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Abstract:
The objective of this paper is to assess the accuracy of C-band synthetic aperture radar (SAR) datasets in mapping peatland types over a region of Canada’s subarctic boreal zone. This research assessed contributions of quad-polarization linear backscatter intensities ($\sigma^0_{\text{HH}}$, $\sigma^0_{\text{HV}}$, $\sigma^0_{\text{VV}}$), image textures, and two polarimetric scattering decompositions: i) Cloude-Pottier, and ii) Freeman-Durden. Four quad-polarimetric RADARSAT-2 images were studied at incidence angles of 19.4°, 23.1°, 45.8°, and 48.1°. The influence of combining dual-angular information acquired within a short temporal span was also assessed. These C-band SAR data were used to classify peatlands according to isolated flat bogs (bogs), channel fens (fens), raised peat plateaus (plateaus), and forested uplands (uplands) using a supervised support vector machine (SVM) classifier. Numerous classifications were examined to compare the unique contributions of these variables to classification accuracy. Results suggest linear backscatter variables in isolation produce comparable classification results with those of the Freeman-Durden and Cloude-Pottier decompositions. Combining polarimetric decomposition and texture data into classifications with linear backscatter data resulted in only minor (~1-3%) improvement. Combining classifications from small and large incidence angles (dual-angular) significantly improved classification results over those of a single image. Classification accuracy was highest for isolated bogs and open water surfaces, whereas fens, uplands and plateaus had lower accuracies. The highest accuracy classification (84% and kappa coefficient of 0.80) used a dual-angular approach, with additional decomposition and texture information. However, it is noted that texture information rarely improved classification results across all tests. This approach identified isolated flat bogs, channel fens, and raised peat plateaus with >76% producer's accuracies.

1.0 Introduction
Peatlands play several functionally important roles at the regional and global scales due to their controls on biological, ecological, and hydrological processes. For example, peatlands recycle nutrients and purify water resources, both of which are critical in the functioning and preservation of sensitive ecosystems. Peatlands, on average, have also been a net sink of atmospheric greenhouse gases over thousands of years [1], making them an immense store of ancient carbon and methane. However, boreal peatlands, specifically those at the southern margin of the Discontinuous Permafrost Zone (DPZ), have recently undergone rapid permafrost loss and dramatic land cover changes concomitant with a warming climate [2]–[5].

Permafrost thaw in these environments is very concerning, as even small disturbances within the DPZ has the potential to transform peatlands from atmospheric sinks into sources [6], [7]. For example, using aerial photographs and high resolution optical satellite imagery dating from the 1940's to 2000, Beilman and Robinson [8] found permafrost areal extent losses of 50% and 33% at two peatland sites within the DPZ (Trout Lake and Liard River, Northwest Territories). This quantified loss of permafrost aligns strongly with the warming trend that has occurred over the northern hemisphere [9]. More specifically, Quinton et al. [4] show that mean annual air temperature measured at Fort Simpson, Northwest Territories, has increased from -4.1°C during 1896-1970, to -3.2°C during 1971-2000, and to -2.3°C during 2001-2007. Consequently, accelerated permafrost thaw from amplified climate warming is affecting the flux and storage of water from major land cover types, as each perform unique hydrological functions [10]–[12]. As peatland hydrology is largely connected to vegetation communities and the extent of the underlying active layer, changes such as alterations to water storage pathways [13] and deepening of the active layer [12] are predicted to drive large-scale changes in ecosystem
functions, such as carbon sequestration and biogeochemical cycling [14]–[16]. This makes monitoring the rate and spatial pattern of land cover change in this region a significant task as continued warming is predicted over the coming decades [17]. However, the extremely vast spatial extents of these sensitive ecosystems, their relative inaccessibility, and their heterogeneous land covers, necessitates the development of remote sensing monitoring techniques.

Techniques involving synthetic aperture radar (SAR) have demonstrated great potential for mapping peatland spatial extent and types [18]–[22]. Spaceborne SAR sensors hold several advantages over multispectral data for mapping peatland complexes in northern hemisphere environments. SAR is favorable because of the sensitivity of microwaves to surface hydrology conditions as well as the condition and physical geometry of vegetation. SAR sensors also operate independent of solar illumination or cloud presence. Depending on the sensor and mode of acquisition, SAR imagery can be acquired at relatively fine resolutions (e.g. 10s of m or less), which is valuable for mapping localized vegetation change and the small-scale fractionation of peatland cover type. Previous and current Earth observation satellites equipped with SAR, such as ERS-1/2, JERS-1, ENVISAT ASAR, and RADARSAT-1/2, offer(ed) a range of image resolutions, some as fine as <10 m. The relatively coarse resolutions of common multispectral sensors, such as Landsat (30 m), have use for regional land cover mapping but are limited in observing localized vegetation change and the detailed fractionation of peatland cover type. Unlike SAR, multispectral sensors are only sensitive to spectral and thermal properties of the land-surface (often vegetation), but provide no direct information on vegetation geometry, vegetation water content, surface structure or soil moisture.
Research has been conducted on the application of SAR for mapping distinct aspects of peatlands, with examples including: the monitoring of surface soil moisture conditions [23], [24], seasonal inundation patterns [25], and estimating properties of vegetation biomass [26], [27]. Much of the research conducted using SAR has focused on multipolarization datasets. These studies have provided knowledge on the most applicable frequencies and polarizations for application to detecting peatland properties, indicating that this depends on factors including the local wetland type, water level, vegetation structure, density, and height. For example, Baghdadi et al. [18] used C-band SAR for mapping wetland type in the Mer Bleue region near Ottawa Canada and demonstrated that $\sigma^0_{HV}$ was optimal for differentiating wetlands (forested and non-forested peat bogs) from other land covers, achieving a 76% overall pixel classification accuracy. At the same peatland site, Li and Chen [28] tested the fusion of optical, SAR, and Digital Elevation Model (DEM) datasets for identifying open bog, open fen, treed bog, marsh, and swamp wetlands and reported overall classification accuracies of 71-92%. Whitcomb et al. [22] used L-band SAR imagery for mapping vegetated wetlands of Alaska and produced a high-resolution large-scale thematic map with 89% overall accuracy. Atwood et al. [29] also used L-Band SAR to demonstrate an improved gamma naught ($\gamma^0$) radiometric correction technique, through classification of a site within interior Alaska characterized by wetlands, herbaceous tundra, and evergreen and deciduous forests. With the application of this technique, woody wetlands were classified with 64% user's accuracy and 72% producer's accuracy.

Supplementary SAR information such as polarimetric decomposition parameters and image textures are also beneficial for assisting in wetland classifications. Incoherent
decompositions, which express the average scattering mechanism of a distributed target (e.g.\cite{30}-\cite{32}), have become a widely researched technique for land cover classifications with SAR data, including wetlands. Two of the most commonly reported scattering decompositions are those of Cloude and Pottier \cite{30} and Freeman and Durden \cite{31}. Brisco et al. \cite{33} found the Freeman-Durden decomposition effective at delineating wetland boundaries because of the characterization of double-bounce scattering from flooded vegetation. These researchers also found the Cloude-Pottier decomposition capable of classifying different plant functional groups within wetlands (65\% overall accuracy). Antropov et al. \cite{34} also used the Freeman-Durden scattering components to map soil types under vegetated peatlands with promising results (up to 70\% overall accuracy). Walfir et al. \cite{35} used manual interpretation techniques of RADARSAT-1 textures and tones for identifying wetland cover classes of the Brazilian Amazon. An accuracy assessment was not completed, however they did conclude that the SAR texture products were fundamental in providing consistent wetland information. In another example, Arzandeh and Wang \cite{36} used texture analysis to improve single-date radar images of a wetland complex and found that optimal multiple-texture combinations significantly improved the discrimination between wetland and non-wetland areas (88\% overall accuracy classifications of wetlands vs. non-wetlands). The previously cited study by Whitcomb et al.\cite{22} also used summer and winter JERS image texture (and other inputs and ancillary data), generated from the full-resolution (12.5 m) SAR backscatter, to assist in developing wetland classifications of Alaska.

Although various studies have explored the utility of SAR for peatland mapping, few have identified the combined influence of various SAR datasets at multiple incidence angles. Dual- or multi-angle approaches have shown to improve target characterization within other
realms of SAR research (e.g. [37], [38]), thus justifying the need to explore this technique more thoroughly with a focus on wetland classification. Addressing this gap within the SAR literature may ultimately present an improved methodology for users applying SAR imaging in wetland dominated environments. The objective of this paper is to assess the contributions of multipolarization backscatter, image textures and two polarimetric SAR decompositions developed from summer acquired RADARSAT-2 imagery for classifying subarctic boreal peatlands in the southern margin of discontinuous permafrost in northwestern Canada. The purpose of this research is to identify the importance of the Cloude-Pottier decomposition, Freeman-Durden decomposition and various image textures to image classifications, in contrast to backscatter information available only from multipolarization datasets. Additionally, we examine the impact of single image compared to combined dual-angle (two-images) image acquisitions on classification accuracies.

2.0 Study site and target land classes

Research was conducted within the lower Liard River valley, in the Scotty Creek basin (Lower Liard watershed), Northwest Territories, Canada (Figure 1). Scotty Creek (61°18'N; 121°18'W) is a relatively small watershed (152 km²) located 50 km south of Fort Simpson. Scotty Creek has a low drainage density (0.016 km km⁻²) and basin slope (0.0032°) with elevation ranging between 240 and 290 m [39]. Scotty Creek watershed is located in the continental high boreal wetland region of Canada and within the discontinuous permafrost zone (DPZ). It is also within the Taiga Plains, a terrestrial ecozone consisting largely of coniferous forest with pines (Pinus), spruces (Picea), and larches (Larix), as well as aspens (Populus) and birches (Betula).
Scotty Creek watershed is a wetland-dominated landscape primarily consisting of peat plateaus, channel fens, flat bogs, wooded uplands, and open surface water (Figure 2). These land cover types were of interest for the classifications performed in this study. Peat plateaus are underlain by a perennially frozen core [40] and rise 1-2 m above the regional water table due to the expansion of their frozen peat. Plateaus are forested (>70% tree cover) to wooded (30-70% tree cover), typically with a uniform cover of open-canopied black spruce (*Picea mariana*) [41]. Plateau ground cover contains various lichens and mosses, but is predominately ericaceous shrub and *Sphagnum*-dominated. Adjacent to plateaus are permafrost free flat bog and channel fen wetlands. This proximity supports the lateral exchange of runoff from raised plateaus to wetlands, while saturated wetland conditions have thermal influences on plateau edge degradation; these are unique hydrological processes of this ecosystem [39]. Channel fens are characteristically located along the drainage network of basins in the form of 50 to >100 m wide channels [11]. As a result, interconnected channel fens provide drainage pathways between major water bodies, such as lakes, through lateral flow conveyance [39]. Ombrotrophic flat bogs are featureless surfaces that form in broadly defined and poorly drained depressions. *Sphagnum* species mostly cover their featureless surfaces, which overlies yellowish peat with *Sphagnum* remains. Also prevalent are club-moss (*Lycopodium*), liverwort species (*Marchantia*), and various fungi [42]. The water table is at or slightly below the surface of bogs and they characteristically have low inputs of basic cations and nutrients, resulting in low pH (< 4.5) [43]. This is contrasting to minerotrophic channel fens, which are commonly neutral pH (> 5.5) [44].
because of their sources of groundwater which typically result in them being species-rich. Depending on their nutritional characteristics (e.g. fens can be classified as poor, moderate, or rich) fens may support a variety of brown mosses, trees, shrubs, sedges, or *Sphagnum* [14], [45], and thus their concentrations of biomass and vegetation are variable. Wooded uplands are located on well-drained moraine deposits with rocky mineral soils that support tall deciduous-dominated mixed forests. As a result, vegetation foliage cover is generally greater than treed land covers found in the lower portions of the watershed (e.g. peat plateaus). Upland tree species predominately include a dense coverage of trembling aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), white spruce (*Picea glauca*), Alaskan birch (*Betula neoalaskana*) and jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*).

[Figure 2: General descriptions and photographs of Scotty Creek land covers.]

### 3.0 Methodology

#### 3.1 RADARSAT-2 Imagery

For this study, four 25 km x 25 km C-band RADARSAT-2 SAR scenes (*Table 1*) were acquired over Scotty Creek watershed. Two scenes were acquired in the summer of 2012 (July 22 and 31) and two in the summer of 2013 (August 26 and 27). All scenes were acquired in RADARSAT-2 fine-quad (FQ) polarimetric beam mode at varying incidence angles (~19°, 23°, 48°, 46°) and in single look complex (SLC) format. All FQ scenes were illuminated in an ascending (right-looking) satellite orbit with 5.2 m x 7.6 m (range x azimuth) resolution. In this paper, RADARSAT-2 scenes will be referred to based on their beam mode acquisition (as shown in *Table 1*).
3.1.1 Polarimetric SAR Data Processing

All RADARSAT-2 images were preprocessed using PCI Geomatica 2013© software (Figure 3). POLSAR datasets were first ingested into the software (in PCIDSK format) and then filtered with a 5 x 5 low-pass mean (boxcar) filter to suppress speckle noise and to increase the effective number of looks (ENL) of the single-look SAR data to 25. The boxcar filter algorithm preserves polarimetric information and operates in the spatial domain by replacing the center pixel in a moving window with the average of pixels in the assigned window size.

Filtered SAR images were then prepared for polarimetric dataset extraction by first converting to an appropriate matrix format. The symmetrized covariance (C3) matrix was used for extracting the HH, HV, and VV linear intensity channels, where H refers to horizontally polarized and V refers to vertically polarized. The VH linear intensity channel was not extracted, as the reciprocity theorem states that the information supplied by the HV channel is identical to VH. Pixel values of the linear intensity images also underwent radiometric calibration to produce dB values of sigma nought ($\sigma^0$) using the equation:

\[
\sigma^0(\text{dB}) = 10 \log_{10}(\sigma^0_{\text{linear}})
\]
Polarimetric decompositions were then applied to the filtered SAR imagery for identifying dominant backscattering mechanisms of peatland types and for the extraction of meaningful decomposition parameters. This research explored the Freeman-Durden [31] and Cloude-Pottier [30] decomposition methods, two of the most frequently applied methods for land cover interpretation (e.g. [33], [46]–[49]). The Freeman-Durden decomposition was used to partition the backscattering for each image pixel from the C3 matrix into the following scattering mechanisms: i) double-bounce scattering, ii) volume scattering, and iii) rough-surface scattering.

The Cloude-Pottier decomposition was then used to extract the entropy ($H$), anisotropy ($A$), and alpha angle ($\alpha$) parameters from the symmetrized coherency (T3) matrix. $H$ characterizes the amount of mixing between scattering mechanisms (eigen values), with single scattering mechanisms associated with values close to 0, and equal scattering mixes associated with values close to 1. $A$ characterizes the amount of mixing between the second and third scattering mechanisms, where a value of 0 indicates equal proportions, and values close to 1 indicate that the second mechanism dominates. $\alpha$ ranges from 0° to 90°, with low values (< 40°) representing surface scattering, intermediate (40° to 52.5°) representing double bounce, and high (> 52.5°) values indicating volume scattering. $A$ is most meaningful for low values of $H$. When $H$ is close to 0, $A$ values of 0° denote single-surface scattering, values of 45° refer to volume (dipole) scattering, and values of 90° indicate double-bounce scattering.

In addition to linear intensities and polarimetric decomposition parameters, image texture information were also extracted for all pixels within each unfiltered RADARSAT-2 FQ image. Unfiltered images were used because of concerns with the loss of textural information from the application of SAR image filters [36]. Texture values were extracted from the total power (TP)
of the SAR signal. The TP of a SAR image equals the span (i.e. sum) of the C3 matrix. Image
texture describes the spatial arrangement and variation of patterns among image pixels within an
image, and has shown to improve land cover classifications in wetland environments [50]–[52].
It therefore provides quantitative properties of smoothness, coarseness, and regularity of image
pixels. The texture measures for this study were based on second-order statistics computed from
the grey level co-occurrence matrices (GLCM). The GLCM can be defined as a tabulation of
how often different combinations of pixel values (grey levels) occur throughout an image.
Haralick et al. [53] introduced 14 statistical parameters that quantify image texture, however
literature indicates six as being most relevant: angular second moment, contrast, variance,
correlation, entropy, and inverse difference moment [54]. Therefore, these texture parameters
were tested for image classification improvement. Texture values were extracted at a 5 x 5 pixel
window, consistent with the filtering window applied to SAR imagery.

All extracted SAR datasets from the RADARSAT-2 FQ images were then orthorectified
to provide terrain correction, due to varying projection between image and ground coordinates.
The orthorectification process was completed with the PCI Geomatica 2013© Orthoengine
extension. Images were corrected to a 2 m resolution airborne LiDAR DEM, collected by [55],
and using the bilinear interpolation resampling method, which incorporates the values of the four
nearest input cell centers to determine the final value on the output raster. The extension's
Rational Function Math Model was also used for orthorectification, rather than manually
collected ground control points (GCP). The Rational Functions Math Model builds a correlation
between an image's pixels and their ground locations. Images were then processed (geocoded) to
UTM NAD 1983 with a post-processing cell resolution of ~8 m.
3.2 Supervised Peatland Classifications

Linear intensities, decomposition parameters, and image textures were evaluated first in isolation (Figure 4) and then in combination to assess their contributions to peatland type identification. Lastly, datasets from large and small incidence angle imagery were combined for testing a dual-angular classification approach. The low temporal differences between images permitted this assessment, as the FQ1 and FQ30 scenes were captured 9 days apart, and the FQ4 and FQ27 scenes were captured 1 day apart. All classifications required the development and input of multi-band files, which were dependant on the assessment being completed. Multi-band raster's were created with Exelis ENVI 4.8 software using the Layer Stacking toolbox.

Figure 4: Composites of SAR datasets at low and high incidence angles. (a) Linear intensities with small (left) and large (right) angle scenes, (b) Freeman-Durden parameters with small (left) and large (right) angle scenes, and (c) Cloude-Pottier parameters with small (left) and large (right) angle scenes. Numbers indicate (1) bogs, (2) fen, (3) open water, and (4) uplands.

To complete classifications, a support vector machine (SVM) supervised classifier (Exelis ENVI 4.8 software) was selected. First described by Vapnik [56], SVM classifiers are a supervised non-parametric statistical learning technique that operate by finding a hyperplane that separates the remotely sensed data into a predefined number of classes. The hyperplane is defined as the decision boundary that minimizes misclassifications based on the optimal separation of data within the feature space. Fundamental to the optimal hyperplane technique are
the support vectors. Support vectors are the data points closest to the hyperplane that lie on the margin boundaries and are critical elements of the training set [57].

A Gaussian radial basis function (RBF) kernel algorithm for the SVM was chosen because it has shown to handle more complex nonlinear class distributions, and is defined by the following equation:

\[ K(x, y) = \exp(-\gamma \|x - y\|^2) \]

where \( K(x, y) \) defines the kernel, \( x \) and \( y \) are the data being separated, and \( \gamma \) is the gamma parameter. The \( \gamma \) parameter defines how strong a single training example (i.e. one digitized target) influences the classification process, and is therefore the width of the kernel function. \( \gamma \) values for each image classification were the inverse of the number of bands (datasets) in the input image stack.

3.2.1 Training and Testing Data

Digitized polygon boundaries of peatland types used for training and testing were predominantly chosen based on highly accurate classification maps of Scotty Creek developed by Chasmer et al. [58], as well as GPS (Garmin eTrex®) collected spatial information from overhead (Cessna 206 aircraft) and field surveys completed in August 2012 and May 2013. The Chasmer et al. [58] land cover maps were developed using a decision-tree (DT) classification approach from the fusion of airborne LiDAR and high-resolution WorldView-2 multispectral imagery. Chasmer et al. [58] used topographic derivatives and vegetation structural and spectral
characteristics to produce classification accuracies between 88% and 97%, depending on land
cover type. These accuracies were obtained by comparing with field surveyed (differential GPS)
waterline extent of land covers.

Based on the described datasets, training and testing polygons were carefully digitized for
SAR images for forested uplands, peat plateaus, flat bogs, channel fens and open surface water
using ArcMap (ESRI® ArcMap 10.1). Digitized targets were applied with an inward buffer of
\~8 m (1 post-processed RADARSAT-2 SAR pixel) or greater (dependant on image
interpretation) to account for mixed pixel edges. This was also done to reduce speckle-related
fluctuations in the backscattered data. Digitized polygon targets were randomly split (50:50) for
the training and testing of supervised SVM classifications (Table 2). Testing sites used to
validate SAR classifications were converted to regions of interest (ROI) in ENVI® for
developing confusion matrices - confusion matrices allow for visualization of a classifications
performance by summarizing the relationship between two sources of information: i) the
classified image (i.e. the predicted class), and ii) ground truthed data (i.e. the actual class). The
Confusion Matrix tool in ENVI pairs ROIs with the land classes of a classification to show the
percentage of ROI pixels that were or were not contained in a resulting class. Statistical
assessments derived from the confusion matrices included the following: overall image
classification accuracy (correctly classified pixels/total number of pixels), kappa coefficient (a
measure between actual agreement and agreement by chance), producer's accuracy (correctly
classified pixels for a given class/total number of pixels for that class as indicated from the
digitized ground truthed reference data), and user's accuracy (correctly classified pixels for a
given class/all pixels classified as that class) [59]. Producer's accuracy quantifies how well a
certain area can be classified (omission error), whereas user's accuracy quantifies the reliability of classes in the classified image (commission error).

[Table 2: Number of pixels used for training and testing.]

### 3.2.2 Field Soil Moisture Measurements

0-5 cm depth soil moisture measurements were also acquired coincident with RADARSAT-2 overpasses. Satellite-based SAR backscatter can be related to surface moisture due to the contrast of dielectric constants of wet and dry surfaces [60], [61], making SAR ideal for observing hydrologic patterns in wetland environments. Therefore, soil moisture measurements assisted in the analysis and interpretation of classification results. Field measurements were conducted with Stevens Hydra Probe (Stevens Water Monitoring Systems Inc.) and ML2x Delta-T Theta Probe (Delta-T Devices, Inc.) sensors and calibrated to <0.05 RMSE using oven-drying techniques. 156 surface measurements were taken for each SAR overpass within a 140 m x 500 m sampling grid (20 m spacing) that spanned open bogs, channel fens, and permafrost plateaus. Table 3 presents the average field measured volumetric soil moisture for coincident overpasses, grouped by landcover class. Note that the wetland (bog and fen) measurements were often near saturation, a result of the water table being sufficiently close to the ground surface throughout most of the year, which satisfies the definition of 'wetland' [62]. Additionally, high water tables within sampled wetlands removes the concern around the SAR signal penetrating deeper than 5 cm (the depth of the soil moisture sampling probe) in organic soils with high porosity, as the signal response is largely controlled by the dielectric from the
(mostly) saturated conditions. Peat characteristics of plateaus, in contrast, typically have higher bulk density, and therefore this concern is reduced amongst these land covers with C-band SAR penetration.

[Table 3: Field surveyed 0-5 cm depth volumetric soil moisture (%) coincident with satellite overpasses.]

4.0 Results and Discussion

4.1 Classifications Using Linear Intensities

Linear intensity channels ($\sigma^{\text{HH}} + \sigma^{\text{HV}} + \sigma^{\text{VV}}$) were first tested in isolation for target identification using each FQ RADARSAT-2 image. Results indicated that operationally suitable wetland classification accuracies (>70%) can be achieved with a multipolarization SAR sensor in this peatland environment, however obtaining this result is beam mode dependent as several classifications were <70% overall accuracy (Table 4). When using linear intensities only, the small angle FQ1 image achieve a highest overall accuracy of 77% (0.71 kappa coefficient). This result supports previous studies indicating that small incidence angle SAR images (<31°) are optimal for boreal wetland mapping [63]. This is in part because SAR sensors operating at small incidence angles better penetrate short shrub wetland vegetation found in bogs and fens, whereas observation at large incidence angles results in increased canopy attenuation and scattering due to the viewing geometry. This produces a backscattering response more similar to upland or plateau targets. However, while small angle SAR images were found to produce better results than large angle SAR images, the fact that the FQ1 linear intensity classification outperformed the FQ4 image by 9% suggests that factors other than the minimal difference in incidence angle
influenced identification ability. To account for this, surface soil moisture measurements acquired during field sampling campaigns coincident with RADARSAT-2 overpasses were used to assist in the interpretation of the radar response. Surface conditions during the FQ4 acquisition were found to be vastly wetter over non-wetland land cover types (26% volumetric soil moisture) than during the FQ1 acquisition (10% volumetric soil moisture), and moisture measurements across fens and bogs were also drier for the FQ1 image acquisition. We hypothesize that contrasting dielectric between mostly saturated wetland surfaces and drier plateaus and uplands enhanced target separation for the FQ1 image. Therefore, although the contrast in results could be attributed to the variation in image beam modes, it is important to consider dynamic surface conditions and incorporate ancillary information (e.g. precipitation data) when available to assist in the interpretation of classification results.

When using only linear intensities, wetland classes were best identified with small angle imagery. Bogs were best classified with the FQ1 image, achieving a 95% producer's accuracy, whereas fens were best classified with the FQ4 image, achieving a 74% producer's accuracy (Table 4). Bogs were easily identifiable with the FQ1 image, likely because of the high $\sigma^\circ_{\text{HH}}$ backscatter from a combination of wet and rough peat surface conditions, which is very distinguishable in Figure 4a. However, classifications using only linear intensities produced poor differentiation between forested uplands and peat plateaus, indicating that C-band wavelength SAR had difficulty in discerning coniferous and deciduous components such as
leafs, branches and stems. Nevertheless, the FQ1 SAR image was able to classify peat plateaus with 81% producer's accuracy. This indicates that C-band SAR can, to some degree, depending on beam mode selection, discriminate scattering events of plateaus and their typically black spruce (Picea mariana) dominated surfaces from deciduous covered uplands. Open surface water was identified with 100% producer's accuracies with all beam modes.

Linear backscatter intensity classification results are comparable to other studies, further supporting that C-band SAR sensors can be employed over boreal peatland dominated environments. Li et al. [63] achieved classification producer's accuracies of ~80-86% for open and treed peatland bogs, however their procedure included the addition of multispectral imagery and elevation data. Baghdadi et al. [18] confirmed that multi-polarizations are necessary for achieving optimal results with active microwave sensors by demonstrating unique sensitivities of each linear channel to peatland types. For instance, they found $\sigma_{HV}$ most suitable for separating forested from non-forested targets, and $\sigma_{HH}$ to be very sensitive to open wetlands due to moisture conditions. Their overall classification accuracies were 74% for $\sigma_{HH}$ alone, 76% for $\sigma_{HV}$ alone, and 59% for $\sigma_{VV}$ alone. Santoro et al. [64] also found $\sigma_{HV}$ to show strong contrast between mature forest stands and open areas such as clear-cuts in boreal Sweden. Morrissey and Livingston [65], classified a complex mosaic of forests, fens, and bogs amongst other land cover types, with C-band obtaining an overall accuracy of 89%.

4.2 Classifications Using Polarimetric Decompositions

The Freeman-Durden and Cloude-Pottier decompositions were used to decompose the fully polarimetric SAR data into their respective components. Decomposed components were
then tested alone to determine their ability to identify peatland types. Interpretations of decomposition components and their respective scattering mechanisms assisted in the classification analysis. It was established that the Freeman-Durden decomposition performed better in this environment than the Cloude-Pottier decomposition, as the volume, double-bounce, and rough-surface scattering contributions could better distinguish peatland types.

Freeman-Durden decompositions demonstrated that a given target’s dominant scattering contributions are quite dependent on the imaging incidence angle, and that these contributions are most clearly differentiated with small angle imagery (Figure 5). For example, bogs were differentiated very well from fens with the FQ1 scene, as they displayed relatively high quantities of rough-surface scattering (83%) and low quantities of volume scattering (15%), whereas fens were dominated by volume scattering (66%). However, fens did share overlapping scattering signatures with plateaus and uplands. This is a product of dense vegetation coverage found on uplands and plateaus, and mostly moderate coverage with fens, therefore their rates of volume-scattering are relatively high regardless of illumination angle (>57%). As expected, the separation of plateaus from uplands was also difficult, however, small angle imagery did prove better than large angle imagery, albeit only marginally. The FQ4 beam mode in particular showed better differentiation of multiple-scattering events from these scenes, as uplands had 12% greater volume-scattering contributions than plateaus - it is possible that the moisture conditions during the time of the FQ4 image acquisition significantly influenced this result. Nevertheless, it is evident that physical geometric characteristics of vegetation stands found in upland environments (e.g. deciduous) and plateaus (e.g. coniferous) produces minor observable differences in scattering interactions regardless of the SAR imaging configuration. Although it
must also be considered that the Freeman-Durden decomposition, like many other model-based
decompositions, may be over estimating the volume scattering component of treed uplands and
plateaus due to the occurrence of negative eigen values. The testing of other decompositions
(e.g.[66], [67]) that account for this may improve results in this instance. Surface water targets
were by and far the most contrasting land cover type. This is because surface water imparts
minimal scattering from specular reflection, resulting in a very dark tonal upon visual inspection
of the SAR image. Further, any backscatter from water that was returned to the sensor could be
attributed to Bragg scattering (a result of wind), although this was mostly absent due to open
water targets being very calm.

[Figure 5: Freeman-Durden volume, double-bounce, and rough-surface scattering contributions of land cover
targets.]

Using the Cloude-Pottier decomposition, alpha-entropy feature space plots were
developed for relating peatland types to physical scattering mechanisms (Figure 6). Alpha-
entropy plots are divided into a series of separating boundaries referred to as sub-zones which
assist in interpreting specific scattering characteristics of targets, as defined by Cloude and
Pottier [30]. Similar to the Freeman-Durden decomposition, peatland types displayed more
contrasting signatures with small angle SAR imagery. With FQ1 and FQ4 images, bog targets
existed primarily in zone 9, a product of low entropy ($H<0.5$) and alpha angles ($<42^\circ$). Targets
that fall in this segmented zone characteristically exhibit single-scattering events such as surface
scattering. Open surface water targets also fell within this zone with small angle imagery because
of specular surface scattering. Densely- and moderately-treed targets (e.g. uplands, plateaus, and
fens) predominately fell in zones 5 and 6. Zone 5 indicates medium entropy vegetation scattering caused by a dominant double-bounce (cylinder) type scattering mechanism, whereas zone 6 reflects an increase in entropy caused by greater terrain surface roughness, and due to canopy propagation effects [30]. Although plateaus and uplands mostly fell in zone 6, a number of sample targets also resided in zone 5. However, fen targets were mostly in zone 5, which is expected due to sparser vegetation cover. At large incidence angles, scattering signatures became extremely aggregated as all targets fell within zones 5 and 6. This degree of signature overlap was unexpected, especially for open surface water targets that induce specular reflection. The conglomeration of targets with large angle images in the alpha-entropy zone-plots help explain the poor classification results at those respective incidence angles.

Following the analysis of decomposition parameters, the Freeman-Durden and Cloude-Pottier techniques were then tested for their contributions to classification potential. The FQ1 SAR image produced the best result with the Freeman-Durden decomposition, achieving a 75% overall accuracy (0.69 kappa coefficient) (Table 4). Surface water was best identified with this beam mode and decomposition (100% producer's accuracy), followed by bogs (96.8% producer's accuracy) and plateaus (81.8% producer's accuracy). A greater degree of confusion was found with fen and upland targets (<64% producer's accuracies), as the decomposition indicated an overlap of scattering contributions. Regardless, this was a 9% overall improvement over the most
successful classification using the Cloude-Pottier decomposition (66% overall accuracy with the FQ1 image). Comparable decomposition performances have been reported for wetland mapping [33]. We also established that for both decomposition techniques, accuracy was reduced as incidence angle became larger. Specifically, results demonstrated that the Cloude-Pottier decomposition parameters for both FQ27 and FQ30 images (<40% overall accuracy) resulted in confusion due to significant overlap of scattering properties among targets (Figure 6).

4.3 Classifications Using Image GLCM Textures

Image GLCM textures in isolation produced unsatisfactory peatland classifications (Table 4). Classifications, regardless of beam mode, produced overall accuracies <50%. The FQ27 image produced the highest overall accuracy using image textures with a 49% overall accuracy (0.39 kappa coefficient). With small angle SAR images (FQ1 and FQ4), textures were the least successful SAR dataset in isolation, as overall accuracies were considerably lower than when using linear intensities or decompositions only. With large angle SAR images (FQ27 and FQ30), textures produced results only better than the Cloude-Pottier decomposition. Image textures were not as useful for identifying fen and upland targets, although modest success was found in classifying plateaus with large angle imagery (82% producer's accuracy with FQ27) and bogs with small angle imagery (68% producer's accuracy with FQ1). Success was achieved in surface water identification again though, as producer's accuracies of 100% were achieved with large angle FQ27 and FQ30 images. This is because water can be considered texture-less in SAR imagery due to little to no spatial variability, whereas in contrast vegetated terrains represent a medium texture class [68].
It was hypothesized that a combination of image textures would produce better classification results in this environment, as previous research has shown SAR image textures to be valuable in wetland type identification [36], [52]. Arzandeh and Wang [36] in particular were able to achieve 70% overall accuracy of their study site using SAR textures, as well as 80% producer's accuracy for wetland types, a remarkably better result than in our study. However, to attain this result their classification hierarchy approach was to simply differentiate wetland (e.g. marsh and swamp) from non-wetland terrain (e.g. urban, agriculture, etc.), a task that SAR is very capable of performing. They also experimentally tested various window sizes (from 3x3 to 25x25) for identifying an optimal texture dataset. As our study did not perform an exhaustive examination of window sizes, the potential for improving textural contributions to classification accuracy in this environment could be further explored with future research. However, Racine et al. [69] used SAR image textures in a peatland environment and classification results were more comparable to our results. They found that SAR textures (extracted using a 15x15 window) were able to achieve 36% overall accuracy for open peatland, forested peatland, water, and mineral targets. This in combination with the results from our study suggests that image textures derived from SAR imagery are not beneficial for peatland mapping, especially in subarctic boreal wetland dominated environments where inter-class wetland differentiation is challenging.

4.4 Classifications Using Additively Combined SAR Datasets

Following the testing of unique SAR datasets in isolation, we then combined SAR datasets in an additive layer stacking approach for potentially improving peatland identification. Adding the Freeman-Durden or Cloude-Pottier decompositions to linear intensities produced ~1-3% overall accuracy improvements, apart from the FQ1 image in which no improvement was
found (Table 4). Combining both decompositions together with linear intensities also produced marginal improvements for most images, although a decrease in accuracy was found with the FQ1 image. It is understandable that little improvement was found with decompositions, as minimal double-bounce scattering was induced for all land covers. This suggest that there is not a dominant scattering mechanism for each class, thus assigning a classification based mostly on volume and surface scattering contributions is challenging. Overall accuracies were slightly reduced (~1%) with the FQ1 and FQ27 images when image textures were added to linear intensities, but improved when added to the FQ4 and FQ30 images (~1-3%). Results indicated that improvements were very modest for all dataset additions using single-date SAR imagery, though the best overall classification accuracies for the FQ4, FQ27 and FQ30 images (71%, 67%, and 63% overall accuracies) were achieved when stacking all linear intensity, decomposition, and texture information together. The FQ1 image was the only exception, as this beam mode found linear intensities only to produce a better overall classification (77% overall accuracy, 0.71 kappa coefficient) than with all collective datasets. Moreover, because overall classification improvements were minimal throughout the additive process, no particular land class had vastly enhanced identification results with added SAR datasets.

4.5 Classifications Using a Dual-angular Approach

The dual-angular classification approach provided the most significant improvements in peatland type identification (Table 5). Several classifications achieved overall accuracies >80% using a combination of dual-angular imagery. Analogous to results observed with single-angular classifications, the Freeman-Durden decomposition outperformed the Cloude-Pottier decomposition (>77% overall accuracies with Freeman-Durden components). Image textures
performed poorly again (<59% overall accuracies), and generally produced little to no
improvements as an additive dataset to linear intensities (~0-1% accuracy improvements). The
highest overall accuracy (84% overall accuracy and 0.80 kappa coefficient) was achieved when
combining all FQ1 and FQ30 linear intensity, polarimetric decomposition, and image texture
datasets together (Figure 7a), although a similar result was achieved without image textures,
further demonstrating that this information is unnecessary. This was a 7% overall accuracy
improvement over the FQ1 linear-intensity only classification, which was the highest reported
classification using only single- image datasets. Merging the FQ4 and FQ27 linear intensity,
polarimetric decomposition, and image texture datasets also produced a strong classification of
Scotty Creek watershed for those respective dates, with a reported 81% overall accuracy and
0.79 kappa coefficient (Figure 7b).

Table 5: Overall classification accuracies (%) and kappa coefficients (K) using a dual-angular approach.
Producer's accuracies (%) for peatland types are also reported.

Analysis of the statistics generated from error matrices provides a valuable understanding
of a classifier's performance. Full confusion matrices were generated for the two dual-angular
classifications that utilized all SAR datasets, as these represent the best achievable results with
their respective image combinations (Tables 6-7). Common trends of target identification and confusion were observed. First, both classifications indicated a very strong identification of bogs (>96% producer's accuracies), and less success with fens (>76% producer's accuracies). Fens were mostly misclassified as upland environments, suggesting that the rate of multiple scattering events from canopies and double-bounce scattering between trees and perpendicular surfaces causes confusion with upland targets when vegetation density is equivalent, or at least partially similar. Plateau and upland targets in particular were best identified with the FQ1 and FQ30 combined SAR datasets (80% and 68% producer's accuracies). Moreover, when these upland and plateau target classes were misclassified, they were predominately mistaken for each other. This again is due to comparable volume scattering events from canopy top-crown interactions, as revealed by decomposition components (Figure 5). This also indicates that additional frequencies (e.g. L- or P-bands) are likely necessary for improving forest stand differentiation, which is a contrasting notion to earlier work by Rignot et al. [70]. However, vegetation density must be considered if multi-band frequencies are to be explored for this, as studies such as [71] have shown canopy penetrating L-band to be sensitive to surface moisture under 3 kg/m$^2$ in black spruce (Picea mariana) boreal forests.

[Table 6: Confusion matrix (number of pixels) for the FQ1 + FQ30 dual-angular classification performed with linear intensity, decomposition and texture datasets combined. Producer's and User's accuracies are reported in %.]
Table 7: Confusion matrix (number of pixels) for the FQ4 + FQ27 dual-angular classification performed with linear intensity, decomposition and texture datasets combined. Producer's and User's accuracies are reported in %.

The dual-angular approach with C-band SAR shows overall promising applications as a high-accuracy tool, specifically for the identification of saturated bogs, open water bodies, and forested terrains in permafrost environments. This can be extremely valuable for monitoring the following key issues: i) the expansion of saturated bog terrain from permafrost thaw, and ii) the terrestrialization of open water bodies. In boreal environments such as Scotty Creek, research has revealed that horizontal heat flows in thawing discontinuous permafrost produces considerable land cover change [72]. This is vital at wetland-plateau interfaces, where plateaus are subject to rapid permafrost degradation and the subsequent conversion to saturated bogs. Using SAR to identify the spatial expansion of bogs can potentially be used to quantify areal extent of permafrost loss, in addition to assisting in understanding the organic matter accumulation and nutrient status of peatlands as permafrost continues to degrade [73]. Northern peatland environments are also beginning to show signs of open water terrestrialization as peatlands encroach lakes and ponds [74]. The capability to accurately delineate water bodies with a cost-effective method such as SAR lends to the potential for monitoring peat expansion under warming climatic conditions.

5.0 Conclusions

The cold and poorly drained conditions of northern boreal peatlands have resulted in the formation of thick soil carbon reservoirs that are highly sensitive to surface disturbances such as
the thawing of permafrost. These reservoirs have the potential to alter global atmospheric greenhouse gas compositions and therefore have important implications on policy development and initiatives for combating climate change. Accurate monitoring and land cover change detection are necessary for understanding these disturbances and subsequent release of greenhouse gases from peatlands. Therefore, this research investigated the contributions of linear backscatter, two polarimetric decompositions and image textures from polarimetric RADARSAT-2 SAR imagery for classification of a peatland-dominated subarctic environment.

This research provided an assessment of the contributions of linear backscatter compared to advanced polarimetric decompositions and image textures for peatland type classification. Results demonstrated that when variables were assessed individually, multi-polarized backscatter ($\sigma^o_{\text{HH}}, \sigma^o_{\text{HV}}, \sigma^o_{\text{VV}}$) generally produced comparable classification results to those of the Freeman-Durden and Cloude-Pottier decompositions, regardless of incidence angle. When combining additional polarimetric and texture datasets into classifications involving linear backscatter, the improvements were generally only minor. However, results also show that dual-angular classifications consistently outperform those of the single-angular approach. This is largely a result of combining complementary scattering information from small and large incidence angle imagery, thus becoming more sensitive to different peatland type properties. In general, target classification was most successful with the identification of isolated bogs and open water surfaces. Channel fens, uplands, and plateaus were commonly misclassified with each other to varying degrees, and the extent of misclassification depended on the SAR beam mode. Variations in environmental and weather conditions during SAR image acquisitions may also result in misclassification, as the sensitivity of C-band to heavy rain and wet conditions are well
documented (e.g.[75]–[78]). The highest rate of misclassification was found with densely treed targets such as uplands and plateaus. However, since they were mostly mistaken for each other indicates that C-band SAR can accurately separate treed from non-treed terrain based on volume scattering contributions, but that confusion occurs when attempting to distinguish one treed target from another. This appears to be independent of biomass or tree species, as upland moraines are often deciduous or mixed forest whereas plateaus are commonly stands of mature black spruce (*Picea mariana*). The application of multi-date imagery spanning a large temporal period with leaf-on and leaf-off conditions [79] could improve this separation. The general confusion of tree type is less important for mapping permafrost extent in subarctic boreal Canada. For this reason, we concluded that C-band SAR is most applicable as a tool for monitoring change in permafrost boundaries and for terrestrialization of open water.

The implications of this research involve future sensor choice and testing for wetland classification, particularly as new C-band SAR sensors are available, such as RADARSAT-Constellation Mission (RCM) and Sentinel-1. The assessment of polarimetric contributions to image classification provides a unique assessment of the benefit of exploiting such complex SAR datasets for this application. It is suggested that future research over similar landscapes investigate the contributions of multi-band SAR imagery for assisting in the separation of treed land covers such as uplands and plateaus from treed wetlands, as longer wavelengths (e.g. L-band) provide increased penetration of canopy structures. For example, previous studies such as [19] detail the need for L-band data for classification of fen types in high-latitude regions. Furthermore, exploration into the seasonal timing effects of image acquisition may yield worthy results, as leaf-off conditions from deciduous upland vegetation could assist in improving overall
mapping accuracies at C-band. An assessment that combines imagery from varying hydrological states of the same sites is also of interest, as temporal differences have often been used to distinguish wetland types. Finally, further evaluation of the datasets and methodologies investigated in this research over other wetland dominated basins in the subarctic should be explored.
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Figure 1: Location of Scotty Creek watershed, Northwest Territories, Canada.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Permafrost</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ground Photo</th>
<th>Overhead Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bog</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Flat, featureless, <em>Sphagnum</em> dominated surface with a water table close to the surface. Sparse ericaceous shrubs, graminoids, and small forbs are often present.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Ground Photo" /> <img src="image2.png" alt="Overhead Photo" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Ground Photo" /> <img src="image4.png" alt="Overhead Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Broad channels with a thick floating vegetation mat. These features often have sparse cover or <em>Larix laricina</em> trees or <em>Betula</em> shrubs and have a diverse collection of non-vascular plants, graminoids, and forbs.</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Ground Photo" /> <img src="image6.png" alt="Overhead Photo" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Ground Photo" /> <img src="image8.png" alt="Overhead Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plateau</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Raised peat surface with a relatively open <em>Picea mariana</em> canopy. Ground surface is covered with <em>Sphagnum</em> and feather mosses and lichen with a layer of ericaceous shrubs and forbs.</td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Ground Photo" /> <img src="image10.png" alt="Overhead Photo" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Ground Photo" /> <img src="image12.png" alt="Overhead Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Well-drained mineral deposits with a closed canopy forest comprised largely of <em>Populus tremuloides</em> and <em>Picea glauca</em>.</td>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Ground Photo" /> <img src="image14.png" alt="Overhead Photo" /></td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Ground Photo" /> <img src="image16.png" alt="Overhead Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Open surface water bodies such as lakes.</td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Ground Photo" /> <img src="image18.png" alt="Overhead Photo" /></td>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Ground Photo" /> <img src="image20.png" alt="Overhead Photo" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2**: General descriptions and photographs of Scotty Creek land covers.
Figure 3: Flow chart of polarimetric SAR processing for peatland classification.
Figure 4: Composites of SAR datasets at low and high incidence angles. (a) Linear intensities with small (left) and large (right) angle scenes, (b) Freeman-Durden parameters with small (left) and large (right) angle scenes, and (c) Cloude-Pottier parameters with small (left) and large (right) angle scenes. Numbers indicate (1) bogs, (2) fen, (3) open water, and (4) uplands.
Figure 5: Freeman-Durden volume, double-bounce, and rough-surface scattering contributions of land cover targets.
Figure 6: Cloude-Pottier entropy/alpha plots for study targets according to incidence angles of four RADARSAT-2 acquisitions in this study. (a) 19.4°, (b) 23.1°, (c) 45.8°, and (d) 48.1°. Zones are labelled according to Cloude and Pottier (1997).
Figure 7: Image subsets of a high density peatland region of Scotty Creek, classified using a dual-angular approach with linear intensity, decomposition, and texture datasets in combination. (a) FQ1 + FQ30 (84% overall accuracy, 0.80 kappa coefficient), and (b) FQ4 + FQ27 (81% overall accuracy, 0.79 kappa coefficient).
Table 1: RADARSAT-2 imagery details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquisition Date</th>
<th>Polarization</th>
<th>Beam Mode</th>
<th>Central Inc. Angle</th>
<th>Orbit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/07/2012</td>
<td>HH, HV, VH, VV</td>
<td>FQ1</td>
<td>19.4°</td>
<td>Ascending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2012</td>
<td>HH, HV, VH, VV</td>
<td>FQ30</td>
<td>48.1°</td>
<td>Ascending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/08/2013</td>
<td>HH, HV, VH, VV</td>
<td>FQ27</td>
<td>45.8°</td>
<td>Ascending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/08/2013</td>
<td>HH, HV, VH, VV</td>
<td>FQ4</td>
<td>23.1°</td>
<td>Ascending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Class</td>
<td>Training Pixels</td>
<td>Testing Pixels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bog</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plateau</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Field surveyed 0-5 cm depth volumetric soil moisture (%) coincident with satellite overpasses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling Date</th>
<th>Overpass Beam Mode</th>
<th>Plateau Average Soil Moisture</th>
<th>Bog Average Soil Moisture</th>
<th>Fen Average Soil Moisture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/07/2012</td>
<td>FQ1</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>80.63</td>
<td>70.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2012</td>
<td>FQ30</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>69.79</td>
<td>52.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/08/2013</td>
<td>FQ27</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>79.78</td>
<td>67.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/08/2013</td>
<td>FQ4</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td>84.43</td>
<td>79.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 156 measurements were taken on each date.
Table 4: Overall classification accuracies (%) and kappa coefficients ($\hat{\kappa}$) reported for each SAR image, using a single image approach. Producer's accuracies (%) for peatland types are also reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beam mode</th>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>Bog</th>
<th>Fen</th>
<th>Plateau</th>
<th>Upland</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Overall Accuracy</th>
<th>$\hat{\kappa}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FQ1</td>
<td>Linear Intensities</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeman-Durden</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cloude-Pottier</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textures</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Freeman-Durden</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Cloude-Pottier</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Both Decompositions</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Textures</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Decompositions + Textures</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ4</td>
<td>Linear Intensities</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeman-Durden</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cloude-Pottier</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textures</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Freeman-Durden</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Cloude-Pottier</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Both Decompositions</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Textures</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Decompositions + Textures</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ27</td>
<td>Linear Intensities</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeman-Durden</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cloude-Pottier</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textures</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Freeman-Durden</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Cloude-Pottier</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Both Decompositions</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Textures</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Decompositions + Textures</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ30</td>
<td>Linear Intensities</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeman-Durden</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cloude-Pottier</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textures</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Freeman-Durden</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Cloude-Pottier</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Both Decompositions</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Textures</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear + Decompositions + Textures</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Overall classification accuracies (%) and kappa coefficients ($\hat{\kappa}$) using a dual-angular approach. Producer's accuracies (%) for peatland types are also reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beam modes</th>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>Bog</th>
<th>Fen</th>
<th>Plateau</th>
<th>Upland</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Overall Accuracy</th>
<th>$\hat{\kappa}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FQ1</td>
<td>Linear Intensities</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Freeman-Durden</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ30</td>
<td>Cloude-Pottier</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textures</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear + Freeman-Durden</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear + Cloude-Pottier</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear + Both Decompositions</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear + Textures</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear + Decompositions + Textures</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ4</td>
<td>Linear Intensities</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Freeman-Durden</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ27</td>
<td>Cloude-Pottier</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textures</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear + Freeman-Durden</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear + Cloude-Pottier</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear + Both Decompositions</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear + Textures</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear + Decompositions + Textures</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Confusion matrix (number of pixels) for the FQ1 + FQ30 dual-angular classification performed with linear intensity, decomposition and texture datasets combined. Producer's and User's accuracies are reported in %.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classified Image</th>
<th>Bog</th>
<th>Fen</th>
<th>Plateau</th>
<th>Upland</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>User's Ac.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bog</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plateau</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Producers Ac. 97.1 76.7 80.2 68.4 100.0

Note: Overall accuracy = 84%, K = 0.76.
Table 7: Confusion matrix (number of pixels) for the FQ4 + FQ27 dual-angular classification performed with linear intensity, decomposition and texture datasets combined. Producer's and User's accuracies are reported in %.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classified Image</th>
<th>Bog</th>
<th>Fen</th>
<th>Plateau</th>
<th>Upland</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>User's Acc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plateau</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Producers Ac. = 96.1, 87.3, 61.4, 59.4, 100.0

Note: Overall accuracy = 81%, K = 0.80.