

# ARTMAP Neural Networks for Multispectral Image Classification

Norbert Kopco\*, Peter Sincák\*\* and Stanislav Kaleta\*\*

\*Department of Cognitive and Neural Systems, Boston University  
677 Beacon St., Boston, MA 02215, the U.S.A.

And CIG, KKU, FEI TU Košice, Letná 9, 04001 Košice, Slovak Rep.

E-mail: kopco@bu.edu

\*\*Computational Intelligence Group, Department of Cybernetics and AI

Faculty of EE and Informatics, Technical University

Letná 9, 04001 Košice, Slovak Republic

E-mail: sincak@tuke.sk

kaleta@neuron-ai.tuke.sk

[Received: May 12, 2000; accepted: July 20, 2000]

**This paper presents an analysis of performance of several types of the ARTMAP neural network. The performance of the networks is analyzed in the task of classification of satellite images obtained by remote sensing. The analysis is concentrated on the dependence of classification accuracy on the difference in cluster type preferably identified by each of the classifiers. Three types of ARTMAP classifier are compared: fuzzy ARTMAP, Gaussian ARTMAP, and Extended Gaussian ARTMAP. The main difference among these classifiers is in the way they determine/represent individual clusters in feature space. Best results are obtained for Extended Gaussian ARTMAP, a modification of the Gaussian ARTMAP neural network that preferably identifies Gaussian-distributed clusters.**

**Keywords:** ARTMAP, Fuzzy ARTMAP, GAUSSIAN ARTMAP, Remote sensing

## 1. Introduction

During the past several years, remote satellite sensing has become one of the main sources of data for many geographical applications, e.g., land-use and vegetation maps generation<sup>1)</sup>. On one hand, this development causes that there are more and more high-quality images easily available for all kinds of users and applications. On the other hand, to be able to process the huge amounts of currently available data with appropriate quality of performance, there is a need for highly accurate, automated, and preferably autonomous systems for image data analysis and processing. Traditional approaches to this task are based on statistical classification and pattern analysis methods, the most important being the Maximum Likelihood classifier<sup>2)</sup>; and on various rule-based algorithms<sup>3)</sup>. Statistical methods have several useful properties, the most important one being their optimal behavior if several assumptions are fulfilled. The disadvantages of these methods include their poor performance if the assumptions are not fulfilled, as well as their large complexity in training

time and memory requirements.

Recently, several alternative approaches have been proposed to the problem of classification of remotely sensed images. Among these approaches, artificial neural networks play a significant role<sup>4)</sup>, and among them the error back-propagation algorithm<sup>5)</sup> is the predominant method. There are also several reports of application of the *Adaptive Resonance Theory (ART)* neural networks in this domain<sup>6-8)</sup>, most of them applying fuzzy ARTMAP neural network. We have reported results of comparative analysis of ARTMAP, fuzzy ARTMAP, and Gaussian ARTMAP neural networks, when applied to the classification of remotely sensed imagery<sup>7)</sup>. The present article is a continuation of that study, introducing a new class of ARTMAP neural networks, called Extended Gaussian ARTMAP networks, and comparing the performance of this neural network to the performance of the previously analyzed systems. In this comparison, the goal is to answer the question "What is the best assumption about distribution of remotely sensed data?" distinguishing between hyper-rectangle data clusters preferred by fuzzy ARTMAP, zero-covariance Gaussian-distributed data preferred by Gaussian ARTMAP, and arbitrary Gaussian distributions preferred by Extended Gaussian ARTMAP.

The data for this study come from a Landsat Thematic Mapper image of the city of Košice in Eastern Slovakia. The whole image consists of 368,125 7-dimensional pixels, out of which an expert assigned 6,331 pixels into seven thematic categories, shown in Table 1. The regions of the image included into the training and testing dataset are shown in Fig. 1.

## 2. Artmap Neural Networks

ARTMAP neural networks belong to the class of neural networks called Adaptive Resonance Theory (ART), a theory of cognitive information processing in human brain<sup>9)</sup>. Based on this theory, a whole family of neural network algorithms was developed. These neural networks were shown to give a very good performance in applications involving clustering, classification, and pattern recognition.

When compared to statistical and other neural-network-based clustering/classification algorithms, these networks usually obtain very good classification accuracy, while securing proven stability and high level of compression in the system.

An overview of the process of development of ARTMAP neural networks can be found<sup>8)</sup>. From the point of view of this study, the currently available ARTMAP classification systems can be divided into two groups. First, systems based on (or systems that are a modification of) fuzzy ARTMAP algorithm (e.g., ARTMAP-IC, ART-EMAP, etc.<sup>10)</sup>). All these systems share the property that they prefer data clusters distributed into hyper-rectangles in feature space. In these systems, the basic properties of the original ARTMAP design (stability, proven convergence, fast on-line learning) are preserved, but they also have well-known disadvantages, e.g., noise sensitivity and tendency to category proliferation. The other group is based on the Gaussian ARTMAP neural network<sup>11)</sup>. In this group of networks, preferably identifying Gaussian-shaped clusters, the stability and fast on-line learning properties of the fuzzy ARTMAP networks is traded for emphasis on ability of the system to generalize and for its decreased sensitivity to noise in the input data.

### 3. Analyzed Artmap Classifiers


Structurally, every ARTMAP network (fuzzy ARTMAP or Gaussian ARTMAP) can be divided into two parts. The first part, represented by an ART module, dynamically generates units, each identifying a single data cluster in feature space. This part can be used autonomously for cluster analysis of a given dataset. The second part serves to identify each of the clusters found in the data with one of the classes defined on the dataset.

A detailed description of fuzzy ARTMAP (FA), first of the algorithms analyzed in this study, can be found in many previously published studies. For a description directly related to processing of data from remote sensing, the reader is referred to publications<sup>6-8)</sup>. From the point of view of this study, the most important property of this system is that the subsystem identifying clusters in feature space preferably identifies the clusters in which patterns are distributed as hyper-rectangles.

The second algorithm, Gaussian ARTMAP (GA), is described in detail, e.g.<sup>7,11)</sup>. Its main feature is that it preferably identifies clusters with Gaussian distribution, in which covariance (off-diagonal) coefficients in the covariance matrix describing the cluster are fixed to zero. This restriction was imposed on the Gaussian ARTMAP system for computational purposes, the reason being that with this kind of representation each cluster-identifying node is described by  $2 \cdot M + 1$  parameters, where  $M$  is the dimensionality of feature space. This memory requirement is only slightly worse than memory requirements of fuzzy ARTMAP networks ( $2 \cdot M$ ). But it is much lower than that of the Extended Gaussian ARTMAP (described in the next section).

**Table 1.** Classes defined in the image

Class	Label
Urban Area	A
Barren Fields	B
Bushes	C
Agricultural Fields	D
Meadows	E
Forests	F
Water	G



**Fig. 1.** Original image. Highlighted areas were classified by expert (A - urban area, B - barren fields, C - bushes, D - agricultural fields, E - meadows, F - forest, G - water)

### 4. Extended Gaussian Artmap

We developed the Extended Gaussian ARTMAP (EGA) independently of this study<sup>12)</sup>. The main difference between this algorithm and the standard Gaussian ARTMAP algorithm is in the way nodes identifying clusters in feature space are described. In contrast to GA, in EGA each cluster-identifying node  $j$  (also called a category) is described by a full Gaussian distribution, i.e., each category is defined by an  $M$ -dimensional vector  $\mu_j$ , describing the mean value in each dimension; by a full  $M \times M$ -dimensional covariance matrix  $\Sigma_j$ , and by a scalar number  $n_j$ , in which the number of patterns coded by a given node is stored. This last number is equivalent to the *a priori* probability of the given category. Thus, to represent an  $M$ -dimensional input  $I$ , each category requires  $M^2 + M + 1$  components.

During the process of training, each new pattern is assigned to the cluster where it belongs with the highest probability. This *a posteriori* probability of category  $j$  given input  $I$  is defined as:

$$P(j | I) = \frac{p(I | j) P(j)}{P(I)} \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

Each category is defined by a fully described (nonseparable) Gaussian distribution, which includes the mean values  $\mu_j$  and covariance matrices  $\Sigma_j$ , so the conditional density of  $I$  given category  $j$  from Eq. 1 is defined as

$$P(I|j) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{M}{2}} |\Sigma_j|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} (I - \mu_j)' \Sigma_j^{-1} (I - \mu_j) \right] \dots (2)$$

where  $\Sigma_j^{-1}$  is inversion of the covariance matrix and  $|\Sigma_j|$  is the determinant of the covariance matrix. The *a priori* probability of category  $j$  in Eq. 1 is

$$P(j) = \frac{n_j}{N} \dots (3)$$

where  $N$  is the number of categories.

For each new training pattern the winning category is determined by first computing the Bayesian discrimination function<sup>13</sup> for each category  $j$ , based on Eqs. 1-3:

$$g'_j(I) = \log \left( (2\pi)^{\frac{M}{2}} P(I|j) P(j) \right) = -\frac{1}{2} \left[ (I - \mu_j)' \Sigma_j^{-1} (I - \mu_j) \right] - \frac{1}{2} \log |\Sigma_j| + \log(P(j)) \quad (4)$$

and then determining the nonreset category with the highest value of the discrimination function:

$$J = \arg \max_j (g'_j(I)) \dots (5)$$

which represents the category to which a given pattern belongs with the highest probability. In all ART network, there is a criterion of degree of *match* between a given input and the proposed category  $J$ . In EGA (similarly to GA) this *match* criterion is defined by first computing the measure of *match*:

$$g'_j(I) = \log \left( (2\pi)^{\frac{M}{2}} P(I|j) \right) = -\frac{1}{2} \left[ (I - \mu_j)' \Sigma_j^{-1} (I - \mu_j) \right] - \frac{1}{2} \log |\Sigma_j| = g'_j(I) - \log(P(j)) \dots (6)$$

and then comparing this value to a *vigilance* parameter  $\rho$ . If the condition

$$g'_j(I) > \rho \dots (7)$$

holds, the state of *resonance* occurs. If condition 7 does not hold, the node  $J$  is reset and a new winner is determined by Eq. 5. Finally, the class  $K$  predicted by category  $J$  is determined

$$K = \Omega(J) \dots (8)$$

where  $\Omega(\cdot)$  maps category  $J$  to its predicted class  $K$ . If the predicted class  $K$  is the correct one for a given input pattern, then the parameters of the winning category  $J$  are updated. Otherwise, *match tracking* occurs. This mechanism is implemented by a temporary increase of the value of the *vigilance* parameter  $\rho$  to a value which forces the system to reset the current winner and thus to a choice of a new winner. The value of the vigilance parameter  $\rho$  is increased to a value of

$$\rho = g'_j(I) \dots (9)$$

and it is reset to its original value only after a new pattern has been presented.

Once a category has been found which correctly predicts the class to which the current input pattern belongs, the parameters of this category are updated according to the following equations

$$\begin{aligned} n_j^{new} &= n_j^{old} + 1 \\ \mu_j^{new} &= (1 - (n_j^{old})^{-1}) \mu_j^{old} + (n_j^{old})^{-1} I \\ \Sigma_{jk,l}^{new} &= (n_j^{new})^{-1} (n_j^{old} \Sigma_{jk,l}^{old} + n_j^{old} \mu_{jk}^{old} \mu_{jl}^{old} + I_k I_l) - \\ &\quad - (n_j^{new})^{-2} (n_j^{old} \mu_{jk}^{old} + I_k)(n_j^{old} \mu_{jl}^{old} + I_l) \dots (10) \end{aligned}$$

Each newly created category is in the first step of the training algorithm initialized. Its mean values  $\mu_j$  are set to the values of the present input  $I$ , and its covariance matrix  $\Sigma_j$  is set to the values of  $\gamma^2 E$ , where  $\gamma^2$  is the initial variance and  $E$  is a diagonal matrix.

During testing, the EGA behaves the same way as during the training stage most of the time. It follows exactly Eqs. 4-7. The difference between training and testing is only in the method of determination of the class, to which an unknown testing pattern is assigned. Here, similarly to the GA algorithm, the unknown pattern is assigned to the class with the highest cumulative probability over the whole network, defined by

$$K = \arg \max_k \left( \sum_{j \in \Omega^{-1}(k)} \exp(g'_j(I)) \right) \dots (11)$$

where  $\Omega^{-1}(k)$  defines the set of categories  $j$  mapped to the output class  $k$ .

The different ways of mapping of the winning category  $J$  to an output class  $K$ , described in Eqs. 8 and 11, are equivalent in that either of them can be used during the training and/or during the testing phase. In the present simulations, these equations were used as described above.

The final mechanism for improvement of classification performance, used in most ARTMAP neural networks, is the *voting* strategy. This strategy consists in training several independent neural networks on the same training set with the training patterns presented to each network in a different order. Then, in the testing phase, an unknown pattern is presented to each of the networks and the decision of each of these networks contributes a vote to the final decision of the system concerning the output class for a given input pattern. In GA and EGA, this strategy is usually implemented as follows

$$K = \arg \max_k \left( \sum_{v=1}^V \sum_{j \in \Omega_v^{-1}(k)} \exp(g'_{v,j}(I)) \right) \dots (12)$$

where  $V$  is the number of the EGA networks participating in *voting*. Eq. 12 does not define the only possible method of *voting* in GA networks, but this is the way *voting* was implemented in the following simulations.

## 5. Simulations

The goal in the present simulations was to compare the three classification methods (fuzzy ARTMAP, Gaussian ARTMAP, and Extended Gaussian ARTMAP) in terms of

their classification accuracy achieved on the image data from remote sensing of the Earth. The results should suggest the most suitable method of cluster identification for the image data used here. Another goal is to present the Extended Gaussian ARTMAP as a new method for classification of remotely sensed data.

The dataset, described in SECTION I, was split into two equal-sized subsets, the training and the testing set. Five permutations of the training set were generated to analyze the sensitivity of the examined systems to the ordering of the data, and to evaluate the usefulness of the *voting* strategy for improvement of classification accuracy in these systems.

All the simulations were run with the following values of the network parameters, obtained by a simple cross-validation technique ( $\rho$  - baseline vigilance/ similarity,  $\beta$  - learning rate, and  $\gamma$  - initial std. Deviation in GA and EGA): FA ( $\rho = 0.8$ ,  $\beta = 1$ ), GA ( $\rho = 0.0$ ,  $\beta = 1$ ,  $\gamma = 0.5$ ), and EGA ( $\rho = 0.0$ ,  $\beta = 1$ ,  $\gamma = 0.5$ ).

## 6. Results and Discussion

The classification performance of the three analyzed systems is compared in terms of the weighted percent of correctly classified patterns (weighted PCC<sup>8</sup>) in Table 2. The table shows the accuracy of classification of the testing set, obtained by each system after training on a permutation of the training set. Also shown is the performance of each system obtained using the *voting* strategy. The results show that the highest classification accuracy is obtained by the Extended Gaussian ARTMAP neural network. This is the case both for training on individual permutations of the training set and for the system using the *voting* strategy. The performance of EGA is only slightly better than that of the GA algorithm, both in simulations with and without *voting*. However, there is a significant difference in performance of EGA (or GA) when compared to the performance of the fuzzy ARTMAP algorithm, especially in the case without *voting*. The difference among algorithms is not so significant when *voting* is used. This suggests that, when compared to the other two algorithms, the fuzzy ARTMAP algorithm is much more sensitive to the ordering of input patterns.

More insight into the behavior of the three systems can be obtained by analyzing confusion matrices shown for FA, GA, and EGA in Tables 3, 4, and 5.

Table 5 was generated by a method slightly different from Tables 3 and 4, so only the values on diagonals are comparable among these tables. Despite this inconsistency, it can be seen from the tables that there are significant differences among the systems when their performance on individual classes is analyzed. The most significant difference is in classification performance on classes A, C, and G. This result suggests that one could create a hierarchical system combining information from all three tested systems to obtain a structure with performance superior to that of any of the individual systems.

When system dynamics and properties of EGA vs. GA are compared, one can conclude that the number of internally generated categories was on average 15-20% lower in EGA than in GA. computations in EGA are much more complex and, in this case, each category is represented by a

**Table 2.** Performance (in weighted pcc) for the three compared methods on permutations of the training set and for voting

	Set #1	Set #2	Set #3	Set #4	Set #5	Voting
Fuzzy ARTMAP	93.72	91.48	90.82	90.82	92.16	93.95
Gauss. ARTMAP	93.90	93.57	93.49	94.24	93.09	94.04
Ext. Gauss. ARTMAP	93.82	94.14	94.14	94.07	93.88	94.23

**Table 3.** Confusion matrix for fuzzy artmap nn with voting (weighted pcc = 93.95). each item in the table gives the per cent of pixels from a given actual class (column) classified into given predicted class (row). the total for each actual class (bottom row) gives per cent of patterns in the testing set that belong to the corresponding actual class. the total for each predicted class has analogous meaning

Predicted Class	Actual Class							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Total
A'	88.84	0.87	1.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.53
B'	2.68	98.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	36.56
C'	5.80	0.16	79.55	0.11	0.00	2.47	3.25	5.31
D'	0.00	0.00	0.52	96.33	0.00	8.45	0.00	28.66
E'	0.00	0.00	2.27	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	6.60
F'	1.34	0.00	12.76	3.56	0.00	88.30	0.61	15.39
G'	1.34	0.00	3.32	0.00	0.00	0.84	93.51	4.96
Total	2.24	0.00	5.72	28.37	6.48	15.39	4.93	100.00

**Table 4.** Confusion matrix for gaussian artmap nn with voting (weighted pcc = 94.04). format of table as described in Table 3

Predicted Class	Actual Class							Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
A'	91.52	0.35	1.05	0.11	0.00	0.00	1.22	2.34
B'	0.00	99.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	36.68
C'	5.80	0.00	87.24	0.11	0.00	4.55	4.46	6.07
D'	1.34	0.00	0.00	97.22	0.00	7.21	0.00	28.72
E'	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	6.54
F'	0.00	0.00	8.92	2.57	0.00	88.04	1.22	14.85
G'	1.34	0.00	2.80	0.00	0.00	0.19	92.90	4.80
Total	2.24	0.00	5.72	28.37	6.48	15.39	4.93	100.00

**Table 5.** Confusion matrix for extended gaussian artmap nn with voting (weighted pcc = 94.23). format of table as described in table iii. the method of generation of this table was different from Tables 3 and 4

Predicted Class	Actual Class							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Total
A'	88.73	0.00	5.63	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	unavail.
B'	0.60	99.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	unavail.
C'	0.00	0.00	87.85	0.00	0.55	8.84	2.76	unavail.
D'	0.00	0.00	0.00	96.21	0.00	3.79	0.00	unavail.
E'	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	unavail.
F'	0.00	0.00	2.46	7.39	0.00	90.14	0.00	unavail.
G'	0.00	0.00	3.21	0.64	0.00	0.00	96.15	unavail.
Total	2.24	0.00	5.72	28.37	6.48	15.39	4.93	100.00

more complex structure (a full covariance matrix has to be stored, updated, inverted, and a determinant of it has to be computed in every iteration). So the time and memory requirements of the EGA system are larger than those for the GA system.

Because of the way EGA represents each category (means, full covariance matrix, and *a priori* probability) it can be expected that this system would be extremely slow when tested on high-dimensional data. However, results of this study show that this method can be successfully used on large datasets with low dimensionality.

## 7. Conclusion

In this study, a new neural network algorithm, called Extended Gaussian ARTMAP, has been introduced. It was shown that despite several disadvantages, EGA is a suitable algorithm for classification of remotely sensed images. Also, it can be concluded that the algorithms that prefer data structured into Gaussian-distributed clusters outperform algorithms that expect data distributed in clusters of hyper-rectangular shape. EGA algorithm is suitable for classification of large low-dimensional datasets. For high-dimensional databases GA is the preferable algorithm. When either of these algorithms is used, the voting strategy can be omitted most of the time, which is not the case for the fuzzy ARTMAP algorithm.

### Acknowledgments

We thank Prof. Howard Veregin from the University of Minnesota for his help with preparation of data used in this study. The core of this paper was presented at INES99.

### References

- 1) P.M. Atkinson and A.R.L. Tatnall, "Neural networks in remote sensing," *Int. J. Remote Sensing*, vol. 18, 4, 1997, 711-725.
- 2) J. Richards, *Remote sensing digital image analysis: An introduction*. Springer Verlag: Berlin, 1993.
- 3) B.G. Lees and K. Ritman, "Decision-tree and rule-induction approach to integration of remotely sensed and GIS data in mapping vegetation in disturbed or hilly environments," *Environmental Management*, vol. 15, 1991, pp. 823-831.
- 4) C.H. Chen, "Trends on information processing for remote sensing," in *Proceedings of the International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS)*, vol. 3, Aug. 3-8 1997, pp. 1190-1192.
- 5) P. Werbos, *Beyond Regression: New Tools for Prediction and Analysis in the Behavioral Sciences*, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1974.
- 6) G.A. Carpenter, M.N. Gajja, S. Gopal, and C.E. Woodcock, "ART neural networks for remote sensing" Vegetation classification from Landsat TM and terrain data," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 35, no. 2, 1997, pp. 308-325.
- 7) N. Kopco, P. Sineák, and H. Veregin, "Extended Methods for Classification of Remotely Sensed Images Based on ARTMAP Neural Networks," in *Computational Intelligence - Theory and Applications (Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1625), Proceedings of International Conference "The 6-th Fuzzy days"*, Dortmund, Germany, May 1999, pp. 206-219.
- 8) H. Veregin, P. Sincák, and N. Kopco, "Conflation techniques in multispectral image processing," *Geocarto Int.*, Jun. 2000.
- 9) S. Grossberg, "Adaptive pattern classification and universal recoding, I: Feedback, expectation, olfaction, and illusions," *Biological Cybernetics*, vol. 23, 1976, pp. 187-202.
- 10) G.A. Carpenter, B.L. Milenova, and B.W. Noeske, "Distributed ARTMAP: a neural network for fast distributed supervised learning," *Neural Networks*, vol. 11, no. 5, Jul. 1998, pp. 793-813.
- 11) J.R. Williamson, "Gaussian ARTMAP: A neural network for fast incremental learning of noisy multidimensional maps," *Neural Networks*, vol. 9, 1996, pp. 881-897.
- 12) R.K. Cunningham, *Learning and recognizing patterns of visual motion, color, and form*, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Boston University, Boston, MA: 1998.
- 13) R. Duda and P. Hart, *Pattern Classification and Scene Analysis*, Wiley, New York: 1973.

### Name:

Norbert Kopco



### Affiliation:

Department of Cognitive and Neural Systems, Boston University

### Address:

677 Beacon St., Boston, MA 02215, And CIG, KKUI, FEI TU Košice, Letná 9, 04001 Košice, Slovak Republic

### Brief Biographical History


Norbert Kopco is a Ph.D student in the Department of Cognitive and Neural Systems at Boston University. He received his Ing. degree (equivalent to M.S.) in Electrical Engineering from the Technical University in Kosice, Slovakia. His interests include spatial auditory perception and adaptive pattern recognition.

### Main Works:

- Shinn-Cunningham, B.G., Santarelli, S., Kopco, N. (2000). "Tori of confusion: Binaural cues for sources within reach of a listener," *J Acoust Soc Am*, 107(3), 1627-1636
- Sincak P., Veregin H., Kopco N.: *Computational Intelligence for Classification of Remotely Sensed Images in Neural Network World*, August 1988, ISSN 1210-0552, pp.577-594, Prague, Czech Republic
- Veregin H., Sincak P., Kopco N.: *Conflation Techniques to Improve Image Classification Accuracy*, *International Journal GEOCARTEO*, Hongkong, March 2000, ISSN 1010 6049, pp.11-19
- Kopco N., Sincak P., Veregin H. (1999a) "Extended Methods for Classification of Remotely Sensed Images Based on ARTMAP Neural Networks," in the book: *Computational Intelligence - Theory and Applications (Lecture Notes in Computational Science 1625)*, May 1999, pp. 206-219, ISSN 0302-9743, Springer-Verlag, Germany

### Membership in Learned Societies:

- Association for Research in Otolaryngology



**Name:**  
Peter Sincák

**Affiliation:**  
Associate professor, Computational Intelligence Group, Department of Cybernetics and AI, Faculty of EE and Informatics, Technical University, Kosice  
Center for Intelligent Technologies

**Address:**

Letná 9, 04001 Košice, Slovak Republic

**Brief Biographical History**

1984- Received M. Sc. of Cybernetics and Intelligence from Technical University of Kosice, Slovakia

1992- Received Ph. D.

2000- Associate professor, Computational Intelligence Group, Department of Cybernetics and AI, Faculty of EE and Informatics, Technical University

**Main Works:**

- Sincak P., Andrejkova, G., Neuronove siete (Dopredne siete), Vol. 1. Elfa-press., 110 pp, ISBN 80-88786-38-X, 1996, Sincak P., Andrejkova, G., Neuronove siete (Rekurentne a modularne neuronove siete), Vol. 2., 70 pp, Elfa-press. ISBN 80-88786-42-8, 1996
- Sokac M., Sztruhar D., Sincak P., Bundzel M. (1999): Vyuzitie prostriedkov hydroinformatiky v mestskej hydrologii, UVTIP press, 305 pp, ISBN 80-85330-64-4
- Sincak P., Veregin H., Kopco N.: Computational Intelligence for Classification of Remotely Sensed Images in Neural Network World, August 1988, ISSN 1210-0552, pp.577-594, Prague, Czech Republic
- Veregin H., Sincak P., Kopco N.: Conflation Techniques to Improve Image Classification Accuracy, International Journal GEOCARTO, Hongkong, March 2000, ISSN 1010 6049, pp.11-19
- Kopco N., Sincak P., Veregin H. (1999a) "Extended Methods for Classification of Remotely Sensed Images Based on ARTMAP Neural Networks," in the book: Computational Science 1625), May 1999, pp. 206-219, ISSN 0302-9743, Springer-Verlag, Germany

**Editorial Works**

- Sincak, Vascak, Kvasnicka, Mesiar : State of Art in Computational Intelligence, pp.404, ISSN 1615-3871, in series "Advances in Softcomputing", Springer-Verlag, 2000
- Sincak, Vascak : Quo Vadis Computational Intelligence, ISBN 3-7908-1324-9, in series "Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing", August 2000, Springer-Verlag

**Membership in Learned Societies:**

- International Neural Networks Society INNS
- European Neural Networks Society ENNS
- Slovak AI Society SAIS



**Name:**  
Stanislav Kaleta

**Affiliation:**  
Computational Intelligence Group, Department of Cybernetics and AI, Faculty of EE and Informatics, Technical University

**Address:**

Letná 9, 04001 Košice, Slovak Republic

**Brief Biographical History**

1998 Received M.Sc. in Automatic Control from Technical University of Kosice, Slovakia

1998- Ph.D student, Computational Intelligence Group, Department of Cybernetics and AI, Faculty of EE and Informatics, Technical University


**Main Works:**

- Kaleta, S.: Vyuzitie vypoctovej inteligencie vo financnej kybernetike, Master's thesis, Technical University of Kosice, 1998
- Kaleta, S.: Integracia prostriedkov vypoctovej inteligencie na predikciu casovych radov, Technical University of Kosice, 2000

**Membership in Learned Societies:**

- Slovak AI Society SAIS

**Vol.4 No.4**  
**Aug. 2000**



Cover Pictures:

Upper left:  
A function of Agent

Upper right:  
Examples of leg's motion based on data received for both waking and running during constant velocity trial  
(Dr. Takashi Yokoi, National Institute of Bioscience and Human Technology)

Center:  
2D CG image drawn with "SBART," a simulated breeding tool  
(Prof. Tatsuo Unemi, Dept. of Information Systems Science, Soka University)

Lower left:  
The structure of retina

Lower right:  
The threshold control method of fuzzy algorithm in FRASH2  
(Prof. Yoichiro Maeda, Faculty of Engineering, Osaka Electro-Communication University)

**Publishing Staff:**

Editor	Keiji Hayashi
Assistant Editor	Kiyoe Kojima
Art Director	Prof. Yuji Isa
Publisher	Keiji Hayashi

Published bimonthly by  
Fuji Technology Press Ltd.

4F Toranomon Sangyo Bldg.  
2-29, Toranomon 1-chome  
Minato-ku, Tokyo, 105-0001 Japan  
Tel: +813-3508-0051  
Fax: +813-3592-0648  
E-mail: TAE00762@nifty.ne.jp

**One year subscription**

Institutional rate (Air speed)	\$660
(Vol.1)	\$220)
Personl rate (Air speed)	\$140
(Vol.1)	\$40)
IFSA member (Air speed)	\$110

Copyright © 2000 by  
Fuji Technology Press Ltd.  
All rights reserved.

## Contents

**Guest Editorial:**

- **Intelligent Engineering Systems** ..... 237  
Imre J. Rudas

**Papers:**

- **ARTMAP Neural Networks for Multispectral Image Classification** ..... 240  
Norbert Kopco, Peter Sincák and Stanislav Kaleta
- **Similarity Relations in Diagnosis Fuzzy Systems.** 246  
Ján Vaščák and Ladislav Madarász
- **System Architecture for Support of Knowledge Management** ..... 251  
Marek Paralic, Tomáš Sabol and Marian Mach
- **Cluster Analysis as a First Step in the Knowledge Discovery Process.** ..... 258  
Andreas Rauber and Jan Paralic
- **Approach to Scheduling Problem Solution in Production Systems Using the Multiagent System.** ..... 263  
Franković, B., Labátová S. and Budinská, I.
- **Emerging Intelligent Technologies in Computer-Aided Engineering.** ..... 268  
László Horváth and Imre J. Rudas
- **Simultaneous Optimization of the External Loop Parameters in an Adaptive Control Based on the Co-operation of Uniform Procedures** ..... 279  
József K. Tar, Imre J. Rudas, Ladislav Madarász and János F. Bitó
- **Complexity Minimalization of Nonsingleton-based Fuzzy-Neural Network.** ..... 286  
Kin-fong Lei, Péter Baranyi and Yeung Yam
- **Learning M-of-N Concepts for Medical Diagnosis Using Neural Networks** ..... 294  
Yoichi Hayashi, Rudy Setiono and Katsumi Yoshida
- **Trajectory Tracking Control of Unconstrained Object Using the SIRMs Dynamically Connected Fuzzy Inference Model** ..... 302  
Jianqiang Yi, Naoyoshi Yubazaki and Kaoru Hirota

# Journal of Advanced Computational Intelligence

## Vol.4 No.4 Aug. 2000

### ■ Intelligent Engineering Systems

In Cooperation with International Fuzzy Systems Association (IFSA),  
Japan Society of Fuzzy Theory and Systems (SOFT),  
Brazilian Society of Automatics (SBA)  
Society of Instrument and Control Engineers (SICE, Japan)  
John von Neumann Computer Society (NJSZT)  
Vietnamese Fuzzy Systems Society (VFSS)

