

Session 3 – SOC prediction algorithms for Non-Vegetated areas Nikolaos Tsakiridis, AUTh WORLDSOILS consortium

ESA Symposium on Earth Observation for Soil Protection and Restoration









0. WorldSoils – general framework





0. WorldSoils – general framework





1. SCMaP processing

Example of region in Central Macedonia









1. SCMaP processing

Example of region in Central Macedonia (zoomed in)











LUCAS topsoil data for non-vegetated areas (continental level)





LUCAS topsoil data for non-vegetated areas (continental level)





2. First modeling approach



- 70 / 30 split into calibration and independent test set
- Weighted Random Forest for imbalanced regression
- Weights determined by arbitrarily splitting the data into three classes
- Parameters optimized via 5-fold CV
- Train / test split via using k-means to create 300 spectral clusters, and random 75% / 25% split within each cluster
- Poor performance but also: no high values!



2. First modeling approach – further considerations

- Similar spectra ⇒ similar SOC
- Dissimilar spectra ⇒ dissimilar SOC

Not always the case!





LUCAS topsoil data for non-vegetated areas – augmented



- Augmenting high SOC content values (i.e., over 50 g / kg)
- Geostatistics: close points \approx similar SOC
- 3x3 grid around the central LUCAS sample
- Distribution improved, but not dramatically



3. Data augmentation for high SOC content

LUCAS topsoil data for non-vegetated areas – augmented



- Custom CNN developed
 - Multi-input (Ref. and Ref. SNV)
 - Hyperparameters optimized using the HyperBand algorithm
 - 3 convolutional layers and 5 fully connected layers
 - Custom loss function to penalize large samples
- Model uncertainty using bootstraps (PICP: 0.93)

Improved accuracy

R ²	RMSE (g / kg)	NRMSE	ссс	Bias	RPIQ
0.41	18.07	0.77	0.46	0.08	0.73



LUCAS topsoil data for non-vegetated areas – augmented



- CNN = blackbox
- Feature importance calculated using model-agnostic Shapley values
- Largest importance ascribed to B3 and B8 in the visible and near infrared, respectively
- Less so in the SWIR, with B12 at 2.19 μ m



4. Technical implementation details

Open-source software used

- Neural network: keras and tensorflow
- Raster loading and calculations: rasterio and gdal
- Connectivity: boto3
- Visualizations: pandas, matplotlib and seaborn
- All models developed in self-contained docker containers, can be run on different infrastructures and can be deployed in different architectures (e.g., arm64)
- Inference process optimized using integer quantization (int16) and parallelized to take advantage of multi-core CPUs



5. Final considerations – summary

The road forward

- Multi-spectral data have limited capacity to predict very accurately the topsoil SOC content, particularly given its high skewness; simulated Sentinel-2 from laboratory LUCAS data also yield similar results
- For a pure spectral-based model, it is necessary to utilize the forthcoming hyperspectral missions (e.g., CHIME, HyperField) whose continuous monitoring will provide a plethora of more data
- Food for thought: the bare soil model requires the presence of bare soil; good agricultural practices mandate the presence of cover crops in the winter months. Will we ever be able to see all (or rather, a good percentage of) bare fields in the future using only spring and autumn months with a revisit time of 12.5 days (CHIME)?





Thank you!

Nikolaos Tsakiridis, tsakirin@auth.gr

ESA Symposium on Earth Observation for Soil Protection and Restoration







