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## SECTION 1

## ANALYSIS PROGRAMS

The data simulation, factor analysis, cluster analysis, classification, and information programs represent analytical techiques developed and applied during the study to accomplish signature data processing. The data simulation program provides data from known distributions with which to evaluate techniques and software. The factor analysis program is the product of several years of development and is specifically tailored for analysis of multispectral data. The cluster analysis program employs a new technique for identification of cluster centers in multivariate hyperspace. It can be applied operationally to reduce the need for or to improve the available ground truth.

The classification programs are not intended for classification of data under operational conditions, but for evaluation of the relative performance of various classification techniques. Both these and the information divergence programs provide for several ways of obtaining the probability density function used in the processes. The performance obtained with the different expressions for the density function is compared to assess the relative merits of the available alternatives.

The following sections are intended to provide descriptions of basic features, logic flow, and the underlying mathematics of these analysis programs.

### 1.1 SIGNATURE DATA SIMULATION PROGRAM

### 1.1.1 General Description

The Signature Data Simulation Program generates random data, in one of three forms, from distributions which are specified parametrically. Use of the simulated data serves to test program logic, to evaluate the effects of varying program parameters, and to establish the performance of the analytical techniques used by evaluating data from known distributions.

A number of clusters with means and standard deviations for each channel is specified by the user. The correlation matrix of the cluster determines the departure of the equal probability contours of the cluster from sphericity and also the directions of the axis of the equal probability ellipsoids. Three options are available in the program concerning correlation:

1. The data may be uncorrelated
2. The user may specify eigenvalues, determining the relative lengths of the axes and requiring random orientation by the program
3. The user may specify the correlation matrix requiring use of the EIGEN subroutine before data are generated by the main program.

The user may request that the data be generated in parametric form (cluster weight, means, covariance matrix, factor loadings matrix), digitized scanner form, or continuous form.

### 1.1.2 Flow Chart of the Data Simulation Program

The reference to subroutine EIGEN, made in Figure 1-1 of the Data Simulation Program is satisfied in Section 1.2.2, where the EIGEN flow chart is presented.

KEY TO NOTATION
Main Program, Data Simulation

| ix | $=$ initial value for random number generator |
| :---: | :---: |
| $8_{8}{ }_{8}$ | $=$ Hadamard orthogonal matrix |
| m | $=$ number of channels |
| ng | $=$ number of groups of data to be simulated |
| $\mathrm{Nk}_{\ell}, \ell=1, \mathrm{ng}$ | $=$ number of clusters in the $l^{\text {th }}$ group |
| $\mathrm{Nob}_{i j}, j=1, n g, i=1, N k_{j}$ | $=$ number of observations in $i^{\text {th }}$ cluster of $j^{\text {th }}$ group |
| $\mathrm{Nn}_{\ell}, \ell=1, \mathrm{ng}$ | $=$ number of observations in $\ell^{\text {th }}$ group |
| $W_{i j}, i=1, N k_{j}, j=1, n g$ | $=$ weight of $i^{\text {th }}$ cluster of $j^{\text {th }}$ group, proportional to number of observations in cluster |
| $\mathrm{Bl} \mathrm{i}^{\text {, }} \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $=$ lower bound of $\mathrm{i}^{\text {th }}$ channel's scanner range |


| $B u_{i}, i=1, m$ | $=$ upper bound of $i^{\text {th }}$ channel's scanner range |
| :---: | :---: |
| $Z_{i}, i=1, m$ | $=$ mean of $i^{\text {th }}$ channel |
| sdi, $i=1, m$ | $=$ standard deviation of $i^{\text {th }}$ channel |
| $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ij}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $=$ correlation matrix of cluster |
| $\mathrm{Gl}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $=$ eigenvalues of correlation matrix |
| $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{ij}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $=$ eigenvectors |
| $A_{i j}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $=$ covariance matrix of cluster |
| $\mathrm{TT}_{\mathrm{ij}}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $=$ factor loadings matrix |
| $\mathrm{Ti}_{\mathrm{ij}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $=$ factor deviation matrix |
| $X_{i}, i=1, m$ | $=$ signature in continuous form |
| $\mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{i}}$, $\mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $=$ signature in digitized scanner form. |



Figure 1-1 Main Program, Data Simulation.
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### 1.2 FACTOR ANALYSIS PROGRAM

The Factor Analysis Program identifi principal components, thereby removing redundancy owing to correlations among variables. The factoring may be done using correlation about the mean, correplation about the origin, covariance about the mean, or covariance about the origin. The number of eigenvalues used in the analysis, and therefore, the number of principal components identified, may be limited in one of three ways. The user may specify directly the number of factors desired, the minimum eigenvalue to remain in the analysis, or the maximum percentage of total variance to be accounted for by the eigenvalues.

Subroutine CORRE reads the $n$ observations of $m$-tuple raw data and from these data calculates means, standard deviations, and product moment correlation coefficients or covariance matrix, either about the mean or origin. Subroutine EIGEN computes the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the input covariance or correlation matrix. Subroutine TRACE computes the cummulative proportion of total variance acccunted for by eigenvalues and number of principal components to be kept for analysis on the basis of one of the three limiting options. Subroutine LOAD calculates the coefficients of each factor by multiplying the elements of eack normaiized eigenvector by the square root of the corresponding eigenvalue.

Input may be in the form of raw data to be read by the CORRE subroutine, or means, standard deviations, eigenvalues, eigenvectors, and factor coefficients may be read by the main program. In either case, the main program handles output and computes the factor score coefficient matrix, channel coefficient settings, and the factor scores.

### 1.2.1 Factor Analysis Mathematical Description

The factor analysis orthogonal solution is a method of finding coordinate systems in which the variables are uncorrelated. If dependence among the variables is limited to linear (i.e., nonlinear ccupling is absent), the transform might also produce statistical independence or something approaching it.

Given a data matrix $m_{n}$ consisting of $n$ column vectors, each one an observation, the covariance matrix* of $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{n}}$ is :

$$
S_{m}=\frac{1}{n} \quad m_{n} \quad X_{n}^{T}
$$

*This applies for covariance about the origin. Covariance about the mean values requires that the data matrix first be properly adjusted.

Since $S$ is a real symmetric positive definite matrix, there exists a transformation $U$ which will transform $S$ into a diagonal matrix $D$ whose diagonal elements are the eigenvalues of $S$.

$$
L=U^{T} S U=\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
\lambda_{1} & 0 & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots  \tag{1-1}\\
0 & 0 \\
0 & \lambda_{2} & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\
\ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\
0 & 0 & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots
\end{array}\right)
$$

The square root of a diagonal matrix can be defined:

So that

$$
\sqrt{L} \sqrt{L}=U^{T} S U
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sqrt{L}-1 U^{T} S U \sqrt{L}-1=I \tag{1-3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting for $S$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sqrt{L}^{-1} U^{T} \times X^{T} U \sqrt{L}^{-1}=n I \tag{1-4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define $A$, the factor score coefficient matrix, and $F$, the factor score matrix:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{A}=\sqrt{\mathrm{L}}^{-1} \mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
& \mathrm{~F}=\mathrm{f} .
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows from these definitions and Equation 1-4, that $F F^{T}=n I ; i . e$, the factor scores are uncorrelated.

If $A$ is nonsingular, its inverse exists and $X$ can be computed from $F$ :

$$
X=A^{-1} F .
$$

If the inverse of $A$ is not defined because $A$ is not square:

$$
\begin{aligned}
A X & =F \\
A^{T} A X & =A^{T} F \\
X & =\left(A^{T} A\right)^{-1} A^{T} F .
\end{aligned}
$$

The correlation matrix of $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{X}^{\prime}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& m_{m}^{R}=\sqrt{D}^{-1} S \sqrt{D}^{-1} \text {, where } \\
& D=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
\sigma_{1}^{2} & \ldots \ldots \ldots & 0 \\
0 & \sigma_{2}^{2} \ldots \ldots \ldots & 0 \\
\cdot & & & \cdot \\
\cdot & & & \cdot \\
\cdot & & & \cdot \\
0 & 0 \ldots \ldots . & \sigma_{m}^{2}
\end{array}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

may be diagonalized during the analysis in place of the covariance matrix, S. If inalysis is done about the sample mean rather than the origin, $m Y_{n}, n$ column vectors of the form $Y_{j}=X_{j}-\bar{X}, j=1, n$, are used in the place of the vectors forming $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{n}}$.

### 1.2.2 Flow Chart of the Factor Analysis Program

The following generalized flow diagram (Figure 1-2) of the factor analysis program is supplemented by detailed Fortran IV statement diagrams of subroutines CORRE, EIGEN, TRACE, and LOAD. (Figures 1-3 to l-6).

## KEY TO NOTATION

Main Program, Principal Component Factor Analysis
n $\quad=$ number of observations
$k \quad=$ number of factors
$\mathrm{m} \quad=$ number of variables
$\bar{X}_{i}, i=1, m=$ mean of $i^{\text {th }}$ variable
$S_{i}, i=1, m=$ standard deviation of $i^{\text {th }}$ variable
$\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{n}} \quad=$ raw data matrix
$\lambda_{j}, j=1, k=j^{\text {th }}$ eigenvalue
$\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{m}} \quad=$ row-wise eignevectors
$d_{j}, j=1, k \quad=\quad$ cumulative proportion of total variance
$\mathrm{m}^{\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{k}}} \quad=$ factor matrix for standard data
${ }_{m} C_{k} \quad=$ factor matrix for nonstandard data
$\mathbf{k}^{\mathrm{A}} \mathbf{m} \quad=$ factor score coefficient matrix for standard data
$\mathbf{k}_{\mathrm{m}} \quad=$ factor score coefficient matrix for nonstandard data
${ }_{k} G_{m} \quad=\quad$ channel coefficient settings matrix
$\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{n}} \quad=$ factor scores
$\bar{X}_{f_{i}}, i=1, k=$ factor score means
$\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{m}} \quad=$ correlation or covariance matrix.


Figure 1-2 Main Program, Principle Component Factor Analysis


Figure 1-2 (Cont.)
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## KEY TO NOTATION

## Subroutine CORRE

| $n_{n} X_{m}$ | $=$ raw data |
| :--- | :--- |
| $n$ | $=$ number of observations |
| $m$ | $=$ number of variables |
| $\bar{X}_{i}, i=1, m$ | $=$ mean of $i^{\text {th }}$ variable |
| $S_{i}, i=1, m$ | $=$ standard deviation of $i^{\text {th }}$ variable |
| $m_{m}^{R}$ | $=$ covariance or correlation matrix. |



Figure 1-3 Subroutine CORRE


Figure 1-3 (Cont.)


Figure 1-3 (Cont.)


Figure 1-3 (Cont.)


Figure 1-3 (Cont.)

BSR 2949


Figure 1-3 (Cont.)

BSR 2949 .


Figure 1-3 (Cont.)


Figure 1-3 (Cont.)

BSR 2949



Figure 1-3 (Cont.)

BSR 2949


8069-102]


Figure 1-3 (Cont.)

BSR 2949


Figure 1-3 (Cont.)


Figure 1-3 (Cont.)

BSR 2949


Figure 1-3 (Cont.)

BSR 2949


8059-102n

Figure 1-3 (Cont.)


Figure 1-3 (Cont.)

## BSR 2949



Figure J-3 (Cont.)

## BSR 2949

## KEY TO NOTATION

Subroutine EIGEN

```
n = crder of input matrix (corresponds to m of main program)
n}\mp@subsup{A}{n}{}=\mathrm{ input correlation or covariance matrix, destroyed curat:
    computation; eigenvalues are placed in diagonal as o:t; ; :
n}\mp@subsup{R}{n}{}=\mathrm{ eigenvectors, columnwise
V
V
t = threshold
ind = indicator that off-diagonal elements found larger than pretr..
        threshold.
```
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Figure 1-4 Subroutine EIGEN

BSR 2949



Figure 1-4 (Cont.)


Figure 1-4 (Cont.)
IF A DOUBLE PRECISION VERSION OF THIS ROUTINE IS OESIRED, THE C IN COLUMN I SHOULO BE REMOYED fRUM THE DOUELE PRECISION StATEMENT HHICH FOLLOHS.
DGUBLE PRECISION A, R, RNGRM, ANRMX, IAR, X, Y, SINX.SINX2,CESX, COSX2,SIN CS. RANGE



Figure 1-4 (Cont.)


Figure 1-4 (Cont.)

BSR 2949 -


8089-1034


Figure 1-4 (Cont.)


Figure 1-4 (Cont.)

BSR 2949


Figure 1-4 (Cont.)


Figure 1-4 (Cont.)

BSR 2949


Figure 1-4 (Cont.)


Figure 1-4 (Cont.)

BSR 2949


Figure 1-4 (Cont.)


Figure 1-4 (Cont.)


Figure 1-4 (Cont.)


Figure 1-4 (Cont.)

PG 13 rINAL

## KEY TO NOTATION

Subroutine TRACE

```
m a number of eigenvalues = (number of variables)
k number of factors kept
\mp@subsup{\lambda}{i}{\prime}},\textrm{i}=1,m= eigenvalue
t = total variance
c = number of factors to keep, or percentage of total variance
    to be explained, or minimum eigenvalue to be kept
d
```
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Figure 1-5 Subroutine TRACE
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## KEY TO NOTATION

Subroutine LOAD

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
m_{k} & =\text { input eigenvectors, columnwise } \\
m^{B_{k}} & =\text { factor matrix } \\
\lambda_{i}, i=1, k & =\text { eigenvalues } .
\end{array}
$$



Figure 1-6 Subroutine LOAD
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END
Figure 1-6 (Cont.)

### 1.3 CLASSIFICATION AND INFORMATION DIVERGENCE PROGRAMS

At the base of all of the classification and information divergence programs is the computation of the probability density function computed from the training sets evaluated at each sample signature. The Bayesian Decision Function Program and the Infurmation Divergence Program provide several options for probability density computation. In contrast, the Density Lister, Decision Ruler, and Density Divergence Program make restricted use of the hyperpyramid smoothing function for the density computation.

The probability density function of signatures for objects of class $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{k}}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{x}})$, can be evaluated in one of several ways.

The univariate normal probability density computation is based upon population parameters:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{k}\left(x_{j}\right)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{j k}} \exp \left(-1 / 2\left(x_{j}-\bar{x}_{j k}\right)^{2} / \sigma_{j k}^{2}\right) \tag{1-5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$j$ is the channel index
$\mathbf{k}$ is the population (target) index.

The multivariate normal probability density computation is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{k}(\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x})=\frac{\left|A_{k}\right|^{1 / 2}}{(2 \pi)^{m / 2}} \exp \left(-1 / 2 \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{Y}^{T} A_{k} \vec{Y}\right) \tag{1-6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$m$ is the number of channels
$\vec{Y}$ is the signature $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x}$ expressed about the $k^{\text {th }}$ training set mean
$A_{k}$ is the inverse covariance matrix of the $k^{\text {th }}$ training set.

The Specht function is a smoothing method for weighting the contribution of each point in a data sample to the total density function evaluated at a point not in the sample. A smoothing function is used to compute the weight given to each sample point. Donald Specht: concluded that an exponential smoothing function should be used and subsequently expanded in polynomial form. The polynomial expansion, however, is unsuitable for this study. The Specht smoothing function used throughout the study is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{k}(\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x})=\frac{1}{N_{k}(2 \pi)^{m / 2}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{m} S_{i k}\right)} 1 / 2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_{k}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{\left(x_{i}-y_{i j k}\right)^{2}}{S_{i k}}\right) \tag{1-7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$N_{k}$ is the number of observations in the $k^{t h}$ training set
$S_{i k}$ is the Specht smoothing parameter for the $i^{\text {th }}$ training set
$y_{i j k}$ is the $i^{\text {th }}$ component of the $j^{\text {th }}$ signature of the $k^{\text {th }}$ training set
$x_{i}$ is the $i^{\text {th }}$ component of $\vec{x}$.
The exponential smoothing is extremely time consuming. In an effort to reduce the computation time, the hyperpyramid smoothing function*\% is implemented. The hyperpyramid smoothing function is:

[^0]$$
f_{k}(\vec{x})=\frac{1}{2^{m-1}} N_{k}\left(S_{1 k} S_{2 k} \ldots S_{m k}\right) \sum_{j=1}^{N_{k}} g\left(\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x}, \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{Y}_{j k}\right)
$$
where
\[

$$
\begin{align*}
& g\left(\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x}^{( } \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{Y}_{j k}\right)=1-\max \left\{\left|\frac{x_{i}-y_{i j k}}{S_{i k}}\right|, i=1, m\right\} \quad \text { for } \\
& \max \left\{\left|\frac{x_{i}-y_{i j k}}{S_{i k}}\right|, i=1, m\right\} \leq 1,  \tag{1-8}\\
& g\left(\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x}, \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{Y}_{j}\right)=0 \text { for max }\left\{\left|\frac{x_{i}-y_{i j k}}{S_{i k}}\right|, i=1, m\right\}>1
\end{align*}
$$
\]

### 1.3.1 Bayesian Decision Function Program

The Bayesian Decision Function Program assigns arbitrary signatures from sample sets to one of the targets characterized by the training sets. The as signment is based upon the probability density functions computed from the training sets evaluated at each sample signature, the a priori probability occurrence of each target, and the penalties of misclassification. The program will compute density functions in one of six ways and will accept training set data in one of four forms.

The options for probability density function computation are as follows:

1. As a product of univariate normal probability densities, using means and standard deviations of each channel or factor from the training sets.
2. As a product of probability densities from univariate histograms.
3. As multivariate normal probability density, using the covariance matrix of the training sets.
4. As a multivariate Specht function or product of bivariate Specht and functions, computed by smu,thing the training set data. The
5. density function may be computed over all channels simultaneously, or over pairs of romponents in which case, the probability density for the observation signature is the product of densities for pairs. The bivariate option can actually be used to subselect any number of channels.
6. As a multivariate hyperpyramid smoothing function.

Training set data may be in the form of digitized scanner data, continuous or factor score lata, univariate histograms, or parametric (means and standard deviations) form. Sample data for classification can be digitized scanner data or continuous data.

Training set forms can be used in conjunction with density computation options according to the following table.

TABLE 1-1
USE OF TRAINING SET FORMS WITH DENSITY COMPUTATIONS

| Training Set Form | Possible Density Computation |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Product of Univariate Normal <br> Digitized Scanner Data or <br> Continuous Data |
| Bivariate from Specht <br> Multivariate from Specht |  |
| Univariate Histograms | Hyperpyramid Smoothing <br> Multivariate Normal |
| Parametric | Product of Univariate Normal |
|  | Product of Univariate Histegrams |

The READ subroutine reads training set data and computes from these data quantities needed for the chosen density computation option. COMPUT calculates the probability density function of each sample signature when attributed to each training set, while the main program calculates the Bayesian Decision Function and handles output of signature target assignment.

### 1.3.1.1 Bayesian Decision Function Mathematical Description

In Bayesian classification of arbitrary samples, the decision criterion is minimum cost. The expected cost of an experiment is:
$E(w)=\sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{j=1}^{K} w(j, k) P(j, k)$
where
w is the cost of the experiment
$w(j, k)$ is the cost of assigning an object of class $j$ to class $k$
$\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k})$ is the probability of assigning an object of class j to class k .
The probability $P(j, k)$ can be expressed as the product of an a priori and a conditional probability:

$$
\begin{equation*}
P(j, k)=P(j) P(k \mid j), \tag{1-10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$P(j)$ is the a priori probability of occurrence for objects of class $j$,
$P(k \mid j)$ is the probability of assigning an object to class $k$ provided it belongs to class $\mathbf{j}$.

Let $\Gamma_{k}$ be the set of signatures (a region in the space of signatures) which is attributed to class $k$. Then, by definition,

$$
\begin{equation*}
P(k \mid j)=\int_{\Gamma_{k}} f_{j}(\vec{x}) d \vec{x}, \tag{1-11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$\overrightarrow{\mathbf{x}}$ is an observed signature
$f_{j}(\vec{x})$ is the probability density function of signatures for objects of class j, or

$$
\begin{equation*}
P(k j)=\int_{\Omega} \Gamma_{k}(\vec{x}) f_{j}(\vec{x}) d \vec{x} \tag{1-12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$\Omega$ is the entire signature space

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{k}(\vec{x}) & =1 \text { for } \vec{x} \in \Gamma_{k} \\
\Gamma_{k}(\vec{x}) & =0 \text { for } \vec{x} \in\left(\Omega-\Gamma_{k}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

By substitution, the expected cost is then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E(w)=\sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{j=1}^{K} w(j, k) P(j) \int_{\Omega} \Gamma_{k}(\vec{x}) f_{j}(\vec{x}) d \vec{x} \\
& =\int_{\Omega} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \Gamma_{k}(\vec{x})\left[\sum_{j=1}^{K} w(j, k) P(j) f_{j}(\vec{x})\right] d \vec{x} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Minimization of cost occurs when the cost function in square brackets is evaluated for each $k$ and $\Gamma_{k}(\vec{x})$ is set to 1 for the $k$ associated with the minimum cost.

### 1.3.1.2 Flow Chart of the Bayesian Decision Function Program

The following flow chart (Figure 1-7) makes reference to Subroutine MINV, inversion of a matrix, whose Fortran IV statement diagram only is provided. Refer to Figures 1-8 and 1-9 for subroutines READ and COMPUT.

## KEY TO NOTATION

Main Program, Bayesian Decision Function

| $m$ | $=$ number of channels |
| :--- | :--- |
| $m r$ | $=$ number of training sets (targets) |
| ms | $=$ number of samples to be classified |


| $\underline{n r} \mathbf{k}^{\prime}$ k $=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ number of signatures in $\mathrm{k}^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{ns}_{\mathrm{k}}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{~ms}$ | $=$ number of signatures in $k^{\text {th }}$ sample set |
| mk | $=$ number of subsets of channels |
| $m n$ | $=$ number of channels in each subset of channels |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ij}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{mr}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{mk} * \mathrm{mn}$ | $\begin{aligned} &= \text { channel numbers in the subsets of channels for } i^{\text {th }} \\ & \text { training set } \end{aligned}$ |
| $P_{i}, i=1, m r$ | = a priori probability of occurrence of target i |
| $C_{i j}{ }^{i=1}, \mathrm{mr}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ cost of attributing a signature of target $i$ to target $j$ |
| $S_{i j}, i=1, m, j=1, m r$ | $=$ smoothing parameters for the $i^{\text {th }}$ channel of the $j^{\text {th }}$ training set (for Specht function or hyperpyramid function) |
| $\operatorname{dmax}_{i}, i=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ upper bound on truncation error for computing the probability density function of a signature attributed to the $i^{\text {th }}$ training set (for Specht function) |
| $d u_{i}, i=1, m r$ | $=$ denominator of the univariate normal probability density function for the $i^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $s d_{i j}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $\begin{aligned} &= \text { standard deviation in the } i^{\text {th }} \text { channel of the } j^{\text {th }} \\ & \text { training set } \end{aligned}$ |
| $d n m_{i j}, i=1, m k, j=1, m r$ | $=$ denominator of the probability density function for the $i^{\text {th }}$ subset of channels of the $j^{\text {th }}$ training set (for Specht function or hyperpyramid function) |
| $\operatorname{smax}_{i j}, i=1, m k, j=1, m r$ | $=$ upper limit on sum of squares for truncation of computation of density function (for Specht function) |
| $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{ijk}}{ }^{\text {, }} \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{nr} \mathrm{k}^{\prime} \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=j^{\text {th }}$ signature of $k^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $=$ signature of sample set |
| $f_{i}, i=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ probability density function of a sample signature when attributed to the $i^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $\mathrm{bdf}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ Bayesian decision function of $i^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $\mathrm{pr}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ Bayesian probability that signature is occurrence of target i. |



Figure 1-7 Main Program, Bayesian Decision Function
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KEY TO NOTATION

## Subroutine READ

| m | $=$ number of |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{nr}_{\mathrm{k}}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ number of signatures in $\mathrm{k}^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| ${ }^{n} i_{k}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ number of intervals in histogram of $\mathrm{k}^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $\overline{\mathrm{X}}_{\mathrm{ik}}{ }^{\mathbf{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{mr}}$ | $=$ mean of $\mathrm{i}^{\text {th }}$ channel of the $\mathrm{k}^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $s d_{i k}, i=1, m, k=1, m r$ | $=$ standard deviation of the $i^{\text {th }}$ channel of the $\mathrm{k}^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $\operatorname{xmid}_{i k}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ midpoint of the first interval of the histogram of the $i^{\text {th }}$ channel of the $k^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $\mathrm{delt}_{\text {ik }}{ }^{\text {i }}$ = $1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ length of interval of the histogram of the $i^{\text {th }}$ channel of the $\mathrm{k}^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $H_{i j k}, i=1, m, j=1, n i_{k}, k=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ frequency in $i^{\text {th }}$ channel, $j^{\text {th }}$ interval, of histogram of $k^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $\operatorname{det}_{k}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ determinant of the covariance matrix of the $k^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ determinant of the inverse of the covariance matrix of the $\mathrm{k}^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $B_{i j k}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=\underset{\text { set }}{m \times m} \text { covariarce matrix for } k^{\text {th }} \text { training }$ |
| $A_{i j k}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $\begin{aligned} & =m \times m \text { inverse of covariance matrix for } k^{\text {th }} \\ & \text { training set } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{ijk}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{nr} \mathrm{k}^{\prime} \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=\mathrm{j}^{\text {th }}$ signature of $\mathrm{k}^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| mr | $=$ number of training sets (targets) |



Figure 1-8 Subroutine READ


Figure 1-8 (Cont.)


Figure 1-8 (Cont.)


Figure 1-8 (Cont.)

BSR 2949


PG3 3 .
Figure 1-8 (Cont.)

BSR 2949


Figure 1-8 (Cont.)


Figure 1-8 (Cont.)

BSR 2949


Figure 1-8 (Cont.)

BSR 2949


Figure 1-8 (Cont.)

BSR 2949


Figure 1-8 (Cont.)


Figure 1-8 (Cont.)

BSR 2.949


P6 10 08_U
Figure 1-8 (Cont.)


## END
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## KEY TO NOTATION

## Subroutine COMPUT


$S_{i j}, i=1, m, j=1, m r$
$A_{i j k}, i=1, m, j=1, m, k=1, m r$
$D_{k}, k=1, m r$
$Y_{i}, i=1, m$
$X_{i j k}, i=1, m, j=1, n r_{i k}, k=1, m r$
$f_{i}, i=1, m r$
$f_{k}, k=1, m k$
$n r_{k}, k=1, m r$
$=$ smoothing parameters for Specht function, or hyperpyramid function, $i^{\text {th }}$ channel of $j^{\text {th }}$ training set
$=$ inverse of covariance matrix ( $\mathrm{m} \times \mathrm{m}$ ) for $\mathrm{k}^{\text {th }}$ training set
$=$ determinant of $A$ for $k^{\text {th }}$ training set
$=$ signature from sample set
$=j^{\text {th }}$ signature of $k^{\text {th }}$ training set
$=$ probability density function of a sample signature when attributed to the ith training set
$=$ probability density function for $\mathbf{k}^{\text {th }}$ subset of channels
$=$ number of signatures in $k^{\text {th }}$ training set.


Figure 1-9 Subroutine COMPUT
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### 1.3.2 Information Divergence Program

The Information Divergence Program computes the measure of the amount of information which the differences between two distributions contribute to the classification of a rectral signature. The training set data may be in one of the forms discussed for the Bayesian Decision Function Program, while the data referred to as sample data are the representation of the training set data in digitized scanner or continuous data form.

The computation is again based upon the probability density functions computed from the training sets evaluated at each sample signature, and the options for this computation are the same as those in the Bayesian Decision Function Program.

### 1.3.2.1 Information Divergence Mathematical Description

Divergence is defined as the sum of two information measures.
Suppose a signature $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{x}}$ arises from one of two object classes, j or k . The likelihood ratio method of classification is to evaluate the likelihood function

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x})=\frac{f_{j}(\vec{x})}{f_{k}(\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x})} \tag{1-14}
\end{equation*}
$$

and assign the signature to object class $j$, if $L$ exceeds some criterion value, and to class $k$ otherwise. The amount of information in the likelihood ratio for making the decision is $\log \mathrm{L}$. $\left(\log _{2} \mathrm{~L}\right.$ gives the information in bits.)

To obtain the average information per observation for evaluating the hypothesis that the signature belongs to object class $j$ against the alternative class $k$, it is necessary to take the expected value over distribution $j$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
I(j ; k)=\int\left(\log \frac{f_{j}(\tilde{x})}{f_{k}(\tilde{x})}\right) f_{j}(\tilde{x}) d x \tag{1-15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similarly, the average informai on for evaluating the hypothesis that the signature belongs to class $k$ against the alternative class $j$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
I(k ; j)=\int\left(\log \frac{f_{k}(\tilde{x})}{f_{j}(\tilde{x})}\right) f_{k}(\tilde{x}) d x \tag{1-16}
\end{equation*}
$$

The divergence between the two classes is

$$
\begin{equation*}
J(j, k)=I(j ; k)+I(k ; j) . \tag{1-17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since the distributions are unknown, they are assumed to be characterized by the training data sets and the alogrithms for evaluating the density functions, $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{k}}(\overrightarrow{\mathrm{x}})$ and $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{j}}(\overrightarrow{\mathrm{x}})$, as described in Section 1.3.

The required computations then become

$$
\begin{align*}
& I(j ; k)=\frac{1}{N_{j}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{j}} \log \frac{f_{j}\left(\tilde{x}_{i}\right)}{f_{k}\left(\tilde{x}_{i}\right)}, \\
& I(k ; j)=\frac{1}{N_{k}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{k}} \log \frac{f_{k}\left(\tilde{x}_{i}\right)}{f_{j}\left(\tilde{x}_{i}\right)}, \tag{1-18}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
J(j, k)=I(j ; k)+I(k ; j) .
$$

1.3.2.2 Flow Chart of Information Divergence Program

All flow charts of subroutines referenced in Figure l-10 may be found in Section 1.3.1.2.

## KEY TO NOTATION

Main Program, Information Divergence

| m | $=$ number of channels |
| :--- | :--- |
| mr | $=$number of training sets to be diverged <br> $(=$ number of sample sets $)$ |
| $m \mathrm{mk}$ | $=$ number of subsets of channels |
| mn | $=$ |


| $N_{i j}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{mr}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{mk} * \mathrm{mn}$ | $=$ channel numbers in the subsets of channels for $\mathrm{i}^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{ns}_{\mathrm{k}}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ number of signatures in $\mathrm{k}^{\text {th }}$ sample set |
| $S_{i j}{ }^{\text {j }}$ = $1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ smoothing parameters for the $i^{\text {th }}$ channel of the $j^{\text {th }}$ training set (for Specht function or hyperpyramid function) |
| $\operatorname{dmax}_{i}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ upper bound on truncation error for computing the probability density function of a signature attributed to the $i^{\text {th }}$ training set (for Specht function) |
| $\mathrm{du}_{i}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ denominator of the univariate normal probability density function for the $\mathrm{i}^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $\mathrm{sd}_{\mathrm{ij}} \mathrm{i}^{\mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{mj}=1, \mathrm{mr}}$ | $=$ standard deviation in the $i^{\text {th }}$ channel of the $j^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $\mathrm{dmm}_{\mathrm{ij}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{mk}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ denominator of the probability density function for the $i^{\text {th }}$ subset of channels of the $j^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $\operatorname{smax}_{i j} \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ upper limit on sum of squares for truncation of computation of density function (for Specht function) |
| $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $=$ signature from sample set |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ probability density function of a sample signature when attributed to the $i^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $\mathrm{djk}_{\mathrm{ij}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{mr}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ total information in training set $i$ for discrimination in favor of set $i$ against the alternative set j |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\ell}{ }_{i} \mathbf{i = 1 , m r}$ | $=$ logarithm of the probability density function of a sample signature when attributed to the $i^{\text {th }}$ training set |
| $d v_{i j}, i=1, m r, j=1, m r$ | $=$ divergence between training sets $\mathbf{i}$ and $\mathbf{j}$ |
| $n r_{k}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{mr}$ | $=$ number of signatures in $\mathrm{k}^{\text {th }}$ training set. |



Figure 1-10 Main Program, Information Divergence
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### 1.3.3 Density Divergence Program

The modified divergence computation, referred to as density divergence, is used to determine the divergence between two representations of the same population. The Density Divergence Program specifically computes the divergence between a population known to be multivariate normal and representation of that population with a training set and the hyperpyramid smoothing function. It is useful in determining the utility of a given set of smoothing parameters. A small density divergence indicates a vaiid smoothing function representation of the true distribution of the population.

The divergence computation (non-modified) is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
J=\int f_{1}(\vec{x}) \log \frac{f_{1}(\vec{x})}{f_{2}(\vec{x})} d \vec{x}+\int f_{2}(\vec{x}) \log \frac{f_{2}(\vec{x})}{f_{1}(\vec{x})} d \vec{x} \tag{1-19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{1} d \vec{x}=d P \text { and } \int f_{1} d \vec{x} \rightarrow \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tag{1-20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{align*}
\vec{d} & \equiv \frac{d P}{f_{1}} \quad \text { and substituting in Equation } 1-19 \\
J & =\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\log \frac{f_{1}\left(\vec{x}_{i}\right)}{f_{2}\left(\vec{x}_{i}\right)}-\frac{f_{2}\left(\vec{x}_{i}\right)}{f_{1}\left(\vec{x}_{i}\right)}\right)  \tag{1-21}\\
& =\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(1-\frac{f_{2}\left(\vec{x}_{i}\right)}{f_{1}\left(\vec{x}_{i}\right)}\right) \log \frac{f_{1}\left(\vec{x}_{i}\right)}{f_{2}\left(\vec{x}_{i}\right)} .
\end{align*}
$$

When $f_{1}$ is the expression for the multivariate normal probability density* and $f_{2}$ is the hyperpyramid function\% using a sample from the distribution, the choice of smoothing parameters used in $f_{2}$ may be evaluated.

[^1]Input to the program consists of a sample from the population, hyperpyr amid smoothing parameters for the sample, and the population inverse covariance matrix and channel means.

| 1.3.3.1 Flow Chart of Density Divergence Program |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | KEY TO NOTATION |
| Main Program, Density Divergence and Subroutine COMPUT2. |  |
| m | $=$ number of channels |
| N | : number of signatures in sample |
| $X_{i j}, i=1, m, j=1, N$ | = sample from population |
| $S_{i}, i=1, m$ | $=$ smoothing parameter for $\mathrm{i}^{\text {th }}$ channel, hyperpyramid function |
| $\mathrm{m}^{\text {A }} \mathrm{m}$ | $=$ inverse covariance matrix of population |
| det | $=$ determinant of inverse covariance matrix |
| $\bar{x}_{i}, i=1, m$ | $=i^{\text {th }}$ channel mean for population |
| dnm | $=$ de cominator of hyperpyramid smoothing function |
| ${ }_{1}$ | $=$ multivariate normal probability density evaluated at one signature |
| $\mathrm{f}_{2}$ | $=$ hyperpyramid smoothing function evaluated at one signature |
| $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $=$ signature at which probability density function is to be evaluated |
| d | $=$ density divergence in bits. |



Figure 1-11 Main Program, Density Divergence and Subroutine COMPUT2
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### 1.3.4 Density Lister Program

Due to the high cost involved in computation of the probability densities necessary for signature analysis, software is needed for calculation and recording of this quantity to be read rather than recomputed by other programs. This program evaluates the hyperpyramid probability density function* at any number of signatures when attributed to one training set, recording the value on an external storage de.. vice for later use.

Input to the program is the training set signatures, signatures at which the probability density is to be evaluated, and hyperpyramid smoothing parameters. The output consists of the signatures at which evaluation was done with the probability density appended as the $m+1^{\text {st }}$ component, where $m$ is the number of channels.
1.3.4.1 Flow Chart of Density Lister Program

Refer to Figure 1-12.
KEY TO NOTATION
Main Program, Density Lister

| m | $=$ number of channels |
| :---: | :---: |
| N | $=$ number of signatures in training set |
| $S_{i}, i=1, m$ | $\begin{aligned} &= \text { hyperpyramid smoothing parameters for } \\ & \text { training set } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{ij}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{j}=1, \mathrm{~N}$ | $=$ training set signatures |
| ns | $=$ number of groups of signatures at which probability densities will be evaluated |
| $\operatorname{rim}_{i}, i=1, n s$ | $=$ number of signatures for evaluation in each group |
| dnm | $=$ hyperpyramid smoothing function denominator |
| $y_{i}, i=1, m$ | $=$ signature at which probability density is to be evaluated |
| $f$ | $=$ hyperpyramid probability density. |

[^2]
## BSR 2949



Figure 1-12 Main Program, Density Lister
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### 1.3.5 Decision Ruler Program

The Decision Ruler Program has only to read any number of files of Density Lister ortput in order to assign a signature to a category. As roted in Section 1.3.4, the Density Lister Program records in an external file the hyperpyramid probability density of each signature as attributed to one target. Upon creation of several such files containing the densities computed at identical signatures attributed to different targets, the Decision Ruler Program is used to make target assignment of the sample signature to the category for which that signature's conditional probability density is the largest. The probabilities of correct classification are computed for each sample signature as well.

### 1.3.5.1 Flow Chart of the Decision Ruler Program

Refer to Figure 1-13.
KEY TO NOTATION
Main Program, Decision Ruler Program

| nr | $=$ number of targets (number of density Lister files) |
| ---: | :--- |
| N | $=$ number of signatures to be classified |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{nr}$ | $=$probability density of sample signature attributed <br>  <br> to the $\mathrm{i}^{\text {th }}$ target |
| prob $_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{nr} \quad=$ | probability of the correct classification of sample <br> signature to the $\mathrm{i}^{\text {th }}$ target. |



Figure 1-13 Main Program, Dec:dion Ruler Program

### 1.4 CLUSTER ANALYSIS

### 1.4.1 Cluster / "sis Mathematical Description

Frequently, in the course of the analysis of multivariate data, it is useful tc represent a population probability density distribution in some parsimonious but reasonably accurate way. Usually, some simple parametric form is assumed and the parameters are estimated from a sample

Even when it would be otherwise difficult to justify, the multivariate normal distribution is used because it is easy to determine the parameters and also easy to evaluate the density exprcssion.

When a sample distribution exhibits excessive skew, kurtosis, multimodality, or other departure from normality, alternative representations are sought. This section describes a technique for dealing with the multimodal or clustered distributions when it may be hypothesized that each cluster is multivariate normal. The procedure requires an estimate of the probability density associated with each observation-this rnay be accomplished by a variety of methods, among which a particular one described by Specht* will serve as an example.

If the observations are resequenced to be in the order of descending probability density, the first observation may clearly be taken to be the mode of the first cluster. Each succeeding observation is then assessed with regari to the probability that it belongs to on? of the existing clusters or, alternatively, that a new cluster must be formed.

Of fundamenta: importance in the assessment is the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(\vec{x})=f(\vec{x}) \exp -1 / 2(\vec{x}-\underline{\underline{x}})^{T} C^{-1}(x-\underline{\vec{x}}) \tag{1.4-1}
\end{equation*}
$$

which gives the probability density $f$ for an observation vector $\dot{x}$ on the hypothesis that the distribution is multivariate normal with mean $\vec{x}$ and covariance matrix C. The quadratic form in the right half of Equation $\overline{1} .4-1$ can be replaced with the generalized Mahalanobis squared distance.

[^3]\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
d^{2}=(\vec{x}-\vec{x})^{T} C^{-1}(\vec{x}-\underline{\hat{x}}) \tag{1.4-2}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

yielding

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{f(\vec{x})}{f(\underline{x})}=\exp \left(-\frac{d^{2}}{2}\right) \tag{1.4-3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Taking the $\log$ of both sides,

$$
\begin{equation*}
d^{2}=-2 \ln \left(\frac{f(\vec{x})}{f(\underline{x})}\right) . \tag{1.4-4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that Equations 1.4-2 and 1.4-4 can be regarded as two different ways of computing the same quantity, one using the hypothesized mean and covariance matrix and the other using the previously estimated probability densities.

In the cluster analysis algorithm to be described, the extent of the disagreement between the two computations makes an important contribution to the decision, becanse appreciable differences will occur only when the wrong cluster (and hence the wrong mean and covariance matrix) has been hypothesized. To allow for the difference, Equation 1.4-4 will be rewritten using the symbol e to represent the value of $d$ that would be expected from the densities $f(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{x}})$ and $f(\underline{\mathbf{x}})$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{2}=-2 \ln \frac{f(\vec{x})}{f(\underline{x})} \tag{1.4-5}
\end{equation*}
$$

At this point, the notation will be permitted to reflect the presence of $m$ clusters, each of which is to be tested with regard to the hypothesis that the current observation $x$ arose from that particular cluster. Evaluating both Equations 1.4-2 and 1.4-5 for the ith cluster,

$$
\begin{gather*}
d_{i}^{2}=\left(\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x}-\vec{x}_{i}\right)^{T} C_{i}^{-1}\left(\vec{x}-\vec{x}_{i}\right)  \tag{1.4-6}\\
e_{i}^{2}=-2 \ln \left(\frac{f(\vec{x})}{f\left(\underline{x}_{i}\right)}\right) . \tag{1.4-7}
\end{gather*}
$$

Since $d_{i}$ is the observed generalized distance (between the observation and the center of the ith cluster) and $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the expected generalized distance, it is reasonable to define the variable $\alpha_{i}$ in Equation 1.4-8 as the expected fraction of the observition relative to the ith cluster,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha_{i}=\frac{e_{i}}{d_{i}} \tag{1.4-8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the unexpected fraction $\beta_{i}$ then given by Equation 1.4-9:

$$
\begin{align*}
\beta_{i} & =1-\alpha_{i} \\
& =1-\frac{e_{i}}{d_{i}} \tag{1.4-9}
\end{align*}
$$

The urexpected part of the observation relative to the ith cluster is the vector:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{z}_{i}=\beta_{i}\left(\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x}^{-}-\vec{x}_{i}\right) \tag{1.4-10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Clearly, since the covariance matrices $C_{i}$, the means $\overrightarrow{\underline{x}}_{i}$, and the probability densities $f(\vec{x})$ and $f\left(\vec{x}_{j}\right)$ are estimated from the observations and hence are not free of -rrors, the unexpected fraction $\beta_{i}$ is not identically zero even for the best choice fc. i .

Although a rule for making a choice has not yet been stated, it may be assumed that one exists. If the rule selects $j$ for the correct value of $i$, the unexpected part of the observation for the chosen cluster is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\overrightarrow{\mathrm{z}}_{\mathrm{j}}=\beta_{\mathrm{j}}\left(\stackrel{\left.\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x}-\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x}_{j}\right)}{ }\right) \tag{1.4-11}
\end{equation*}
$$

The covariance matrix of the $Z_{j}$ for all previous selections can be called the unexpected covariance matrix. This matrix, denoted by $W$, plays a central role in the selection rule to be proposed.

The generalized Mahalanobis squared distance for the unexpected part of an observation $\vec{x}$ (relative to the ith cluster) is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{i}}^{2}=\mathrm{z}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{w}^{-1} \mathrm{z}_{\mathrm{i}} \tag{1.4-12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The desired selection procedure can now be stated:

1. Evaluate $g_{i}^{2}$ for each cluster.
2. Let $j$ be the value of $i$ which minimizes $g_{i}^{2}$ for $i=1, m$.
3. If $g_{j}^{2}$ is $g r \in$ thr than a prechosen number $Q$, form a new cluster number $m+1$ centered at the given observation $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{x}}$.
4. If $g_{j}^{2}$ is not greater than $Q$, the observation is classified as part of the jth cluster, with appropriate modifications mane to the mean $\vec{x}_{j}$ and covariance matrix $C_{j}$.
On the hypothesis that unexpected variance is multivariate normal, the $g_{i}^{2}$ will possess the chi-squared distribution and $Q$ can be chosen to yield a specified probability of forming a new cluster by chance when a large deviation occurs.

The covariance matrixes for $t$. individual clusters are all biased in the direction leading to underestimation of expected variance. This effect occurs because observations are included in each cluster in the order of decreasing probability density. Fortunately, a suitable correction for the variance is available in the expression:

$$
K=1-\left(\frac{f\left(\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x}^{x}\right)}{f\left(\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x}_{i}\right)}\right) \frac{2}{n+2}
$$

where
$K=$ the fractional amount by which variance is underestimated
$\mathbf{n}$ :- the number of variables in each multivariate observation.

## 1.4.? Flow Chart of the Cluster Analysis Program

The following flow chart of the Cluster Analysis i rogram, Figure 1-14, makes reference to Subroutine EIGEN whose chart is presented in Section 1.2.2.

## KEY TO NOTATION

## Main Program, Cluster Analysis

IIN - input unit for data set to be cluster analyzed
IOUT - output unit for cluster analyzed data
LBL - data set identification
KD - data type
NV - number of variables
NG - number of groups
SL - smoothing parameters
OPT - option for space in which results of cluster analysis are to be printed
MEAS - measurement space
FACT - factor space
YM - constant vector in transformation ( $y=\tilde{A} x+\bar{b}$ )
SA - transformation matrix ( $y=\tilde{A} x+\bar{b}$ )
X - data point
NC - number of ca:es
$N_{k} \quad$ - number of vectors belonging to kth cluster
$\mathbf{V} \mathbf{F}_{k} \quad$ - factor by which variance in cluster $k$ has been misestimated
PS - probabılity density
NOG - number of clusters
$X_{i j} \quad$ - mean of cluster $j$
NCR - number of data points which have been read into progrim
$\mathrm{PM}_{\mathrm{i}}$ - probability density at mode of cluster $j$
$\mathrm{COV}_{i j} \quad-\quad j$ th component of covariance matrix from cluster $i$
DF - number of data points used in computing unexplained covariance matrix
ESDS - expected square of inahalanobis distance between vector arising from cluster under hypothesis and cluster mean
CHISQ - unexpected portion of square of Mahalanobis distance from mode of cluster under hypothesis
GMDS - Mahalanobis distance between vector a:d mode of cluster under hypothesi:
CSMIN - minimum value of CHISQ urter all hypotheses
CSMAX - maximum value which CSMIN can assume without causing a new cluster to be formed
$\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{ijk}}$ - diagonalized scatter matrix fo* cluster $\mathrm{k}-1$
$\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i} j \mathrm{k}}$ - unitary matrix used to diagonalizescatter matrix for cluster $\mathrm{k}-1$
$V_{i j 1} \quad-\quad$ diagonalized scatter matrix for unexpected variance
$U_{i j 1}-$ unitary matrix used to diagonalizescatter matrix of unexpected variance.


Figure 1-14 Main Program, Cluster Analysis
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## SECTION 2

## UTILITY PROGRAMS

Several of the computer programs produced during the study are not of any real theoretical interest in terms of advancing the ability to perform spectral pattern recognition. Hoever, they perform necessary clerical and data handling services in preparation for the programs that actually perform multivariate data analysis and classification. The functions performed by these programs will be required by any signature data processing system, although the details of those discussed here are peculiar to the requirements of the hardware used. Thus, only the functions performed are described.

### 2.1 TAPE EDITOR PROGRAM

Analog video is sampled with an eight-channel A/D converter under push button control by the operator. The results are recorded on a computer-compatible incremental tape recorder. While the tapes produced in this way are computercompatible, the format is not Fortran-compatible. The Tape Editor Program accepts the output of the $A / D$ converter and converts it to a record length and format which can be read by Fortran programs. During this process, incomplete records and records containing readings outside the scanner range specified by the user are deleted.

### 2.2 DATA SELECTION PROGRAM

The Data Selection Program regroups existing sets of data, as in selecting homogeneous samples for collating signatures with imagery. Input to the program may be the output of the Tape Editor or output from a previous run of the Data Selection or Subsampling Programs, along with the case numbers of the signatures to be extracted to form a new data set. The user may choose an option of recording the original Tape Editor output observation number along with the signature selected, for ease in associating ground truth information.

## 2. 3 SUBSAMPLING PROGRAM

The Subsampling Program selects random subsamples of a specified length from existing sets of data. Input may be in the form of digitized scanner data or continuous data with or without case numbers of the Tape Editor output appended. If input does not already have case numbers appended, the user may choose an option to append them in this program.
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## 2. 4 DATA TRANSFORMATION PROGRAM

The Data Transformation Program is designed to accept any number of factor score coefficient matrices produced by analysis about the mean or origin, for transforming any number of sets of data in digitized scanner or continuous form. Several computation options are available to the user as well:

1. A factor score correlation matrix may be computed from resultant transformed values.
2. A data correlation matrix may be computed from raw input data.
3. A data covariance matrix may be computed from raw input data.

### 2.5 HISTOGRAM TALLY PROGRAM

The Histogram Tally Program produces univariate histograms for each channel in the form of a frequency distribution by interval. Input may be either continuous data, digitized scanner data, or factor scores along with the number of intervals desired in the histogram. Output includes sample size, number of intervals, midpoint of first interval, length of interval, and observed frequency in each interval.

## 2. 6 PLOTTING ROUTINES

The Scatter Diagram Program produces a Calcomp Pen Plotter scatter diagram of values df any two specified channels. The user specifies the scale on the axes of the plot and may input continuous, digitized scanner, or factor score data. Digitized scanner data are converted to continuous data before plotting by use of the upper and lower bounds of scanner range.

The Histogram Plotter Program accepts as input the output of the Histogram Tally Program, and produces a Calcomp Pen Plotter graph per channel of the frequencies in each interval. Scaling of the axes is handled automatically by the program.


[^0]:    *Specht, Donald F., "Generation of Polynomial Discriminant Functions for Pattern Recognition, "Stanford Electronics Laboratories, Stanford, Calif., Tech. Report No. 6764-5, May 1966.
    **Smoothing functions are discussed in Section 4.3, Vol. I.

[^1]:    *Refer to Section 1.3.

[^2]:    ${ }^{*}$ Pefer to Section 1.3.

[^3]:    *D. F. Specht, "Generation of Polynomial Discriminant Funcions for Pattern Recognition, " IEEE Traısactions on Electronic Computers, Vol EC-16, No. 3, Jui e 1967.

