

159904

Radiometric Correction Procedure Study

{NASA-CR-159904}	RADIOMETRIC CORRECTION	N79-15284
PROCEDURE STUDY	Final Report, Sep. 1977 -	
Jun. 1978 (IBM Federal Systems Div.)	159 p	
HC A08/MF A01	CSCI 14B	Unclas
		63/35 43203

RADIOMETRIC CORRECTION PROCEDURE STUDY

Final Report for Period September 1977 to June 1978

June 1978

Prepared for

**Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt, Maryland 20771**

by

**C P Colby, Jr.
R. L. Sands
S. W. Murphrey**

**Federal Systems Division
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760**

TECHNICAL REPORT STANDARD TITLE PAGE

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Radiometric Correction Procedure Study		5. Report Date June, 1978	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) C. Colby, R. Sands, S. Murphrey		8. Performing Organization Report No. FSD 78-0015	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address IBM Federal Systems Division Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760		10. Work Unit No.	
		11. Contract or Grant No. NAS 5-24276	
		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report Sept. 1977-June 1978	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Goddard Space Flight Center Greenbelt, Maryland 20771 Benard Peavey, Technical Officer		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes			
16. Abstract A comparison of MSS radiometric processing techniques identified as a preferred radiometric processing technique a procedure which equalizes the mean and standard deviation of detector-specific histograms of uncalibrated scene data. Evaluation of MSS calibration data demonstrated that the relationship between detector responses is essentially linear over the range of intensities typically observed in MSS data, and that the calibration wedge data possesses a high degree of temporal stability. An analysis of the preferred radiometric processing technique showed that it could be incorporated into the MDP-MSS system without a major redesign of the system, and with minimal impact on system throughput.			
17. Key Words (Selected by Author(s)) MSS Radiometric Equalization MSS Radiometric Calibration		18. Distribution Statement	
19. Security Classif. (of this report)	20. Security Classif. (of this page)	21. No. of Pages	22. Price*

*For sale by the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, Springfield, Virginia 22151.

APPROVAL

This final report for the Radiometric Correction Procedure Study has been reviewed and approved by the undersigned.

Charles P. Colby, Jr.
Project Engineer
IBM Federal Systems Division
Gaithersburg, Maryland

Ralph Bernstein
Senior Engineer
IBM Federal Systems Division
Gaithersburg, Maryland

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The technical group which performed the Radiometric Correction Procedure Study wishes to acknowledge with gratitude the financial and technical support provided by NASA-GSFC for this study. In particular the interest, encouragement and technical assistance provided by the Technical Officer for this contract, Bernard Peavey, is greatly appreciated.

NASA PAGE IS
POOR QUALITY

CONTENTS

FINAL PAGE IS
POOR QUALITY

Section		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	1-1
2	PROCESSING DESCRIPTION	2-1
2.1	Preprocessing	2-2
2.2	Radiometric Processing	2-2
2.2.1	IBM's Destripping Procedures	2-2
2.2.2	Modified MSS Calibration Procedures	2-3
3	EVALUATIONS OF PROCESSED IMAGES	3-1
3.1	Evaluation by Detector-Specific Histograms	3-3
3.2	Evaluation by Visual Inspection	3-12
3.3	Evaluation by Power Spectra Analysis	3-14
3.4	Evaluation by Multispectral Classification	3-30
3.5	Summary of Comparative Evaluation Results	3-33
4	EVALUATION OF MSS CALIBRATION DATA	4-1
4.1	Temporal Variation of Reported Calibration Wedge Values	4-2
4.2	Gain and Bias Coefficient Time Series	4-9
4.3	Interdetector Correlation Plots	4-75
4.4	Summary of Calibration Data Evaluation	4-91
5	INTERDETECTOR RESPONSE EQUALIZATION IN THE MDP	5-1
 Appendix		
A	IBM DESTRIPPING PROCEDURES	A-1
B	MSS CALIBRATION PROCEDURE	B-1
C	PLATES	C-1

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure		Page
3-1	Data Flow for Radiometric Processing Evaluations	3-2 3-2
3.1-1	Detector-specific Histograms for Uncalibrated Scene Data from MSS Band 1 After Type a1 Radiometric Processing	3-6
3.1-2	Detector Specific Histograms for Uncalibrated Scene Data from MSS Band 1 After Type a2 Radiometric Processing	3-7
3.1-3	Detector-specific Histograms for Uncalibrated Scene Data from MSS Band 1 After Type a3 Radiometric Processing	3-8
3.1-4	Detector-specific Histograms for Uncalibrated Scene Data from MSS Band 1 after Type 1b Radiometric Processing	3-9
3.1-5	Detector-specific Histograms for Uncalibrated Scene Data from MSS Band 1 after Type b2 Radiometric Processing	3-10
3.1-6	Detector-specific Histograms for Calibrated Scene Data from MSS Band 1 after Type a1 Radiometric Processing	3-11
3.3-1	Power Spectrum for High Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data	3-17
3.3-2	Power Spectrum for High Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a1 Processing	3-18
3.3-3	Power Spectrum for High Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a2 Processing	3-19
3.3-4	Power Spectrum for High Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a3 Processing	3-20

**ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY**

Figure		Page
3.3-5	Power Spectrum for Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data	3-21
3.3-6	Power Spectrum for Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a1 Processing	3-22
3.3-7	Power Spectrum for Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a2 Processing	3-23
3.3-8	Power Spectrum for Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a3 Processing	3-24
3.3-9	Power Spectrum for Smaller Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data	3-25
3.3-10	Power Spectrum for Smaller Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a1 Processing	3-26
3.3-11	Power Spectrum for Smaller Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a2 Processing	3-27
3.3-12	Power Spectrum for Smaller Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a3 Processing	3-28
3.4-1	Field Structure of the Hand County LACIE Intensive Study Site	3-34
4.1-1	Plot of Decompressed Calibration Wedge Data Values and their Standard Deviations for Detector 1, Band 1	4-3
4.1-2	Plot of Decompressed Calibration Wedge Data Values and their Standard Deviations for Detector 2, Band 1	4-4
4.1-3	Plot of Decompressed Calibration Wedge Data Values and their Standard Deviations for Detector 3, Band 1	4-5
4.1-4	Plot of Decompressed Calibration Wedge Data Values and their Standard Deviations for Detector 4, Band 1	4-6

Figure		Page
4.1-5	Plot of Decompressed Calibration Wedge Data Values and their Standard Deviations for Detector 5, Band 1	4-7
4.1-6	Plot of Decompressed Calibration Wedge Data Values and their Standard Deviations for Detector 6, Band 1	4-8
4.2-1	Time Series of Normalized Gain Values for Band 1, Detector 1	4-15
4.2-2	Time Series of Normalized Bias Values for Band 1, Detector 1	4-20
4.2-3	Time Series of Normalized Gain Values for Band 1, Detector 2	4-25
4.2-4	Time Series of Normalized Bias Values for Band 1, Detector 2	4-30
4.2-5	Time Series of Normalized Gain Values for Band 1, Detector 3	4-35
4.2-6	Time Series of Normalized Bias Values for Band 1, Detector 3	4-40
4.2-7	Time Series of Normalized Gain Values for Band 1, Detector 4	4-45
4.2-8	Time Series of Normalized Bias Values for Band 1, Detector 4	4-50
4.2-9	Time Series of Normalized Gain Values for Band 1, Detector 5	4-55
4.2-10	Time Series of Normalized Bias Values for Band 1, Detector 5	4-60
4.2-11	Time Series of Normalized Gain Values for Band 1, Detector 6	4-65
4.2-12	Time Series of Normalized Bias Values for Band 1, Detector 6	4-70

Figure		Page
4.3-1	Interdetector Correlation Plot for Corresponding Decomposed Calibration Wedge Samples and Their Standard Deviations, Detector 2 versus Detector 1, Band 1	4-80
4.3-2	Interdetector Correlation Plot for Corresponding Decomposed Calibration Wedge Samples and Their Standard Deviations, Detector 3 versus Detector 1, Band 1	4-79
4.3-3	Interdetector Correlation Plot for Corresponding Decomposed Calibration Wedge Samples and Their Standard Deviations, Detector 4 versus Detector 1, Band 1	4-80
4.3-4	Interdetector Correlation Plot for Corresponding Decomposed Calibration Wedge Samples and Their Standard Deviations, Detector 5 versus Detector 1, Band 1	4-81
4.3-5	Interdetector Correlation Plot for Corresponding Decomposed Calibration Wedge Samples and Their Standard Deviations, Detector 6 versus Detector 1, Band 1	4-82
4.3-6	Interdetector Functional Relationships for Detector 1 and Detector 2, Band 1	4-84
4.3-7	Interdetector Functional Relationships for Detector 1 and Detector 3, Band 1	4-85
4.3-8	Interdetector Functional Relationships for Detector 1 and Detector 4, Band 1	4-86
4.3-9	Interdetector Functional Relationships for Detector 1 and Detector 5, Band 1	4-87
4.3-10	Interdetector Functional Relationships for Detector 1 and Detector 6, Band 1	4-88

TABLES

Tables		Page
3.1-1	Chi-squared Values for Comparison of Detector-Specific Histograms	3-5
3.2-1	Results of Visual Evaluation of Radiometrically Processed Scene Data for Landsat MSS Scene 2183-16433, MSS Band 1	3-13
3.3-1	Relative (to Average Power) Power Spectrum Values for Restricted Low Frequency Image Region at Frequencies Corresponding to Striping	3-29
3.4-1	Results of Evaluation by Multispectral Classification	3-32
3.5-1	Summary of Evaluation Results (1 = Best)	3-35
4.2-1	Summary of Variations in Gain and Bias Coefficients	4-13
4.2-2	Variations of Calibration Function Coefficients	4-14
4.3-1	Positions in Calibration Wedge Data of Samples Represented in Interdetector Correlation Plots	4-76
4.3-2	Functional Interdetector Relationship for MSS Calibration Wedge Data	4-89

Section 1
INTRODUCTION

The objectives of this study were to provide both qualitative and quantitative comparisons of several radiometric processing procedures applied to MSS data, to assess the adequacy of present MSS calibration procedures, and to assess the impact of a modified MSS radiometric processing procedure on the throughput of the Master Data Processor.

The radiometric calibration currently performed by NASA on image data received from the Landsat Multispectral Scanner (MSS) is based on a linear radiometric transformation derived dynamically from six samples of the calibration wedge data provided by the MSS for each image line. This radiometric calibration procedure leaves a residual periodic variation in image radiometry which is termed striping. This radiometric variation, in addition to its impact on the visual quality of processed imagery, introduces a systematic radiometric error which may compromise the validity of results obtained by machine processing for information extraction.

Over the years, various techniques have been proposed to compensate MSS digital data for striping. These proposals have concentrated on techniques which characterize the response of individual MSS detectors by examining the image data reported by each, and equalize this response across the detectors of a spectral band. These techniques have been shown to provide considerable reduction in visible striping. They fail, however, to address the questions of why the calibration procedures employed are not effective in eliminating striping originally, and whether the calibration procedures can be modified to eliminate striping.

These questions could only be answered by studying the calibration procedures and the data available to perform the calibration. It was anticipated that investigation of the temporal stability of the complete set of calibration wedge data, together with interdetector comparisons of this data, would provide the information necessary to formulate a more effective MSS calibration procedure, thus eliminating these inter-detector variations as part of the calibration process.

Section 2
PROCESSING DESCRIPTION

The study was designed to empirically investigate both destriping procedures and the MSS calibration procedure, evaluating their effectiveness by both visual and quantitative procedures. It also considered the characteristics of MSS calibration wedge data in order to elucidate the temporal and interdetector effects which exist in this data.

The study consisted of the following tasks:

- a. Preprocessing of scene CCT to produce band separated images with associated calibration data
- b. Destriping processing and MSS calibration processing
- c. Visual evaluation of processing results
- d. Power spectrum analysis of processed image data
- e. Detector-specific image histogram generation
- f. Multispectral classification of agricultural areas in processed scene data
- g. Evaluation of MSS Calibration Data
- h. Evaluation of the impact on MDP throughput of the selected destriping procedure.

One Landsat scene, provided in both calibrated and uncalibrated form, was used in this study. This MSS scene, E-2183-16433, contains water, rural crop areas, and areas of high and low radiance. Both the radiometrically calibrated and radiometrically uncalibrated versions of this scene were processed and evaluated as described below.

2.1 PREPROCESSING

Each of the two versions (calibrated and uncalibrated) of the scene were reformatted to produce complete images of each of the four MSS bands, with the calibration data from the CCT provided for each MSS mirror sweep. These images were radiometrically adjusted to match the characteristics of the IBM Drum Scanner/Plotter, and recorded on photographic film, to permit inspection for data quality.

2.2 RADIOMETRIC PROCESSING

The radiometric processing techniques investigated in this study are outlined below.

2.2.1 IBM's Destriping Procedures

Type a1. Mean and standard deviation equalization based on the data from a single MSS mirror sweep (i.e., six contiguous lines of image data), with the resulting detector unique gain and bias radiometric compensations applied to the data from the subsequent mirror sweep.

Type a2. Mean and standard deviation histogram equalization based on the data from the first 60 mirror sweeps of the image (approximately 15% of the image data in an MSS frame), with the resulting detector unique gain and bias radiometric compensations applied to the data for the entire image.

Type a3. Mean and standard deviation histogram equalization based on the data from the first 195 mirror sweeps of the image (50% of the image data), with the resulting detector unique gain and bias radiometric compensations applied to the data for the entire image.

Details of this processing are presented in Appendix A.

2.2.2 Modified MSS Calibration Procedures

Type b1. The smoothed gain and offset values developed for the lines of the initial 98 mirror sweeps of a spectral image (approximately 25% of the image data) were averaged for each of the six detectors in a spectral band, and these six averaged gain and bias sets were used as the radiometric correction for the entire image. This smoothed gain and offset calibration employed the six calibration wedge values present in the CCT data for the scene.

Type b2. The smoothed gain and offset values developed for the lines of the entire spectral image (100%) were averaged for each of the six MSS detectors of that band, and these six averaged gain and bias sets were used as the radiometric correction for the entire image.

The algorithm used to calculate the smoothed gain and offset is presented in Appendix B.

Section 3
EVALUATIONS OF PROCESSED IMAGES

The comparative evaluations which were performed in this study of radiometric processing procedures are shown in Figure 3-1, together with the data processing required to generate products for comparison. These results of evaluations are discussed in the following subsections. All the evaluations except multispectral classification were performed on the scene data from MSS band 1 (0.5 to 0.6 micrometers), which exhibited the greatest visually apparent striping in photographic recordings of the unprocessed, uncalibrated scene data. The multispectral classification evaluation employed data from all four MSS bands.




Figure 3-1. Data Flow for Radiometric Processing Evaluations

3-2

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

3.1 EVALUATION BY DETECTOR-SPECIFIC HISTOGRAMS

A comparative evaluation among images of MSS band 1 was made using radiometrically uncalibrated data processed by the type a1, a2, and a3 destriping procedures and the type b1 and b2 MSS calibration procedures, and radiometrically calibrated data processed by the type a1 destriping procedure. The evaluation was made on the basis of histograms of the data reported from each of the six MSS detectors in each of the six radiometrically processed spectral images. Detector-specific and aggregate histograms of this data were generated, and the consistency of each individual detector histogram with the corresponding aggregate histogram was considered. These histograms are presented in Figures 3.1-1 through 3.1-6.

A conventional statistical approach to evaluating the goodness of fit between the aggregate histograms and their associated detector-specific histograms was used to test the hypothesis that the frequency distribution of pixel values for an individual detector is one sixth of the frequency distribution of pixel values over all detectors, using the statistic:

$$X_j^2 = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{N_{ji} - (N_i/6)}{(N_i/6)}$$

Where N_{j1} is the number of occurrences of pixel value i for detector j , and

N_1 is the number of occurrences of pixel value i for all detectors.


All of the calculated X_j^2 values for the histogram sets, as given in Table 3.1-1, greatly exceed the critical X^2 value at the 0.005 level of significance (i.e., there is less than a 0.5% probability that a random set of pixel values, taken from a population whose frequency distribution is given by the aggregate histogram, would show such poor agreement with

the aggregate histogram), forcing the conclusion that none of the processing techniques has achieved a completely satisfactory equalization across the detectors.

The calculated X_j^2 values do, however, provide a summary measure of the deviations of the distributions in each of the detector-specific histograms from the distribution in the corresponding aggregate histograms. By summing the X_j^2 values for the six detectors of a spectral image, an overall measure of these deviations is obtained which can be used to rank the performance of the various radiometric processing techniques. On this basis the best equalization of the detector histograms was obtained with the type a2 processing of the uncalibrated scene data.

Table 3.1-1. Chi-squared Values for Comparison of Detector-Specific Histograms

Radiometric Processing	Degrees of Freedom in χ^2	χ^2 Values						Sum of χ^2_j	$\chi^2_{0.005}$
		j = 1	j = 2	j = 3	j = 4	j = 5	j = 6		
Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a1 Processing	10	254587	1316226	375530	9126	39104	8929	2,003,503	25.2
Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a2 Processing	10	36392	50097	65716	47192	127396	52941	379,733	25.2
Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a3 Processing	10	35113	178514	41636	80355	102538	80897	519,054	25.2
Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type b1 Processing	17	487846	69935	174762	67419	92641	63042	955,646	35.7
Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type b2 Processing	17	488333	69918	175037	67403	92638	63020	956,348	35.7
Calibrated Scene Data after Type a1 Processing	19	130507	104505	259655	341799	417700	421118	1,675,284	38.6



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

PIXEL INTENSITY DISTRIBUTIONS: LANDSAT SCENE 2163-16433 BAND 4 UNCALIBRATED, UNSTRIPED (TYPE B)

PIXEL VALUE	DETECTOR 1 OF 6	DETECTOR 2 OF 6	DETECTOR 3 OF 6	DETECTOR 4 OF 6	DETECTOR 5 OF 6	DETECTOR 6 OF 6	AGGREGATE HISTOGRAM
2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	13	7	1	0	21
12	24	43	222	138	69	73	569
13	401	381	0	467	479	465	2193
14	819	697	594	839	959	877	4765
15	2552	2005	1227	2511	3681	2381	14457
16	21130	11844	5333	16542	0	16334	71183
17	0	70015	39271	84234	29769	84407	307696
18	95904	174287	129360	0	126730	0	526281
19	201116	0	231360	190986	248190	190455	1062107
20	277465	277061	292082	285941	315926	283354	1731829
21	288527	295794	253425	286439	258698	286529	1649412
22	188584	211774	154878	189752	0	197244	942232
23	103406	107200	74533	103000	146074	100132	634345
24	48014	54284	0	45487	66058	46740	260563
25	20682	21744	35067	20611	28766	19852	146722
26	9972	10245	15064	10005	11794	9526	66606
27	4498	4962	7634	5151	5419	0	27664
28	0	2568	3596	0	0	4614	10778
29	2313	0	1991	2529	2627	2264	11724
30	1343	1470	1152	1499	1417	1356	8237
31	719	888	693	988	738	754	4760
32	298	411	312	471	370	315	2177
33	155	212	130	220	169	203	1089
34	36	81	42	120	0	88	367
35	22	15	0	42	47	15	141
36	6	5	7	2	12	0	31
37	4	8	4	8	3	11	38
38	0	0	3	4	0	2	12
39	2	1	1	0	0	1	5
40	2	0	3	0	0	2	7
41	0	1	0	3	0	1	5
42	2	2	0	1	0	1	6
43	1	0	1	2	1	1	7
44	3	2	1	1	0	0	6
45	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
46	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Figure 3.1-2. Detector Specific Histograms for Uncalibrated Scene Data from MSS Band 1 after Type a2 Radiometric Processing

PIXEL INTENSITY DISTRIBUTIONS: LANDSAT SCENE 2163-164J3 BAND 4 UNCALIBRATED, UNSTRIPED (TYPE C)							
PIXEL VALUE	DETECTOR 1 OF 6	DETECTOR 2 OF 6	DETECTOR 3 OF 6	DETECTOR 4 OF 6	DETECTOR 5 OF 6	DETECTOR 6 OF 6	AGGREGATE HISTOGRAM
1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	13	7	1	0	21
12	24	43	222	138	69	73	569
13	401	381	594	467	479	465	2787
14	819	697	0	839	959	877	4191
15	2552	2005	1227	2511	3681	2381	14357
16	21130	11844	5333	16542	0	16334	71185
17	0	70015	39271	84234	0	84407	307696
18	95904	174287	129360	0	29769	0	526281
19	401116	277061	231360	190986	248190	190455	1339168
20	277465	0	292082	285941	315926	283354	1454768
21	268527	295794	253425	286439	258698	286529	1649412
22	188594	211774	154878	189752	0	197244	942232
23	103406	107200	74533	103000	146074	100132	634345
24	48014	54284	0	45487	66058	46740	260583
25	20652	21744	35067	20611	28766	19852	146722
26	9972	10246	15064	10005	11794	9526	66606
27	0	4962	7634	0	5419	0	18015
28	4498	0	3596	5151	0	4614	17859
29	2313	2568	1991	2529	2627	2264	14292
30	1343	1470	1152	1499	1417	1356	8237
31	719	888	693	988	738	754	4780
32	298	411	312	471	370	315	2177
33	155	212	130	220	169	203	1089
34	36	81	0	120	0	88	325
35	22	15	42	42	47	0	168
36	5	0	7	2	12	15	41
37	0	5	4	0	3	11	23
38	4	8	3	8	3	2	28
39	2	1	1	4	0	1	9
40	2	0	3	0	0	2	7
41	0	1	0	3	0	1	5
42	2	2	0	1	0	1	6
43	1	0	1	2	0	0	5
44	3	0	0	1	0	1	5
45	0	2	1	0	0	1	4
46	1	0	0	0	6	1	2
47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Figure 3.1-3. Detector-specific Histograms for Uncalibrated Scene Data from MSS Band 1 after Type a3 Radiometric Processing

FILE INTENSITY DISTRIBUTIONS: LANDSAT SCENE 2183-16433 BAND 4 UNCALIBRATED, UNSTRIPED (TYPE E)							
PIXEL VALUE	DETECTOR 1 OF 6	DETECTOR 2 OF 6	DETECTOR 3 OF 6	DETECTOR 4 OF 6	DETECTOR 5 OF 6	DETECTOR 6 OF 6	AGGREGATE HISTOGRAM
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	13	7	1	0	21
14	24	43	0	138	69	73	347
15	401	381	222	0	479	465	1948
16	819	0	598	467	0	0	1880
17	2552	657	1227	839	959	0	5536
18	21130	2005	5333	2511	3681	877	5615
19	95904	11844	39271	16542	29769	2381	22342
20	201116	70015	129360	84234	126730	16334	65850
21	277465	174267	231360	190586	248190	84407	223422
22	268527	277061	292082	285941	315926	190455	375433
23	168584	295794	253425	286439	258698	283354	65850
24	103406	211774	154872	189752	146074	286529	43362
25	48014	107260	74533	103000	66058	197244	375433
26	20680	54284	35067	45487	28766	100132	56041
27	9970	21744	15064	20611	11794	46740	174522
28	4498	10245	7634	10000	5419	19852	51271
29	2313	4962	3596	5151	0	9520	31771
30	1343	2558	1991	1499	2627	4614	24922
31	719	1470	1152	988	1417	2264	19482
32	298	888	693	471	738	0	10957
33	155	411	312	220	370	0	1991
34	36	212	130	120	169	315	6439
35	2	81	42	42	47	1356	4243
36	0	15	0	0	0	754	3483
37	0	0	0	0	0	0	2380
38	0	0	0	0	0	0	1883
39	0	0	0	0	0	0	726
40	0	0	0	0	0	0	980
41	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
42	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
43	0	0	0	0	0	0	415
44	0	0	0	0	0	0	514
45	0	0	0	0	0	0	514
46	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
47	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
48	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
49	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
50	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
51	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
52	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
53	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
54	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
55	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
56	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
57	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
58	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
59	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
60	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
61	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
62	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
63	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
64	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
65	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
66	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
67	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
68	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
69	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
70	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
71	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
72	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
73	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
74	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
75	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
76	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
77	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
78	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
79	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
80	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Figure 3.1-4. Detector-specific Histograms for Uncalibrated Scene Data from MSS Band 1 after Type b1 Radiometric Processing

PIXEL INTENSITY DISTRIBUTIONS:		LANDSAT SCENE 2163-16433				BAND4 CALIBRATED		COMPLETE IMAGE
PIXEL VALUE	DETECTOR 1 OF 6	DETECTOR 2 OF 6	DETECTOR 3 OF 6	DETECTOR 4 OF 6	DETECTOR 5 OF 6	DETECTOR 6 OF 6	AGGREGATE HISTOGRAM	
1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10	0	0	0	4	1	0	5	
11	0	10	13	85	21	9	138	
12	9	52	216	56	55	106	490	
13	139	362	574	194	462	423	2154	
14	538	0	22	448	10	60	1078	
15	1535	697	2	340	946	910	4430	
16	1575	2005	1197	647	1674	2144	9242	
17	0	11844	5250	4166	2392	2252	25904	
18	10098	42887	38747	14564	29128	21549	156973	
19	56427	27128	128405	5955	124994	77084	420003	
20	71828	0	1592	78269	2005	15199	168933	
21	133156	174287	3958	7132	56339	174510	549382	
22	196818	0	225836	191792	191851	4364	810461	
23	127488	277061	1566	278085	0	186436	870564	
24	162777	295794	289890	5223	312650	112853	1179187	
25	165750	0	254188	282480	268413	266976	1169887	
26	0	4505	1429	185488	1561	10801	285874	
27	141442	207269	144434	0	383	189812	683340	
28	129452	107200	10998	2176	145085	96474	491385	
29	21096	0	73979	100824	66483	199	262581	
30	0	54284	0	249	181	31423	86137	
31	40084	0	35007	45238	2105	15317	137751	
32	25208	20823	60	93	26601	910	73695	
33	3404	921	15038	20518	60	18901	58842	
34	3349	23	26	31	11730	576	15735	
35	6073	10222	131	9997	64	8927	35414	
36	550	6	7583	5128	48	64	13299	
37	3544	4966	6	10	5354	1422	15302	
38	954	2558	3590	2497	17	3341	12957	
39	148	7	1989	29	2614	2110	6897	
40	1680	668	2	229	1416	125	4120	
41	485	795	899	1263	14	1220	4676	
42	964	1	253	20	0	37	1275	
43	777	887	9	968	735	558	3934	
44	287	2	684	6	3	174	1156	
45	34	409	0	465	291	53	1252	
46	190	1	312	1	79	260	843	
47	108	131	0	219	0	46	504	
48	46	80	83	0	166	159	534	
49	97	0	47	120	3	0	267	
50	12	81	0	0	28	72	193	
51	25	0	42	37	19	14	137	
52	11	15	0	5	0	4	35	
53	0	0	7	0	12	13	32	
54	17	4	0	2	0	4	27	
55	5	1	1	1	2	7	17	
56	4	0	3	7	1	1	16	
57	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	
58	0	0	3	4	3	1	11	
59	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	
60	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	
61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
62	2	0	1	0	0	3	6	
63	0	0	2	3	0	0	5	
64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
65	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	
66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
67	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	
68	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	
69	1	0	0	1	1	0	3	
70	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	
71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
72	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	
73	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
74	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	
75	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	
76	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Figure 3.1-6. Detector-specific Histograms for Calibrated Scene Data from MSS Band 1 after Type a1 Radiometric Processing

3.2 EVALUATION BY VISUAL INSPECTION

A comparative evaluation among images of MSS Band 1 was made using radiometrically uncalibrated data processed by the type a1, a2, and a3 destriping procedures and the type b1 and b2 MSS calibration procedures. The method of evaluation was visual inspection of film recordings of the radiometrically processed images. The images were ranked on the basis of the visually apparent striping which they exhibited.

Photographic prints of the scene data used in this visual evaluation are presented as Plates 1 through 6. The actual evaluation was made from the negatives used to produce these prints, in order to avoid any variations which might be introduced in producing prints from the negatives, and to provide the best possible presentation of the data during evaluation. Negatives of image data for the five radiometrically processed versions of the scene for MSS band 1 (0.5 to 0.6 micrometers), together with a negative of the unprocessed, uncalibrated data, were arranged randomly in a two-wide by three-high array and uniformly illuminated from behind. Five experienced members of IBM's digital image processing group were then asked to rank the six images on the basis of the visually apparent striping.

The rankings which were obtained are presented in Table 3.2-1, together with an overall ranking obtained by summing the individual rankings. On the basis of this overall ranking, the type a2 processing of uncalibrated scene data is clearly preferred.

Table 3.2-1. Results of Visual Evaluation of Radiometrically Processed Scene Data for Landsat MSS Scene 2183 - 16433, MSS Band 1

Image Number	Image Description	Rankings Obtained*					Overall Ranking
		Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5	
1	Uncalibrated scene data, type b1 radiometric processing	1	2	4	3	3	13
2	Uncalibrated scene data, type a1 radiometric processing	1	5	5	2	1	14
3	Uncalibrated scene data, type b2 radiometric processing	1	1	1	5	5	13
4	Uncalibrated scene data, type a2 radiometric processing	1	3	2	1	2	9
5	Uncalibrated scene data, type a3 radiometric processing	1	4	3	4	4	16
6	Uncalibrated, unprocessed scene data	6	6	6	6	6	30

* 1 = best
6 = worst

3.3 EVALUATION BY POWER SPECTRA ANALYSIS

A comparative evaluation among images of one spectral band was made using radiometrically uncalibrated data processed by the type a1, a2, and a3 destriping procedures. The method of evaluation was power spectra comparison.

Power spectra for two 128-line by 50 sample subimages were generated for each of these radiometrically processed images. The subimages were chosen to provide power spectra of a low frequency and a high frequency region. Power spectra were taken only in the "along track" direction of the image, since the linear gain and offset radiometric transformations employed by the destriping and calibration procedures have known effects on the power spectra in the along scan direction. The specific subimages are identified in Plate 7, which is an overlay for Plates 1 through 6.

The power spectra obtained for this evaluation for regions in the uncalibrated scene data and in the three radiometrically processed scenes are presented in Figures 3.3-1 through 3.3-12. In these figures, the abscissa is the unnormalized squared value of the discrete Fourier coefficient, while the ordinate is the index of the coefficient, and ranges from 0 to the index corresponding to the folding frequency, which is 64 for the 128-line transforms used in this evaluation.

In engineering terms, the spacing between the Fourier components is:

$$\Delta F = \frac{1}{(128 \text{ lines})(80 \text{ meters})} = 9.766 \times 10^{-5} \text{ cycles/meter}$$

while the frequency range of the plotted spectra is:

$$F_f = 64(\Delta F) = 6.25 \times 10^{-3} \text{ cycles/meter.}$$

Components of the power spectra which correspond to striping would be expected to occur at intervals of:

$$F_{st} = \frac{1}{6 (80 \text{ meters})} = 2.083 \times 10^{-3} \text{ cycles/meter,}$$

corresponding to index values $i = n [(1/480)] / [(128)(80)]$ where n is an integer. For the frequency range of the plotted spectra, $i = 21.3$, 42.7 , and 64 .

In the power spectra of the high frequency region presented in Figures 3.3-1 through 3.3-4, there is only minimal evidence in the uncalibrated scene data of greater power concentration at those frequencies which would correspond to striping than at other points in the spectra, and there is less evidence of this effect for the processed data. The peak in spectral power which is seen at the folding frequency, in the absence of lower frequency striping-related harmonics, cannot justifiably be attributed to striping, since power at this frequency alone corresponds to a two-line periodicity rather than a six-line periodicity. In the power spectra of the low frequency region presented in Figures 3.3-5 through 3.3-8, the expected concentration of power at the frequencies corresponding to striping is evident, in the unprocessed data, as is the suppression of power at these frequencies which results from the three different types of radiometric processing.

A less complex power spectrum comparison of the striping in these images is provided by power spectra which were generated for a smaller (30 sample by 64 line) low frequency region contained entirely within the originally defined low frequency region and containing only image samples of the Missouri River. These spectra are presented as Figures 3.3-9 through 3.3-12. The simple power spectrum of this uniform-level subimage provides a background against which the power concentrations at the striping frequencies are much more apparent than they are for the power

spectra of Figures 3.3-1 through 3.3-8. For this smaller region, the Fourier coefficient indices calculated for the striping frequencies are 10.7, 21.3, and 32.0, and power concentrations are quite apparent near these values in Figure 3.3-9, the power spectrum obtained for the uncalibrated scent data.

A quantitative characterization of the power present at the striping frequencies for this small, low frequency subimage in the uncalibrated data and in the three processed data sets is presented in Table 3.3-1. In this table, the power levels at the striping frequencies are expressed in decibels above the average power level for the particular spectrum in order to normalize the data for this average, which differs among the source data sets. From this table, it is apparent that the type a3 radiometric processing is most effective in suppressing the power at the fundamental striping frequency, and the type a2 radiometric processing is marginally better than type a3 at suppressing the first harmonic. Both of these techniques considerably enhance the relative power present at the folding frequency. An exact explanation for this effect is unknown, but the detector-specific histograms presented in Figures 3.1-1, 3.1-2, and 3.1-3 suggest that the "forbidden" pixel values produced by these two radiometric processing techniques, which are different for each detector, result in an effective increase in the quantization noise present in the image. Since such an increase would be detector-related, it could appear in the power spectrum at the highest frequency, the folding frequency.

Overall, the type a3 radiometric processing provides the most effective combined suppression of the fundamental and first harmonics of striping, and is the most effective technique on this basis.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 3.3-1. Power Spectrum for High Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data




Figure 3.3-2. Power Spectrum for High Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a1 Processing





Figure 3.3-3. Power Spectrum for High Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a2 Processing



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 3.3-4. Power Spectrum for High Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a3 Processing





Figure 3.3-5. Power Spectrum for Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 3.3-6. Power Spectrum for Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type al Processing




Figure 3.3-7. Power Spectrum for Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a2 Processing




Figure 3.3-8. Power Spectrum for Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a3 Processing

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 3.3-9. Power Spectrum for Smaller Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data




Figure 3.3-10. Power Spectrum for Smaller Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a1 Processing

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 3.3-11. Power Spectrum for Smaller Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a2 Processing

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 3.3-12. Power Spectrum for Smaller Low Frequency Region in Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a3 Processing

Table 3.3-1. Relative (to Average Power) Power Spectrum Values for Restricted Low Frequency Image Region at Frequencies Corresponding to Striping

	Fundamental $f = 2.15 \times 10^{-3}$ cycles/meter $i = 11$	First Harmonic $f = 4.10 \times 10^{-3}$ cycles/meter $i = 21$	Second Harmonic $f = 6.25 \times 10^{-3}$ cycles/meter $i = 32$
Uncalibrated Scene Data	4.04 db	5.78 db	4.83 db
Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a1 Radiometric Processing	2.42 db	1.80 db	5.87 db
Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a2 Radiometric Processing	0.08 db	-0.08 db	10.17 db
Uncalibrated Scene Data after Type a3 Radiometric Processing	0.02 db	-0.09 db	10.25 db

3.4 EVALUATION BY MULTISPECTRAL CLASSIFICATION

A comparative evaluation by multispectral classification was performed between two multispectral image data sets, one produced by application of the type b1 MSS calibration procedures to the four bands of uncalibrated MSS data and the other produced by application of type a1 destriping procedure to the four bands of calibrated MSS data.

Each four-band data set was evaluated using a parallelepiped (limit) classifier. For each data set, a training field for each of two classes was selected based on the ground truth data. These training fields were used to determine the class limits. A test field for each of these classes was identified, and the four-vectors within each of these fields were classified against the class limits for the class.

This procedure was then repeated, exchanging the definition of training and testing fields.

Plate 7 is an overlay for Plate 5 which identifies the location in the image data sets of the Hand County LACIE Intensive Study Site 2, which contained the fields employed in this evaluation. Figure 3.4-1 is a diagram of the field structure in this site, and the specific fields employed (5, 50, 204, and 270) are identified on this diagram.

The results obtained in these classification experiments are presented in Table 3.4-1. In all cases, the Type a1 radiometric processing on calibrated scene data has produced image data for which a higher percentage of the field pixels are correctly classified than has the Type b1 radiometric processing on uncalibrated data. However, if the evaluation is based on the volume of the four space parallelepiped which characterizes the classes, a preferred radiometric processing cannot be identified, since for spring wheat this volume is smaller for the Type a1 processing of calibrated data, while for oats this volume is smaller for the Type b1 processing of uncalibrated data.

Because of conflicting conclusions which resulted from this experiment, and because of the lack of separation of the class regions in four-space which is evident in Table 3.4-1, no reliable conclusions can be drawn for this evaluation.


Table 3.4-1. Results of Evaluation by Multispectral Classification

Class	Field 1 ID	MSS Band	Class 4-Space Range (Counts)	Class Mean Vector (Counts)	No of Pixels	Field 2 ID	MSS Band	Class 4-Space Range (Counts)	Class Mean Vector (Counts)	No of Pixels	Radiometric Processing, Source Data	Percent of Pixels Correctly Classified	
												Field 1 = Training Field 2 = Test	Field 2 = Training Field 1 = Test
Mature Spring Wheat	204	1	6	23 5	42	270	1	11	26 0	30	Type a 1 Calibrated Data	13% 4 Pixels	71% 30 Pixels
		2	11	29 0			2	34	38 5				
		3	12	53 5			3	18	60 5				
		4	7	28 0			4	9	30 0				
		4-Space Volume 5544					4-Space Volume 60588						
Mature Spring Wheat	204	1	7	24 0	42	270	1	14	28 5	30	Type b 1 Uncalibrated Data	3 3% 1 Pixel	50% 21 Pixels
		2	11	29 0			2	32	44 5				
		3	11	55 0			3	19	62 0				
		4	7	28 0			4	11	31 0				
		4-Space Volume 5929					4-Space Volume 93622						
Mature Oats	5	1	13	27 0	37	50	1	11	26 0	24	Type a 1 Calibrated Data	83 3% 20 Pixels	67 6% 25 Pixels
		2	27	37 0			2	20	37 5				
		3	19	62 0			3	23	56 0				
		4	6	30 5			4	11	28 0				
		4-Space Volume 40014					4-Space Volume 55660						
Mature Oats	5	1	8	29 5	37	50	1	7	29 0	24	Type b 1 Uncalibrated Data	54 2% 13 Pixels	54 1% 20 Pixels
		2	14	44 5			2	10	42 5				
		3	12	65 5			3	18	60 5				
		4	6	31 5			4	10	28 5				
		4-Space Volume 8064					4-Space Volume 12600						

HAND COUNTY, SOUTH DAKOTA SITE 2

LACIE INTENSIVE STUDY SITE


TFSI SITE NO. 1 (LACIE 1977)



Photography Acquired June 1975

Approximate Scale 1:24,000

Land Use Data Collected
by the ASCS June 1975



Prepared by
FSO Cartographic Laboratory
Earth Observations Division
S & AD JSC/NASA
Houston, Texas, January 1976

Figure 3.4-1. Field Structure of the Hand County LACIE Intensive Study Site

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

3.5 SUMMARY OF COMPARATIVE EVALUATION RESULTS

The results obtained in the comparative evaluations of the radiometrically processed image data are summarized in Table 3.5-1. From this table, it is apparent that the Type a2 radiometric processing of uncalibrated scene data has provided the most satisfactory compensation for striping on an overall basis. Scene data produced by this technique was ranked first when evaluated both visually and by means of detector-specific histograms, and was ranked second when evaluated by power spectrum analysis.

Since the multispectral classification evaluation was performed for only the type b1 processing of uncalibrated data and the type a1 processing of calibrated data, the inconclusive results obtained from this evaluation do not compromise the identification of the type a2 processing of uncalibrated scene data as the best overall procedure. Had this evaluation identified a preferred processing technique, one could still not conclude that this processing technique was superior to the type a2 processing of uncalibrated scene data.

Table 3.5-1. Summary of Evaluation Results

(1 = best)

Evaluation Method	Uncalibrated Scene Data					Calibrated Scene Data
	Processing Type					a1
	a1	a2	a3	b1	b2	
Detector Specific Histograms	6	1	2	3	4	5
Power Spectrum	3	2	1	-	-	-
Multispectral Classification	inconclusive results					
Visual Evaluation	4	1	5	2	2	-

Section 4
EVALUATION OF MSS CALIBRATION DATA

The calibration wedge data for one MSS band was investigated to characterize its temporal stability, by detector, and the relationship between the calibration data for the various detectors. For this investigation, the full set of MSS band 1 calibration wedge data corresponding to the first 210 mirror sweeps of MSS scene E-2183-16433 was employed.

4.1 TEMPORAL VARIATION OF REPORTED CALIBRATION WEDGE VALUES

For each detector of MSS band 1, plots of the mean and root-mean-squared variation of 50 calibration wedge samples were generated. These plots statistically summarized the temporal variation of a larger number of these values than the six points employed for calibration. These plots are presented as Figures 4.1-1 through 4.1-6. On these plots, the abscissa is the decompressed calibration sample value, and the ordinate is the sample number, counting the first sample of calibration data as 1. For each calibration sample considered, the range of values it assumed is indicated by a string of asterisks, which show the limits of the mean sample value plus and minus the standard deviation. These plots show a stable but non-linear response characteristic over the region of the ordinate where the ordinate scale is linear. (Note that on both ends of the ordinate, the scale of the plot is compressed with respect to the central region. This was done in order to display calibration sample values over the full range of the wedge without producing an excessively large plot.) Over the low value range of the calibration data, and for all detectors, the calibration sample values are stable to within a standard deviation of plus or minus one count, and there is evident no characteristic which suggests that the calibration data is inadequate or inferior for any particular detector.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

Calibration
Sample
Number




Figure 4.1-1. Plot of Decompressed Calibration Wedge Data Values and their Standard Deviations for Detector 1, Band 1

4-4




Figure 4.1-2. Plot of Decompressed Calibration Wedge Data Values and their Standard Deviations for Detector 2, Band 1

5-7

Calibration
Sample
Number





Figure 4.1-3. Plot of Decompressed Calibration Wedge Data Values and their Standard Deviations for Detector 3, Band 1

Calibration
Sample
Number



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.1-4. Plot of Decompressed Calibration Wedge Data Values and their Standard Deviations for Detector 4, Band 1

4-7

Calibration
Sample
Number





Figure 4.1-5. Plot of Decompressed Calibration Wedge Data Values and their Standard Deviations for Detector 5, Band 1

8-7

Calibration
Sample
Number



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.1-6. Plot of Decompressed Calibration Wedge Data Values and their Standard Deviations for Detector 6, Band 1

4.2 GAIN AND BIAS COEFFICIENT TIME SERIES

The MSS calibration procedure was applied to the standard six points from the calibration wedge data, and the resulting time series of gain and bias coefficients was plotted. These plots are presented in Figures 4.2-1 through 4.2-12. In these plots, the scale of the abscissa is the same among all the individual gain plots and among all the individual bias plots, so that visual comparison among corresponding plots for different detectors is not deceptive.

For the gain coefficient plots, the plotted values have been normalized into the range 0 to 1, where 0 corresponds to an actual gain value of 95.52, and 1 corresponds to an actual gain value of 122.64. Thus, the quantization of the plotting for the abscissa is an interval of 0.27 in the value of the gain coefficient.

For the bias coefficient plots, a similar normalization has been employed. In this case, the minimum plot value of zero corresponds to a bias value of -47.670563, and the maximum plot value of 1 corresponds to a bias coefficient value of 52.329422. Thus, the quantization of the plotting on the abscissa is an interval of 1.00.

To provide an intuitive appreciation for the meaning of the fluctuations observed in these plots, the way in which the gain and bias coefficients are employed in radiometric calibration of MSS data must be considered.

The equation which is used to calibrate the data is:

$$V_c = \frac{KV_{Max}}{\Delta R} \left[\frac{V - p_a}{q b_s} - R_{Min} \right] - r$$

where the symbols are defined in Appendix B. This can be rewritten in the form:

$$V_c = GV + B$$

where

$$G = \left(\frac{K}{\Delta R} \right) \left(\frac{V_{Max}}{b_s} \right)$$

and

$$B = - \left\{ \left(\frac{K}{\Delta R} \right) \left(\frac{V_{Max} a_s}{b_s} \right) p + \left[\left(\frac{K V_{Max}}{\Delta R} \right) R_{Min} + r \right] \right\}$$

For the radiometric calibration implemented in the MDP for MSS band 1 (0.5 to 0.6 micrometers), the nominal values for the constants in these expressions are:

$$\frac{K}{\Delta R} = 1$$

$$p = 1$$

$$\left[\frac{K V_{Max}}{\Delta R} R_{Min} + r \right] = 0$$

$$V_{Max} = 127$$

Using these values for the constants in the calibration function, the expressions for G and B become:

$$G = \frac{127}{b_s}$$

$$B = - \frac{127}{b_s} a_s$$

Since we are using unsmoothed values for the gain and bias values in the present investigation, the subscript 's' will be dropped, yielding as the expression for the calibration function:

$$V_c = \frac{127}{b} (V - a)$$

The effect of the observed variations in the gain and bias coefficient values in the plots can be demonstrated by means of a Taylor series expansion of the calibration function about nominal coefficient values. The variation in the calibrated sample value is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta v_c &= -\left[\frac{127}{b^2} (v-a)\right] \Big|_{\substack{b=b_o \\ a=a_o}} - \frac{127}{b} \Big|_{b=b_o} \Delta a \\ &= -\frac{127}{b_o^2} (\Delta b)v + \frac{127}{b_o^2} [a_o \Delta b - b_o \Delta a] \\ &= (\Delta G)v + \Delta B \end{aligned}$$

where a_o and b_o are typical values for the MSS calibration coefficients and

$$\Delta G = -\frac{127}{b_o^2} (\Delta b)$$

and

$$\Delta B = \frac{127}{b_o^2} [a_o \Delta b - b_o \Delta a]$$

Table 4.2-1 presents a compilation of the maximum and minimum gain coefficient values observed in the gain coefficient plots, together with the corresponding bias coefficient values, typical coefficient values obtained by averaging the values from the plots, and deviations from the typical values obtained by taking one-half the difference of the values obtained from the plots. The effect of these typical values and the observed deviations is shown in Table 4.2-2, which presents the values of the coefficients of the calibration function and series expansion of the calibration function, taking into account the observed inverse relation between variations in the gain coefficient and variations in the bias coefficient.

Note that the variation in the additive constant is limited to approximately ± 1 , and this for the unsmoothed data. Thus, the variations in calibrated sample values attributable to this term in the calibration function are at most of this magnitude. The amount of variation in calibrated sample values attributable to the multiplicative factor depends on the value of the uncalibrated sample, but for a typical uncalibrated sample value of 20, is of the same magnitude as that due to the additive term.

Pairwise comparison of the gain plots (or bias plots) for the detectors (e.g., detector 1 against detector 5) reveals no apparent correlation in the variation of the coefficient values along the time series. If striping, which on close inspection exhibits a six-line periodicity and is therefore necessarily, even if non-causally, detector related, were attributable to a systematic, detector-related variation in the calibration function, one would expect to observe a consistency in these variations across detectors (e.g., the bias value for detector 1 varying in synchronization with that for detector 5).

Thus, while there exist fluctuations in the calibration coefficient values which are of sufficient magnitude to produce a striping effect, these variations do not have the interdetector correlation which would be necessary to identify inadequate radiometric calibration processing procedures as the cause of the striping of MSS images.

Table 4.2-1. Summary of Variations in Gain and Bias Coefficients
Obtained with Mss Calibration Procedure

Detector	Minimum Gain	Bias	Record	Maximum Gain	Bias	Record	Gain		Bias	
							Typical b_0	Deviation from Typical Δb	Typical a_0	Deviation from Typical Δa
1	95.51874	1.72894	123	102.64764	0.76947	115	99.08	+3.56	1.25	+0.48
2	104.12521	3.38972	8	114.47604	2.86726	71	109.30	+5.18	3.13	+0.26
3	104.42088	2.57248	37	112.57640	0.98093	47	108.50	+4.08	1.78	+0.80
4	112.91699	3.32911	127	122.64281	1.55055	49	117.78	+4.86	2.44	+0.89
5	97.20721	4.04221	146	105.33539	2.26438	205	101.27	+4.06	3.15	+0.89
6	106.34644	2.89016	40	114.60645	1.52419	197	110.48	+4.13	2.21	+0.68

Table 4.2-2. Variations of Calibration Function Coefficients

Detector	MSS Calibration Coefficient Values				Calibration Function Coefficients			
	Gain		Bias		Gain		Bias	
	Typical Value b_o	Deviation from Typical Δb	Typical Value a_o	Deviation from Typical Δa	Typical Value G	Deviation from Typical ΔG	Typical Value B	Deviation from Typical ΔB
1	99.08	± 3.56	1.25	∓ 0.48	1.282	$\mp 4.60 \times 10^{-2}$	-1.602	± 0.673
2	109.30	± 5.18	3.13	∓ 0.26	1.162	$\mp 5.51 \times 10^{-2}$	-3.637	± 0.474
3	108.50	± 4.08	1.78	∓ 0.80	1.170	$\mp 4.40 \times 10^{-2}$	-2.084	± 1.014
4	117.78	± 4.86	2.44	∓ 0.89	1.078	$\mp 4.50 \times 10^{-2}$	-2.631	± 1.068
5	101.27	± 4.06	3.15	∓ 0.89	1.254	$\mp 5.03 \times 10^{-2}$	-3.950	± 1.274
6	110.48	± 4.13	2.21	∓ 0.68	1.150	$\mp 4.30 \times 10^{-2}$	-2.540	± 0.877


$$G = + \frac{127}{b_o}$$

$$B = - \frac{127}{b_o} a_o$$

$$\Delta G = -\Delta b \frac{127}{b_o^2}$$

$$\Delta B = \frac{127}{b_o^2} [a_o \Delta b - b_o \Delta a]$$

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 1
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723




4-15

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-1 (Sheet 1 of 5)


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 1
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO "MAXIMUM" GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



91-7

Figure 4.2-1 (Sheet 2 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 1
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



4-17

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-1 (Sheet 3 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 1
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723




Figure 4.2-1 (Sheet 4 of 5)

4-19

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 1
NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723





Figure 4.2-1 (Sheet 5 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 1
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



4-20

Figure 4.2-2 (Sheet 1 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 1
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-2 (Sheet 2 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 1
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563





Figure 4.2-2 (Sheet 3 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 1
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-2 (Sheet 4 of 5)


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAWD 1, DETECTOR 1
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563

RECORD NUMBER	0	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.40	0.50	0.60	0.70	0.80	0.90	1.00	BIAS
201						*						0.95624
202						*						0.95624
203						*						1.22797
204						*						1.22797
205						*						1.07513
206						*						1.07513
207						*						1.26972
208						*						1.26972
209						*						0.81781
210						*						0.81781

4-24

Figure 4.2-2 (Sheet 5 of 5)


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 2
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-3 (Sheet 1 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 2
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723




4-26

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-3 (Sheet 2 of 5)


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 2
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



4-27

Figure 4.2-3 (Sheet 3 of 5)


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 2
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



4-28

Figure 4.2-3 (Sheet 4 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 2
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723




4-29

Figure 4.2-3 (Sheet 5 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAPER IS
 OF POOR QUALITY


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 2
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



4-30

Figure 4.2-4 (Sheet 1 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 2
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



4-31

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-4 (Sheet 2 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 2
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563

RECORD NUMBER	0	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.40	0.50	0.60	0.70	0.80	0.90	1.00	BIAS
101	*					*						1.89289
102	*					*						1.89289
103	*					*						1.73152
104	*					*						1.73152
105	*					*						2.07893
106	*					*						2.07893
107	*					*						2.40510
108	*					*						2.40510
109	*					*						2.58747
110	*					*						2.58747
111	*					*						2.02278
112	*					*						2.02278
113	*					*						2.54255
114	*					*						2.54255
115	*					*						1.73152
116	*					*						1.73152
117	*					*						2.21907
118	*					*						2.21907
119	*					*						2.86872
120	*					*						2.86872
121	*					*						2.07893
122	*					*						2.07893
123	*					*						2.25251
124	*					*						2.25251
125	*					*						1.55793
126	*					*						1.55793
127	*					*						2.41389
128	*					*						2.41389
129	*					*						1.89289
130	*					*						1.89289
131	*					*						1.63240
132	*					*						1.63240
133	*					*						2.54255
134	*					*						2.54255
135	*					*						1.87019
136	*					*						1.87019
137	*					*						2.69367
138	*					*						2.69367
139	*					*						2.36897
140	*					*						2.36897
141	*					*						1.73152
142	*					*						1.73152
143	*					*						2.21907
144	*					*						2.21907
145	*					*						1.55793
146	*					*						1.55793
147	*					*						1.73152
148	*					*						1.73152
149	*					*						1.73152
150	*					*						1.73152

4-32

Figure 4.2-4 (Sheet 3 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 2
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563


RECORD NUMBER	0	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.40	0.50	0.60	0.70	0.80	0.90	1.00	BIAS
151	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.02278
152	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.02278
153	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.06648
154	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.06648
155	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.87019
156	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.87019
157	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.89289
158	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.89289
159	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.74006
160	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.74006
161	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.06648
162	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.06648
163	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.41389
164	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.41389
165	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.88410
166	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.88410
167	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.33747
168	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.33747
169	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.67243
170	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.67243
171	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.89289
172	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.89289
173	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.39265
174	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	3.39265
175	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	3.40510
176	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	3.40510
177	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.21907
178	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.21907
179	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.53376
180	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.53376
181	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.54255
182	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.54255
183	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.55793
184	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.55793
185	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.06648
186	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.06648
187	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.21907
188	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.21907
189	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.58747
190	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.58747
191	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.89289
192	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.89289
193	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.06648
194	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.06648
195	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.57868
196	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.57868
197	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.36897
198	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.36897
199	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.08918
200	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.08918

4-33

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-4 (Sheet 4 of 5)


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 2
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



4-34

Figure 4.2-4 (Sheet 5 of 5)


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 3
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-5 (Sheet 1 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 3
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723




4-36

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-5 (Sheet 2 of 5)


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 3
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



4-37

Figure 4.2-5 (Sheet 3 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 3
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



4-38

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-5 (Sheet 4 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 3
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723

RECORD NUMBER	0	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.40	0.50	0.60	0.70	0.80	0.90	1.00	GAIN
201						*						109.76097
202						*						109.76097
203							*					111.92235
204							*					111.92235
205						*						109.98973
206						*						109.98973
207							*					111.49706
208							*					111.49706
209					*							105.07494
210					*							105.07494

4-39

Figure 4.2-5 (Sheet 5 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 3
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563


RECORD NUMBER	0	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.40	0.50	0.60	0.70	0.80	0.90	1.00	BIAS
1						*						1.58738
2						*						1.58738
3						*						1.58738
4						*						1.58738
5						*						1.26780
6						*						1.26730
7						*						1.91062
8						*						1.91062
9						*						1.58738
10						*						1.58738
11						*						1.64280
12						*						1.64280
13						*						1.87424
14						*						1.87424
15						*						1.58738
16						*						1.58738
17						*						1.00925
18						*						1.00925
19						*						2.62546
20						*						2.62546
21						*						1.92722
22						*						1.92722
23						*						1.67112
24						*						1.67112
25						*						2.11374
26						*						2.11374
27						*						2.05417
28						*						2.05417
29						*						1.21238
30						*						1.21238
31						*						1.85705
32						*						1.85705
33						*						1.38425
34						*						1.38425
35						*						2.28562
36						*						2.28562
37						*						2.57248
38						*						2.57248
39						*						1.58738
40						*						1.58738
41						*						1.58738
42						*						1.58738
43						*						2.28562
44						*						2.28562
45						*						1.92722
46						*						1.92722
47						*						0.98809
48						*						0.98809
49						*						1.87424
50						*						1.87424

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

07-7

Figure 4.2-6 (Sheet 1 of 5)


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 3
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



17-7

Figure 4.2-6 (Sheet 2 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 3
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



4-42

Figure 4.2-6 (Sheet 3 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 3
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563

RECORD NUMBER	0	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.40	0.50	0.60	0.70	0.80	0.90	1.00	BIAS
151	*					*						1.58738
152	*					*						1.58738
153	*					*						1.38425
154	*					*						1.38425
155	*					*						2.21409
156	*					*						2.21409
157	*					*						2.21409
158	*					*						2.21409
159	*					*						1.21238
160	*					*						1.21238
161	*					*						1.58738
162	*					*						1.58738
163	*					*						2.28562
164	*					*						2.28562
165	*					*						1.69578
166	*					*						1.69578
167	*					*						1.43967
168	*					*						1.43967
169	*					*						1.58738
170	*					*						1.58738
171	*					*						1.58738
172	*					*						1.58738
173	*					*						2.19748
174	*					*						2.19748
175	*					*						1.92722
176	*					*						1.92722
177	*					*						1.58738
178	*					*						1.58738
179	*					*						1.92722
180	*					*						1.92722
181	*					*						1.77952
182	*					*						1.77952
183	*					*						1.91062
184	*					*						1.91062
185	*					*						1.49924
186	*					*						1.49924
187	*					*						1.58738
188	*					*						1.58738
189	*					*						2.53733
190	*					*						2.53733
191	*					*						0.98093
192	*					*						0.98093
193	*					*						2.28562
194	*					*						2.28562
195	*					*						1.21238
196	*					*						1.21238
197	*					*						2.34104
198	*					*						2.34104
199	*					*						1.26780
200	*					*						1.26780

4-4

Figure 4.2-6 (Sheet 4 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 3
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563




47-4

Figure 4.2-6 (Sheet 5 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 4
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723




4-45

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-7 (Sheet 1 of 5)


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 4
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



97-7

Figure 4.2-7 (Sheet 2 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 4
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723




4-47

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-7 (Sheet 3 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 4
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



87-7

[Handwritten signature]

Figure 4.2-7 (Sheet 4 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 4
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723


RECORD NUMBER	0	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.40	0.50	0.60	0.70	0.80	0.90	1.00	GAIN
201									*			117.02147
202									*			117.02147
203										*		118.04930
204									*	*		118.04930
205									*	*		118.04930
206									*	*		118.04930
207										*		119.90688
208										*		119.90688
209									*	*		118.04930
210									*	*		118.04930

4-49

Figure 4.2-7 (Sheet 5 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 4
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



4-50

Figure 4.2-8 (Sheet 1 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 4
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



4-51

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4.2-8 (Sheet 2 of 5)


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 4
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563

RECORD NUMBER	0	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.40	0.50	0.60	0.70	0.80	0.90	1.00	BIAS
101	*					*						1.91725
102	*					*						1.91725
103	*					*						1.91725
104	*					*						1.91725
105	*					*						1.91725
106	*					*						1.91725
107	*					*						1.91725
108	*					*						1.91725
109	*					*						2.01539
110	*					*						2.01539
111	*					*						2.01539
112	*					*						2.01539
113	*					*						2.62257
114	*					*						2.62257
115	*					*						2.95997
116	*					*						2.95997
117	*					*						2.29103
118	*					*						2.29103
119	*					*						2.49049
120	*					*						2.49049
121	*					*						1.91725
122	*					*						1.91725
123	*					*						2.49049
124	*					*						2.49049
125	*					*						1.91725
126	*					*						1.91725
127	*					*						3.32911
128	*					*						3.32911
129	*					*						2.01539
130	*					*						2.01539
131	*					*						1.68141
132	*					*						1.68141
133	*					*						1.91725
134	*					*						1.91725
135	*					*						2.29103
136	*					*						2.29103
137	*					*						1.91725
138	*					*						1.91725
139	*					*						1.68141
140	*					*						1.68141
141	*					*						1.91725
142	*					*						1.91725
143	*					*						1.91725
144	*					*						1.91725
145	*					*						1.68141
146	*					*						1.68141
147	*					*						1.68141
148	*					*						2.05519
149	*					*						2.05519
150	*					*						1.63062

4-52

Figure 4.2-8 (Sheet 3 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 4
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



4-53

Figure 4.2-8 (Sheet 4 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 4
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563

RECORD NUMBER	0	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.40	0.50	0.60	0.70	0.80	0.90	1.00	BIAS
201						*						2.29103
202						*						2.29103
203						*						1.91725
204						*						1.91725
205						*						1.91725
206						*						1.91725
207						*						2.01539
208						*						2.01539
209						*						1.91725
210						*						1.91725

45-7

Figure 4.2-8 (Sheet 5 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 5
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723




4-55

Figure 4.2-9 (Sheet 1 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 5
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



95-4

Figure 4.2-9 (Sheet 2 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 5
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723




4-57

Figure 4.2-9 (Sheet 3 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 5
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



4-58

Figure 4.2-9 (Sheet 4 of 5)

65-7





Figure 4.2-9 (Sheet 5 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 5
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



09-7

Figure 4.2-10 (Sheet 1 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 5
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563




19-4

Figure 4.2-10 (Sheet 2 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 5
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



4-62

Figure 4.2-10 (Sheet 3 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 5
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563




4-63

Figure 4.2-10 (Sheet 4 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 5
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



79-7

Figure 4.2-10 (Sheet 5 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 6
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723




4-65

Figure 4.2-11 (Sheet 1 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUPS FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 6
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



99-7

Figure 4.2-11 (Sheet 2 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 6
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.642792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723




4-67

Figure 4.2-11 (Sheet 3 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED GAIN VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 6
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 122.682792 AND MINIMUM GAIN VALUE OF 95.518723



89-7

Figure 4.2-11 (Sheet 4 of 5)

69-4





Figure 4.2-11 (Sheet 5 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 6
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329822 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



4-70

Figure 4.2-12 (Sheet 1 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 6
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



4-71

Figure 4.2-12 (Sheet 2 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY


TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 6
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563

RECORD NUMBER	0	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.40	0.50	0.60	0.70	0.80	0.90	1.00	BIAS
101	*					*						1.45461
102	*					*						1.45461
103	*					*						1.27858
104	*					*						1.27858
105	*					*						1.65139
106	*					*						1.65139
107	*					*						2.19118
108	*					*						2.19118
109	*					*						1.26857
110	*					*						1.26857
111	*					*						2.09963
112	*					*						2.09963
113	*					*						2.09963
114	*					*						1.79152
115	*					*						1.79152
116	*					*						1.46535
117	*					*						1.46535
118	*					*						1.46535
119	*					*						0.96047
120	*					*						0.96047
121	*					*						1.95949
122	*					*						1.95949
123	*					*						2.28566
124	*					*						2.28566
125	*					*						2.32228
126	*					*						2.32228
127	*					*						0.82033
128	*					*						0.82033
129	*					*						2.09963
130	*					*						2.09963
131	*					*						1.45461
132	*					*						1.45461
133	*					*						1.77340
134	*					*						1.77340
135	*					*						1.58669
136	*					*						1.58669
137	*					*						2.07717
138	*					*						2.07717
139	*					*						2.06984
140	*					*						2.06984
141	*					*						1.99758
142	*					*						1.99758
143	*					*						2.37795
144	*					*						2.37795
145	*					*						1.77340
146	*					*						1.77340
147	*					*						1.46535
148	*					*						1.46535
149	*					*						1.26857
150	*					*						1.26857

4-72

Figure 4.2-12 (Sheet 3 of 5)

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 6
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563




4-73

Figure 4.2-12 (Sheet 4 of 5)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
 OF POOR QUALITY

TIME SERIES OF NORMALIZED BIAS VALUES FOR BAND 1, DETECTOR 6
 NORMALIZED WITH RESPECT TO MAXIMUM BIAS VALUE OF 52.329422 AND MINIMUM BIAS VALUE OF -47.670563



4-74

Figure 4.2-12 (Sheet 5 of 5)

4.3 INTERDETECTOR CORRELATION PLOTS

Interdetector correlation plots of the means and root-mean-squared variation for 50 calibration wedge values were generated in order to display the relative radiometric characteristics of the six detectors and to evaluate the adequacy of the present linear MSS calibration procedure, as well as that of the various linear striping removal procedures. These plots use sample position within the calibration wedge to identify corresponding detector response samples. To the extent that the calibration radiances presented to each detector at corresponding sample positions are the same, the plots present the relationship which exists between the responses of the detector pairs. These plots are presented as Figures 4.3-1 through 4.3-5. A list of the sample positions in the calibration wedge data used to provide data for the plots is given in Table 4.3-1. Position 1 is the first sample of the calibration wedge data.

These plots are essentially two-dimensional histograms where the abscissa scale consists of radiometric values for the reference detector (detector 1), and the ordinate scale consists of radiometric values for detector n ($n = 2,3,4,5,6$). In constructing this plot, the mean value of calibration wedge sample k of detector 1, \bar{i}_{1k} , and the mean value of calibration sample k of detector n , \bar{i}_{nk} , plus and minus the corresponding standard deviations about these means, s_{1k} and s_{nk} , are used to specify a region of the plot array, and the counts in the array elements within this region are incremented by 1. The numbers in the interdetector correlation plots are counts thus accumulated. This sort of plot provides a graphic representation of the functional relationship between the radiometric response characteristics of the separate MSS detectors (e.g., for two detectors viewing a set of equal radiances, if the relationship between the radiometric responses of the two detectors is linear, the plot will be a straight line; if the responses of the two detectors are the same, the line will have unity slope and zero intercept).

Table 4.3-1. Positions in Calibration Wedge Data of Samples
Represented in Interdetector Correlation Plots

160	380	530	680
180	390	540	690
200	400	550	700
220	410	560	710
240	420	570	720
260	430	580	730
280	440	590	750
300	450	600	770
310	460	610	790
320	470	620	810
330	480	630	830
340	490	640	850
350	500	650	870
360	510	660	890
370	520	670	910

All five of these plots show a relationship between detector responses which is essentially linear over the range from 0 to 80 along the reference detector axis, with a minor departure from this linearity from 80 to 110 for all detectors. Detectors 4 and 5 exhibit the most severe departures from a linear relationship, this amounting to 3 counts displacement from a linear trend at a reference detector value of 110.

In order to provide a quantitative comparison of the functional relationship among the six detectors the slopes, $p_n = \Delta i_n / \Delta i$, and intercepts, q_n , for each of the correlation plots over the linear region, from 0 to 80 with respect to detector 1, were calculated for straight lines manually laid on the plots. These slopes are presented in Table 4.3-2. Also presented in this table are corresponding slope and intercept values calculated from the typical gain and bias values (B and G) given in Table 4.2-2, which were obtained from the gain plots of the standard MSS calibration coefficients. To calculate these latter slope and intercept values, the linear calibration functions for detector 1 and detector n

$$\sigma_1 = g_1 i_1 + b_1$$

and
$$\sigma_n = g_n i_n + b_n$$

where σ_i is a calibrated sample value
 i_1 is an uncalibrated sample value
 g_i is the gain coefficient G for detector i
 b_i is the bias coefficient B for detector i

are used. Note that the calibration processing for a detector is performed so that, for a given incident detector excitation, r, the calibrated

Table 4.3-2. Functional Interdetector Relationship
for MSS Calibration Wedge Data

Detectors	Functional Interdetector Relationship $i_n = p_n i_n + q_n$		Interdetector Relationship from MSS Calibration $i_n = p'_n i_n + q'_n$	
	p_n	q_n	p'_n	q'_n
1 vs 2	0.9866	0.0	1.1033	1.7513
1 vs 3	1.1059	1.1	1.0957	0.4120
1 vs 4	1.1586	0.9	1.1892	0.9545
1 vs 5	0.9794	1.0	1.0223	1.8724
1 vs 6	1.1055	1.5	1.1148	0.8156

sample value is independent of the detector. Therefore, it should be the case that:

$$\sigma_1 = g_1 i_1 (r) + b_1 = \sigma$$

and
$$\sigma_n = g_n i_n (r) + b_n = \sigma$$

Thus independent of the incident detector excitation and calibrated sample value

$$g_n i_n + b_n = g_1 i_1 + b_1$$

or
$$i_n = \frac{g_1}{g_n} i_1 + \frac{b_1 - b_n}{g_n} = p'_n i_1 + q'_n$$

Using the typical values established for the calibration function gain and bias for as g_i and b_i , the slope and intercept of the interdetector relationship can be calculated.

Figures 4.3-6 through 4.3-10 are plots of the lines whose slopes and intercepts are given in Table 4.2-2, comparing the interdetector relationship obtained from the calibration data with that obtained from the MSS calibration procedure. In these plots, the solid line presents the interdetector relationship established on the basis of the correlation plots, of calibration data, while the dashed line presents the interdetector relationship which MSS calibration processing anticipates. As can be seen from these plots, there is substantial agreement between the two different interdetector relationships for detectors 3, 4, and 6, while for detectors 2 and 5 the MSS calibration relationship anticipates a different relationship from that expected on the basis of the calibration data.

It is tempting to identify the discrepancy observed for detectors 2 and 5 as the cause of the observed striping. However, visual inspection of

the data in the smaller, low frequency region employed in the power spectrum analysis reveals that the striping evident in the data set produced by using the MSS calibration procedure on the calibration data for a full scene of uncalibrated data (type b2 radiometric processing) consists of an apparent discrepancy in the radiometric data values of detectors 1 and 3 (approximately level 19) with respect to detectors 2, 4, 5, and 6 (approximately level 21). This observation is inconsistent with the hypothesis that a faulty calibration procedure is the cause of striping in data from detectors 2 and 5.

The foregoing analysis indicates that while the MSS calibration procedure does not produce a completely accurate characterization of the relationships among the MSS detectors, as represented by the calibration data reported for the detectors, the phenomenon of striping cannot be attributed to such inaccuracies. It must also be noted that the validity of this analysis depends critically on the assumption that the calibration wedge data used to establish the interdetector relationships represents the response of the detector pairs to the same set of radiances. If the calibration lamps are not uniform, or the neutral density filter used to generate the wedge is not uniform across the detectors, then the interdetector plots would need to be compensated for any such non-uniformity before valid conclusions could be drawn.

Detector 1




Figure 4.3-1. Interdetector Correlation Plot for Corresponding Decompressed Calibration Wedge Samples and their Standard Deviations, Detector 2 versus Detector 1, Band 1

Detector 1




Figure 4.3-2. Interdetector Correlation Plot for Corresponding Decompressed Calibration Wedge Samples and their Standard Deviations, Detector 3 versus Detector 1, Band 1

Detector 1




Figure 4.3-3. Interdetector Correlation Plot for Corresponding Decompressed Calibration Wedge Samples and their Standard Deviations, Detector 4 versus Detector 1, Band 1

Detector 1




Figure 4.3-4. Interdetector Correlation Plot for Corresponding Decompressed Calibration Wedge Samples and their Standard Deviations, Detector 5 versus Detector 1, Band 1




Figure 4.3-5. Interdetector Correlation Plot for Corresponding Decompressed Calibration Wedge Samples and their Standard Deviations, Detector 6 versus Detector 1, Band 1




Figure 4.3-6. Interdetector Functional Relationships for Detector 1 and Detector 2, Band 1




Figure 4.3-7. Interdetector Functional Relationships for Detector 1 and Detector 3, Band 1




Figure 4.3-8. Interdetector Functional Relationships for Detector 1 and Detector 4, Band 1




Figure 4.3-9. Interdetector Functional Relationships for Detector 1 and Detector 5, Band 1




Figure 4.3-10. Interdetector Functional Relationships for Detector 1 and Detector 6, Band 1

4.4 SUMMARY OF CALIBRATION DATA EVALUATION

The analyses of the MSS calibration wedge data support the following

4.4 SUMMARY OF CALIBRATION DATA EVALUATION

The analyses of the MSS calibration wedge data support the following conclusions:

- a. Calibration wedge sample values are stable to within ± 1 count (rms) for a given sample position in the reported data.
- b. Variation in the bias adjustment in radiometric calibration of MSS detectors is at most ± 1 count for unsmoothed calibration constants.
- c. Variation in the gain adjustment in radiometric calibration of MSS data is approximately ± 1 part in 20 for unsmoothed calibration constants.
- d. There is no evidence of any correlation in the fluctuation of the calibration constants which would indicate this as the cause of striping.
- e. The relationship between the response characteristics of any pair of MSS detectors, as a function of calibration wedge sample position, is linear over a wide dynamic range. This implies that linear radiometric transformations should be adequate to remove striping by equalizing the effective radiometric responses of the individual detectors in a given spectral band, unless, improbably, this linearity results from the cancellation of detector non-linearities by calibration wedge non-linearities.

- f. Correlation plots of MSS calibration data reveal some inconsistencies between the linear interdetector relationship derived from the calibration data and that derived from the MSS calibration procedure. However, these inconsistencies cannot be identified as the cause of striping.

The analyses of calibration wedge data have failed to establish any causal link between MSS calibration procedures and the phenomenon of striping. One additional item worthy of investigation which could not be pursued in this study is the effect of applying the radiometric calibration developed from the MSS calibration procedure to the calibration wedge data itself. This study has already established that linear relationships exist among the radiometric responses of the MSS detectors as represented by the calibration data. If the MSS calibration procedure is adequate within the limits of the calibration data, and if the assumption is valid that, for all detectors, the same correspondence exists between calibration wedge sample number and radiance incident on the detector, then striping should be absent from the calibrated calibration data, and it would thus be firmly established that the cause of striping is not faulty calibration processing.

By concentrating on use of the calibration wedge data, one has a set of detector excitations whose properties uniquely suit them to analysis of interdetector variations. Histogram shapes can reasonably be expected to be consistent without making assumptions regarding the statistical nature of image data. Along-track power spectra for different sample positions in the calibration wedge would differ primarily in the zero-frequency term, thus facilitating the identification of detector related, periodic, variations in response. With calibration wedge data, the along-track extent of the data sample used to produce a power spectrum is not limited by the size of imaged features, so that a finer frequency

resolution can be obtained. Finally, visual evaluation of the effectiveness of a radiometric processing techniques is performed for a standard pattern, so that this form of evaluation is not complicated by evaluator biases in selecting a particular section of the image on which to base a decision.

Section 5
INTERDETECTOR RESPONSE EQUALIZATION IN THE MDP

Analysis of the throughput reduction and microcode changes required to implement the selected destriping procedure in the MDP was performed. The results of this analysis are presented here.

The results presented in Section 3 of this report identified the type a2 radiometric processing of uncalibrated scene data as the best procedure for providing interdetector response equalization for MSS scene data. In this procedure, detector-specific histograms of the image data from the first 60 mirror sweeps of the input image data for a scene are generated and then characterized by their means and standard deviations. These 6 means and 6 standard deviations are then averaged to produce a target mean and standard deviation. For each detector, a linear gain and bias radiometric transformation is then determined which, when applied to the scene data from that detector, will transform it so the mean and standard deviation of the histogram of the transformed data are equal to the target mean and standard deviation. This section discusses the effect of incorporating this radiometric processing procedure in the Master Data Processor (MDP)

The radiometric calibration of MSS data which is now performed by the MDP is conceptually a two-step process:

1. Generation of the calibration function parameters, in which for each detector, six samples of the calibration wedge data, which is supplied every second MSS mirror sweep, are used to calculate the gain and bias parameters of a linear transformation of radiometric values for use on the scene data for that detector in each of the two mirror sweeps.
2. Application of this calibration function to the scene data.

Extraction of the calibration wedge samples is performed during Input Processing of the data stream from the HDT, and the samples are stored in a disk file. Generation of the calibration function parameters from the samples in this file is performed on blocks of these sample corresponding to an input data segment (i.e., the calibration samples corresponding to the data acquired between two successive nadir points in the World Reference System). These parameters are stored in a gain and bias file for that segment. Calibration of scene data is subsequently performed as an integral part of the resampling process, using parameters from these segment files which are identified by the Resampling Application Controller.

The type a2 radiometric processing does not employ any of the calibration wedge data which is available from the MSS. It, instead requires the computation of the mean and standard deviation of detector-specific histograms, as outlined above and detailed in Appendix A. Using a modification of the notation of Appendix A, the type a2 processing requires computation of the values:

$$m_i = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[\frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J u_{ijk} \right]$$

$$s_i^2 = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[\frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J (u_{ijk})^2 \right] - m_i^2$$

$$M = \frac{1}{I} \sum_{i=1}^I m_i$$

$$S = \frac{1}{I} \sum_{i=1}^I s_i$$

where u_{ijk} is the scene data value of sample j from detector i for MSS mirror sweep k

- J is the number of samples in the line
- I is the number of detectors used to collect scene data in one MSS band (6, if the thermal band is excluded)
- K is the number of MSS mirror sweeps contained in the subimage employed for equalization (60 in the case of type a2 processing).

The quantities

$$\sum_{j=1}^J u_{ijk}$$

and $\sum_{j=1}^J (u_{ijk})^2$

are already available to MDP, since they are contained in the 23 quality data pixels at the beginning of each major frame on the HDT (HDT-FM), and thus are available for each detector on a line basis. The MDP-MSS system could be modified to strip off these sums instead of the six calibration sample pixel values.

In the present MDP-MSS system, generation of the calibration function parameters is an autonomous task which is performed on an input segment basis, and which has no information available relating the specific input segment to an output frame. Because the type a2 radiometric processing requires interdetector equalization over the first 60 mirror sweeps of a frame, replacement of the present calibration parameter generation code with code to provide this radiometric equalization is not possible without considerable redesign of the MDP-MSS system.

However, if the equalization processing is performed on the scene data from the last 60 mirror sweeps in an input segment, rather than on the first 60 sweeps of the input data for an output frame, such code replacement is possible. This modification of the type a2 radiometric processing implies the reasonable assumption that any 60 sweep sample of the scene data for a frame is statistically equivalent to the first 60 sweeps. The radiometric equalization transformations obtained from this processing (one gain and bias set for each detector for each input data segment) would then be used for the output data frame containing the nadir reached at the end of the input data segment. It should be noted that this procedure, which requires only one gain and bias set per detector per output frame, may decrease the size of the gain and bias file, which at present is required to contain a gain and bias set for each detector for each sweep in a swath of MSS data.

In addition to the modifications discussed above, the present MDP-MSS system would have to be modified so that the Resampling Application Controller would cause the same gain and bias set per detector to be applied over an entire output data frame.

Since the changes required to perform this form of radiometric processing for destripping on the MDP-MSS system can be accomplished as described above, a procedure which does not require any major revisions to the system data flow, the system throughput can be expected to be unchanged.

Appendix A
IBM DESTRIPIING PROCEDURES

A.1 SWEEP HISTOGRAM EQUALIZATION

An algorithm of the following type satisfies the requirement for adjusting detector gains and offsets between detectors to minimize striping.

- a. Compute a histogram for each detector.
- b. Adjust the gain and offset of each detector so that the mean and standard deviation of the histogram of its corrected output matches the average of the means and standard deviations of histograms produced for each detector.

Let the average mean and standard deviation for the detector histograms M , S ; let the mean and standard deviation for the i th detector be m_i , s_i , and let the output of the i th detector for sample j be u_{ij} . The following equation then transforms u_{ij} into a variable w_{ij} having the mean and standard deviation of the ensemble:

$$w_{ij} = M + \frac{S}{s_i} (u_{ij} - m_i)$$

The corrected output for the i th detector is w_{ij} . The gain and offset for the i th detector then are:

$$G_i = \frac{S}{s_i}$$

$$B_i = M - m_i G_i$$

The quantities m_i , s_i , M , and S should be evaluated over a span of data such that the ground area scanned by each detector is statistically equivalent. During a single sweep, the set of inputs to each detector is assumed to meet this criterion.

Let u_{ij} be the j th sample from the i th detector. Compute for $i=1,2,3,4,5,6$:

$$m_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n u_{ij} \quad (n = \text{number of samples in the line})$$

$$s_i^2 = \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (u_{ij})^2 \right] - m_i^2$$

$$s_i = \left[s_i^2 \right]^{1/2}$$

Then
$$M = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{i=1}^6 m_i$$

$$S = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{i=1}^6 s_i$$

These computations can be implemented as follows. While a scan line is being processed, the sum and the sum of squares are accumulated and used to calculate B_i and G_i values to be used on a following sweep. In the same pass the corrected values w_{ij} are calculated using the following equation:

$$w_{ij} = B_i + G_i u_{ij}$$

The values of B_i and G_i used are from the data of the sweep previous to the sweep being corrected. This technique avoids having to make two passes of each scan line: one to compute the B_i and G_i values and another to use those B_i and G_i values to modify the line.

A.2 SUBIMAGE HISTOGRAM EQUALIZATION

In the procedure for sweep histogram equalization described above, the assumption is made that the data provided by any detector for one mirror sweep is statistically equivalent to that provided by the other detectors in the same sweep. An alternative procedure, which has the advantage of increasing the data on which this statistical equivalence is imposed, is to base the interdetector equalization on the image data from some significant fraction of the entire image. This image fraction can be anywhere from one sweep to the entire image.

In this alternative equalization procedure, the gain and bias radiometric constants for each detector are calculated and outlined above, but based on histograms derived from all the image data contained in a specified subimage. The radiometric constants are then applied to the entire image data set.

Appendix B
MSS CALIBRATION PROCEDURE

The radiometric calibration formula employed for the four MSS bands available on Landsat 1 and 2 is:

$$V_c = \frac{KV_{\max}}{\Delta R} \left[\frac{V - pa_s}{q b_s} - R_{\min} \right] - r$$

where V_c = calibrated pixel value;

V = input (decompressed) pixel value;

V_{\max} = maximum pixel value (127 for three bands and 63 for the fourth band);

$\Delta R = R_{\max} - R_{\min}$, depending on each band;

K , p , q , and r are constants (expected to vary infrequently);

a_s = smoothed offset (computed per scan line);

b_s = smoothed gain or slope (computed per scan line).

This calibration formula assumes that the data either was taken in the linear mode or has been decompressed.

The offset and gain coefficients are determined once per scan line as follows:

$$a = \sum_i C_i V_i, \quad b = \sum_i D_i V_i$$

where i runs from 1 to 6.

The V_i are the linear or linerized detector calibration samples associated with the scan line; C_i , D_i are regression coefficients, which may differ for each detector and band, but remain constant during normal sensor performance.

Smoothed offset and gain coefficients, a_s and b_s , for each detector are calculated for every mirror sweep, n , as follows:

$$b_s(n) = b_s(n-1) + W(n) [b(n) - b_s(n-1)]$$

$$a_s(n) = a_s(n-1) + W(n) [a(n) - a_s(n-1)]$$

where

n = sequential number of mirror sweep;

$b(n)$, $a(n)$ = latest value of b and a determined;

$b_s(n)$, $a_s(n)$ = new smoothed value of b and a ;

$W(n) = 1/n+1$ for $n=1$ to 15 ,

$W(n) = 1/16$ for $n \geq 16$.

The C_i and D_i are predetermined on the basis of prelaunch radiance test data.

Appendix C

PLATES

Plate 1 - MSS Scene 2183-16433, MSS Band 1, Uncalibrated Data

Plate 2 - MSS Scene 2183-16433, MSS Band 1, Uncalibrated Data after
Type a1 Radiometric Processing

Plate 3 - MSS Scene 2183-16433, MSS Band 1, Uncalibrated Data after
Type a2 Radiometric Processing

Plate 4 - MSS Scene 2183-16433, MSS Band 1, Uncalibrated Data after
Type a3 Radiometer Processing

Plate 5 - MSS Scene 2183-16433, MSS Band 1, Uncalibrated Data after
Type b1 Radiometric Processing

Plate 6 - MSS Scene 2183-16433, MSS Band 1, Uncalibrated Data after
Type b2 Radiometric Processing

Plate 7 - Scene Overlay Showing Specific Regions Employed in Evaluations

(These plates are contained in the envelope at the end of this report)




Plate 1 - MSS Scene 2183-16433, MSS Band 1,
Uncalibrated Data



Plate 2 - MSS Scene 2183-16433, MSS Band 1,
Uncalibrated Data after Type 1
Radiometric Processing



Plate 3 - MSS Scene 2183-16433, MSS Band 1, Uncalibrated
Data after Type a2 Radiometric Processing




Plate 4 - MSS Scene 2183-16433, MSS Band 1, Uncalibrated
Data after Type a3 Radiometric Processing



Plate 5 - MSS Scene 2183-16433, MSS Band 1, Uncalibrated
Data after Type b1 Radiometric Processing




Plate 6 - MSS Scene 2183-16433, MSS Band 1, Uncalibrated
Data after Type b2 Radiometric Processing

High
Frequency
Region

Lacie
Test
Site




Plate 7 - Scene Overlay Showing Specific Regions Employed in Evaluations