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Motivation

▪ Geomorphological mapping / segmentation
  ▪ Course analytic scale
  ▪ Generalization is necessary
  ▪ Finding appropriate levels

▪ Quality of generalization methods
  ▪ Common methods limitation
  ▪ Insufficient preservation of land surface shapes
Generalization methods working with TIN

- Irregular elements and complex data structure
  - Flexible structure
  - Effective for capturing shape changes
  - Suitable for simplification
  - Suitable for further analysis
Generalization methods working with TIN

- Classical methods for DEM: grid $\Rightarrow$ TIN
  - Selection of relevant elements
  - Determination of deviations

- Polygonal simplification
  - TIN modifications instead of selection of vertices
  - Maximum shape fidelity
  - Advanced in computer graphics
Polygonal simplification / triangle optimization

Maintaining the characteristic shapes

Triangle edges are located on the greatest surface changes
Triangle area represents homogeneous part

✓ Principle of maximizing internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity in land surface segmentation
Quadric error metric simplification (QEMS) method

- Decimation of a triangular network by edge contraction
- Minimization of the quadratic distance of a point to the planes of the surrounding triangles
  - In accordance with the theory of the optimal triangle
  - Without subjective choices
Quadric error metric simplification (QEMS) method
Comparison with conventional method

QEMS

vs

maximum z-tolerance

- Widespread approach to generalization
- Zemlya implementation was used

- RMSE of signed approximation error
  - Signed Euclidean distance (point to surface)
  - Random points on triangle planes (approx. 50 000)
Comparison (dolina Zeleného plesa valley)

RMSE = 1212.05480 \times 10^{-0.64548}
R^2 = 0.99041

RMSE = 407.09559 \times 10^{-0.62924}
R^2 = 0.99763
Comparison (artificial models)

RMSE = 2739.28 ± 1.13
$R^2 = 0.99639$

RMSE = 273.64 ± 1.04
$R^2 = 0.99031$
Suitability for segmentation

- Third order morphometric quantities
  - Affinity of second order quantities to constant values

- Calculation of values of curvature changes
  - \((k_n)_{ss}\)  \((k_n)_{sc}\)  \((k_n)_{cc}\)  \((k_n)_{cs}\)
  - Based on a third-order polynomial least-square fitting

- Concentration of data around zero
  - Quantile-based measure of kurtosis
    \[ K_0 = \frac{\tilde{x}_{95} - \tilde{x}_5}{\tilde{x}_{0+5} - \tilde{x}_{0-5}} \]
$K_0$ curves (Slovinec/Sandberg)
$K_0$ curves
$K_0$ curves (Dolina Zeleného plesa valley)
$K_0$ comparison

![Graph showing $K_0$ comparison with different datasets and average triangle area.](image_url)
Conclusions

▪ QEMS algorithm is well suited for land surface segmentation
  ▪ Preserves important topographic features efficiently

▪ Local maximum of $K_0$ depict well the leading landforms in nested hierarchy

▪ The experiment of comparing $K_0$ values
  ▪ Significant differences between natural and artificial surfaces
  ▪ Can easily be interpreted in terms of the theory of elementary forms
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