Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The state of the earth: estimating physical parameters from noisy and incomplete earth observation data

Arp, L.R.

Citation

Arp, L. R. (2026, June 23). *The state of the earth: estimating physical parameters from noisy and incomplete earth observation data*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4306907

Version:	Publisher's Version
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4306907

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary iii

Samenvatting v

1 Introduction 1
- 1.1 Motivation . . . 3
  - 1.1.1 Challenge 1: data inconsistency . . . 4
  - 1.1.2 Challenge 2: noise and ill-posedness . . . 5
- 1.2 Contributions . . . 8
- 1.3 Organisation of this dissertation . . . 10

2 Background 11
- 2.1 Earth Observation data . . . 11
  - 2.1.1 Types of EO data . . . 12
  - 2.1.2 Optical EO data . . . 15
  - 2.1.3 EO data challenges: quality, quantity, and diversity . . . 17
- 2.2 Radiative transfer models . . . 18
  - 2.2.1 RTM inversion . . . 19
  - 2.2.2 Ill-posedness . . . 21
- 2.3 Estimation methodologies . . . 21
  - 2.3.1 Black-box optimisation . . . 22
  - 2.3.2 Supervised machine learning . . . 23

3 VPint: value propagation-based spatial interpolation 27
- 3.1 Introduction . . . 27
- 3.2 Related work . . . 30
- 3.3 Problem statement . . . 32
- 3.4 Methods . . . 33
  - 3.4.1 General interpolation procedure . . . 33
  - 3.4.2 Background: update rule . . . 33
  - 3.4.3 Variants . . . 35
  - 3.4.4 Vector-based update rule for parallel computation . . . 38

3.5 Experiments . . . 40
3.5.1 Research questions . . . 40
3.5.2 Baselines . . . 40
3.5.3 Datasets . . . 43
3.5.4 Experimental setup . . . 45
3.6 Results . . . 47
3.6.1 Performance metrics . . . 48
3.6.2 Empirical performance (CRQ1) . . . 48
3.6.3 Other properties (CRQ2-CRQ5) . . . 51
3.6.4 High-level summary . . . 56
3.7 Conclusion and future work . . . 57

4 Training-free cloud removal using value propagation interpolation 59
4.1 Introduction . . . 60
4.2 Problem statement . . . 62
4.3 Related work . . . 63
4.4 Methods: Revisiting VPint . . . 65
4.4.1 VPint2 properties . . . 68
4.4.2 Further enhancing VPint2 for remote sensing data . . . 69
4.5 Experiments . . . 74
4.5.1 Chapter research questions addressed in our experiments . . . 74
4.5.2 Data . . . 75
4.5.3 Competing and alternative methods . . . 77
4.5.4 Experimental setup . . . 80
4.6 Results and discussion . . . 84
4.6.1 CRQ1: Identity priority and elastic band resistance . . . 85
4.6.2 CRQ2: Comparative analysis . . . 86
4.6.3 CRQ3 and CRQ4: Patch properties and computational efficiency . . . 88
4.6.4 CRQ5: Complementary strengths and ensembling . . . 92
4.7 Concluding remarks and future directions . . . 93

5 Characterising the ill-posedness of PROSAIL inversion for parameter estimation 97
5.1 Introduction . . . 97
5.2 Related work . . . 99
5.3 Methods . . . 100
5.3.1 General experimental setup . . . 102
5.3.2 Parameter importance and correlation . . . 102
5.3.3 PROSAIL inversion approach . . . 105

5.4 Experiments . . . 105
5.4.1 Ill-posedness characteristics (CRQ1) . . . 106
5.4.2 Causes of ill-posedness (CRQ2) . . . 107
5.4.3 Impact of range constraint priors (CRQ3) . . . 110
5.5 Results . . . 112
5.5.1 CRQ1: Ill-posedness characteristics . . . 112
5.5.2 CRQ2: Ill-posedness causes . . . 115
5.5.3 CRQ3: Impact of range constraint priors . . . 119
5.6 Discussion . . . 120
5.6.1 Summary of results . . . 120
5.6.2 Future work . . . 121
5.7 Conclusions . . . 123

6 eMMI: ϵ-manifolds of potential solutions for noisy inference 125
6.1 Introduction . . . 125
6.2 Related work . . . 128
6.3 Problem definition . . . 131
6.4 Representing the viable solution set . . . 133
6.4.1 Introducing ϵ-manifolds . . . 133
6.4.2 Properties of ϵ-manifolds . . . 137
6.4.3 Contrasting ϵ-manifolds and confidence intervals . . . 139
6.5 Approximating the viable solution set . . . 141
6.5.1 eMMI high-level overview . . . 142
6.5.2 Step 1: finding an optimum . . . 144
6.5.3 Step 2: finding a diverse set of solutions around the ϵ-boundary 146
6.5.4 Step 3: Approximating the ϵ-manifold . . . 150
6.5.5 Limitations of the current heuristics . . . 152
6.6 Experiments . . . 153
6.6.1 Experimental setup . . . 153
6.6.2 Simulation models . . . 156
6.6.3 Baselines and performance metrics . . . 159
6.7 Results . . . 161
6.7.1 CRQ1: effectiveness of ϵ-manifolds . . . 162
6.7.2 CRQ2: eMMI performance . . . 163
6.7.3 CRQ3: budget and scalability . . . 165
6.8 Conclusions and future work . . . 166

7 General discussion and conclusion **169**
7.1 Answering research questions. . . . 169
7.1.1 RQ1: Spatial interpolation 169
7.1.2 RQ2: EO data interpolation 171
7.1.3 RQ3: Parameter estimation ill-posedness 172
7.1.4 RQ4: Possible solution set 174
7.2 Outlook and future work 175
7.2.1 Alternative research directions 175
7.2.2 Future work 177
7.3 Concluding remarks 183

A Supplementary information **217**
A.1 PROSAIL inversion implementation details 217
A.1.1 Loss functions 217
A.1.2 Optimisation procedure 218
A.2 PROSAIL inversion: real-world Sentinel-2 data 219

B Additional results **221**
B.1 PROSAIL inversion 221
B.1.1 Optimisation convergence 221
B.1.2 Parameter importance per band 222
B.1.3 PROSAIL inversion SAM results 223
B.2 eMMI 225
B.2.1 ϵ-manifold effectiveness with precision and recall 225
B.2.2 eMMI results with precision and recall 225

Acknowledgements **227**

Curriculum Vitæ **229**

List of Publications **231**

Glossary **233**