The comparison of PCA and discrete rough set for feature extraction of remote sensing image classification – A case study on rice classification, Taiwan

T. C. Lei · S. Wan · T. Y. Chou

Published online: 5 August 2008
© Springer Science + Business Media B.V. 2008

Erratum to: *Comput Geosci* (2008) 12:1–14 DOI: 10.1007/s10596-007-9057-7

Unfortunately, due to the improper extraction of samples, the Table 4 has to be modified as the following:

Table 4 The image classification accuracy of two difference knowledge methods (Original Paper of Table 4, of revised)

	PCA + RSKC (%)	Discrete rough set + RSKC (%)
1. Percentage from paddy rice	47.00	47.67
2. Percentage from non-paddy rice	39.67	46.33
3. Omission error:		
Paddy rice	6.00	4.67
Non-paddy rice	20.67	7.33
4. Commission error:		
Paddy rice	18.02	7.14
Non-paddy rice	7.03	4.79
5. Overall accuracy result	86.67	94.00
6. Overall inaccuracy result	13.33	6.00

The reason for modifying this Table is the original percentage for PCA + RSKC and Discrete Rough Set + RSKC stemmed from different base data. More specifically, the original paper the case for PCA + RSKC is using 150(paddy rice) + 150(non-paddy rice) and Discrete Rough Set + RSKC is using 110(paddy rice) + 190(non-paddy rice). This is inappropriate for expression. The new Table is generated by using equal samples of paddy rice and no-paddy rice in both cases. That is, PCA + RSKC is using 150(paddy rice) + 150(non-paddy rice) for PCA + RSKC and PCA + RSKC is using 150(paddy rice) + 150(non-paddy rice).

The online version of the original article can be found at
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10596-007-9057-7>.

T. C. Lei (✉) · T. Y. Chou
GIS Center, Feng Chia University,
No. 100 Wenhwa Rd., Seatwen,
Taichung, Taiwan 40724, Republic of China
e-mail: tclei@fcu.edu.tw

S. Wan
Department of Information Management,
Ling Tung University, No.1 Ling Tung Road,
Taichung, Taiwan, Republic of China
e-mail: Shiuan123@mail.ltu.edu.tw