL. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology* **2009**, *48*, 2271-2283.
- 91. Doelling, D.R.; Nguyen, L.; Minnis, P. On the use of deep convective clouds to calibrate AVHRR data. In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems IX; pp. 281-289.
- 92. Morfitt, R.; Barsi, J.; Levy, R.; Markham, B.; Micijevic, E.; Ong, L.; Scaramuzza, P.; Vanderwerff, K. Landsat-8 Operational Land Imager (OLI) radiometric performance on-orbit. *Remote Sensing* **2015**, *7*, 2208-2237.
- Angal, A.; Xiong, X.; Helder, D.; Kaewmanee, M.; Leigh, L. Assessing the calibration differences in the reflective solar bands of Terra MODIS and Landsat-7 enhanced thematic mapper plus. *Journal of Applied Remote Sensing* 2018, *12*, 044002.

- 94. Barsi, J.A.; Markham, B.L.; Helder, D.L. Continued monitoring of Landsat reflective band calibration using pseudo-invariant calibration sites. In Proceedings of 2012 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium; pp. 7007-7010.
- 95. Markham, B.L.; Barker, J.L.; Barsi, J.A.; Kaita, E.; Thome, K.J.; Helder, D.L.; Palluconi, F.D.; Schott, J.R.; Scaramuzza, P. Landsat-7 ETM+ radiometric stability and absolute calibration. In Proceedings of Sensors, Systems, and Next-Generation Satellites VI; pp. 308-318.
- 96. Zanter, K. Landsat 8 (L8) data users handbook. *Landsat Science Official Website* **2016**.
- 97. Helder, D.L.; Ruggles, T.A.; Dewald, J.D.; Madhavan, S. Landsat-5 Thematic Mapper reflective-band radiometric stability. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* **2004**, *42*, 2730-2746.
- 98. Kaewmanee, M. Pseudo invariant calibration sites: PICS evolution. 2018.
- 99. Barsi, J.A.; Markham, B.L.; Czapla-Myers, J.S.; Helder, D.L.; Hook, S.J.; Schott, J.R.; Haque, M.O. Landsat-7 ETM+ radiometric calibration status. In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems XXI; p. 99720C.
- 100. Markham, B.L.; Thome, K.J.; Barsi, J.A.; Kaita, E.; Helder, D.L.; Barker, J.L.; Scaramuzza, P.L. Landsat-7 ETM+ on-orbit reflective-band radiometric stability and absolute calibration. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 2004, *42*, 2810-2820.
- Sterckx, S.; Adriaensen, S.; Dierckx, W.; Bouvet, M. In-Orbit Radiometric Calibration and Stability Monitoring of the PROBA-V Instrument. *Remote Sensing* 2016, 8, 546.
- Sun, J.-Q.; Xiong, X.; Barnes, W.L.; Guenther, B. MODIS reflective solar bands on-orbit lunar calibration. *IEEE Transactions on geoscience and remote sensing* 2007, 45, 2383-2393.
- 103. Eplee Jr, R.E.; Barnes, R.A.; Patt, F.S.; Meister, G.; McClain, C.R. SeaWiFS lunar calibration methodology after six years on orbit. In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems IX; pp. 1-13.
- 104. Teillet, P.; Barsi, J.; Chander, G.; Thome, K. Prime candidate earth targets for the post-launch radiometric calibration of space-based optical imaging instruments. In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems XII; p. 66770S.
- 105. Teillet, P.; Chander, G. Terrestrial reference standard sites for postlaunch sensor calibration. *Canadian Journal of Remote Sensing* **2010**, *36*, 437-450.
- 106. Chander, G. Catalog of Worldwide Test Sites for Sensor Characterization. US *Geological Survey* 2009.
- 107. Kim, W.; He, T.; Wang, D.; Cao, C.; Liang, S. Assessment of long-term sensor radiometric degradation using time series analysis. *IEEE transactions on geoscience and remote sensing* **2013**, *52*, 2960-2976.
- 108. Angal, A.; Xiong, X.; Choi, T.; Chander, G.; Wu, A. Using the Sonoran and Libyan Desert test sites to monitor the temporal stability of reflective solar

bands for Landsat 7 enhanced thematic mapper plus and Terra moderate resolution imaging spectroradiometer sensors. *Journal of Applied Remote Sensing* **2010**, *4*, 043525.

- Helder, D.L.; Markham, B.L.; Thome, K.J.; Barsi, J.A.; Chander, G.; Malla, R. Updated radiometric calibration for the Landsat-5 Thematic Mapper reflective bands. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 2008, 46, 3309-3325.
- Helder, D.L.; Basnet, B.; Morstad, D.L. Optimized identification of worldwide radiometric pseudo-invariant calibration sites. *Canadian Journal of Remote Sensing* 2010, *36*, 527-539.
- 111. Tabassum, R. Worldwide optimal PICS search. 2017.
- Hasan, M.N.; Shrestha, M.; Leigh, L.; Helder, D. Evaluation of an Extended PICS (EPICS) for Calibration and Stability Monitoring of Optical Satellite Sensors. *Remote Sensing* 2019, 11, 1755.
- 113. Chander, G.; Christopherson, J.; Stensaas, G.; Teillet, P. Online catalog of world-wide test sites for the post-launch characterization and calibration of optical sensors. In Proceedings of 58th International Astronautical Congress 2007; pp. 2043-2051.
- 114. Castracane, P. PICS: Pseudo-Invariant Calibration Sites. Available online: <u>http://calvalportal.ceos.org/tools/impetus/-</u> /asset_publisher/fR59YEK8GYhK/content/pics-pseudo-invariant-calibrationsites;jsessionid=17CD9AD300A60C4DA9EDA661DE4D061D (accessed on June 18).
- Magellium, C.a. CEOS WGCV IVOS initiative on the characterization of PICS. Availabe online: <u>https://picscar.magellium.com/#</u> (accessed on June 18).
- Tuli, F.T.Z.; Pinto, C.T.; Angal, A.; Xiong, X.; Helder, D. New Approach for Temporal Stability Evaluation of Pseudo-Invariant Calibration Sites (PICS). *Remote Sensing* 2019, 11, 1502.
- 117. Vuppula, H. Normalization of pseudo-invariant calibration sites for increasing the temporal resolution and long-term trending. **2017**.
- 118. Tiao, G.C.; Reinsel, G.C.; Xu, D.; Pedrick, J.; Zhu, X.; Miller, A.; DeLuisi, J.; Mateer, C.; Wuebbles, D. Effects of autocorrelation and temporal sampling schemes on estimates of trend and spatial correlation. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 1990, 95, 20507-20517.
- 119. Spooner, J.; Dressing, S.; Meals, D. Minimum detectable change analysis. Tech Notes 7, December 2011. *Environmental Protection Agency* **2011**.
- 120. Waldner, P.; Marchetto, A.; Thimonier, A.; Schmitt, M.; Rogora, M.; Granke, O.; Mues, V.; Hansen, K.; Karlsson, G.P.; Žlindra, D. Detection of temporal trends in atmospheric deposition of inorganic nitrogen and sulphate to forests in Europe. *Atmospheric Environment* **2014**, *95*, 363-374.

- Weatherhead, E.C.; Reinsel, G.C.; Tiao, G.C.; Meng, X.L.; Choi, D.; Cheang, W.K.; Keller, T.; DeLuisi, J.; Wuebbles, D.J.; Kerr, J.B. Factors affecting the detection of trends: Statistical considerations and applications to environmental data. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 1998, *103*, 17149-17161.
- 122. Weatherhead, E.C.; Reinsel, G.C.; Tiao, G.C.; Jackman, C.H.; Bishop, L.; Frith, S.M.H.; DeLuisi, J.; Keller, T.; Oltmans, S.J.; Fleming, E.L. Detecting the recovery of total column ozone. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* **2000**, *105*, 22201-22210.
- 123. Bhatt, R.; Doelling, D.R.; Wu, A.; Xiong, X.; Scarino, B.R.; Haney, C.O.; Gopalan, A. Initial stability assessment of S-NPP VIIRS reflective solar band calibration using invariant desert and deep convective cloud targets. *Remote Sensing* 2014, 6, 2809-2826.
- Mendenhall, J.; Bernotas, L.; Bicknell, W.; Cerrati, V.; Digenis, C.; Evans, J.; Forman, S.; Hearn, D.; Hoffeld, R.; Lencioni, D. Earth Observing-1 Advanced Land Imager: instrument and flight operations overview. *Massachusetts Institute of Technology & Lincoln Laboratory Project Report EO-1* 2000, 1, 121.
- 125. Anderson, C.; Naughton, D.; Brunn, A.; Thiele, M. Radiometric correction of RapidEye imagery using the on-orbit side-slither method. In Proceedings of Image and Signal Processing for Remote Sensing XVII; p. 818008.
- 126. Angal, A.; Helder, D. Advanced Land Imager relative gain characterization and correction. Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Department, South Dakota State ..., 2005.
- 127. Krause, K.S. Relative radiometric characterization and performance of the QuickBird high-resolution commercial imaging satellite. In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems IX; pp. 35-44.
- 128. Pesta, F.; Bhatta, S.; Helder, D.; Mishra, N. Radiometric non-uniformity characterization and correction of landsat 8 oli using earth imagery-based techniques. *Remote Sensing* **2015**, *7*, 430-446.
- Henderson, B.G.; Krause, K.S. Relative radiometric correction of QuickBird imagery using the side-slither technique on orbit. In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems IX; pp. 426-436.
- 130. Li, H.; Man, Y.-y. Relative radiometric calibration method based on linear CCD imaging the same region of non-uniform scene. In Proceedings of International Symposium on Optoelectronic Technology and Application 2014: Optical Remote Sensing Technology and Applications; p. 929906.
- 131. Wang, M.; Chen, C.; Pan, J.; Zhu, Y.; Chang, X. A Relative Radiometric Calibration Method Based on the Histogram of Side-Slither Data for High-Resolution Optical Satellite Imagery. *Remote Sensing* 2018, 10, 381.

- Kubik, P.; Pascal, V. Amethist: A method for equalization thanks to histograms. In Proceedings of Sensors, Systems, and Next-Generation Satellites Viii; pp. 256-267.
- Pesta, F. Relative Radiometic Characterization and Correction of the Landsat 8 OLI Using the On-Orbit Side-Slither Maneuver. 2015.
- 134. Shrestha, A.K. Relative Gain Characterization and Correction for Pushbroom Sensors Based on Lifetime Image Statistics and Wavelet Filtering. Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Department, South Dakota State ..., 2010.
- 135. Anderson, C.; Helder, D.L.; Jeno, D. Statistical relative gain calculation for Landsat 8. In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems XXII; p. 104021F.
- 136. Amit Angal, D.D.H. Advanced Land Imager Relative Gain Characterization and Correction. In Proceedings of Pecora 16 "Global Priorities in Land Remote Sensing", Sioux Falls, South Dakota, October 23 -27, 2005.
- 137. Micijevic, E.; Vanderwerff, K.; Scaramuzza, P.; Morfitt, R.A.; Barsi, J.A.; Levy, R. On-orbit performance of the Landsat 8 Operational Land Imager. In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems XIX; p. 921816.
- Markham, B.L.; Barker, J.; Kaita, E.; Seiferth, J.; Morfitt, R. On-orbit performance of the Landsat-7 ETM+ radiometric calibrators. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 2003, 24, 265-285.
- Xiong, X.; Angal, A.; Xie, X. On-orbit noise characterization for MODIS reflective solar bands. In Proceedings of IGARSS 2008-2008 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium; pp. IV-1336-IV-1339.
- 140. Van der Meer, F.D.; De Jong, S.M. *Imaging spectrometry: basic principles and prospective applications*; Springer Science & Business Media: 2011; Vol. 4.
- 141. Gao, B.-C. An operational method for estimating signal to noise ratios from data acquired with imaging spectrometers. *Remote sensing of environment* 1993, 43, 23-33.
- 142. Ren, H.; Du, C.; Liu, R.; Qin, Q.; Yan, G.; Li, Z.-L.; Meng, J. Noise evaluation of early images for Landsat 8 Operational Land Imager. *Optics express* 2014, 22, 27270-27280.
- 143. Fujimotor, N.; Takahashi, Y.; Moriyama, T.; Shimada, M.; Wakabayashi, H.; Nakatani, Y.; Obayashi, S. Evaluation of SPOT HRV image data received in Japan. In Proceedings of 12th Canadian Symposium on Remote Sensing Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium; pp. 463-466.
- 144. Jiang, B.; Liang, S.; Townshend, J.R.; Dodson, Z.M. Assessment of the radiometric performance of Chinese HJ-1 satellite CCD instruments. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing* 2013, 6, 840-850.
- 145. Piscini, A.; Amici, S. Estimation of Signal to Noise Ratio for Unsupervised Hyperspectral Images. *Quaderni di Geofisica* **2010**.

- 146. Li, J.; Chen, X.; Tian, L.; Huang, J.; Feng, L. Improved capabilities of the Chinese high-resolution remote sensing satellite GF-1 for monitoring suspended particulate matter (SPM) in inland waters: Radiometric and spatial considerations. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing* 2015, *106*, 145-156.
- 147. Roman-Gonzalez, A. Compression based analysis of image artifacts: Application to satellite images. 2013.
- Zhang, H.; Li, J.; Huang, Y.; Zhang, L. A nonlocal weighted joint sparse representation classification method for hyperspectral imagery. *IEEE Journal* of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing 2013, 7, 2056-2065.
- Tarabalka, Y.; Chanussot, J.; Benediktsson, J.A. Segmentation and classification of hyperspectral images using watershed transformation. *Pattern Recognition* 2010, 43, 2367-2379.
- Iordache, M.-D.; Bioucas-Dias, J.M.; Plaza, A. Collaborative sparse regression for hyperspectral unmixing. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 2013, 52, 341-354.
- 151. Pande-Chhetri, R.; Abd-Elrahman, A. De-striping hyperspectral imagery using wavelet transform and adaptive frequency domain filtering. *ISPRS journal of photogrammetry and remote sensing* **2011**, *66*, 620-636.
- 152. Chen, Y.; Huang, T.-Z.; Zhao, X.-L.; Deng, L.-J.; Huang, J. Stripe noise removal of remote sensing images by total variation regularization and group sparsity constraint. *Remote Sensing* **2017**, *9*, 559.
- 153. Chang, Y.; Yan, L.; Wu, T.; Zhong, S. Remote sensing image stripe noise removal: From image decomposition perspective. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* **2016**, *54*, 7018-7031.
- 154. Liu, J.G.; Morgan, G.L.K. FFT selective and adaptive filtering for removal of systematic noise in ETM+ imageodesy images. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* **2006**, *44*, 3716-3724.
- 155. USGS. Landsat Known Issues- Coherent Noise. Availabe online: <u>https://www.usgs.gov/land-resources/nli/landsat/coherent-noise?qt-</u> <u>science_support_page_related_con=0#qt-science_support_page_related_con</u> (accessed on March 13).
- 156. Amraei, E.; Mobasheri, M.R. Coherent Noise Removal in Dark pixels (Case Study: Images Acquired By Landsat 5 Thematic Mapper). *International Journal of Innovative Science, Engineering & Technology* 2014, 1.
- 157. Nichol, J.; Vohora, V. Noise over water surfaces in Landsat TM images. International Journal of Remote Sensing **2004**, 25, 2087-2093.
- 158. Tilton, J.C.; Markham, B.L.; Alford, W.L. Landsat-4 and Landsat-5 MSS Coherent Noise: Characterization and Removal. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* **1985**, *51*, 1263-1279.

- Helder, D.L.; Ruggles, T.A. Landsat thematic mapper reflective-band radiometric artifacts. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and remote Sensing* 2004, 42, 2704-2716.
- 160. Pedelty, J.A.; Markham, B.L.; Barker, J.L.; Seiferth, J.C. Pre-launch noise characterization of the Landsat-7 Enhanced Thematic Mapper Plus (ETM Plus). In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems IV; pp. 376-387.
- 161. Crespi, M.; De Vendictis, L. A procedure for high resolution satellite imagery quality assessment. *Sensors* **2009**, *9*, 3289-3313.
- 162. Choi, T.; Helder, D.L. Generic sensor modeling for modulation transfer function (MTF) estimation. In Proceedings of Pecora; pp. 23-27.
- Helde, D.; Choi, J.; Anderson, C. On-orbit modulation transfer function (MTF) measurements for IKONOS and QuickBird. 2007.
- Schowengerdt, R.; Archwamety, C.; Wrigley, R.C. Operational MTF for Landsat thematic mapper. In Proceedings of Image quality: An overview; pp. 110-118.
- 165. Helder, D.; Choi, T.; Rangaswamy, M. In-flight characterization of spatial quality using point spread functions. In *Post-launch calibration of satellite sensors*, CRC Press: 2004; pp. 159-198.
- 166. Kohm, K. Modulation transfer function measurement method and results for the Orbview-3 high resolution imaging satellite. In Proceedings of Proceedings of ISPRS; pp. 12-23.
- Berthelot, B.; Santer, R.; Blanc, R.; Saunier, S.; Kocaman, S. Calibration Test Sites Selection and Characterisation–WP210. VEGA Technologies SAS. France 2008.
- 168. Choi, T.; Xiong, X.; Wang, Z. On-orbit lunar modulation transfer function measurements for the moderate resolution imaging spectroradiometer. *IEEE transactions on geoscience and remote sensing* **2013**, *52*, 270-277.
- 169. Viallefont-Robinet, F.; Léger, D. Improvement of the edge method for onorbit MTF measurement. *Optics express* **2010**, *18*, 3531-3545.
- 170. Nelson, N.R.; Barry, P. Measurement of Hyperion MTF from on-orbit scenes. In Proceedings of IGARSS 2001. Scanning the Present and Resolving the Future. Proceedings. IEEE 2001 International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (Cat. No. 01CH37217); pp. 2967-2969.
- Helder, D.; Choi, J. On-orbit modulation transfer function (mtf) measurement of quickbird. In Proceedings of Proceedings of the 2003 High Spatial Resolution Commercial Imagery Workshop.
- 172. Wang, Z.; Xiong, X. VIIRS on-orbit spatial characterization using the Moon. *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters* **2013**, *11*, 1116-1120.
- 173. Wang, Z.; Xiong, X.; Choi, T.; Link, D. On-orbit characterization of MODIS modulation transfer function using the moon. *IEEE transactions on geoscience and remote sensing* **2013**, *52*, 4112-4121.

- 174. Shea, J.J. Lunar limb knife-edge optical transfer function measurements. *Journal of Electronic Imaging* **1999**, *8*, 196-209.
- 175. USGS. Test Sites Catalog. Availabe online: <u>https://calval.cr.usgs.gov/apps/test_sites_catalog</u> (accessed on March 20).
- 176. Xu, M.; Cong, M.; Li, H. Research of on-orbit MTF measurement for the satellite sensors. In Proceedings of Remote Sensing of the Environment: 18th National Symposium on Remote Sensing of China; p. 915809.
- Helder, D.; Choi, T.; Rangaswamy, M. Quickbird Satellite in-orbit Modulation Transfer Function (MTF) Measurement Using Edge, Pulse and Impulse Methods for Summer 2003. 2005.
- 178. USGS. Edge MTF target. Availabe online: <u>https://calval.cr.usgs.gov/apps/salon-de-provence-france-mtf-site</u> (accessed on March 20).
- Storey, J.C. Landsat 7 on-orbit modulation transfer function estimation. In Proceedings of Sensors, Systems, and Next-Generation Satellites V; pp. 50-61.
- 180. Hearn, D.R. Earth Observing-1 Advanced Land Imager: Imaging Performance On-Orbit; MASSACHUSETTS INST OF TECH LEXINGTON LINCOLN LAB: 2002.
- 181. Meygret, A.; Blanchet, G.; Latry, C.; Kelbert, A.; Gross-Colzy, L. On-Orbit Star-Based Calibration and Modulation Transfer Function Measurements for PLEIADES High-Resolution Optical Sensors. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 2019, 57, 5525-5534.
- 182. Leger, D.; Viallefont, F.; Hillairet, E.; Meygret, A. In-flight refocusing and MTF assessment of SPOT5 HRG and HRS cameras. In Proceedings of Sensors, Systems, and Next-Generation Satellites VI; pp. 224-231.
- 183. Leger, D.; Duffaut, J.; Robinet, F. MTF measurement using spotlight. In Proceedings of Proceedings of IGARSS'94-1994 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium; pp. 2010-2012.
- 184. Fourest, S.; Kubik, P.; Lebègue, L.; Déchoz, C.; Lacherade, S.; Blanchet, G. Star-based methods for Pleiades HR commissioning. *Int. Arch. Photogramm. Remote Sens. Spat. Inf. Sci* 2012, *39*, 513-518.
- 185. Kang, C.-H.; Chung, J.-H.; Kim, Y.-H. On-orbit MTF estimation for the KOMPSAT-3 satellite using star images. *Remote sensing letters* 2015, 6, 1002-1011.
- 186. Faran, S.; Eshet, I.; Yehezkel, N.; Molcho, J. Estimation of the MTF of a satellite imaging-system from celestial scenes. In Proceedings of 2009 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium; pp. II-452-II-455.
- 187. Rangaswamy, M. Two-dimensional on-orbit modulation transfer function analysis using convex mirror array. *Master of Science. South Dakota State University, the United States* **2003**, 30-69.
- 188. Barducci, A.; Baronti, S.; Bonsignori, R.; Capanni, A.; Del Bello, U.; Marcoionni, P.; Pippi, I.; Romoli, A.; Santurri, L.; Vitulli, R. Aliasing effects

on images acquired by hyperspectral pushbroom sensors. In Proceedings of Sensors, Systems, and Next-Generation Satellites V; pp. 135-146.

- 189. Chae, E.; Lee, E.; Kang, W.; Cheong, H.; Paik, J. Spatially adaptive antialiasing for enhancement of mobile imaging system using combined wavelet-Fourier transform. *IEEE Transactions on Consumer Electronics* 2013, 59, 862-868.
- 190. Baronti, S.; Aiazzi, B.; Selva, M.; Garzelli, A.; Alparone, L. A theoretical analysis of the effects of aliasing and misregistration on pansharpened imagery. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing* **2011**, *5*, 446-453.
- 191. Geiger, C.; Müller, H.-R.; Samluk, J.P.; Bernstein, E.R.; Richter-Menge, J. Impact of spatial aliasing on sea-ice thickness measurements. *Annals of Glaciology* 2015, 56, 353-362.
- 192. Schowengerdt, R.A. Aliasing in remote sensing imagery. In Proceedings of Visual Information Processing XI; pp. 92-98.
- 193. Coulange, B.; Moisan, L. An aliasing detection algorithm based on suspicious colocalizations of fourier coefficients. In Proceedings of 2010 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing; pp. 2013-2016.
- 194. Vandewalle, P.; Süsstrunk, S.; Vetterli, M. A frequency domain approach to registration of aliased images with application to super-resolution. *EURASIP journal on advances in signal processing* **2006**, *2006*, 071459.
- 195. Chae, E.; Lee, E.; Kang, W.; Lim, Y.; Jung, J.; Kim, T.; Katsaggelos, A.K.; Paik, J. Frequency-domain analysis of discrete wavelet transform coefficients and their adaptive shrinkage for anti-aliasing. In Proceedings of 2013 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing; pp. 1071-1074.
- 196. Valenzuela, Á.Q.; Reyes, J.C.G. Basic Spatial Resolution Metrics for Satellite Imagers. *IEEE Sensors Journal* **2019**, *19*, 4914-4922.
- 197. Leachtenauer, J.C.; Driggers, R.G. *Surveillance and reconnaissance imaging systems: modeling and performance prediction*; Artech House: 2001.
- 198. USGS. Guide to Digital Imagery Spatial Resolution; 2018.
- 199. Ghamisi, P.; Rasti, B.; Yokoya, N.; Wang, Q.; Hofle, B.; Bruzzone, L.; Bovolo, F.; Chi, M.; Anders, K.; Gloaguen, R. Multisource and multitemporal data fusion in remote sensing: A comprehensive review of the state of the art. *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Magazine* 2019, 7, 6-39.
- 200. Xie, Y.; Xiong, X.; Qu, J.J.; Che, N.; Summers, M.E. Impact analysis of MODIS band-to-band registration on its measurements and science data products. *International journal of remote sensing* **2011**, *32*, 4431-4444.
- Xiong, X.; Che, N.; Barnes, W. Terra MODIS on-orbit spatial characterization and performance. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 2005, 43, 355-365.

- 202. Xie, Y.; Xiong, X.; Qu, J.J.; Che, N.; Wang, L. MODIS on-orbit spatial characterization results using ground measurements. In Proceedings of Earth Observing Systems XI; p. 62961L.
- 203. Choi, T.; Shao, X.; Cao, C. NOAA-20 Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite (VIIRS) on-Orbit Band-To-Band Registration Estimation for Reflective Solar Band (RSB) Using Scheduled Lunar Collections. In Proceedings of IGARSS 2019-2019 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium; pp. 9059-9062.
- Wang, Z.; Xiong, X.; Li, Y. Improved band-to-band registration characterization for VIIRS reflective solar bands based on lunar observations. *Remote Sensing* 2016, 8, 27.
- 205. Xiong, X.; Sun, J.; Xiong, S.; Barnes, W.L. Using the moon for MODIS onorbit spatial characterization. In Proceedings of Sensors, Systems, and Next-Generation Satellites VII; pp. 480-487.
- 206. Gruen, A. Development and status of image matching in photogrammetry. *The Photogrammetric Record* **2012**, *27*, 36-57.
- 207. Storey, J.; Choate, M.; Lee, K. Landsat 8 Operational Land Imager on-orbit geometric calibration and performance. *Remote sensing* **2014**, *6*, 11127-11152.
- 208. Lee, D.S.; Storey, J.C.; Choate, M.J.; Hayes, R.W. Four years of Landsat-7 on-orbit geometric calibration and performance. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* **2004**, *42*, 2786-2795.
- 209. Pratt, W.K. Correlation techniques of image registration. *IEEE transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems* **1974**, 353-358.
- 210. Li, H.; Manjunath, B.; Mitra, S.K. A contour-based approach to multisensor image registration. *IEEE transactions on image processing* **1995**, *4*, 320-334.
- 211. Tseng, Y.-H.; Tzen, J.-J.; Tang, K.-P.; Lin, S.-H. Image-to-image registration by matching area features using Fourier descriptors and neural networks. *Photogrammetric engineering and remote sensing* **1997**, *63*, 975-983.
- Gao, F.; Masek, J.G.; Wolfe, R.E. Automated registration and orthorectification package for Landsat and Landsat-like data processing. *Journal of Applied Remote Sensing* 2009, *3*, 033515.
- 213. USGS. Geometric Calibration Sites. Availabe online: https://calval.cr.usgs.gov/apps/usgs-eros-range (accessed on March 03).