

## Polarimetric Decomposition Techniques and Machine Learning Modelling for Soil Moisture Retrieval from Simulated NASA-ISRO SAR (NISAR) L-Band Data

Authors : **Dev Dinesh<sup>1</sup>, Shashi Kumar<sup>1</sup>, Unmesh Khati<sup>2</sup>, Sameer Saran<sup>3</sup>** <sup>1</sup>Indian Institute of Remote Sensing, Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO) <sup>2</sup>Indian Institute of Technology, Indore <sup>3</sup>Regional Remote Sensing Center- North, NRSC, ISRO

ESA UNCLASSIFIED - For ESA Official Use Only

#### 💳 🖬 🖬 🔚 🧫 🚍 📲 📲 📕 📲 📲 📲 📲 📲 🔤 🖬 🕼 🚬 📲 👫 🕂 🖽 😓 📰 🐏 🔹 The Eu

## **INTRODUCTION / BACKGROUND**

- eesa
- Soil moisture plays a crucial role in sustaining a healthy ecosystem by supporting plant growth and survival, improving crop yields, and ensuring good crop quality.
- Soil Moisture is an influencing component in crop growth and development in the agricultural application as well as an early warning indicator of agricultural drought emergencies.
- An In-depth understanding of soil moisture dynamics has an essential significance for a wide range of meteorological, climatologic, and hydrologic applications.
- In addition, having a precise idea of the amount of moisture in the soil can help us manage our water resources better, make our irrigation practices more efficient, and give us a better understanding.

#### 💳 🔜 📲 🚍 💳 🕂 📲 🔚 🔚 🔚 📰 📲 🚟 📥 🔯 🖿 📲 🗮 🖿 🖬 🖉 📥 🖬

## **PROBLEM SATATEMENT / OBJECTIVE**

**Objective** 

3

- · eesa
- Manual mapping of soil moisture content (SWC) through field surveys is a difficult task as it consumes time and labour and provides limited data due to sampling constraints.
- Temporal mapping of large areas is also a challenging part as surface soil moisture is dynamic in nature and it changes frequently over time.
- Airborne and Space-borne remote sensing techniques keep track of the soil on a large scale and provide us with detailed data at reasonable temporal and spatial resolutions, allowing us to study soil moisture dynamics over a large area more effectively

The primary aim of this investigation is to assess the capacity of fully polarimetric Synthetic Aperture Radar data to examine L-Band for estimating soil moisture

To use Polarimetric decomposition technique and Machine Learning modelling to estimate soil dielectric and soil moisture.

To generate a high resolution soil dielectric and soil moisture map by using best performance algorithm

## **STUDY AREA**



(a)



The Soil Moisture Active Passive Experiment 2012 (SMAPVEX12), which was conducted in a region of Manitoba, Canada ( $98^{\circ}00'23'' W$ ,  $49^{\circ}40'48'' N$ ) situated within the Red River Watershed and the Assiniboine River flows through the northern part of the area.

·eesa

The region is primarily dominated by annual crops. The study area of SMAPVEX12 covers a distance of 12.8 km x 70 km and demonstrates substantial changes in surface soil moisture as a result of varying soil textures.

#### **DATA USED**



The Simulated "NISAR" data used in this study were collected by the "UAVSAR (Uninhabited Aerial Vehicle Synthetic Aperture Radar)" system as a part of the SMAPVEX12 Campaign.

NISAR L-Band Data					
Sensor Type	SAR				
Band	L-Band				
Simulated NISAR Mode	138A (frequency A)				
Frequency	1.253 Ghz				
Polarization	Quad Pol Data				
Angle of incidence	Near – 33.88, Far – 47.2				
Look Direction	Left				
Resolution	7.3 m x 7.3 m (Ground Range				
	Detected)				
Data Provider	Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL),				
	NASA				

(Flight Line ID: Simulated **Soil Moisture** Roughness NISAR 31606) Measurement Measurement Date Flight ID Data (Available) (Available) **Availabale** 7<sup>th</sup> June Yes ---10<sup>th</sup> June Yes \_\_\_ 11<sup>th</sup> June Yes ------12<sup>th</sup> June Yes Yes ------13<sup>th</sup> June ---Yes ---15<sup>th</sup> June Yes Yes ------16<sup>th</sup> June Yes ------Flight 12044 Yes Yes Yes 18<sup>th</sup> June Yes ------19<sup>th</sup> June Yes Yes ---21<sup>st</sup> June Yes ---------22<sup>nd</sup> June Flight 12046 Yes Yes ---Flight 12047 Yes Yes \_\_\_ 24<sup>th</sup> June Yes ------Flight 12048 25<sup>th</sup> June Yes \_\_\_ Yes Flight 12049 Yes Yes ---29<sup>th</sup> June Flight 12050 Yes Yes ---30<sup>th</sup> June Yes Yes ---Flight 12055 Yes ---Yes Flight 12056 Yes Yes \_\_\_ 7<sup>th</sup> July Yes ------Flight 12057 Yes \_\_\_ Yes 10<sup>th</sup> July Yes Yes ---Flight 12059 Yes Yes ---Flight 12060 Yes Yes ---Flight 12061 Yes Yes \_\_\_ 19<sup>th</sup> July Yes

https://uavsar.jpl.nasa.gov/

Data Processed

#### METHODOLOGY





MLR: Multi-Linear Regression RFR: Random Forest Regression DTR: Decision Tree Regression SGD: Stochastic gradient descent KNN : K-Nearest Neighbor XGB :Extreme Gradient Boosting NN: Neural Network

#### **DEVELOPMENT OF ML FRAMEWORK**





ML Software for soil Moisture

#### Length and the second second

#### **RESULTS:** Soil Dielectric



## **Soybean Field**











(e)





30

40

In-situ Soil Dielectric

(g)

50



RMSE= 13.19

70

MAE= 11.04

60



70

Soil Dielectric va 0 0 00

\$ 30

.

20

30

40

In-situ Soil Dielectric

(f)

50

RMSE= 15.06

70

MAE= 11.92

60

#### **RESULTS:** Soil Dielectric



#### Wheat Field

50

Observed

Best Fit

95% Prediction interval

95% Confidence interval



Soil Dielectric Retrieval from Wheat Field

(a) Random Forest (b) SGD (c) Decision Tree (d) XGBoost (e) KNN (f) MLR (g) Neural Network

9

#### **RESULTS:** Soil Dielectric





**Soil Dielectric Retrieval from Corn Field** 

(a) Random Forest (b) KNN (c) Neural Network (d) XGBoost (e) SGD (f) Decision Tree (g) MLR

10

#### **RESULTS:** Soil Moisture



## Soybean Field

0.8

0.7

ຕຼີ 0.6

B 0.5

15 0.4

ved Soil

æ 0.2

0.1

0.0

0.0

0.1

Observed

Best Fit

95% Prediction interval

95% Confidence interva

-----

0.2

0.3

0.4

In-situ Soil Moisture (m<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>3</sup>)

(d)

0.5



Soil Moisture Retrieval from Soybean Field

(a) Random Forest (b) Decision Tree (c) XGBoost (d) KNN (e) SGD (f) Neural Network (g) MLR

11

#### **RESULTS:** Soil Moisture



#### Wheat Field

0.5

0.0 0.0

Observed

Best Fit

95% Prediction interval

95% Confidence interval

0.1

0.2

In-situ Soil Moisture (m<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>3</sup>)

(d)

0.3



Soil Moisture Retrieval from the Wheat Field

(a) Random Forest (b) Decision Tree (c) SGD (d) KNN (e) MLR (f) XGBoost (g) Neural Network

12

#### **RESULTS:** Soil Moisture





Soil Moisture Retrieval from Corn Field

(a) Random Forest (b) KNN (c) SGD (d) Neural Network (e) Decision Tree (f) MLR (g) XGBoost

13

### RESULTS

		Soil Dielectric			Soil Moisture		
Algorithms	Field Type	R <sup>2</sup>	RMSE	MAE	R <sup>2</sup>	RMSE (m <sup>3</sup> /m <sup>3</sup> )	MAE (m <sup>3</sup> /m <sup>3</sup> )
Random Forest	Soybeans	0.89	6.79	5.15	0.89	0.05	0.04
	Wheat	0.73	3.99	2.64	0.88	0.03	0.02
	Corn	0.72	1.96	1.62	0.78	0.03	0.02
Decision Tree	Soybeans	0.84	8.16	6.05	0.88	0.05	0.04
	Wheat	0.58	4.98	3.53	0.77	0.04	0.03
	Corn	0.30	3.10	2.42	0.34	0.05	0.04
XGBoost	Soybeans	0.65	12.05	8.28	0.77	0.07	0.05
	Wheat	0.54	5.21	3.45	0.58	0.06	0.05
	Corn	0.47	2.71	1.94	-0.25	0.07	0.06
Stochastic	Soybeans	0.58	13.19	11.04	0.61	0.09	0.08
Gradient	Wheat	0.63	4.65	3.20	0.68	0.05	0.04
Descent	Corn	0.44	2.79	2.25	0.50	0.05	0.04
KNN	Soybeans	0.64	12.17	9.01	0.65	0.09	0.06
	Wheat	0.53	5.28	3.79	0.66	0.05	0.04
	Corn	0.65	2.22	1.86	0.68	0.04	0.03
Multi Linear Regression	Soybeans	0.45	15.06	11.92	0.58	0.10	0.08
	Wheat	0.50	5.40	3.85	0.62	0.06	0.05
	Corn	-0.52	4.58	3.77	-0.07	0.07	0.06
Neural Network	Soybeans	0.63	12.49	8.88	0.51	0.10	0.08
	Wheat	0.41	5.90	4.59	0.37	0.07	0.06
	Corn	0.54	2.52	2.05	0.36	0.05	0.04

#### Feature Importance in Random Forest



Analysis of modelled output of soil dielectric & soil moisture

→ THE EUROPEAN SPACE AGENCY

· eesa

#### RESULTS



Estimation of Soil Dielectric using Random Forest



Estimation of Soil Moisture using Random Forest

Estimated Soil Dielectric and Soil Moisture using Random Forest

## CONCLUSION



- The results were obtained for three crop types: wheat, soybean, and corn fields, for soil dielectric estimation, the random forest again provided better results in the soybean crop field with an R<sup>2</sup> of 0.89, RMSE of 6.79, and MAE of 5.15.
- Random forest showed best results for the soybean field with a coefficient of determination of 0.89, RMS of 0.033 m<sup>3</sup> m<sup>-3</sup>, MAE of 0.001 m<sup>3</sup> m<sup>-3</sup>.
- For the wheat field, a coefficient of determination of 0.87 was observed. Random forest performed better in the soybean field compared to the wheat field, but it still outperformed the other machine learning (ML) algorithms.
- The Adverse performance was reported for neural networks, XGBoost, and multi-linear regression.
- One of the reasons random forest performed better than other ML algorithms was its ability to handle a larger number of input variables without overfitting.

#### 💻 🔜 📲 🚍 💳 🕂 📲 🔚 🔚 🔚 🔚 🔚 🗮 🔚 🚛 📲 🔤 🛶 🚳 🍉 📲 👫 📲 🖬 📾 📾 📾 🌬 👘 → The European space agency



# THANK YOU

Shashi@iirs.gov.in

