

**Earth Surface
Processes and Landforms**

**From manned to unmanned aircraft: Adapting airborne
particle size mapping methodologies to the characteristics
of sUAS and SfM**

Journal:	<i>Earth Surface Processes and Landforms</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Woodget, Amy; University of Worcester, Institute of Science and Environment Fyffe, Catriona; University of Worcester, Institute of Science and Environment Carbonneau, Patrice; Durham University, Department of Geography
Keywords:	Unmanned aerial system, Structure from motion, Grain size, Texture, Roughness

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

1
2
3 1 From manned to unmanned aircraft: Adapting airborne particle size mapping
4
5 2 methodologies to the characteristics of sUAS and SfM
6
7

8 3 Woodget, A.S., Fyffe, C. and Carbonneau, P.E.
9

10
11 4 Abstract
12

13 5 Subaerial particle size data holds a wealth of valuable information for fluvial, coastal,
14
15 6 glacial and other sedimentological applications. Recently, we have gained the
16
17 7 opportunity to map and quantify particle sizes at the mesoscale using data derived
18
19 8 from small unmanned aerial system (sUAS) imagery processed using structure from
20
21 9 motion (SfM) photogrammetry. These sUAS-SfM approaches have been based
22
23 10 typically on calibrating orthoimage texture or point cloud roughness with particle size.
24
25 11 Variable levels of success are reported and a single, robust method capable of
26
27 12 producing consistently accurate and precise results in a range of settings has
28
29 13 remained elusive. In this paper, we develop an original method for particle size
30
31 14 mapping with the specific constraints of sUAS and SfM in mind. This method uses
32
33 15 the texture of single sUAS images, rather than orthoimages, calibrated with particle
34
35 16 sizes normalised by individual image scale. We compare results against existing
36
37 17 orthoimage texture and roughness approaches, and provide the first quantitative
38
39 18 investigation into the implications of the use of sUAS camera gimbals. Our results
40
41 19 indicate that our novel single image method delivers the optimal particle size
42
43 20 mapping performance for our study site, outperforming both other methods and
44
45 21 delivering residual mean errors of 0.02mm (accuracy), standard deviation of residual
46
47 22 errors of 6.90mm (precision) and maximum residual errors of 16.50mm. Accuracy
48
49 23 values are more than two orders of magnitude worse when a camera gimbal is not
50
51 24 used, thereby demonstrating the critical importance of mechanical image
52
53 25 stabilisation for particle size mapping using measures of image texture.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 Introduction
4
5 2 The quantification of subaerial particle sizes is of value in a range of environmental
6
7 3 scenarios. In river science, for instance, we rely on mapping particle size
8
9 4 distributions for assessing habitat quality and diversity, for modelling flow hydraulics
10
11 5 and determining the impact of fluvial transport on engineering structures, flood
12
13 6 protection measures and restoration works. Here, we use the term 'particle size'
14
15 7 interchangeably with 'grain size' to refer to material typically within the gravel size
16
17 8 classification and larger (Wentworth, 1922). Traditional methods of characterising
18
19 9 grain size distributions include quantitative sampling, such as laboratory based
20
21 10 sieving or the measurement of in-situ grains at set intervals along transects, as well
22
23 11 as qualitative classification schemes such as the Wentworth Scale (Wentworth,
24
25 12 1922; Wolman, 1954; Hey and Thorne, 1983; Church et al., 1987; Rice and Church,
26
27 13 1996). In recent decades, remote sensing approaches have provided alternative
28
29 14 techniques that are typically faster, less labour intensive and less affected by bias
30
31 15 than traditional manual measurements (Leopold, 1970; Church et al., 1987; Verdú et
32
33 16 al., 2005). Readers are referred to Woodget and Austrums (2017) for an overview of
34
35 17 the key remote sensing methods used for grain size quantification to date. These
36
37 18 methods can be broadly categorised into two main schools of thought, where the
38
39 19 focus is typically on either;

- 40
41
42
43
44
45
46 20 (1) The use of high resolution remotely sensed data to delineate individual grains,
47
48 21 or;
49
50 22 (2) The development of a statistical relationship between grain size and remotely
51
52 23 sensed data properties.

53
54
55 24 The former, commonly referred to as 'photo-sieving', has been dominated by the use
56
57 25 of close range, high-resolution photography, often collected by hand or from tripods
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 and gantries set up over the material of interest (Adams, 1979; Ibbeken and
2 Schleyer, 1986; Butler et al., 2001; Sime and Ferguson, 2003). Automated software
3 packages (e.g. Sedimetrics, Basegrain) have been developed to measure individual
4 grains with high levels of accuracy (Graham et al., 2005a; Graham et al., 2005b;
5 Detert and Wietbrecht, 2012).

6 The second category comprises a variety of methods used to establish a correlation
7 with measured grain sizes, including;

8 (a) Textural analysis of imagery collected from manned aircraft (Carbonneau
9 et al., 2004; Carbonneau, 2005; Carbonneau et al., 2005; Verdú et al.,
10 2005).

11 (b) Analysis of the roughness of point cloud data obtained from terrestrial
12 laser scanners (TLS) (McEwan et al., 2000; Entwistle and Fuller, 2009;
13 Heritage and Milan, 2009; Hodge et al., 2009; Brasington et al., 2012;
14 Milan and Heritage, 2012; Rychov et al., 2012; Baewert et al., 2014).

15 (c) Analysis of the spectral or frequency content of imagery acquired at close
16 range (Rubin, 2004; Buscombe, 2008; Buscombe and Masselink, 2009;
17 Buscombe et al., 2010; Buscombe and Rubin, 2012; Buscombe, 2013).

18 These methods have been established in a variety of sedimentological settings, but
19 here we focus on their application to river systems in particular. Whilst approach (a)
20 is used at the macroscale (i.e. over many kilometres of channel length at metre
21 spatial resolution), and method (c) at the patch scale (i.e. over about a square metre,
22 with millimetre spatial resolution), few methods are yet capable of surveying grain
23 size at the mesohabitat scale (i.e. channel lengths of 50-500m with centimetre
24 spatial resolution) without the significant expense of purchasing a laser scanner

1
2
3 1 under method (b). Critically however, the mesoscale is the scale most relevant for
4
5 2 fluvial ecosystems and the health and survival of their inhabitant biota (Newson and
6
7 3 Newson, 2000).

8
9
10 4 Very recently, the development of small unmanned aerial systems (sUAS) and
11
12 5 structure from motion digital photogrammetry (SfM) (e.g. Westoby et al., 2012;
13
14 6 Fonstad et al., 2013) has provided a new remote sensing based approach for fluvial
15
16 7 surveying, which has shown great potential for application at the mesoscale
17
18 8 (Woodget et al., 2017). Outputs from sUAS-SfM typically comprise an orthoimage, a
19
20 9 digital elevation model (DEM) and a dense point cloud, similar to the point clouds
21
22 10 obtained using TLS. Data acquired using a sUAS-SfM approach has been tested
23
24 11 using both the image textural analysis methods of group (a) and the point cloud
25
26 12 roughness methods of group (b).

27
28
29
30
31 13 The work of de Haas et al., (2014) found that images acquired from sUAS, which are
32
33 14 more unstable than manned aircraft, suffer from blurring which precludes a strong
34
35 15 predictive relationship between image texture and grain size. In contrast, Tamminga
36
37 16 et al., (2015) found strong calibration relationships ($R^2 = 0.82$), but these could not be
38
39 17 replicated by the more recent work of Woodget and Austrums (2017), where the best
40
41 18 calibration relationships reached an R^2 of just 0.48. Woodget and Austrums (2017)
42
43 19 also report weak validation relationships, as indicated by a slope of 0.44 for the
44
45 20 observed versus predicted grain size relationship. They suggest that these poor
46
47 21 results, as well as those of de Haas et al., (2014), relate to the use of an inadequate
48
49 22 camera gimbal that introduces additional blur to the sUAS imagery. The set-up used
50
51 23 by Tamminga et al., (2015) featured a more advanced gimbal, isolating the camera
52
53 24 from platform vibrations and permitting the collection of higher quality images. In
54
55 25 addition, earlier work on the texture method, by Carbonneau et al., 2004 and Verdú
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 et al., 2005, found that the process of orthorectification introduces further visual
4
5 2 distortions that then negatively affected grain size predictions. It is likely then, that
6
7 3 the SfM orthorectification process may be partly responsible for limiting the strength
8
9 4 of results obtained from sUAS platforms.

10
11
12 5 Point cloud roughness approaches using sUAS-SfM data have also been
13
14 6 demonstrated recently, as pioneered by Woodget (2015) and subsequently applied
15
16 7 by others (Vázquez-Tarrío et al., 2017; Woodget and Austrums, 2017). Inspired by
17
18 8 methods used with TLS data (e.g. Brasington et al., 2012), these papers sought to
19
20 9 develop a predictive calibration between the roughness of dense point clouds (i.e.
21
22 10 fine scale variation in elevation of the points), obtained using the SfM process, with
23
24 11 grain size data. To date, more consistent results have been obtained using this
25
26 12 method than by using image textural approaches. Vázquez-Tarrío et al., (2017)
27
28 13 report high R^2 calibration values ($R^2 = 0.89$), as do Woodget and Austrums (2017)
29
30 14 ($R^2 = 0.80$) and others (M. Detert, *pers. comm*). Validation results are also promising,
31
32 15 and with mean errors of <1mm and standard deviation of errors of <2cm (Woodget
33
34 16 and Austrums, 2017).

35
36
37
38
39 17 Despite the encouraging outcomes of some of these initial studies however,
40
41 18 quantitative investigations aimed at explaining the discrepancies in results between
42
43 19 different papers is lacking. Furthermore, we are largely reliant on methods which
44
45 20 have been developed with manned aircraft or terrestrial laser scanners in mind,
46
47 21 which may not be wholly suitable when applied to sUAS-SfM data. Further
48
49 22 investigation is therefore necessary if we are to develop a consistent and reliable
50
51 23 method of determining grain size distributions at the critical mesoscale, both in fluvial
52
53 24 settings and beyond. Therefore, within this paper, our main aim is to present a
54
55 25 comprehensive approach to particle sizing from sUAS platforms that relies on
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 methods designed with the specific characteristics of sUAS image acquisition and
4
5 2 flight patterns in mind. We address the following objectives:
6
7

8 3 (1) To quantify the impact of camera gimbals (i.e. sUAS image blur) on the
9
10 4 derived metrics of orthophoto image texture and point cloud roughness.
11
12 5

13
14 6 (2) To adapt image-based methods of grain size determination developed for
15
16 7 manned aircraft to sUAS and compare performance to the derived metrics
17
18 8 obtained under objective 1.
19
20 9
21
22
23

24 10 Site Details

25
26 11 We selected a c. 80m long fluvial gravel bar for this research, which is located along
27
28 12 the right bank of the River Wear, near Willington, County Durham, UK. At this
29
30 13 location, the River Wear is c. 20m wide, with a bed composed of imbricated gravels
31
32 14 and cobbles. A pre-flight visit confirmed that this site was easily accessible and safe
33
34 15 for sUAS flying.
35
36
37
38

39 16 Methods

40 17 sUAS surveys

41
42 18 We acquired image data in July 2016 during dry and bright weather conditions. To
43
44 19 investigate the effects of sUAS image blur, we flew two different rotary-winged sUAS
45
46 20 at the River Wear, with different camera gimbal set-ups. The first was a DJI Phantom
47
48 21 3 Pro (P3P) with an integrated camera held within a 3-axis brushless gimbal. The
49
50 22 second was an older platform, a DJI F550, mounted with a Canon Powershot S100
51
52 23 camera, which we strapped to the underside of the sUAS without the use of a
53
54 24 gimbal. We used each sUAS to perform two surveys:
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 • Survey 1 comprised the collection of a series of images whilst hovering the
2 sUAS above a set location on the gravel bar, to address objective (1).
- 3 • Survey 2 involved collecting imagery over the entire area of interest, to
4 address objectives (1) and (2).

5

6 For survey 1, we flew each sUAS at an altitude of 20-30m to collect a series of RGB
7 images of a set location on the gravel bar. For survey 2, we flew each sUAS at
8 heights of c. 20m and 50m above ground level to collect RGB imagery of the whole
9 site. Dual altitudes were used in accordance with the findings of Carbonneau and
10 Dietrich (2017). This flight was easily controlled using the P3P since the flight
11 controller app displays altitude in real time. For the F550, a best guess of the altitude
12 was made by the pilot due to a lack of available flight information. We obtained
13 imagery with a high level of overlap (c. 80%) and with a mix of nadir and convergent
14 view angles, to facilitate camera self-calibration during the subsequent SfM
15 processing. Figure 2 presents the resulting flying altitudes that were estimated *a*
16 *posteriori* with the photogrammetry outputs described below. We note the much
17 greater variability in flying altitudes for the F550 which reflects the manual nature of
18 the F550 surveys. The gravel bar was systematically imaged with nadir imagery and
19 convergent view imagery was added to support the nadir imagery. For the P3P, the
20 off-nadir imagery was acquired with a simple change in the camera angle using the
21 gimbal. For the F550 and the non-gimballed camera, we used a bespoke set-up to
22 fix the camera at an angle. We acquired more than 100 images using each sUAS.
23 We distributed 10 ground control points (GCPs) prior to the sUAS surveys and
24 positioned them carefully, based on prior experience, to ensure adequate

1
2
3 1 representation of variations in topography within our site. We used a total station to
4
5 2 survey the position of each GCP in a local co-ordinate system.
6
7
8 3

9 10 4 Ground truthing

11
12 5 To calibrate and validate the grain size determination models for objective (2), we
13
14 6 established 30 ground truth plots along the gravel bar. Each plot was 1m² in size and
15
16 7 efforts were made to ensure within plot grain size was as uniform as possible, since
17
18 8 plot uniformity is known to impact upon the strength of the grain size/roughness
19
20 9 relationship (Pearson et al., 2017; Woodget and Austrums, 2017). We recorded the
21
22 10 location of two opposing corners of each plot using a total station and acquired a
23
24 11 scaled, close-range photograph of the plot using a handheld digital camera. Next, we
25
26 12 georeferenced each photograph within a GIS environment based on the associated
27
28 13 total station data.
29
30
31
32 14

33
34 15 Within the GIS environment, we selected a sample of grains for measurement by
35
36 16 placing a regular 10 cm x 10 cm grid over each ground truth photograph (Figure 3).
37
38 17 Those grains that fell beneath each grid node were measured for their A- and B-axes
39
40 18 dimensions using the scaled and reference photograph of each plot (Figure 3). Some
41
42 19 grains were unsuitable for measurement, including those that were obscured by
43
44 20 other grains, those that were not fully visible within the photograph and those that
45
46 21 were too small to measure at a scale of 1:1. We used these measurements to
47
48 22 compute grain size statistics for each plot, including the mean, D₅₀ and D₈₄ of both
49
50 23 the A- and B-axes.
51
52
53
54 24
55
56 25
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 Structure from motion photogrammetry
4
5 2 Prior to SfM processing, we conducted a subjective quality check on all Survey 2
6
7 3 images from both sUAS. We excluded images with notable blur or other visual
8
9 4 artefacts from further processing. Whilst this was a subjective decision based on
10
11 5 prior experience, subsequent results suggest that in future this could be established
12
13 6 quantitatively using image entropy information. Sufficient redundancy within the
14
15 7 surveys meant we would exclude images without compromising the subsequent
16
17 8 processing chain. We imported a total of 70 P3P images and 79 F550 images from
18
19 9 Survey 2 into Agisoft's PhotoScan Pro digital photogrammetry software. These
20
21 10 image sets were processed separately to create an orthophoto (c. 1cm resolution)
22
23 11 and a dense 3D point cloud for each sUAS set-up. We referenced all data to the
24
25 12 local co-ordinate system by importing GCP locations and optimising the image
26
27 13 alignments accordingly. Further information on the SfM-photogrammetry method can
28
29 14 be found in recent papers by Fonstad et al., (2013), Smith et al., (2015) and Eltner et
30
31 15 al., (2016).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 17 Quantifying the impact of camera gimbals

40
41 18 To judge the quality of imagery collected by the two sUAS during Survey 1, we
42
43 19 employed the 'Estimate image quality' tool within Agisoft's PhotoScan Pro software.
44
45 20 This tool returns a value between 0 and 1, where higher values relate to higher
46
47 21 quality images (Agisoft, *pers. comm.*). Using this information, we selected a set of 15
48
49 22 images for each sUAS survey over a range of image qualities, including the best and
50
51 23 worst quality images. Whilst maintaining a range of image qualities, we also ensured
52
53 24 that all images had a minimum image quality of 0.5, because lower quality images
54
55 25 are not recommended for photogrammetric processing (Agisoft LLC, 2016). The
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 image quality of the F550 images ranged from 0.582 to 0.803, with the P3P image
4
5 2 quality ranging from 0.828 to 0.834. It should be noted that the PhotoScan image
6
7 3 quality does not specifically measure image blur, but instead provides a normalised
8
9 4 measure of image quality, relating to the sharpest area of the image (Agisoft, *pers.*
10
11 5 *comm.*). As a result and in order to better compare between images (and gimbal set-
12
13 6 ups), for subsequent analysis we decided to use a measure of image entropy as
14
15 7 indicative of the magnitude of image blur, since this would allow a more consistent
16
17 8 and repeatable approach.

20
21 9 Entropy (E) is defined by Equation 1, which uses a grey level co-occurrence matrix
22
23 10 (Haralick et al., 1973). This matrix (P) reports the probabilities of all pairwise (i, j)
24
25 11 grey level combinations occurring within a neighbourhood of a specified size. We
26
27 12 computed entropy for every image within each set using the *Entropyfilt* function in
28
29 13 Matlab (Mathworks Inc.), with a neighbourhood size of 21 pixels on only the red band
30
31 14 of the image (i.e. a greyscale image). High entropy values indicate large differences
32
33 15 in the spectral values of neighbouring pixels. This suggests that the imagery is sharp
34
35 16 and of high quality. In contrast, blurred imagery features small differences between
36
37 17 nearby pixels and therefore lower entropy values.

$$E = - \sum_{i,j} P_{i,j} (\log 2P_{i,j})$$

41
42
43
44
45
46 18 Equation 1.

47
48
49 19 Next, we used the *OpenSURF* feature point matching function in Matlab (Kroon,
50
51 20 2010) to find the 30 best matched points between the image with the highest entropy
52
53 21 (i.e. highest quality) and the remaining 14 images within each sUAS image set (using
54
55 22 full colour images). We exported the coordinates of each of these matched points,
56
57
58
59
60

1 and at the location of each point, we extracted the entropy values for each pair of
2 images within each set. This allowed us to compare the entropy for the same
3 location between the highest quality image and each of the other images in the set.
4 As a result, where values of entropy between the best image and the matched image
5 are similar we would expect consistent image quality, and where they diverge we
6 would expect inconsistent image quality, with the entropy values at each point
7 relating to the level of blur.

8
9 Grain size mapping: Image-based approaches

10 We use both (a) orthomosaics and (b) single, non-mosaicked, images from both the
11 F550 and the P3P drones:

12 (a) The Orthomosaic Approach

13 PhotoScan was used to produce orthomosaics with spatial resolutions of
14 11mm for the F550 and 9mm for the P3P. Verdú et al., (2005) suggest the use
15 of image orthomosaics in grain size mapping because they have a constant
16 scale. However, de Haas et al., (2014) found that image mosaics produced
17 from non-gimballed sUAS images have considerable and spatially variable
18 levels of image blur that can significantly affect grain-size mapping
19 performance. Here, we aim to separate out the effect of camera gimbal from
20 the possible noise induced by the orthomosaicking process. Additionally, it is
21 now well established that texture-based grain size mapping approaches are
22 sensitive to the kernel size used during the local texture mapping process
23 (Carbonneau, 2005; Carbonneau et al., 2005a, Carbonneau et al., 2005b,
24 Black et al., 2014). Therefore, here we use an iterative approach that scans
25 through a range of kernel sizes in a Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation (LOOCV)

1
2
3 1 approach that simultaneously calibrates and validates the grain sizes against
4
5 2 local values of textural entropy.
6
7 3

8
9 4 For the purpose of calibration, we introduce a key innovation to the grain size
10 mapping process: dimensionless grain sizes. Co-occurrence based metrics,
11 5 such as entropy, compare pixel brightness values for pairs of pixels separated
12 6 by a fixed distance which is measured in image pixel units. In order to
13 7 harmonise the units used in the grain size mapping algorithm, we normalise
14 8 the grain sizes measured in the field by the spatial resolution of the image
15 9 where they are captured. For the orthomosaic approach, this equates to using
16 10 the unique spatial resolution of the orthomosaic (9mm for the P3P and 11mm
17 11 for the F550).
18 12

19 13 The analysis begins by pre-calculating and storing textural entropy images
20 14 obtained from a range of kernel sizes ranging from 5 to 101 pixels, in steps of
21 15 4 pixels, for each orthomosaic. Then, we take the D_{50} of the B-axis calculated
22 16 for each ground truth plot. The LOOCV process starts by excluding the data
23 17 from the first plot. For the remaining 29 plots, the D_{50} is normalised by the
24 18 spatial resolution of the orthomosaic and the algorithm builds a table of
25 19 normalised D_{50} vs. entropy values for the first kernel size. These values are
26 20 regressed to determine a linear model which is then used to predict and store
27 21 the value of the excluded plot. The LOOCV code loop then iterates and
28 22 excludes the second of 30 plots and repeats the calibration for the first kernel
29 23 size. Once all 30 plots have been excluded and the corresponding 32
30 24 predictions calculated, we iterate the kernel size, reset the LOOCV loop and
31 25 repeat the entire process for kernel sizes ranging from 5 pixels to 101 pixels in
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 steps of 4 pixels. This algorithm is applied to the orthomosaics from both the
4
5 2 F550 and P3P sUAS. The results are analysed by identifying the calibration
6
7 3 with the strongest fit (via the adjusted R^2) and the corresponding quality of the
8
9
10 4 predictions. Figure 4 shows a flowchart for this process.
11
12 5

13
14 6 (b) The Single Image Approach
15

16 7 Given the observations of de Haas et al., (2014), we now develop a method
17
18 8 that obviates the orthomosaic by using a series of individual images which
19
20 9 cover the study site. As noted by Verdú et al., (2005), in a critique of
21
22 10 Carbonneau et al., (2004), one issue in using individual images is the
23
24 11 possibility of variable scale, which weakens the cross-comparability of image
25
26 12 textures calculated on image pixel units which have slightly different scales.
27
28 13 We expect this effect to be even more significant for sUAS imagery since the
29
30 14 lower flying heights and weaker altitude control will lead to greater variations in
31
32 15 scale than those experienced with manned aircraft. In the case of the present
33
34 16 data, the data in Figure 2 shows variability in the flying altitudes. Even for the
35
36 17 automated flight of the P3P surveys, we find that the altitude of imagery
37
38 18 collected at 20m AGL has a standard deviation of 0.53m. For the F550,
39
40 19 standard deviation of the lower altitude flights was 3.44 m. Another related
41
42 20 difficulty in working with single images is the need to establish a spatial
43
44 21 reference system that can allow for a geospatial algorithm to retrieve ground
45
46 22 truth values of grain size, referenced to map coordinates, and compare them
47
48 23 to local texture values. We therefore begin by developing a semi-automated
49
50 24 approach, similar to Dugdale et al., (2010), to georeference individual sUAS
51
52 25 images.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1
4
5 2 The first step is to export camera locations and orientations from PhotoScan
6
7 3 Pro (Agisoft LLC). This information gives the adjusted XYZ positions along with
8
9
10 4 yaw (azimuth), pitch and roll for each camera as calculated by the
11
12 5 photogrammetric bundle adjustment. Our experience strongly suggests that
13
14 6 this information is more accurate than that which can be obtained from drone
15
16 7 flight logs. The camera parameters, along with the single images and the
17
18 8 orthomosaic are then used in a MATLAB code for automatic registration point
19
20 9 generation. The core principle of this algorithm is to find matching points
21
22 10 shared by the georeferenced orthomosaic and single images. Once matched,
23
24 11 the position information of a point can be extracted from the orthomosaic in
25
26 12 order to define a 2D ground control point. Multiple points can then be used to
27
28 13 georeference the single image with a standard affine transform. We begin by
29
30 14 using the camera position and yaw information to roughly locate the image
31
32 15 with respect to the orthomosaic. This approximate position is used to constrain
33
34 16 the search area of the *OpenSURF* keypoint descriptor used above. The
35
36 17 sensitivity threshold of the *OpenSURF* algorithm was manually adjusted to
37
38 18 very high severity in order to minimise the presence of false positive matches
39
40 19 and to deliver between 5 and 15 matches between the orthomosaic and each
41
42 20 given single image. Once adjusted, the algorithm extracts the spatial position
43
44 21 of the matched points and outputs a control points file in the open-source
45
46 22 format used by the QGIS software (version 2.18). It was found that, despite the
47
48 23 severity of the matching criteria used in the *OpenSURF* algorithm, false
49
50 24 positives persist. We therefore used the georeferencing tool in QGIS to
51
52 25 manually eliminate these false positives. Once developed, this process allows
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 for a user to georeference an image in 3-4 minutes. We georeferenced 10
4
5 2 images covering the gravel bar for each sUAS.
6
7 3

8
9 4 The main drawbacks of this method of georeferencing are that; (1) we do not
10 5 account for roll and pitch angles of the sUAS when each image was captured,
11 6 and (2) the process is 2D and we do not account for the slope of the bank.
12 7 Therefore, images that were off-nadir are expected to have higher residual
13 8 errors and areas on top of the bank, in the vegetated areas, are expected to
14 9 have even higher errors. The quality of the outputs was checked by finding 3
15 10 distinct gravel-bar features in each sUAS image. For each feature, we
16 11 measure the 2D distance between the position of the feature in the
17 12 orthomosaic and the single image. If the single image is perfectly co-registered
18 13 to the orthomosaic, this distance should be zero. We then conducted an
19 14 additional check on the quality of the spatial resolution of each image as
20 15 derived from the georeferencing process. We used the exported camera
21 16 locations, focal length and the point cloud of the ground in order to derive the
22 17 spatial resolution according to Equation 2, where R_s is the spatial resolution, H
23 18 is the flying height, p is the linear size of 1 pixel on the camera detector and f is
24 19 the focal length. Here we use the adjusted focal length exported from
25 20 PhotoScan after the bundle adjustment process. We then compare this
26 21 measurement of spatial resolution to the one derived from the georeferencing
27 22 process which is directly written as a term in the affine transformation matrix
28 23 saved in the world file.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

$$Rs = \frac{Hp}{f}$$

Equation 2.

The LOOCV grain size mapping algorithm used above was then adapted to single images. This involved pre-calculating the texture for all individual sUAS images. We used the same range of kernel window sizes as above: 5 to 101 pixels in steps of 4 pixels. We then run the adapted LOOCV algorithm. This starts by excluding the first of the 30 ground truth plots. The algorithm then loads the first of 10 sUAS images and, by using the surveyed location, determines which plots were captured in this image. We then apply an exclusion criterion of twice the current texture kernel size in order to eliminate plots which fall too close to the edge of the image and whose texture might be affected by edge effects. The spatial resolution of the image is then used to normalise the D_{50} values for each visible plot. Local textural entropy values for the first kernel size (5 pixels) are then extracted for each visible plot and stored as a table of dimensionless grain size against texture. The algorithm then moves to the next image and again locates the visible plots. The D_{50} values are normalised by the new image scale. Readers should note that the normalised D_{50} value for a given plot visible in more than 1 image will be different for successive images as the image scale varies. Once again, textures are extracted and the table of texture vs. normalised D_{50} is expanded and stored. Once all images and plots have been processed, the algorithm fits a linear model of normalised D_{50} vs. texture and attempts to predict the excluded plot with the texture from each image where it is visible. This means

1
2
3 1 that each excluded plot may be associated with more than 1 prediction. Once
4
5 2 the first LOOCV prediction is calculated, the second plot is excluded and the
6
7 3 entire process is repeated. Once all 30 plots have been excluded in the
8
9 4 LOOCV loop, the kernel size is iterated, the LOOCV loop is reset, and the
10
11 5 entire process is again repeated for kernel sizes up to 101 pixels, in steps of 4
12
13 6 pixels. This algorithm is applied to the single images from both the F550 and
14
15 7 P3P sUAS. The results are analysed by identifying the calibration with the
16
17 8 strongest fit (via the adjusted R^2) and the corresponding quality of the
18
19 9 predictions. Figure 5 gives a workflow.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 11 Grain size mapping: Roughness-based approach

27
28 12 An overview of the grain size mapping approach using roughness, based on the
29
30 13 method first presented by Woodget (2015), is presented in Figure 6. We begin by
31
32 14 detrending and cleaning the cloud to remove the unwanted effects of local slope and
33
34 15 noise within the cloud respectively, which might otherwise adversely impact
35
36 16 roughness calculations. Both operations are conducted within the open source
37
38 17 CloudCompare software (www.danielgm.net/cc/): detrending by fitting a 3D plane to
39
40 18 the cloud and cleaning by applying the in-built noise filter with a radius of 0.15m and
41
42 19 an absolute maximum error of 0.3m, based on *a priori* knowledge of typical grain
43
44 20 sizes at this site. A visual sensitivity check was used to ensure that sufficient noise
45
46 21 removal occurred whilst not sacrificing topographic detail.
47
48
49

50
51 22 Next, we select the kernel size which will be used to compute roughness using
52
53 23 CloudCompare's inbuilt tool. This tool defines roughness as the shortest distance
54
55 24 between each point in the cloud and the ordinary least-squares best fitting plane
56
57 25 computed on the nearest neighbours of that point within a spherical kernel of a user-

1 specified size. We selected a starting roughness kernel size of 0.1m, based on a
2 *priori* knowledge of the typical grain size and point cloud density at this site, which
3 was then used to compute roughness for every point in the cloud. The only time
4 when roughness is not computed for a point is when less than four points fall within
5 the kernel, as a minimum of three points are required for computing the least-
6 squares plane. Next, we compute the mean roughness of all points falling within
7 each ground truth plot, and regress this against the equivalent A- and B-axis grain
8 size statistics (i.e. mean, D50, D84) for each plot. We repeat this process multiple
9 times, incrementing the kernel size by 0.05m each time, up to a maximum kernel
10 size of 0.5m. Linear regression of mean roughness and grain sizes statistics is then
11 possible for all ground truth sample plots and all kernel sizes, to find the best
12 calibration relationship between these two variables.

13 Finally, we validate the best calibration relationship using jack-knifing (Quenouille,
14 1949; Tukey, 1958). This is an iterative validation approach which excludes one
15 ground truth plot with each iteration. It uses the regression relationship computed
16 from all remaining plots to predict the grain size from the roughness value of the
17 excluded plot. This is repeated until all plots have been excluded and their grain size
18 predicted. A comparison of observed versus predicted grain sizes is then possible,
19 permitting an assessment of the strength of the predictive relationship and the
20 calculation of error metrics, including mean error (accuracy), standard deviation of
21 error (precision) and maximum error.

22 Results

23

1
2
3 1 Quantifying the impact of camera gimbals
4
5 2 Table 1 details the PhotoScan image quality and entropy values computed for each
6
7 3 sUAS image set from Survey 1. Overall, it is clear that absolute image quality is
8
9 4 lower for those images acquired using the F550 with no gimbal, than for those
10
11 5 images acquired using the P3P sUAS with a three-axis gimbal, as indicated by lower
12
13 6 F550 values for the minimum PhotoScan image quality.
14
15
16

17 7 In addition, we observe a greater range in image quality within the F550 imagery
18
19 8 compared to the P3P, as indicated by the PhotoScan image quality range, the
20
21 9 entropy range, the entropy standard deviation and the average and standard
22
23 10 deviation of difference in entropy between the best quality and other images (mean
24
25 11 error and standard error). This greater range of blur within the F550 images is
26
27 12 demonstrated in Figure 7, where we observe a greater scatter in the arrangement of
28
29 13 points and a lower R^2 value when compared to the P3P data. The tight clustering of
30
31 14 points obtained from the P3P imagery and high R^2 value are indicative of
32
33 15 consistently sharp, higher quality imagery. Furthermore, whilst maximum image
34
35 16 entropy values for the two sUAS set-ups are similar (Table 1), **Error! Reference source**
36
37 17 **not found.**7 shows that values greater than 7 are only seen consistently within the
38
39 18 P3P imagery. These results indicate that the use of a gimbal (within the P3P set up)
40
41 19 is paramount for collecting consistently high quality, sharp imagery. These results do
42
43 20 not provide information about the effects of using different gimbal types, but rather
44
45 21 provide the first quantitative evidence of the effect of (a) using a gimbal, versus (b)
46
47 22 not using a gimbal, on the quality of imagery which can be captured from a sUAS.
48
49
50
51
52

53 23
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Grain size mapping: Image-based approaches

2 Figure 8 shows the results for the orthomosaic approach applied to the F550 data

3 and Figure 9 shows the same results for the P3P data. Calibration performance (part

4 A of each figure) is better for the P3P with a maximum R^2 of approximately 0.48 for a

5 kernel size of 69 pixels. In contrast, the best calibration for the F550 had an R^2 of

6 only about 0.32 for a kernel size of 41 pixels. We define error as the difference

7 between predicted and observed grain sizes. A negative error means an under-

8 prediction. Validation performance is very similar with a significant underestimation

9 of grain sizes (mean error of -34mm in both cases) and a standard deviation of error

10 of 8.8mm and 8.7mm for the F550 and the P3P respectively. Validation slopes in

11 part C of both figures are low (<0.65) and indicate a relatively poor prediction of grain

12 sizes. Given the marked difference in image qualities displayed in Table 1 and

13 Figure 7, these results suggest that the orthorectification process significantly

14 degrades the consistent textures in the single P3P images.

15 In the case of the single image approach, the georeferencing quality check revealed

16 mean errors of 224mm and 91mm, and standard deviations of error of 209mm and

17 88mm for the F550 and P3P sUAS respectively. Maximum errors were 581mm and

18 833mm for the P3P and the F550, respectively. Despite the larger errors for the

19 F550, which are to be expected in the absence of a gimbal, both mean errors are

20 significantly smaller than the 1m size of the ground truth plots. Verification of the

21 spatial resolution revealed that the georeferencing process resulted in scales that

22 were very consistent with those obtained with Equation (2). For the P3P, the

23 difference in spatial resolutions was on average 0.04mm with a standard deviation of

24 0.13mm. For the F550, the difference in spatial resolutions was on average 0.06mm

25 with a standard deviation of 0.35mm. When compared to the average spatial

1
2
3 1 resolution, the standard deviation of differences equates to 1.3% and 3.1% for the
4
5 2 P3P and F550, respectively. Closer examination of the data in Figure 2 shows that,
6
7 3 even for the P3P flights which were programmed to fly at a set altitude of 20m, there
8
9 4 is an actual range in flight altitudes of +/- c. 2m. At altitudes of c. 20m, this
10
11 5 represents a variance of scale of nearly 15%. The case is more severe for the F550
12
13 6 with a range in flight altitudes of +/- c. 10m for a mean flight altitude of 34m. This
14
15 7 demonstrates that calculating a single spatial resolution based on the average flying
16
17 8 altitude would be highly inaccurate.

18
19
20
21 9 Figure 10 presents the result for the F550 while Figure 11 presents the results for the
22
23 10 P3P for the single image approach. For the F550, the results are poor with low
24
25 11 calibration R^2 values and a very high scatter for the validation associated with a
26
27 12 mean error of 12.4mm and a standard error of 9.7mm. The validation slope is 0.5,
28
29 13 once again indicating proportional under-estimation. Results for the P3P are
30
31 14 significantly better. Calibration R^2 reaches 0.6 for window sizes of 61 pixels. The
32
33 15 best validation now has a mean error of 0.02mm and a standard error of 6.9mm.
34
35 16 Crucially, the slope of the best validation is 0.97. However, despite these positive
36
37 17 indicators, the maximum error remains high at 16.5mm.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Grain size mapping: Roughness-based approaches

2 Figure 12 shows the results for the point cloud roughness approach applied to the

3 F550 data and Figure 13 shows the same results for the P3P data. Calibration

4 performance (part A of each figure) is better for the P3P with a maximum R^2 of

5 approximately 0.6 for a kernel size of 0.4m. In contrast, the best calibration for the

6 F550 has an R^2 of only about 0.39 for a kernel size of 0.35m. Validation performance

7 is markedly different between the P3P and F550, with all error metrics for the P3P

8 being significantly lower (i.e. better) than those obtained for the F550 (Table 2).

9 Validation slopes in part C of both figures are low and indicate a relatively poor

10 prediction of grain sizes, although the slope for the P3P data (0.59) is notably higher

11 than that for the F550 data (0.33).

12

13 Summary of grain size mapping results

14 Table 2 provides a summary comparing key metrics across methods and for both

15 sUAS. Our new single image texture method produces stronger calibration and

16 validation results than either the orthomosaic or roughness methods, when used on

17 data collected by the P3P with a 3-axis gimbal. The roughness method tends to

18 perform better than the orthomosaic approach when applied to the P3P data, with a

19 stronger calibration R^2 and notably lower mean and maximum errors. The results

20 from the F550 sUAS are almost always inferior to the P3P results, regardless of the

21 method. No single method consistently outperforms the other methods where no

22 gimbal is used on the F550 sUAS.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Discussion

2 Our results show that our novel approach of using single sUAS images, acquired
3 from a 3-axis stabilised gimbal and calibrated with grain sizes normalised by
4 individual image scale, delivered the optimal grain size mapping performance for our
5 study site. This new method outperformed an advanced roughness-based method
6 and a more traditional image-based method reliant on orthoimagery to control image
7 scale. Our results also demonstrate the critical importance of mechanical image
8 stabilisation for grain size mapping or any other analysis method which relies on
9 image texture. We focus our discussion on the following key points; the poor
10 performance of the roughness mapping in comparison with existing research, the
11 excellent performance of our novel single image approach, the need for camera
12 gimbals and the implications of these findings for future work on grain size mapping.

13 The sUAS-SfM point cloud roughness method was originally developed in response
14 to concerns about the effects of blurring within sUAS imagery (Woodget, 2015;
15 Woodget and Austrums, 2017). Initial results have shown promise, yet applications
16 have been focussed on sites where grain size is clearly expressed in three
17 dimensions (i.e. in the topographic signature) and where the range in grain size is c.
18 0.16m (D_{84} of B axis). At our site, however, particles are imbricated and grain size
19 range is notably smaller (c. 0.07m for D_{84} of B axis). As a result, we observe that
20 grain size is not being expressed in 3D to the same extent and therefore roughness
21 does not readily calibrate with grain size. This is some of the first evidence to
22 suggest that the topographic roughness approach may not have universal
23 applicability. The level of imbrication is significant to the success of this approach.
24 Furthermore, very recently, others have suggested that grain shape also impacts on
25 the success of roughness based grain size quantification methods (Pearson et al.,

1
2
3 1 2017). Clearly, further work to quantify the range in grain size, shape and level of
4
5 2 imbrication where the roughness method performs successfully is required.
6
7

8 3 In contrast, our single image method performs exceptionally well (when a gimbal is
9
10 4 used). For studies at the micro and mesoscale, this novel method produces results
11
12 5 of a spatial resolution, accuracy, precision and grain size predictive strength (i.e.
13
14 6 slope of observed versus predicted regression) which is at least as good as, and
15
16 7 sometimes better than, all existing remote-sensing based grain size quantification
17
18 8 measures, including close range photosieving (e.g. Butler et al., 2001; Graham et al.,
19
20 9 2005a; Graham et al., 2005b), statistical image analysis (e.g. Rubin, 2004;
21
22 10 Buscombe, 2008; Buscombe and Masselink, 2009; Buscombe et al., 2010;
23
24 11 Buscombe and Rubin, 2012; Buscombe, 2013) and terrestrial laser scanning (e.g.
25
26 12 McEwan et al., 2000; Entwistle and Fuller, 2009; Heritage and Milan, 2009; Hodge et
27
28 13 al., 2009; Brasington et al., 2012; Milan and Heritage, 2012; Rychov et al., 2012).
29
30 14 Furthermore, it is more robust to imbrication because the particles on the top layer of
31
32 15 an imbricated bed will have a significant portion of their edges, in the two-
33
34 16 dimensional AB plane, uncovered. This means that these edges will produce
35
36 17 shadows which is the mechanism postulated by Carbonneau et al. (2004) which
37
38 18 permits the correlation of image texture with grain size. In addition, because grain
39
40 19 size is inferred from the two dimensional patterns of image brightness, image-based
41
42 20 approaches are less affected by variability in grain shape. For example, where flat,
43
44 21 disc-like particles produce little topographic signature, and therefore minimal
45
46 22 roughness within the point cloud, their 2D appearance within the image is unaffected
47
48 23 and thus the calibration with texture is uncompromised. This would suggest that
49
50 24 image-based approaches (single image or orthomosaic) should always provide a
51
52 25 more robust method of grain size mapping than roughness-based methods.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 However, this is not borne out by existing research where sUAS-SfM derived
4
5 2 orthomosaics are compared with roughness approaches (Woodget and Austrums,
6
7 3 2017), nor within the results we present here. The processing of single sUAS images
8
9 4 into orthomosaics using SfM modifies the patterns of image brightness in a way
10
11 5 which compromises the texture-grain size relationship. For the first time, we have
12
13 6 presented a single image method which circumvents this problem and promises
14
15 7 wider applicability for use on sUAS imagery. Further testing at a range of contrasting
16
17 8 locations is required however. At present, the complexity of this approach may
18
19 9 present barriers to applicability in terms of the required technical expertise, time and
20
21 10 processing power. For example, whilst the georeferencing of 10 images took us 30-
22
23 11 40 minutes to process, it would not be unreasonable to expect the collection of more
24
25 12 than 1000 images during a survey of numerous gravel bars on a longer stretch of
26
27 13 river. This has become possible recently given the longer battery lives of the sUAS
28
29 14 which are now available, and the efficient image acquisition missions now made
30
31 15 possible by flight planning apps such as Ground Station Pro (DJI, 2017) or Litchi (VC
32
33 16 Technology Ltd, 2017). In such scenarios, it is hoped that future developments of
34
35 17 SfM packages would include the option to export georeferenced individual images
36
37 18 without orthorectification.

38
39 19 Our results also provide evidence that without the use of a gimbal, grain size
40
41 20 mapping results will be poor, regardless of the choice of method. This is of particular
42
43 21 significance to our single image method, where we have shown that the outputs for
44
45 22 the F550 drone remain of poor quality even when dimensionless grain sizes are
46
47 23 used to account for changes of image scale and spatial resolution. That is, we
48
49 24 observe a deterioration of mean error by more than two orders of magnitude when a
50
51 25 gimbal is not used. A notable deterioration in quality metrics are also observed for
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 our roughness method when the gimbal is not used. This provides the first
4
5 2 quantitative evidence of the implications of camera stabilisation for the acquisition of
6
7 3 aerial imagery from sUAS. It also provides evidence that camera stabilisation may be
8
9 4 responsible for the variable success of sUAS grain size mapping methods reported
10
11 5 previously (de Haas et al., 2014; Tamminga et al., 2015; Vázquez-Tarrío et al., 2017;
12
13 6 Woodget and Austrums, 2017). Fortunately, many newer sUAS are equipped with 3-
14
15 7 axis stabilisation gimbals as standard, driven by requirements of the video filming
16
17 8 community in particular. Such developments may obviate the need for methods of
18
19 9 detecting and eliminating blur from imagery post-acquisition, and we suggest that
20
21 10 particle size quantification should not be undertaken using a sUAS which does not
22
23 11 have a gimbal mounted sensor.
24
25
26
27

28 12 Further work on grain size quantification from sUAS should focus on developing an
29
30 13 approach which works regardless of whether grain size is expressed in 2D or 3D.
31
32 14 Our new single image method may be capable of this, however further quantitative
33
34 15 evidence at a range of sites is needed. It will be of interest to those requiring a quick
35
36 16 and easy approach to know how our single image method compares to the less
37
38 17 complex roughness method at sites where 3D expression of grain size is stronger.
39
40 18 Alternatively, improvements to the speed and automation of georeferencing single
41
42 19 images would be advantageous, as would dedicated experiments within submerged
43
44 20 parts of the fluvial environment. As an ultimate goal, a method which removes the
45
46 21 need for ground truth calibration plots altogether would be of great value, as this
47
48 22 often consumes the greatest time and effort during the data acquisition phase.
49
50
51
52

53 Conclusion

54
55 24 Within this paper we have developed and presented a comprehensive approach to
56
57 25 particle sizing from sUAS within a fluvial setting. This has comprised quantifying the
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 impacts of camera gimbals on image quality and subsequent grain size estimation,
4
5 2 and the adaptation of a traditional image-based texture method for use with single
6
7 3 images acquired from sUAS. Our key findings demonstrate that the use of a 3-axis
8
9
10 4 stabilising gimbal is paramount for accurate and precise grain size estimation from
11
12 5 sUAS data. Furthermore, our novel approach using the texture of single sUAS
13
14 6 images with dimensionless calibration grain sizes has outperformed the equivalent
15
16 7 results of an orthophoto texture approach and a method based on the roughness of
17
18 8 SfM point clouds. Whilst improvements in the usability and efficiency of our new
19
20 9 method are required before more widespread use is possible, our results clearly
21
22 10 demonstrate proof of concept for our method which compare favourably to existing
23
24 11 grain size mapping methods based on remote sensing data. Further testing is
25
26 12 required to confirm the wider applicability of this approach and in particular, its ability
27
28 13 to predict grain size in a range of environments, over a range of scales, over a range
29
30 14 of grain shapes and at different imbrication levels.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Acknowledgements and author contributions

39
40 17 We would like to thank Carlos Puig-Mengual for assistance in the field and ground
41
42 18 truthing of grains in GIS. AW and PC conceived of the study. AW implemented the
43
44 19 roughness-based grain size analysis method and wrote 70% of the paper. CF
45
46 20 performed the texture stability analysis and wrote 10% of the paper. PC developed
47
48 21 the concept of dimensionless grain sizes, implemented all texture-based grain size
49
50 22 analysis methods and wrote 20% of the paper.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 References

4 2 Adams, J. 1979. Gravel size analysis from photographs. Journal of the Hydraulics
5 3 Division, Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, 105, HY10: 1247-
6 4 1255

7 5
8 6 Agisoft LLC (2016) *Agisoft PhotoScan User Manual: Professional Edition, Version*
9 7 *1.2*, Agisoft

10 8
11 9 Baewert, H., Bimböse, M., Bryk, A., Rascher, E., Schmidt, K.H. and Morche, D.
12 10 2014. Roughness determination of coarse grained alpine river bed surfaces using
13 11 terrestrial laser scanning data. *Zeitschrift für Geomorphologie Supplementary Issues*
14 12 58 (1): 81-95

15 13
16 14 Black, M., Carbonneau, P.E., Church, M. and Warburton, J. 2014. Mapping sub-pixel
17 15 fluvial grain sizes with hyperspatial imagery. *Sedimentology* 61 (3): 691-711

18 16
19 17 Brasington, J., Vericat, D. and Rychov, I. 2012. Modeling river bed morphology,
20 18 roughness, and surface sedimentology using high resolution terrestrial laser
21 19 scanning. *Water Resources Research* 48 W11519, doi: 10.1029/2012WR012223

22 20
23 21 Buscombe, D. 2008. Estimation of grain size distributions and associated
24 22 parameters from digital images of sediment. *Sedimentary Geology* 210: 1-10

25 23
26 24 Buscombe, D. 2013. Transferable wavelet method for grain-size distribution from
27 25 images of sediment surface and thin section, and other natural granular patterns.
28 26 *Sedimentology* 60 (7): 1709-1732.

29 27
30 28 Buscombe, D. and Masselink, G. 2009. Grain-size information from the statistical
31 29 properties of digital images of sediment. *Sedimentology* 56: 421-438

32 30
33 31 Buscombe, D. Rubin, D.M. and Warrick, J.A. 2010. A universal approximation of
34 32 grain size from images of noncohesive sediment. *Journal of Geophysical Research*
35 33 115 F02014 doi: 10.1029/2009JF001477

36 34
37 35 Buscombe, D. and Rubin, D.M. 2012. Advances in the simulation and automated
38 36 measurement of well sorted granular material: 2. Direct measures of particle
39 37 properties. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* 117 (F2)

40 38
41 39 Butler, J.B., Lane, S.N, and Chandler, J.H. 2001. Automated extraction of grain-size
42 40 data from gravel surfaces using digital image processing. *Journal of Hydraulic*
43 41 *Research* 39 (4): 519-529

44 42
45 43 Carbonneau, P.E., Bergeron, N.E. and Lane, S.N. 2005a. Texture-based
46 44 segmentation applied to the quantification of superficial sand in salmonids river
47 45 gravels. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 30: 121-127

48 46 Carbonneau, P.E., Lane, S.N. and Bergeron, N. 2004b. Catchment-scale mapping of
49 47 surface grain size in gravel bed rivers using airborne digital imagery. *Water*
50 48 *Resources Research* 40, W07202, doi: 10.1029/2003WR002759

51 49

- 1
2
3 1 Carbonneau, P.E. 2005. The threshold effect of image resolution on image-based
4 2 automated grain size mapping in fluvial environments. *Earth Surface Processes and*
5 3 *Landforms* 30 (13) : 1687-1693
6 4
7 5 Carbonneau, P.E., Bergeron, N. and Lane, S.N. 2005. Automated grain size
8 6 measurements from airborne remote sensing for long profile measurements of fluvial
9 7 grain sizes. *Water Resources Research* 41, W11426, doi:10.1029/2005WR003994
10 8
11 9 Carbonneau, P.E. and Dietrich, J.T. 2017. Cost-effective non-metric photogrammetry
12 10 from consumer-grade sUAS: Implications for direct georeferencing of structure from
13 11 motion photogrammetry. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 42 (3): 473-486
14 12
15 13 Church, M.A. McLean, D.G. and Wolcott, J.F. 1987. River bed gravels: Sampling and
16 14 Analysis, In Thorne, C.R., Bathurst, J.C. and Hey, R.D. (Eds) *Sediment Transport in*
17 15 *Gravel-bed Rivers*, John Wiley and Sons, Chichester
18 16
19 17 De Haas, T., Ventra, D., Carbonneau, P. and Kleinhans, M.G. 2014. Debris flow
20 18 dominance of alluvial fans masked by runoff reworking and weathering.
21 19 *Geomorphology* 217: 165-181
22 20
23 21 Detert, M. and Weitbrecht, V. 2012. Automatic object detection to analyse the
24 22 geometry of gravel grains – a free, standalone tool. In Muñoz, R.E.M (Eds) *River*
25 23 *Flow 2012*. CRC Press/Balkema, Leiden
26 24
27 25 Dugdale, S.J., Carbonneau, P.E. and Campbell, D. 2010. Aerial photosieving of
28 26 exposed gravel bars for the rapid calibration of airborne grain size maps. *Earth*
29 27 *Surface Processes and Landforms* 35: 627-639
30 28
31 29 Eltner, A., Kaiser, A., Castillo, C., Rock, G., Neugirg, F. and Abellán, A. 2016. Image-
32 30 based reconstruction in geomorphometry – merits, limits and developments. *Earth*
33 31 *Surface Dynamics* 4: 359-389
34 32
35 33 Entwistle, N.S. and Fuller, I.C. 2009. Terrestrial laser scanning to derive the surface
36 34 grain size facies character of gravel bars. In Heritage, G.L. and Large, A.R.G. (Eds)
37 35 *Laser Scanning for the Environmental Sciences*, Wiley-Blackwell, London
38 36
39 37 Fonstad, M.A., Dietrich, J.T., Courville, B.C., Jensen, J.L. and Carbonneau, P.E.
40 38 2013. Topographic structure from motion: a new development in photogrammetric
41 39 measurement. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 38 (4): 421-430
42 40
43 41 Graham, D.J., Reid, I. and Rice, S.P. 2005a. Automated sizing of coarse-grained
44 42 sediments: image- processing procedures. *Mathematical Geology* 37(1): 1-28
45 43
46 44 Graham, D.J., Rice, S.P. and Reid, I. 2005b. A transferable method for the
47 45 automated grain sizing of river gravels. *Water Resources Research* 41, W07020,
48 46 doi:10.1029/2004WR003868
49 47
50 48 Haralick, R.M., Shanmugam, K. and Dinstein, I. 1973. Textural features for image
51 49 classification. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics* SMC-3 (6): 610-
52 50 621
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 Heritage, G.L. and Milan, D.J. 2009. Terrestrial laser scanning of grain roughness in
4 2 a gravel-bed river. *Geomorphology* 113: 4-11
5 3
6 4 Hey, R.D. and Thorne, C.R. 1983. Accuracy of surface samples from gravel bed
7 5 materials. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 109 (6): 842-851
8 6
9 7 Hodge, R., Brasington, J. and Richards, K. 2009. In situ characterization of grain-
10 8 scale fluvial morphology using Terrestrial Laser Scanning. *Earth Surface Processes*
11 9 and Landforms 34: 954-968
12 10
13 11 Ibbeken, H. and Schleyer, R. 1986. Photo-sieving: a method for grain size analysis
14 12 of coarse-grained, unconsolidated bedding surfaces. *Earth Surface Processes and*
15 13 *Landforms* 11: 59-77
16 14
17 15 Kroon, D. (2010) *OpenSURF*, MathWorks,
18 16 [https://uk.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/28300-opensurf--including-](https://uk.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/28300-opensurf--including-image-warp-)
19 17 [image-warp-](https://uk.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/28300-opensurf--including-image-warp-) [accessed 02/05/2017]
20 18
21 19 Leopold, L.B. 1970. An improved method for size distribution of stream bed gravel.
22 20 *Water Resources Research* 6 (5): 1357-1366
23 21
24 22 McEwan, I. K., Sheen, T.M., Cunningham, G.J. and Allen, A.R. 2000. Estimating the
25 23 size composition of sediment surfaces through image analysis. *Proceedings of the*
26 24 *Institution of Civil Engineers – Water and Maritime Engineering* 142: 189–195
27 25
28 26 Milan, D.J. and Heritage, G.L. 2012. LiDAR and ADCP use in gravel-bed rivers:
29 27 Advances since GBR6. In Church, M., Biron, P. and Roy, A. (Eds) *Gravel-bed*
30 28 *Rivers: Processes, Tools, Environments*, Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester
31 29
32 30 Newson, M.D. and Newson, C.L. 2000. Geomorphology, ecology and river channel
33 31 habitat: mesoscale approaches to basin-scale challenges. *Progress in Physical*
34 32 *Geography* 24 (2): 195-217
35 33
36 34 Pearson, E., Smith, M.W. Klaar, M.J. and Brown, L.E. 2017. Can high resolution 3D
37 35 topographic surveys provide reliable grain size estimates in gravel bed rivers?
38 36 *Geomorphology* 293: 143-155
39 37
40 38 Quenouille, M.H. 1949. Approximate tests of correlation in time-series. *Journal of the*
41 39 *Royal Statistical Society Series B* 11: 68-84
42 40
43 41 Rice, S. and Church, M. 1996. Sampling surficial fluvial gravels: the precision of size
44 42 distribution percentiles estimates. *Journal of Sedimentary Research* 66 (3): 654-665
45 43
46 44 Rubin, D.M. 2004. A simple autocorrelation algorithm for determining grain size from
47 45 digital images of sediment. *Journal of Sedimentary Research* 74 (1): 160-165
48 46
49 47 Rychov, I., Brasington, J. and Vericat, D. 2012. Computational and methodological
50 48 aspects of terrestrial surface analysis based on point clouds. *Computers and*
51 49 *Geosciences* 42: 64-70
52 50
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 Sime, L. C. and Ferguson, R. I. 2003. Information on grain sizes in gravel-bed rivers
4 2 by automated image analysis. *Journal of Sedimentary Research* 73 (4): 630-636
5 3
6 4 Smith, M.W., Carrick, J.L. and Quincey, D.J. 2015. Structure from motion
7 5 photogrammetry in physical geography. *Progress in Physical Geography* 40 (2): 247-
8 6 275
9 7
10 8 Tamminga, A., Hugenholtz, C., Eaton, B. and LaPointe, M. 2015. Hyperspatial
11 9 remote sensing of channel reach morphology and hydraulic fish habitat using an
12 10 unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV): A first assessment in the context of river research
13 11 and management. *River Research and Applications* 31 (3): 379-391
14 12
15 13 Tukey, J.W. 1958. Bias and confidence in not-quite large samples. *Annals of*
16 14 *Mathematical Statistics* 29: 614
17 15
18 16 Vázquez-Tarrió, D. Borgniet, L., Liébault, F. and Recking, A. 2017. Using UAS
19 17 optical imagery and SfM photogrammetry to characterize the surface grain size of
20 18 gravel bars in a braided river (Vénéon River, French Alps). *Geomorphology* 285: 94-
21 19 105
22 20
23 21 Verdú, J.M., Batalla, R.J. and Martínez-Casasnovas, J.A. 2005. High-resolution
24 22 grain-size characterisation of gravel bars using imagery analysis and geo-statistics.
25 23 *Geomorphology* 72: 73-93
26 24
27 25 Wentworth, C.K. 1922. A scale of grade and class terms for clastic sediments.
28 26 *Journal of Geology* 30: 377-392
29 27
30 28 Westoby, M.J., Brasington, J., Glasser, N.F., Hambrey, M.J. and Reynolds, J.M.
31 29 2012. 'Structure –from-Motion' photogrammetry: A low-cost, effective tool for
32 30 geoscience applications. *Geomorphology* 179: 300-314
33 31
34 32 Wolman, M.G. 1954. A method of sampling coarse river-bed material. *Transactions*
35 33 *of the American Geophysical Union* 35 (6): 951-956
36 34
37 35 Woodget, A.S. 2015. Quantifying physical river habitat parameters using
38 36 hyperspatial resolution UAS imagery and SfM-photogrammetry. Unpublished PhD
39 37 Thesis, University of Worcester, UK.
40 38
41 39 Woodget, A.S. and Austrums, R. 2017. Subaerial gravel size measurement using
42 40 topographic data derived from a UAV-SfM approach. *Earth Surface Processes and*
43 41 *Landforms* 42 (9): 1434-1443
44 42
45 43 Woodget, A.S., Austrums, R., Maddock, I.P. and Habit, E. 2017. Drones and digital
46 44 photogrammetry: from classifications to continuums for monitoring river habitat and
47 45 hydromorphology. *WIREs Water* 4:4 doi: 10.1002/wat2.1222
48 46
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Table 1. Image quality for both UAVs, as determined by PhotoScan and the entropy
2 values of selected points. *denotes that measure relates to the linear regression
3 between highest quality image and all other images, as shown in Figure 7.

Impact measure	3-axis gimbal (P3P)	No gimbal (F550)
PhotoScan image quality minimum (worst)	0.828	0.582
PhotoScan image quality range	0.006	0.221
Maximum entropy	7.280	7.070
Entropy range	4.020	5.680
Entropy standard deviation	0.770	0.850
*Average difference in entropy (mean error)	0.033	0.442
*Standard deviation of difference in entropy (standard error)	0.124	0.508
*R ²	0.902	0.652
*Slope	0.974	0.902

4
5

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3

Table 2. Summary of key quality metrics for orthomosaic, single image and roughness methods performed using imagery acquired by two different sUAS/gimbal set-ups.

Quality Metric	Method	3-axis gimbal (P3P)	No gimbal (F550)
Strongest calibration R ²	Orthomosaic	0.48	0.32
	Single Image	0.69	0.14
	Roughness	0.60	0.39
Predicted v. observed slope	Orthomosaic	0.59	0.64
	Single Image	0.97	0.50
	Roughness	0.59	0.33
Mean error (mm)	Orthomosaic	-34.00	-34.10
	Single Image	0.02	12.40
	Roughness	0.07	0.30
Standard deviation of error (mm)	Orthomosaic	8.80	8.70
	Single Image	6.90	9.70
	Roughness	10.15	23.63
Maximum error (mm)	Orthomosaic	53.40	49.30
	Single Image	16.50	33.90
	Roughness	19.46	53.81

4
5




Figure 1. Study site. Orthophoto generated from Phantom 3 Pro imagery is shown overlying Google Quickmap imagery. The arrow indicates the direction of flow.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2. Flight altitudes above ground level (AGL) for the F550 and the P3P surveys.

Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3. Example of a ground truth sample plot.

226x249mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 4. Texture mapping method, as applied to the orthomosaics computed from the P3P and F550 imagery acquired during Survey 2. W = window or kernel size, B = B axis grain size.




Figure 5. Texture mapping method, as applied to the single images acquired from the P3P and F550 sUAS during Survey 2. W = window or kernel size, B = B axis grain size.




Figure 6. Roughness method, as applied to dense point clouds. K = radius size of spherical roughness kernel.

210x297mm (96 x 96 DPI)




Figure 7. Linear regression of entropy of highest quality image with matched points from all other images, for the F550 and P3P sUAS image sets acquired during Survey 1.




Figure 8. Grain size mapping quality for the F550 using the orthomosaic A) Calibration model quality. Results of each of the 30 leave-one-out calibrations are plotted against texture radius. B) Best calibration result. C) Best validation result with a mean error of -34.1 mm and a standard deviation of error of 8.7mm. Maximum error is 49.3mm.




Figure 9. Grain size mapping quality for the P3P using the orthomosaic. A) Calibration model quality. Results of each of the 30 leave-one-out calibrations are plotted against texture radius. B) Best calibration result. C) Best validation result with a mean error of -34.0 mm and a standard deviation of error of 8.8mm. Maximum error is 53.4 mm.




Figure 10. Grain size mapping quality for the F550 using single images. A) Calibration model quality. Results of each of the 30 leave-one-out calibrations are plotted against texture radius. B) Best calibration result. C) Best validation result with a mean error of 12.4 mm and a standard deviation of error of 9.7mm. Maximum error is 33.9 mm.




Figure 11. Grain size mapping quality for the P3P using single images. A) Calibration model quality. Results of each of the 30 leave-one-out calibrations are plotted against texture radius. B) Best calibration result. C) Best validation result with a mean error of 0.02 mm and a standard deviation of error of 6.9mm. Maximum error is 16.5 mm.




Figure 12. Grain size mapping quality for the F550 using point cloud roughness. A) Calibration model quality. Results for each measure of grain size are plotted against roughness kernel size. B) Best calibration result. C) Best validation result with a mean error of 0.3 mm and a standard deviation of error of 23.63 mm. Maximum error is 53.81 mm.




Figure 13. Grain size mapping quality for the P3P using point cloud roughness. A) Calibration model quality. Results for each measure of grain size are plotted against roughness kernel size. B) Best calibration result. C) Best validation result with a mean error of 0.07 mm and a standard deviation of error of 10.15 mm. Maximum error is 19.46 mm.

From manned to unmanned aircraft: Adapting airborne particle size mapping methodologies to the characteristics of sUAS and SfM

Woodget, A.S.*, Fyffe, C. and Carbonneau, P.E.

A new approach for image-based particle size estimation which is specifically adapted for sUAS and SfM is presented and found to perform favourably against existing particle size approaches. It resolves problems arising when using methods originally designed for manned aircraft. We also provide the first quantitative evidence (a) of the critical importance of camera gimbal presence on the accuracy and precision of grain size estimates, and (b) that the sUAS-SfM point cloud roughness method does not offer universal applicability.

