

ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY



# Synthetic Discriminant Function Performance Versus Filter Count

Michael J. Vrabel

ARL-TN-157

April 2000

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

20000516 035

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

Citation of manufacturer's or trade names does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use thereof.

Destroy this report when it is no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.

# Army Research Laboratory

Adelphi, MD 20783-1197

---

ARL-TN-157

April 2000

## Synthetic Discriminant Function Performance Versus Filter Count

Michael J. Vrabel

Sensors and Electron Devices Directorate

Sponsored by  
AMCOM\*

Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5240

\*Also sponsored by the U.S. Army Research Laboratory.

---

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

---

---

## **Abstract**

---

The relationship between performance and filter count is examined for a synthetic discriminant function-based target-detection algorithm.

---

## Contents

---

1	Introduction	1
2	Clustering	2
3	Results	4
4	Conclusion	8
	References	9
	Appendix. Attributes—Image Set and SDF Codes	11
	Distribution	15
	Report Documentation Page	17

---

# Figures

---

1	Example scenes with targets indicated by crosshairs . . . . .	5
2	Target-detection rate versus false alarms . . . . .	6
3	Threshold versus false-alarm and target-detection rates . . .	7

---

## 1. Introduction

---

This report examines the relationship between the performance of the synthetic discriminant function (SDF) approach to automatic target recognition (ATR) and SDF filter count. The SDF approach to ATR is relatively mature, with much research published on various aspects of this concept appearing in the literature [1-7]. While a classification capability presently exists, I do not include it in this report. Consequently, this report is to be restricted to target detection only.

---

## 2. Clustering

---

To develop a set of SDF filters, one must have a reasonable method for organizing target images (the basis for the filters) based on some measure of target image similarity. For present purposes, all images are masked scene size ( $128 \times 128$  pixels) representations with varying-sized centered targets. One obvious and reasonable basis for clustering images is the Euclidean distance between images in gray-scale pixel space. The images used to construct the filters can be represented by a set of reference vectors, one for each filter, that minimizes the following cost function:

$$\varepsilon = \sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \xi_i} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|^2, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$  is an image vector,  $\mathbf{c}_i$  is a reference vector for cluster  $\xi_i$ , and  $\mathbf{x} \in \xi_i$  if

$$\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| < \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_j\|, j \neq i. \quad (2)$$

An obvious approach to a solution is the well-known  $k$ -means algorithm [8]. Traditional  $k$ -means suffers from problems addressed by a number of authors. The algorithm to be used in this report is the latest and probably the best iteration on this concept [9]. It is referred to as "optimal adaptive  $k$ -means." In adaptive  $k$ -means, the  $k$ -means uses an iterative approach to finding a set of optimum reference vectors. An updated vector is computed as

$$\mathbf{c}_{k.T+1} = \mathbf{c}_{k.T} + M_k \nu (\mathbf{x}_T - \mathbf{c}_{k.T}), \quad (3)$$

where  $\nu$  is a constant governing the learning rate and  $M_k$  is defined as

$$M_k = 1 \quad \text{if} \quad v_k(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_k\|^2) \leq v_i(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|^2) \quad i \neq k; \quad (4)$$

$$M_k = 0 \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

To obtain the within-region variation  $v_k$ , one calculates

$$v_{k.T+1} = \alpha v_{k.T} + (1 - \alpha)(M_k \|\mathbf{x}_T - \mathbf{c}_{k.T}\|^2), \quad (5)$$

with  $\alpha$  as a constant selected to be slightly less than 1.

One potential problem suffered by all  $k$ -means algorithms is the inability to define initial reference vectors (with its potential consequence on finding

a globally optimum solution). Rather than selecting initial reference vectors randomly, I used a recurrent neural network to perform this task. It has been shown that the Hopfield neural network [10] can be used to solve various problems in optimization [11–14]. Its properties are detailed elsewhere [10]. In the following, I briefly summarize its attributes. The asynchronously updated state of each neural network node is

$$V_n = \Gamma \left( \sum_{m=1}^N W_{nm} V_m \right), \quad (6)$$

where

- $V_m$  = present state of node  $m$ ,
- $N$  = node count,
- $W_{nm}$  = nodes  $n$  to  $m$  weights, and
- $\Gamma$  = a hard thresholding function. If the following restrictions are imposed upon the weights,

$$\begin{aligned} W_{nm} &= W_{mn} \text{ and} \\ W_{mm} &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

then an energy function can be associated with the network (assuming a zero externally applied threshold):

$$E = -1/2 \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^N W_{nm} V_n V_m. \quad (7)$$

An asynchronous network update guarantees an eventual settling into a final invariant state for all nodes—a state representing either a global or local energy minimum. Note from equations (6) and (7) that a two-population distribution will be selected that minimizes the absolute values of the weights within each population and maximizes them between populations. The resultant vectors have just the attributes required for initializing  $k$ -means. In this instance, the weights are equated with an average difference in gray-scale pixel values among the filter-generating images. The neural network divides the image population into two clusters. To increase the population cluster count, one determines the standard deviation of each cluster and subdivides the cluster with the largest deviation using, once more, the Hopfield neural network. In this way, the initial population can be divided into as many clusters as desired.

---

### 3. Results

---

The purpose of this work is to explore the relationships among four significant variables: (1) filter count, (2) false-alarm rate, (3) target-detection rate, and (4) SDF threshold. To test the performance of the SDF algorithm as a function of filter count, I modified the original code\* to allow a filter count independent of the target count. I then ran the code with the chosen filter population and combined the results for each filter. The output from each filter was examined for peaks in the response as per standards built into the SDF code, and the magnitude and location of each peak were stored for a maximum of the 60 largest peaks. This meant that a maximum of 480 peak responses could be stored for the maximum tested filter count of eight for each analyzed scene. All peak responses for a given filter set were ordered by magnitude, and the resultant data set was scanned starting at the maximum response. A circle of one of three chosen radii (3, 5, and 10 pixels) was centered on the location of the given peak, and the peaks within the circle were combined two different ways. The first approach was to consider any peak falling within a given circle as coincident with the main peak of that circle with the consequence that all lesser peaks were eliminated from the peak list.


The second approach was to define a location for the within-circle response by averaging the weighted locations of all peaks within the circle. The weighting factor was just the location peak response. Again, the ancillary within-circle peaks were eliminated from the peak response set. After comparing both approaches, I found little difference in the final results. Thus, all subsequent results are to be given for the first (and simpler) approach. A target was considered detected if its location fell within a radius of the peak response location as defined previously. Similarly, when consolidating all background hits falling within the preceding defined circle into a consequent single hit, I assumed that all hits within the circle were detecting the same false background attribute.

Figure 1 contains four examples of the target-containing scenes used to examine filter performance. The images in these scenes were selected from the beginning, middle, and end of the test sequence and represent the whole data set. The crosshairs are centered on the targets. The images are in an as-given state, with no rescaling or image renormalization. A narrow band

---

\*The original version of the SDF code was written by Lipchen (Alex) Chan of ARL.

Figure 1. Example scenes with targets indicated by crosshairs.



of pixels appearing about the perimeter of some of the images has an intensity distribution unlike the rest of the scene. For this reason, I discarded all peak responses occurring within six pixels of the scene perimeter. All images are  $128 \times 128$  pixels and the test sequence comprises 236 scenes, each containing two target images. Additional details about each of these two images and the images used to create the filter sets are given in the appendix.

False alarm versus target-detection rates are given in figure 2. The graph legend identifies the number of filters for a target-detection rate radius (as previously noted) of 3, 5, and 10 pixels. In general, the larger the filter count the poorer the performance. Figure 3 is the background and target performance as a function of threshold. As can be seen, the relatively modest target-detection rate improvement with filter count increase is more than offset by the corresponding increase in false alarms.

The SDF model has a number of desirable attributes:

- It readily adapts to a changing target environment.
- It appears to extract even low-quality images.
- Speed of execution appears to make the SDF model amenable to a real-time implementation.

Figure 2. Target-detection rate versus false alarms. Legends show filter counts of 1 to 4, 6, and 8 and three circle radii (a) 3, (b) 5, and (c) 10 pixels.








Figure 3. Threshold versus false-alarm and target-detection rates. Legends show filter counts of 1, 2, 4, and 8 and circle radii of 3 and 5 pixels.



---

## 4. Conclusion

---

A clustering algorithm was developed to optimally organize a set of correlation filter images for an SDF-based target-detection algorithm into one through eight populations. The resultant set of one through eight filters was tested (target-detection versus false-alarm rate) with the SDF algorithm. It was demonstrated that for the test population of target-containing scenes, the optimum SDF filter count is one.

---

## References

---

1. A. Mahalanobis, "Special section on correlation pattern recognition," ed., *Opt. Eng.* **36**, 10 (1997).
2. A. Mahalanobis, B.V.K. Vijaya Kumar, and S.R.F. Sims, "Distance-classifier correlation filters for multiclass target recognition," *Appl. Opt.* **35** (1996), 3127–3133.
3. D. L. Flannery, "Optimal trade-off distortion-tolerant constrained-modulation correlation filters," *J. Opt. Soc. Am.* **A12** (1995), 66–72.
4. A. Mahalanobis, B.V.K. Vijaya Kumar, S. Song, S.R.F. Sims, and J. F. Epperson, "Unconstrained correlation filters," *Appl. Opt.* **33** (1994), 3751–3759.
5. B.V.K. Vijaya Kumar, "Tutorial survey of composite filter designs for optical correlators," *Appl. Opt.* **31** (1992), 4773–4801.
6. B.V.K. Vijaya Kumar, A. Mahalanobis, S. Song, S.R.F. Sims, and J. F. Epperson, "Minimum squared error synthetic discriminant functions," *Opt. Eng.* **31** (1992), 915–922.
7. C. F. Hester and D. Casasent, "Multivariant technique for multiclass pattern recognition," *Appl. Opt.* **19** (1980), 1758–1761.
8. S. P. Lloyd, "Least squares quantization in PCM, Bell Laboratories Internal Technical Report," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **IT-28:2** (1957), 1982.
9. C. Chinrungrueng and C. H. Sequin, "Optimal adaptive  $k$ -means algorithm with dynamic adjustment of learning rate," *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks* **6** (1995), 157–169.
10. J. J. Hopfield, "Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities," *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **79** (1982), 2554–2558.
11. J. J. Hopfield and D. W. Tank, "Neural computation of decision in optimization problem," *Biol. Cybern.* **52** (1985), 141–152.

12. S. Cavalieri, A. Di Stefano, and O. Mirabella, "Optimal path determination in a graph by Hopfield neural network," *Neural Networks* 7 (1994), 397-404.
13. M. J. Vrabel, "Image edge detection with a recurrent neural network," *Proc. SPIE* 2760 (1996).
14. M. J. Vrabel, "Neural network-based segmentation," *Proc. IASTED (SIP'96)* (1996), 173-177.

---

## Appendix. Attributes—Image Set and SDF Codes

---

All filters were constructed from an image data set provided by the U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Command (AMCOM). This set contained 716 images and comprises the following images: l1815041\_r1.apc through l1815226\_r1.apc and l1816053%s through l1816288%s, where %s is one of the following: .m60, .tnk, \_r1.m60, or \_r1.tnk.

The SDF-based ATR algorithm was tested on the following set of 236 AMCOM-provided scenes: L1816S00053\_r1.bin through L1816S00288\_r1.bin. Each scene contained two target images: the M60 and tnk.

The following is a flowchart of the codes used for this study, along with the files generated by each code. This chart is followed by a description of the contents of each output file. All source code is available upon request.

- **filter\_cluster.c**

outputs: ↓

- 1.: diagnostics
- 2.: distance\_matrix
- 3.: hopfield\_clusters
- 4.: vector%d.dat
- 5.: matrix
- 6.: merged\_file

- **make\_list.c**

outputs: ↓

- 7.: detect\_list%d → mv to: test.list

- **sdf.c** → a.out -bd 1

(change value NOBJECT to filter count)

outputs: ↓

- 8.: test.dfil

- **make\_frame\_list.c**

outputs: ↓

- 9.: test.list

- **sdf.c** → a.out -td 1  
outputs: ↓
  - 10.: detection.dat
  - 11.: images.dat
  - 12.: sdf\_output.dat
- **sdf\_imaging.c**  
outputs: ↓
  - 13.: scene.dat → MATLAB™ imagery
- **sdf\_evaluate.c**  
outputs: ↓
  - 14.: results.%d.%d.dat
- **plot\_maker.c** → MATLAB 2D curves

### Output file contents.

- diagnostics:** Contains a description of the code performance at every 50 iterations for each cluster. This includes (1)  $(c_{k,T} - c_{k,i})/c_{k,i}$ , where  $i$  refers to the initial value of the reference vector; (2) the filter image population count for each cluster; and (3) the within-region variation  $v_k$ .
- distance\_matrix:** Contains the gray-scale distance matrix for the 716 filter images.
- hopfield\_clusters:** Assigns each of the 716 filter images to its appropriate cluster for filter counts of 1 through  $n$ , with  $n$  nominally assigned the value 8. This is for the Hopfield clustering model.
- vector%d.dat:** Contains the  $128 \times 128$  final reference vectors for a cluster count defined by %d.
  - matrix:** Is averaged distances between the Hopfield cluster populations for cluster count of 1 through, nominally, 8.
- merged\_file:** For the 716 filter images, contains in column format the cluster membership for a 1 through 8 cluster population, along with the image ID.
- detect\_list:** Contains from merged\_file the population for a selected cluster count along with the full paths to the individual images.
- test.dfil:** Is the filter set generated by sdf.c to be used by the detection function of the aforementioned code.
- test.list:** Contains table of image file names of scenes to be analyzed by the SDF code detector.

- detection.dat: Contains the detector response map for a limited number of scenes along with the corresponding target locations.
- images.dat: Contains a limited number of the unprocessed scenes used as input to the detector.
- sdf\_output.dat: Lists the locations of all targets on all scenes passed through the detector along with the top 60 peaks of the detector's output for each filter.
- scene.dat: Contains a square array of image pixels composed of either (multiple) unprocessed scenes or the output of the detector with all targets indicated with crosshairs and in a MATLAB compatible format.
- results.%d.%d.dat: Is in a four-column format: first column are threshold values; second column, corresponding first target-detection rate; third column, the second target-detection rate, and fourth column, the per scene background hit count. The first %d is the filter count and the second %d is the aforementioned radius value.

## Distribution

Admnstr  
Defns Techl Info Ctr  
Attn DTIC-OCP  
8725 John J Kingman Rd Ste 0944  
FT Belvoir VA 22060-6218

Ofc of the Secy of Defns  
Attn ODDRE (R&AT)  
The Pentagon  
Washington DC 20301-3080

Ofc of the Secy of Defns  
Attn OUSD(A&T)/ODDR&E(R) R J Trew  
3080 Defense Pentagon  
Washington DC 20301-7100

AMCOM MRDEC  
Attn AMSMI-RD W C McCorkle  
Attn AMSMI-RD-MG-IP R Sims  
Redstone Arsenal AL 35898-5240

CECOM  
Attn PM GPS COL S Young  
FT Monmouth NJ 07703

Dir for MANPRINT  
Ofc of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Prsnl  
Attn J Hiller  
The Pentagon Rm 2C733  
Washington DC 20301-0300

Night Vsn & Elect Sensors Dir  
Attn AMSEL-RD-NVOD L Garn  
10221 Burbeck Rd Ste 430  
FT Belvoir VA 22060-5806

US Army ARDEC  
Attn AMSTA-AR-TD M Fisette  
Bldg 1  
Picatinny Arsenal NJ 07806-5000

US Army Info Sys Engrg Cmnd  
Attn ASQB-OTD F Jenia  
FT Huachuca AZ 85613-5300

US Army Natick RDEC  
Acting Techl Dir  
Attn SSCNC-T P Brandler  
Natick MA 01760-5002

US Army Simulation, Train, & Instrmntn  
Cmnd  
Attn J Stahl  
12350 Research Parkway  
Orlando FL 32826-3726

US Army Tank-Automtv Cmnd Rsrch, Dev, &  
Engrg Ctr  
Attn AMSTA-TR J Chapin  
Warren MI 48397-5000

US Army Train & Doctrine Cmnd  
Battle Lab Integration & Techl Dirctr  
Attn ATCD-B J A Klevecz  
FT Monroe VA 23651-5850

US Military Academy  
Mathematical Sci Ctr of Excellence  
Attn MDN-A LTC M D Phillips  
Dept of Mathematical Sci Thayer Hall  
West Point NY 10996-1786

Nav Surface Warfare Ctr  
Attn Code B07 J Pennella  
17320 Dahlgren Rd Bldg 1470 Rm 1101  
Dahlgren VA 22448-5100

DARPA  
Attn S Welby  
3701 N Fairfax Dr  
Arlington VA 22203-1714

Hicks & Associates Inc  
Attn G Singley III  
1710 Goodrich Dr Ste 1300  
McLean VA 22102

Palisades Inst for Rsrch Svc Inc  
Attn E Carr  
1745 Jefferson Davis Hwy Ste 500  
Arlington VA 22202-3402

US Army Rsrch Ofc  
Attn AMSRL-RO-D JCI Chang  
Attn AMSRL-RO-EN W Bach  
PO Box 12211  
Research Triangle Park NC 27709

## Distribution (cont'd)

US Army Soldier & Biol Chem Cmnd  
Dir of Rsrch & Techlgy Dirctr  
Attn SMCCR-RS I G Resnick  
Aberdeen Proving Ground MD 21010-5423

TECOM  
Attn AMSTE-CL  
Aberdeen Proving Ground MD 21005-5057

US Army Rsrch Lab  
Attn AMSRL-DD J M Miller  
Attn AMSRL-CI-AI-A Mail & Records Mgmt

US Army Rsrch Lab (cont'd)  
Attn AMSRL-CI-AP Techl Pub (3 copies)  
Attn AMSRL-CI-LL Techl Lib (3 copies)  
Attn AMSRL-IS-EP P Gillespie  
Attn AMSRL-SE J Pellegrino  
Attn AMSRL-SE-SA J Eicke  
Attn AMSRL-SE-SE M Vrabel (5 copies)  
Adelphi MD 20783-1197

<b>REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE</b>			<i>Form Approved</i> <i>OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
<b>1. AGENCY USE ONLY</b> <i>(Leave blank)</i>		<b>2. REPORT DATE</b> April 2000	<b>3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED</b> Final, 1 Oct 98 to 30 Sept 99	
<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b> Synthetic Discriminant Function Performance Versus Filter Count			<b>5. FUNDING NUMBERS</b> DA PR: AH16 PE: 62120A	
<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b> Michael J. Vrabel				
<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> U.S. Army Research Laboratory Attn: AMSRL-SE-SE                      email: vrabel@arl.mil 2800 Powder Mill Road Adelphi, MD 20783-1197			<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b> ARL-TN-157	
<b>9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> AMCOM* Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5240			<b>10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER</b>	
<b>11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b> ARL PR: 9NE4MM AMS code: 622120.H16			*Also sponsored by the U.S. Army Research Laboratory.	
<b>12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b> Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.			<b>12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE</b>	
<b>13. ABSTRACT</b> <i>(Maximum 200 words)</i> The relationship between performance and filter count is examined for a synthetic discriminant function-based target-detection algorithm.				
<b>14. SUBJECT TERMS</b> SDF, correlation filters, automatic target recognition			<b>15. NUMBER OF PAGES</b> 23	
			<b>16. PRICE CODE</b>	
<b>17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT</b> Unclassified	<b>18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE</b> Unclassified	<b>19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT</b> Unclassified	<b>20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b> UL	