MULTI-LABEL SCENE CLASSIFICATION IN REMOTE SENSING BENEFITS FROM IMAGE SUPER-RESOLUTION

Ashitha Mudraje^{1,2} Brian B. Moser^{1,2} Stanislav Frolov^{1,2} Andreas Dengel^{1,2}

¹German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence, Germany ²RPTU Kaiserslautern-Landau, Germany

first.last@dfki.de

ABSTRACT

Satellite imagery is a cornerstone for numerous Remote Sensing (RS) applications; however, limited spatial resolution frequently hinders the precision of such systems, especially in multi-label scene classification tasks as it requires a higher level of detail and feature differentiation. In this study, we explore the efficacy of image Super-Resolution (SR) as a pre-processing step to enhance the quality of satellite images and thus improve downstream classification performance. We investigate four SR models - SRResNet, HAT, SeeSR, and RealESRGAN - and evaluate their impact on multilabel scene classification across various CNN architectures, including ResNet-50, ResNet-101, ResNet-152, and Inception-v4. Our results show that applying SR significantly improves downstream classification performance across various metrics, demonstrating its ability to preserve spatial details critical for multi-label tasks. Overall, this work offers valuable insights into the selection of SR techniques for multi-label prediction in remote sensing and presents an easy-to-integrate framework to improve existing RS systems.

Index Terms— Multi-Label Scene Classification, Remote Sensing, Image Super-Resolution

1. INTRODUCTION

Remote Sensing (RS) is vital for monitoring and analyzing the Earth's surface [1]. However, despite the increasing demand for High-Resolution (HR) imagery in this domain, limited sensor capabilities often constrain fine-grained classification, detection, or mapping tasks [2, 3]. To alleviate these constraints - without relying solely on costly HR sensors or upgrades - image Super-Resolution (SR) offers a cost-efficient alternative by generating HR images from Lower-Resolution (LR) inputs [4]. While SR has been explored for various classification tasks [5, 6, 7], its influence on multi-label scene prediction in RS remains underexplored.

In RS, multi-label scene classification typically involves detecting multiple land cover types, urban structures, vegetation, or water bodies within a single satellite image, necessitating the capture of fine spatial details across diverse scales [8, 9]. Yet, with LR images,



Fig. 1: Illustration of our proposed pipeline that uses image super-resolution as a pre-processing step for multilabel scene classification for improved label prediction.

classical approaches often fail to capture subtle boundaries or small objects, ultimately leading to diminished precision [3]. By applying SR as pre-processing step, shown in Figure 1, models can leverage these finer features, leading to improved multi-label recognition [5].

This paper investigates the potential of SR to enhance multi-label scene classification in RS. We selected a range of pre-trained SR techniques - including diffusion-based, GAN-based, and CNN approaches and compare their performance on SR-enhanced and original LR images [10, 11, 12, 13]. Our findings highlight that using image SR excels at reconstructing spatial details critical for classification. As a result, the added details lead to improved identification of multiple labels within a single image. In summary, we shed light on the benefits and limitations of SR in improving downstream prediction accuracy.

2. RELATED WORK

2.1. Remote Sensing

Singh et al. [14] explore the application of satellite imagery for monitoring environmental changes. The authors leverage various machine learning and deep learning models such as ResNet[15], VGG[16], Inception[17], and so on to classify satellite images based on atmospheric conditions and land use. By employing multi-label classification, the authors captured the intricate relationships between different environmental factors.

Similar in spirit, Liu et al. [18] presents a simplified

residual network model for multi-label classification of RS images. The model leverages transfer learning with ResNet-50, incorporating some techniques like batch normalization, image augmentation and self-defined loss evaluation index to enhance training efficiency and accuracy. The proposed approach effectively addresses challenges related to power consumption and performance, achieving over 90% precision and recall

Similarly, Gardner et al. [19] explored multi-label classification by applying CNN-based architectures like VGG-16, Inception-v3, and ResNet-50 to classify Amazon rainforest features and illegal mining activities. Although a baseline model captured common categories, it struggled with rare classes crucial for detecting illicit operations. Notably, ResNet-50 outperformed other architectures, demonstrating the value of deeper networks for multi-label remote sensing tasks.

While deeper CNN architectures have yielded promising results, the question of how SR might further boost downstream classification performance in RS remains underexplored. The present work addresses this gap by systematically investigating the impact of SR-driven enhancements.

2.2. Image Super-Resolution

A trained SR model $M_{\theta} : \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times C} \to \mathbb{R}^{s \cdot H \times s \cdot W \times C}$ should inverse the degradation relationship between a LR image $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times C}$ and the HR image $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{s \cdot H \times s \cdot W \times C}$, where *s* denotes the scaling. The optimization of θ is based on a dataset $\mathbb{D}_{SR} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ of *N* LR-HR pairs with the goal

$$\theta^* = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \mathbb{D}_{SR}} \| M_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbf{y}_i \|^2.$$
(1)

Using SR have found use across diverse domains, ranging from medical imaging, where sharper images can critically affect patient outcomes, to satellite imagery, enabling more precise geographic analysis of the Earth's surface [20, 21, 1]. This work investigates the influence of using existing and pre-trained SR methods as a pre-processing stage to RS downstream tasks.

3. METHODOLOGY

Our goal is to apply SR models of the form M_{θ} : $\mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times C} \to \mathbb{R}^{s \cdot H \times s \cdot W \times C}$ prior to training a multi-label classifier to improve the precision of RS downstream tasks. Since the amount and quality of generally available images outnumber high-quality satellite images, we refer to pre-trained SR models with fixed parameters θ rather than training a new model M_{θ} from scratch.

3.1. SR Models

For SR methods, two primary factors drive performance: the model architecture M_{θ} and the training objectives to optimize θ [22]. For the latter, SR models can be categorized into two groups: regression-based models, which typically employ a regression loss, and generative SR models (GANs and diffusion models) [23].

Consequently, we analyze representatives of each category. For regression-based models, we employ the ResNet-based model SRResNet [10, 24] and the vision transformer HAT [25, 11]. For generative SR, we analyze SeeSR [12] as a diffusion-based representative and RealESRGAN [13] as a representative for GANs. As image SR models are usually trained for $2\times$, $3\times$, or $4\times$, we will use $4\times$ pre-trained models to allow for maximum flexibility for the multi-label scene classifier.

3.2. Multi-Label Classifier

We adopt four commonly used models for multi-label scene classification, namely ResNet-50, ResNet-101, ResNet-152, and Inception-v4. We train each model under two configurations:

- **Baseline (No SR):** The network is trained directly on the original LR images (120×120) .
- With SR Pre-processing (SR): The network is trained on images super-resolved by one of the four SR models described in the previous Section (i.e., SRResNet, HAT, SeeSR, or RealESRGAN). We first apply the respective SR model (4× i.e. 480 × 480 resolution) and then feed the enhanced images to the multi-label classifier.

3.3. Impact Assessment

To evaluate the impact of image SR models on the classifier under different aspects, we employ the following evaluation metrics:

- Sample Accuracy (ACC): Measures the proportion of correctly predicted labels among all labels. Giving equal importance to each sample of the test set.
- Hamming Loss (HL): Quantifies the fraction of misclassified labels, capturing the multi-label misalignment [26]. Lower HL indicates fewer label-wise errors.
- **One-Error (OE):** Checks whether the top prediction (the label with the highest probability) is present in the true label set. A lower OE implies the model's highest-confidence prediction is more likely correct.
- **Precision (P), Recall (R)**, and **F1-Score:** Standard measures assessing the balance between correctly predicted labels (Precision) and the coverage of positive instances (Recall). F1 is their harmonic mean. All metrics are calculated based on the sample (test) data.
- Macro F2 Score: An extension of F1 that places additional emphasis on Recall. Useful when missing labels is costlier than having false positives.

Table 1: Accuracy (ACC), Hamming Loss (HL), One-Error (OE), Precision (P), Recall (R), and F1 Score Comparison Across Models and Configurations. Best (classifier-wise) results are marked in bold.

	ResNet-50					ResNet-101					ResNet-152					Inception-v4								
	ACC	HL	OE	Р	R	F1	ACC	HL	OE	Р	R	F1	ACC	HL	OE	Р	R	F1	ACC	HL	OE	Р	R	F1
No SR	0.411	0.138	0.323	0.556	0.564	0.526	0.413	0.144	0.345	0.534	0.570	0.525	0.402	0.137	0.371	0.533	0.546	0.512	0.278	0.153	0.498	0.458	0.327	0.360
SRResNet	0.474	0.138	0.231	0.647	0.586	0.583	0.462	0.126	0.272	0.609	0.592	0.571	0.419	0.144	0.295	0.550	0.587	0.535	0.333	0.136	0.330	0.547	0.381	0.422
HAT	0.448	0.125	0.265	0.617	0.570	0.559	0.457	0.119	0.278	0.619	0.569	0.564	0.464	0.115	0.241	0.648	0.560	0.570	0.421	0.159	0.338	0.530	0.585	0.531
SeeSR	0.445	0.122	0.290	0.606	0.561	0.552	0.446	0.122	0.291	0.613	0.555	0.572	0.452	0.122	0.295	0.595	0.587	0.562	0.233	0.171	0.540	0.361	0.295	0.306
RealESRGAN	0.439	0.124	0.277	0.622	0.555	0.550	0.440	0.122	0.284	0.598	0.566	0.550	0.455	0.120	0.265	0.626	0.561	0.560	0.325	0.142	0.437	0.487	0.412	0.419

 Table 2: Macro F2 Score for 19 classes, evaluated on

 ResNet-152 model. Best (label-wise) is marked in bold.

Class	No SR	SRResNet	HAT	SeeSR	RealESRGAN
Urban fabric	0.519	0.534	0.428	0.506	0.452
Industrial or commercial units	0.249	0.235	0.256	0.179	0.258
Arable land	0.701	0.732	0.765	0.756	0.730
Permanent crops	0.356	0.374	0.341	0.408	0.257
Pastures	0.374	0.389	0.365	0.448	0.416
Complex cultivation patterns	0.633	0.512	0.556	0.628	0.488
Land principally occupied by agriculture	0.556	0.537	0.383	0.446	0.168
Agro-forestry areas	0.588	0.637	0.716	0.668	0.643
Broad-leaved forest	0.555	0.535	0.460	0.554	0.577
Coniferous forest	0.653	0.618	0.725	0.720	0.742
Mixed forest	0.754	0.552	0.568	0.719	0.729
Natural grassland & sparsely vegetated areas	0.013	0.037	0.013	0.0004	0.102
Moors, heathland & sclerophyllous vegetation	0.178	0.285	0.168	0.044	0.084
Transitional woodland, shrub	0.520	0.599	0.521	0.478	0.487
Beaches, dunes, sands	0.274	0.276	0.449	0.366	0.324
Inland wetlands	0.244	0.176	0.157	0.221	0.261
Coastal wetlands	0.082	0.111	0.226	0.045	0.089
Inland waters	0.575	0.662	0.678	0.683	0.642
Marine waters	0.089	0.602	0.597	0.430	0.535
Average Macro F2 score	0.417	0.443	0.440	0.437	0.420

4. EXPERIMENTS

We utilized a standard dataset for multi-label prediction in remote sensing for our experiments: BigEarth-Net [27, 28], containing 519,284 non-overlapping image patches, where CORINE Land Cover (CLC)[29] database provides one or more land cover class labels (multi-labels) for each image[30]. Each patch is a segment of 120×120 pixels for bands of 10m. These 10m band patches stacked to make RGB images(LR images).

4.1. Quantitative Results

Table 1 shows the quantitative results. In short, training on SR-enhanced images outperforms the baseline across all classifier backbones, confirming the value of SR in recovering details beneficial for multi-label prediction. Notably, SRResNet achieves the highest accuracy on ResNet-50 and ResNet-101, demonstrating its strong performance in moderately deep networks. Meanwhile, HAT attains the best Hamming Loss on ResNet-101 and ResNet-152, indicating more precise label-wise predictions when paired with deeper architectures.

Regarding One-Error, SRResNet provides the largest reduction on ResNet-50 (0.231 vs. 0.323 baseline). However, with deeper models such as ResNet-152, HAT outperforms SRResNet (0.241 vs. 0.295). This finding suggests that while SRResNet excels in shallower configurations, HAT's attention mechanisms align better with higher-capacity networks. Similarly, SRResNet consistently yields high F1 scores on ResNet-50, partly due to a robust balance of Precision and Recall. In contrast, HAT demonstrates stronger Precision and F1 in deeper setups (ResNet-152, Inception-v4).

Overall, these three perspectives (ACC/HL, OE, and

Fig. 2: SR Comparison of HAT and RealESRGAN. While HAT provides relatively balanced enhancements, RealESRGAN tends to hallucinate details (e.g., overemphasizing streets and introducing artificial patterns in forest regions), illustrating the pitfalls of generative SR methods in certain remote sensing scenes.

P/R/F1) show consistent performance trends yet emphasize different quality aspects. Despite their complementary perspectives, they collectively indicate that attention-based SR (i.e., HAT) delivers the strongest gains when paired with deeper networks. In contrast, SRResNet provides the best quality for smaller architectures. While all tested SR methods generally enhance multi-label prediction, generative approaches (i.e., SeeSR and RealESRGAN) hallucinate details, which explains their reduced positive impact, as exemplified in Figure 2.

By examining the class-level results via Macro F2 (see Table 2), we observe that SR notably boosts performance for certain land-cover types, particularly those defined by clear boundaries and texture (e.g., Marine and Inland Waters). Yet, while a SR method improves certain classes, it does not consistently improve predictions across all labels. These variations suggest that SR's effectiveness can be class-specific and should be factored into pre-processing decisions for multi-label RS tasks.



Fig. 3: Comparison of Grad-CAM visualizations in ResNet models between the baseline (No SR) and various SR methods. SRResNet (for shallow classifier) and HAT (for deeper classifier) lead to more activation coverage across the whole satellite image.

4.2. Qualitative Results

To gain deeper insight into how SR pre-processing influences network behavior, we employ Grad-CAM [31] to visualize class activation maps in the final convolutional layer of ResNet architectures. The results are shown in Figure 3. Overall, SR-enhanced images exhibit more pronounced and varied activations (highlighted by dark red or blue regions), indicating that the classifier focuses more strongly on distinct features. Interestingly, the strongest performance gains often coincide with broadly distributed positive CAM responses: for ResNet-50, SRResNet yields widespread high-intensity activations, whereas for ResNet-152, HAT demonstrates similarly extensive coverage. These observations align with the quantitative results, suggesting that spatially richer activations under SR pre-processing directly contribute to improved multi-label classification.

One plausible explanation for the observed performance gains and heightened activation variance is that higher resolution inputs better align with the receptive field that increases with deeper networks, allowing the classifier to extract richer, more discriminative features at each convolutional layer. Consequently, the classifier can more effectively utilize these cues when predicting multiple labels, leading to a broader and more varied activation map in the Grad-CAM visualizations and ultimately improving overall classification performance.

5. CONCLUSION & FUTURE WORK

In this study, we have investigated the potential of image SR as a pre-processing step for improving multilabel scene classification in RS. Our findings reveal that across diverse SR architectures (e.g., SRResNet, HAT, SeeSR, RealESRGAN) and classification backbones (ResNet-50, ResNet-101, ResNet-152, Inception-v4), SR-based enhancements can yield notable gains in multiple evaluation metrics, including accuracy, Hamming Loss, One-Error, F1-Score, and Macro F2 Score. Notably, SRResNet consistently boosted performance in shallower models (ResNet-50, ResNet-101), whereas the attention-based HAT approach aligned more effectively with deeper architectures (ResNet-152, Inceptionv4). In conclusion, this study bridges the gap between SR and multi-label classification in satellite imagery, offering a robust framework for improving remote sensing applications.

Future work should also analyze the effect of using SR models trained on satellite images for multi-label scene classification.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the BMBF project SustainML (Grant 101070408) and by Carl Zeiss Foundation through the Sustainable Embedded AI project (P2021-02-009).

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Fanen Meng, Sensen Wu, Yadong Li, Zhe Zhang, Tian Feng, Renyi Liu, and Zhenhong Du, "Single remote sensing image super-resolution via a generative adversarial network with stratified dense sampling and chain training," *IEEE Transactions* on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 2023.
- [2] Yu Wang, Zhenfeng Shao, Tao Lu, Changzhi Wu, and Jiaming Wang, "Remote sensing image superresolution via multiscale enhancement network," *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters*, vol. 20, pp. 1–5, 2023.
- [3] Runmin Dong, Lichao Mou, Lixian Zhang, Haohuan Fu, and Xiao Xiang Zhu, "Real-world remote sensing image super-resolution via a practical degradation model and a kernel-aware network," *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, vol. 191, pp. 155–170, 2022.
- [4] Francesco Salvetti, Vittorio Mazzia, Aleem Khaliq, and Marcello Chiaberge, "Multi-image super resolution of remotely sensed images using residual attention deep neural networks," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 12, no. 14, pp. 2207, 2020.
- [5] Vijul Shah, Brian B Moser, Ko Watanabe, and Andreas Dengel, "Webcam-based pupil diameter prediction benefits from upscaling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.10397*, 2024.
- [6] Junqi Chen, Lijuan Jia, Jinchuan Zhang, Yilong Feng, Xiaobin Zhao, and Ran Tao, "Superresolution for land surface temperature retrieval images via cross-scale diffusion model using reference images," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 1356, 2024.
- [7] Chengxun He, Yang Xu, Zebin Wu, and Zhihui Wei, "Connecting low-level and high-level visions: A joint optimization for hyperspectral image super-resolution and target detection," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 2024.
- [8] Xiaohui Cheng, Bingwu Li, Yun Deng, Jian Tang, Yuanyuan Shi, and Junyu Zhao, "Mmdl-net: Multi-band multi-label remote sensing image classification model," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 2226, 2024.
- [9] Gencer Sumbul and Begüm Demİr, "A deep multiattention driven approach for multi-label remote sensing image classification," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 95934–95946, 2020.
- [10] Christian Ledig, Lucas Theis, Ferenc Huszár, Jose Caballero, Andrew Cunningham, Alejandro Acosta, Andrew Aitken, Alykhan Tejani, Johannes Totz, Zehan Wang, et al., "Photo-realistic single

image super-resolution using a generative adversarial network," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 4681–4690.

- [11] Xiangyu Chen, Xintao Wang, Wenlong Zhang, Xiangtao Kong, Yu Qiao, Jiantao Zhou, and Chao Dong, "Hat: Hybrid attention transformer for image restoration," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05239*, 2023.
- [12] Rongyuan Wu, Tao Yang, Lingchen Sun, Zhengqiang Zhang, Shuai Li, and Lei Zhang, "Seesr: Towards semantics-aware real-world image super-resolution," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2024, pp. 25456–25467.
- [13] Xintao Wang, Liangbin Xie, Chao Dong, and Ying Shan, "Real-esrgan: Training real-world blind super-resolution with pure synthetic data," in *International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops (ICCVW)*.
- [14] Aditya Kumar Singh and B. Uma Shankar, "Multilabel classification on remote-sensing images," 2022.
- [15] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun, "Identity mappings in deep residual networks," in *Computer Vision–ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part IV* 14. Springer, 2016, pp. 630–645.
- [16] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman, "Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. arxiv 2014," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, vol. 1409, 2014.
- [17] Christian Szegedy, Wei Liu, Yangqing Jia, Pierre Sermanet, Scott Reed, Dragomir Anguelov, Dumitru Erhan, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Andrew Rabinovich, "Going deeper with convolutions," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2015, pp. 1–9.
- [18] Jingyuan Liu and Huajun Shi, "Multi-label classification of remote sensing image based on deep learning on embedded device," in 2021 International Conference on Computer, Blockchain and Financial Development (CBFD). IEEE, 2021, pp. 112–116.
- [19] Daniel Gardner and David Nichols, "Multi-label classification of satellite images with deep learning," *stanford. edu*, 2017.
- [20] Liyao Song, Quan Wang, Ting Liu, Haiwei Li, Jiancun Fan, Jian Yang, and Bingliang Hu, "Deep robust residual network for super-resolution of 2d fetal brain mri," *Scientific reports*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 406, 2022.

- [21] Jiali Tang, Jie Zhang, Dan Chen, Najla Al-Nabhan, and Chenrong Huang, "Single-frame super-resolution for remote sensing images based on improved deep recursive residual network," *EURASIP Journal on Image and Video Processing*, vol. 2021, pp. 1–19, 2021.
- [22] Brian B Moser, Federico Raue, Stanislav Frolov, Sebastian Palacio, Jörn Hees, and Andreas Dengel, "Hitchhiker's guide to super-resolution: Introduction and recent advances," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 45, no. 8, pp. 9862–9882, 2023.
- [23] Brian B Moser, Arundhati S Shanbhag, Federico Raue, Stanislav Frolov, Sebastian Palacio, and Andreas Dengel, "Diffusion models, image superresolution, and everything: A survey," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2024.
- [24] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference* on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [25] Xiangyu Chen, Xintao Wang, Jiantao Zhou, Yu Qiao, and Chao Dong, "Activating more pixels in image super-resolution transformer," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2023, pp. 22367–22377.
- [26] Anqi Mao, Mehryar Mohri, and Yutao Zhong, "Multi-label learning with stronger consistency guarantees," 2024.
- [27] Gencer Sumbul, Marcela Charfuelan, Begüm Demir, and Volker Markl, "Bigearthnet: A largescale benchmark archive for remote sensing image understanding," in *IGARSS 2019-2019 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 5901–5904.
- [28] Gencer Sumbul, Arne De Wall, Tristan Kreuziger, Filipe Marcelino, Hugo Costa, Pedro Benevides, Mario Caetano, Begüm Demir, and Volker Markl, "Bigearthnet-mm: A large-scale, multimodal, multilabel benchmark archive for remote sensing image classification and retrieval [software and data sets]," *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Magazine*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 174–180, 2021.
- [29] George Büttner, Jan Feranec, Gabriel Jaffrain, László Mari, Gergely Maucha, and Tomas Soukup, "The corine land cover 2000 project," *EARSeL eProceedings*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 331–346, 2004.
- [30] Gencer Sumbul, Jian Kang, Tristan Kreuziger, Filipe Marcelino, Hugo Costa, Pedro Benevides,

Mario Caetano, and Begüm Demir, "Bigearthnet dataset with a new class-nomenclature for remote sensing image understanding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.06372*, 2020.

[31] Ramprasaath R Selvaraju, Michael Cogswell, Abhishek Das, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra, "Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization," in *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2017, pp. 618– 626.