Abstract—In this paper, we present various approaches for combining classifiers to improve classification of textured images, which are not generally used in this application framework. This is what we call post-classification step of textured images. Three approaches to combine classifiers are presented: the majority voting approach, belief approach, and classification-based approach. Belief, majority voting and classification-based approaches are compared for classification of real world-data that are sonar images. The obtained results show the interest of this post-classification step, particularly with the belief approach, to improve textured image classification results.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The classification of textured images plays an important role in image processing, pattern recognition and particularly for sonar images classification [7], [9], [10]. This classification is based on the use of supervised classification approaches (requiring an a priori knowledge of data classes), and it is based on texture features. The extraction of texture features cannot be done at pixel level, because the texture is defined on a set of pixels. Thus the unity used for classification depends on the number of pixels needed to extract these features, for example 8 × 8, 16 × 16 or 32 × 32 pixels. The precision obtained on the image can be improved using a sliding window with a recovery step, then the class found for this window is assigned to its central part (see Figure 1). This approach provides a more accurate precision and thus gives smoother borders between classes, but it does not take into account any information obtained by the classifications on successive and overlapped areas. Indeed, we have on each part of the image multiple classifiers giving their outputs (classes) that we can combine in order to improve the classification accuracy. We call this step of fusion: post-classification of textured images.

Classification algorithms have their own accuracy which should be improved in post-classification stage. There are many conventional techniques such as, majority filter, Thomas’s filter [11], transition matrix [4], Probability Label Relaxation (PLR) [12] model which are used to improve accuracy of classification results.

The seabed characterization based on sonar image classification is a very difficult task. Indeed, the produced sonar images contains a lot of imperfection coming form the instrumentation and some interference due to the signal traveling on multiple paths (reflection on the bottom or surface), due to speckle, and due to fauna and flora. In order to find the different kind of sediments (characterized by a difference of the texture), we must classify determinate the texture on small tile of size depending on the resolution of the sonar.

We give in section II the principle of the basic approach for classification of textured images, which uses the center of the sliding windows. In section III-B, we recall the principle of different approaches to combine classifiers that we propose to use to combine the classification results of sliding windows. Finally, we present the results of different fusion approaches for sonar images classification.

II. CLASSIFICATION OF TEXTURED IMAGES USING SLIDING WINDOWS

To characterize the texture of an image, it is divided into tiles of size $L \times L$ pixels with a recovery step $l$ ($l < L$) specified by the user in order to obtain an accurate classification. On each tile we calculate texture features using texture analysis methods [9], [10]. These features are used by the classifier. The classification of these tiles gives an image classified on homogeneous areas. To get a better classification (smooth border and better precision) it is necessary to use a $l$ closer to the size of tiles $L$. Note that the time used for classification increases if $l$ is close to $L$, since the number of tiles to classify increases with $l$.

The classification is done on tiles of size $L \times L$ pixels, but in the simplest approach, only the central area, of size $(L-l) \times (L-l)$ pixels is assigned to the class found. Thus, we have a classification resolution of $(L-l) \times (L-l)$ pixels. Figure 1 illustrates this approach.

In order to improve the classification results, we propose to use fusion approaches to combine classification results of
III. FUSION FOR POST-CLASSIFICATION

The approach outlined above is based on the assignment of the class found to the central area of the tile. But this area belongs to other neighbors tiles that can be classified into other classes. Our approach is based on the fusion of results for classification of tiles that contain “this central area”.

Let $N_c$ be the number of classes, $L$ the size of used sliding tile, $l$ the recovery step and $r$ the effective size of the studied central area ($r = L - l$). This area $z$ of size $r \times r$ pixels belongs to a set of tiles $I^z_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, N_z$ where $N_z$ is the number of tiles containing the zone $z$ and depends on the position of $z$ in the image, that is at maximum $(2r + 1)^2$ tiles contain partially the area $z$ and $(2r)^2$ tiles contain completely the area $z$. Each tile $I^z_i$ belongs to a class $C_q$, $q = 1, \ldots, N_c$.

Figure 2 illustrates this approach by drawing some tiles containing the studied area. In the case of this figure, the studied area is far away from the image borders, in this case the $z$ belongs to a maximum number of tiles unlike the case where the area is close to the edges (less than $L$ pixels between area $z$ and the borders of the image $I$).

Figure 3 gives the steps of fusion of informations calculated on tiles $I^z_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, N_z$ containing the area $z$ ($I^z_{i_0}$ centered in $z$): on each tile $I^z_i$, we calculate information $F^z_i$, this information can be: (i) the class of the tile $I^z_i$ (fusion by vote (cf. section III-A), (ii) the features extracted from the tile $I^z_i$ and the class of this tile (fusion by classification (cf. section III-B) or (iii) mass functions (belief fusion (cf. section III-C)).

Therefore, it is interesting to use all this information to calculate the class of the area $z$. So it is an information fusion problem for an optimal decision. We can find in [8] a general description of various approaches to combine classification results.

A. Fusion by majority voting

The simplest approach for fusion is the majority voting approach based on the combination of classes of classified tiles [6]. The fusion is done using the principle of majority voting by taking the maximum on the number of times that the area $z$ is assigned to a given class. We calculate the normalized histogram $p_z$ of number of times that tiles $I^z_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, N_z$, are classified to a class $C_q$, $q = 1, \ldots, N_c$:

$$p_z(q) = \frac{\text{card}\{i = 1, \ldots, N_z : I^z_i \in C_q\}}{N_z}. \quad (1)$$

Using this approach, the class $C_z$ of area $z$ is the maximum of $p_z$:

$$C_z = \arg\max_{q=1,\ldots,N_c} p_z(q). \quad (2)$$

If the maximum is reached for several values of $q$, we can choose, for example, the class of the area above $z$.

Let $S_z = p_z(C_z)$ be the value of the maximum of $p_z$. Using a sliding window over the image $I$, we form a matrix of class of areas $z$ noted $I_z$ and a matrix $I_w$ containing the values $S_z$. This matrix (with a maximum of 1) indicates a kind of “certainty” on the classification of each zone: a value close to
1 indicates that the classifier is “sure” about the class assigned to this zone.

We did not make a difference, in terms of distance between the images containing the area \( z \) for the decision of its class. We can use weights of these tiles using a “high” weight for the neighborhood tiles of \( I_y \) centered in \( z \) and a “low” weight for the other tiles. This weight is a function \( \psi_p \), decreasing with distance \( d \) between the area \( z \) and centers of tiles containing this area. For example:

\[
\psi_p(d) = e^{-\rho d}, \rho \geq 0,
\]

Or step function:

\[
\psi_p(d) = \mathbb{I}_{[0,\rho]}(d).
\]

The use of a step function limits the number of used tiles in the decision of the class of area \( z \).

In this case, to find \( C_z \) the class of the area \( z \), we use a weighted vote by weighting the value of the histogram \( p_z \) by the summation of weights of tiles of the same class (cf. Figure 4) for distances and the associated weight:

\[
p_w(q) = p_z(q) \sum_{i \in C_q} \psi_p(d_E(G_z, G_i)),
\]

where \( G_z \) and \( G_i \) are, respectively, centers of tiles \( I_y \), \( I_i \) and \( d_E \) is the Euclidean distance in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). Of course, other distances could be chosen.

Hence, the class \( C_z \) of the area \( z \) is given by:

\[
C_z = \arg \max_{q=1,\ldots,N_c} p_w(q).
\]

In this case, the “certainty” matrix \( I_c \) is defined by \( I_c(z) = p_w(C_z) \).
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Figure 4. Distances and associated weights (\( L = 32, I = 28 \) and \( \rho = 0.1 \) (cf. Equation (3))).

In this case, the “certainty” matrix \( I_c \) is defined by \( I_c(z) = p_w(C_z) \).
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B. Fusion by classification

Suppose that we search the class of an area \( z \) of size \( r \times r \). We use, for this, the \( N_z \) tiles \( I_i \), \( i = 1, \ldots, N_z \) of sizes \( L \times L \) pixels containing the area \( z \). Each tile \( I_i \), \( i = 1, \ldots, N_z \), of features \( x_i \) classified to a class \( y_i \) among \( N_c \) classes \( (x_i \in \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ and } y_i \in \{1, \ldots, N_c\}) \). Let \( X_z = \{x_i, y_i\}; i = 1, \ldots, N_z \}. \) Therefore, we can predict the class \( C_z \) of the area \( z \) using \( X_z \) for classifier learning.

We used here a supervised classification for decision because we have an \textit{a priori} knowledge of the initial class (the classes of tiles \( I_i \) are found from the first classification of the image). Therefore, the fusion by classification depends on the quality of the first classification. Note that the classifier used for fusion and the one used for initial classification can be different.

There are many classification approaches, for example, the \( k \)-nearest neighbors \([3]\), the neural networks, or the support vector machines (SVM) \([21]\). If we use the \( k \)-nearest neighbors, \( k_z := k \) must be less than \( N_z \) for each area \( z \). Note that the fusion by \( k \)-nearest neighbors with \( k_z = N_z \) is equivalent to the majority voting approach.

The choice of the classification approach depend on the number of tiles we can use in the learning step. Indeed, if \( L - l \) is near \( L \), we can not use easily the approaches such as neural networks and SVM.

In our case, with the sonar images, we consider a classifier based on support vector machines in the experiments part.

C. Belief fusion

The belief function theory have been used before for image segmentation \([14]\), \([15]\) and also in order to combine image classification results \([9]\), \([18]\).

We propose here the use of the belief functions theory for fusion of classification results of sliding windows.

The belief functions theory is based on the use of mass functions. The mass functions are defined over \( 2^\Theta \) that represent the set of the disjunctions of the frame of discernment \( \Theta = \{C_1, \ldots, C_N\} \) and of values in \([0,1] \), where \( C_q \) represents the assumption “the observation belongs to the class \( q \)”. Generally, it is added a condition of normalization, given by:

\[
\sum_{A \in 2^\Theta} m(A) = 1,
\]

where \( m(.) \) represents the mass function. The first difficulty is to define these mass functions according to the problem. Other belief functions can be defined from these mass functions, such as the functions of credibility, representing the intensity that all sources believe in an element, and as the functions of plausibility representing the degree with which we believe on an element.

In order to estimate the mass functions to be combined, \([1] \) suggests two models addressing three axioms that involve the use of \( N_c \times N_z \) mass functions to the unique focal elements \( \{C_q\}, \{C_q^c\} \text{ and } \Theta \). Furthermore, an axiom guarantees the equivalence with the Bayesian approach where the reality is perfectly known. Both models are substantially equivalent for our data, we use in this article the model given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_{iq} (C_q)(z) &= \frac{\alpha_{iq} R_{iq} p(F_z^c/C_q)}{1 + R_{iq} p(F_z^c/C_q)} \\
\alpha_{iq} (C_q^c)(z) &= \frac{\alpha_{iq} R_{iq} p(F_z^c/C_q^c)}{1 + R_{iq} p(F_z^c/C_q^c)} \\
\alpha_{iq} (\Theta)(z) &= 1 - \alpha_{iq}
\end{align*}
\]

Where \( p \) is the probability, \( R_{iq} = (\max_{i,q} p(F_z^c/C_q))^{-1} \) is a normalization factor, and \( \alpha_{iq} \in [0,1] \) is a weakening factor.
to take into account the reliability of the information provided by the tile \(I^*_i: F^*_i\) for a class \(C_q\) that we choose equal to 0.95. The difficulty for this model is the estimation of probabilities \(p(F^*_i/C_q)\). Where the given \(F^*_i\) of the tile \(I^*_i\) is the response of a classifier given in the form of class (symbolic data), the estimation of these probabilities can be done by confusion matrices on the learning step.

The combination of \(N_e \times N_z\) mass functions can be a real problem if this number is high. Indeed, the first combination rule in the belief function framework proposed by Dempster and Shafer is the normalized conjunctive combination rule given for two basic belief assignments \(m_1\) and \(m_2\) and for all \(X \in 2^\Theta\), \(X \neq \emptyset\) by:

\[
m_{mDS}(X) = \frac{1}{1-k} \sum_{A \cap B = X} m_1(A)m_2(B), \tag{9}\]

where \(k = \sum_{A \cap B = \emptyset} m_1(A)m_2(B)\) is the inconsistency of the combination.

Smets [19] proposes to consider an open world, therefore the conjunctive rule is non-normalized and we have for two basic belief assignments \(m_1\) and \(m_2\) and for all \(X \in 2^\Theta\) by:

\[
m_{mConj}(X) = \sum_{A \cap B = X} m_1(A)m_2(B). \tag{10}\]

\(m_{mConj}(\emptyset)\) can be interpreted as a non-expected solution. In the Transferable Belief Model of Smets, the repartition of the inconsistency is done in the decision step by the pignistic probability (12).

These two rules (9) and (10) are not idempotent. So the combination of \(n\) times the same mass function \(m\), \(m_{mConj}(\emptyset)\) and \(m_{mDS}(\emptyset)\) tend to 1 when \(n\) tends toward \(\infty\), that is what we call the auto-conflict (or auto-inconsistency) in [13]. Hence the normalization by \(1-k\) in the combination rule (9) or in the pignistic probability can be problematic.

In our application the number \(n = N_e \times N_z\) can be high, it is why, we prefer use the rule proposed by [22] defined for two mass functions \(m_1\) and \(m_2\) and for all \(X \in 2^\Theta\) by:

\[
\begin{align*}
m_Y(X) &= m_{mConj}(X), \\
m_Y(\Theta) &= m_{mConj}(\Theta) + m_{mConj}(\emptyset). \tag{11}\end{align*}
\]

Many other rules have been proposed, a brief state of the art as well as new rules for managing the conflict in combination is given by [17].

In order to preserve maximum of information, it is preferable to stay on a credal level (i.e. to handle belief functions) during the information combination stage to make the decision on the belief functions resulting from this combination. If the decision taken by the maximum of credibility is too pessimistic, the decision obtained by the maximum of plausibility is too optimistic. The maximum of the pignistic probability, introduced by [20], is the most used compromise. The pignistic probability is given for all \(X \in 2^\Theta\), with \(X \neq \emptyset\) by:

\[
\text{betP}(X) = \sum_{Y \subseteq 2^\Theta, Y \neq \emptyset} \frac{|X \cap Y|}{|Y|} m(Y) \sum_{B \subseteq Y} m(B), \tag{12}\]

IV. EXPERIMENTS

The database is composed of 42 sonar images provided by the GESMA (Groupe d‘Etudes Sous-Marines de l’Atlantic), which were obtained from a Klein 5400 sonar. These images were labeled using a software developed specifically by specifying the kind of sediment (sand, ripple, sand, rocks, cobbles or shade) (see Figure 5) and the degree of certainty given by the expert (sure, moderately sure or not sure) [7]. We considered three separate classes, which are extremely important to submarine navigation and for seabed mapping. The first class combines rock and cobbles, the second class contains ripples and the third class contains sand and silt.

The measurement unit used for texture extraction and for classification is windows of size \(32 \times 32\) pixels (about \(640 \text{ cm} \times 640 \text{ cm}\)).

A. Texture feature extraction

We calculated on these windows six parameters extracted from the cooccurrence matrices approach [9]. The cooccurrence matrices are calculated, by numbering the occurrence of identical gray level of two pixels in a given direction and a given distance.

Let \(I\) be an image of dimension \(R \times C\), and \(n_g\) the number of gray levels. By definition, the co-occurrence matrix \(p\) of \(I\) in the direction \(\theta\) and a distance \(d\) is \(p(i, j, d, \theta) = \{(i, j); \text{dist}(i, j) = d, \text{angle}(i, j) = \theta, i, j \in [1, \ldots, n_g]\}\).

Co-occurrence matrix is of high dimension (a \(n_g \times n_g\) matrix), thus, it is suitable to extract the relevant features. Haralick suggest the calculus of fourteen features [5], not all relevant for a given application. We consider here four directions: 0°, 45°, 90° and 135°. In these four directions, six parameters are calculated and then averaged over the four directions:

1) Homogeneity:

\[
\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_g} \sum_{j=1}^{n_g} p(i, j, d, \theta)^2}{n_g^2 - 1} \tag{13}\]

it has a big value for uniform images and for periodic textured image in the direction \(\theta\),

2) Contrast:

\[
\frac{1}{n_g^2 - 1} \sum_{k=0}^{n_g-1} k^2 \sum_{i,j=1}^{n_g} p(i, j, d, \theta) \tag{14}\]

it characterizes the big transition probabilities between pixels with high differences in gray level,

3) Entropy:

\[
1 - \sum_{i=1}^{R} \sum_{j=1}^{C} p(i, j, d, \theta) \log(p(i, j, d, \theta)) \tag{15}\]

it represents information present on the image,

4) Correlation between image rows and columns:

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n_g} \sum_{j=1}^{n_g} (i - \mu_x)(j - \mu_y)p(i, j, d, \theta) \tag{16}\]

\[
\sigma_x \sigma_y \]
where \( \mu_x \) and \( \mu_y \) describe the mean on rows and columns of \( p \) respectively, and \( \sigma_x \) and \( \sigma_y \) are the standard deviations.

5) The directivity:

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n_y} p(i, i, d, \theta) \tag{17}
\]

texture with high direction privilege in the direction \( d \) has a big directivity,

6) Uniformity:

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n_y} p(i, i, d, \theta)^2 \tag{18}
\]

it gives the proportion of each gray level in the image.

where \( p(i, j, d, \theta) \) is the estimation of the probability of transition of the pixel \( i \) to the pixel \( j \) in the direction \( \theta \) with a distance \( d \).

B. Evaluation of the classification

The evaluation of the classification of sonar images is important [10], [16]. The result of image classification can be visually evaluated by comparing it with the ground truth (reference image). But, to evaluate the classification algorithm, we must consider several possible configurations. Typically, classification algorithms are evaluated using confusion matrix. This matrix (CM) is composed by the numbers \( CM_{q_1,q_2} \) of elements of the class \( q_1 \) which are classified in class \( q_2 \). We can normalize this matrix to get rates that are easy to interpret:

\[
CM_{N_{q_1,q_2}} = \frac{CM_{q_1,q_2}}{N_{q_1}}, \quad N_c \sum_{q_k=1}^{q_{q_1}} CM_{q_1,q_k}, \tag{19}
\]

\( N_c \) is the number of classes and \( N_{q_1} \) is the number of elements of class \( q_1 \). We calculate from this confusion matrix a normalized vector of good classification rates (CR):

\[
CR_q = CM_{N_{qq}}, \tag{20}
\]

The mean classification rate \( CR_m \), where \( N \) represents the total number of images used by the classification algorithm, is given by:

\[
CR_m = \frac{\sum_{q=1}^{N_c} CM_{qq}}{N}, \tag{21}
\]

And the vector of probability error (PE) is defined by:

\[
PE_{q_1} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{q_2=1,q_2\neq q_1}^{N_c} CM_{N_{q_1,q_2}} + \sum_{q_2=1,q_2\neq q_1}^{N_c} \frac{CM_{N_{q_2,q_1}}}{N_c - 1} \right), \tag{22}
\]

Hence, we define the weighted mean probability of PE\(_{q_1} \) by:

\[
PE_m = \frac{\sum_{q=1}^{N_c} N_q PE_{q}}{N}. \tag{23}
\]

We proposed in [10], [16] an approach that takes into account the certainty and the imprecision of the expert: if a tile of class \( q_1 \) with certainty, associated with a weight \( w \in [0,1] \), is classified into class \( q_2 \) then \( CM_{N_{q_1,q_2}} \) will be \( CM_{N_{q_1,q_2}} + w \), and if a tile contains more than one class is classified as a class \( q_1 \), then, for \( q_2 = 1, \ldots, N_c \) \( CM_{N_{q_1,q_2}} \) will be \( CM_{N_{q_1,q_2}} + N_{q_2}/L^2 \), where \( N_{q_2} \) is the number of pixels \( q_2 \) on the tile.

C. Results

We present below the results obtained using the method of Support Vector Machines for the classification [21]. We used \texttt{libSVM} [2] for our tests using a gaussian kernel with \( C = 1 \), \( \gamma = 1/6 \) the value of the gaussian kernel parameter (6 is the number of textural parameters). The same classifier is used for classification fusion.

We used 24 sonar images for learning and 18 sonar images for test. We used homogeneous tiles of size \( 32 \times 32 \) pixels for learning step. We have 20424 tiles with 2353 tiles of rocks and cobbles, 2583 of ripples and 15488 tiles of sand and silt. The classifier used in the fusion considers a database for learning of size \( N_z \) for each area \( z \).
Figure 6 gives a manual segmentation by an expert of a used sonar image. Figure 7 shows the result of classification of a sonar image without fusion and with the three proposed approaches. We note that the post-classification with the three fusion approaches provide less false detection of ripple. Moreover the borders between the different classes are more smooth.

Figure 6. Sonar image and a manual segmentation of this image.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without fusion</th>
<th>Fusion by vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Without fusion" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Fusion by vote" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Classification of a sonar image.
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Certitude image | Ignorance image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Certitude image" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Ignorance image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The confusion matrix, calculated on the basis of learning to estimate the masses of small-images, is given by:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1753 & 141 & 459 \\
221 & 1353 & 1009 \\
138 & 91 & 15259
\end{pmatrix}
\]

We present in Table I the results with and without fusion using the three approaches described above. These results are presented in the form of normalized confusion matrices using the approach presented in [16]. We will adopt the confidence interval at 95% to represent the classification rate and error means. This table, (cf. Table I), also gives the CPU time for the three approaches to classification fusion of the image shown in Figure 6. We note that the belief fusion approach is much slower than the majority voting and classification approaches.

Note also the classification rates obtained by fusion approaches are significantly better than the rate found by the first approach without fusion. Indeed, in terms of classification rate, belief approach provides a significantly better rate with 89.22\pm 0.09%. Both approaches, by majority voting and by classification give similar classification rates (89.03\pm 0.09%). In terms of probabilities of error, the majority voting approach gives the low values with 17.14\pm 0.09% for belief approach, 18.10\pm 0.09% for the majority voting approach and 18.11\pm 0.09% for the classification fusion approach. The classification rate found considering the sliding windows center is 88.11\pm 0.08% with a probability error of 19.26\pm 0.09%. In terms of classification rate per class, we note that all three approaches were able to improve rates for the three classes, except in the case of a belief combiner for classification of the third class (sand and silt).

V. CONCLUSION

We studied in this paper novel approaches to combine classifiers to improve the classification performance of textured image, a step that we call: post-classification. Thus, the fusion of classification results of sliding windows, uses all the windows containing the area to classify. We studied an approach based on majority voting, an approach using a classifier, and a belief approach providing a significant improvement to results for the classification of sonar images.
The belief approach is time consuming but allows the best performance in the context of this application.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CM_{N} (%)</th>
<th>CR_{M} (%)</th>
<th>PB_{ON} (%)</th>
<th>CPU time (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before fusion</td>
<td>68.68</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>26.84</td>
<td>13.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>98.86</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority voting</td>
<td>70.99</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>8.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>99.24</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM fusion</td>
<td>70.92</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>27.66</td>
<td>8.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>99.24</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief fusion</td>
<td>74.14</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>24.31</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>98.39</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.22±0.09</td>
<td>17.14±0.09</td>
<td>2599.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I

CLASSIFICATION RESULTS WITH AND WITHOUT FUSION.