PCM-SAR: Physics-Driven Contrastive Mutual Learning for SAR Classification

Pengfei Wang^{*}, Hao Zheng^{*}, Zhigang Hu, Aikun Xu, Meiguang Zheng[†], and Liu Yang School of Computer Science and Engineering, Central South University, Changsha, China Email: {234712162, zhenghao, zghu, aikunxu, zhengmeiguang, yangliu}@csu.edu.cn

Abstract-Existing SAR image classification methods based on Contrastive Learning often rely on sample generation strategies designed for optical images, failing to capture the distinct semantic and physical characteristics of SAR data. To address this, we propose Physics-Driven Contrastive Mutual Learning for SAR Classification (PCM-SAR), which incorporates domainspecific physical insights to improve sample generation and feature extraction. PCM-SAR utilizes the gray-level co-occurrence matrix (GLCM) to simulate realistic noise patterns and applies semantic detection for unsupervised local sampling, ensuring generated samples accurately reflect SAR imaging properties. Additionally, a multi-level feature fusion mechanism based on mutual learning enables collaborative refinement of feature representations. Notably, PCM-SAR significantly enhances smaller models by refining SAR feature representations, compensating for their limited capacity. Experimental results show that PCM-SAR consistently outperforms SOTA methods across diverse datasets and SAR classification tasks.

Index Terms—SAR Classification, Contrastive Learning, Physics-Driven Feature Extraction, Mutual Learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) has become an indispensable tool in remote sensing, providing all-weather, day-night imaging capabilities for critical applications such as marine monitoring, disaster management, and resource exploration [1]. However, automating SAR image classification faces significant challenges due to the scarcity of labeled data [2]– [4]. Acquiring high-quality labels for SAR images is not only labor-intensive but also expensive, making supervised learning approaches less feasible for large-scale applications.

In recent years, Contrastive Learning (CL) has emerged as a promising unsupervised learning technique to alleviate the reliance on labeled data by training networks through positive and negative sample pairs to learn robust feature representations [5]. Although CL has achieved success in optical image classification, its adaptation to SAR imagery is inherently challenging. Existing CL methods often employ sample generation strategies, such as introducing random Gaussian noise [6], [7] or random cropping [8]–[10], that fail to capture SAR's unique semantic and physical characteristics. Unlike optical images, SAR data exhibits sparse and highly concentrated semantic information along with complex physical imaging properties, such as surface texture and speckle noise . These differences often lead to suboptimal sample representations and hinder the performance of CL-based SAR classification methods. Traditional feature extraction methods, such as the graylevel co-occurrence matrix (GLCM) [11]–[13], are designed to capture texture features and have proven effective in image classification tasks. However, their reliance on fixed scales and predefined patterns restricts their ability to adapt to the diverse and multi-scale textures inherent in SAR imagery. Furthermore, SAR data are characterized by physical structures and highly localized semantic information, which GLCM cannot adequately capture due to its lack of semantic awareness. This limitation prevents GLCM from interpreting global contexts or modeling the intricate imaging characteristics of SAR, such as speckle noise [14], [15], spatial heterogeneity [16], and localized semantic regions [17], reducing its relevance in modern deep learning-based SAR frameworks.

To address these limitations, we propose Physics-Driven Contrastive Mutual Learning for SAR Classification (PCM-SAR), a novel framework that integrates domain-specific physical insights and semantic awareness into the sample generation process and feature extraction. PCM-SAR utilizes GLCM to simulate realistic noise patterns and employs a semantic-driven local sampling method to generate positive and negative sample pairs that better represent SAR's unique imaging properties. This ensures that the generated samples reflect critical physical and semantic characteristics, enhancing the model's ability to handle the heterogeneity of SAR data. Additionally, PCM-SAR incorporates a multi-level feature fusion mechanism based on mutual learning, enabling models to collaboratively refine their feature representations. This collaborative approach reduces reliance on individual positive-negative sample pairs while benefiting smaller models, which gain refined feature representations despite their limited capacity. Experimental results demonstrate that PCM-SAR consistently outperforms state-of-the-art methods across diverse datasets, achieving substantial improvements in SAR classification accuracy. In summary, the contribution of our method PCM-SAR is summarized as follows:

- We integrate SAR-specific physical insights into CL by utilizing GLCM to simulate realistic noise patterns and applying semantic-driven local sampling to generate positive and negative sample pairs.
- We propose a multi-level feature fusion mechanism based on ML, enabling models to collaboratively refine feature representations. This design not only enhances the extraction of SAR-specific features but also reduces reliance on

^{*} These authors contributed equally and † is corresponding author.



Fig. 1. Overview of PCM-SAR. (a) is the GMCL nosie noise sample generation process, (b) is the sematic-aware sample generation process. Each model contains an encoder and a momentum encoder. The momentum encoder does not accept gradients but uses EMA(Exponential Moving Average) to update. The encoder accepts two types of losses: contrastive learning loss L_{sm} and mutual learning loss L_{ml} .

individual positive-negative sample pairs.

• we benefits smaller models by providing more refined feature representations, effectively compensating for their limited capacity. This improvement enables superior performance in SAR classification tasks across diverse datasets and model scales.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Sample Generation Driven by Physical Mechanism

1) Noise Sample Generation(NSG) based on GLCM: The speckle noise in SAR images follows a multiplicative noise model [18], [19], where the the observed noisy image \tilde{x} and the original image x as follows:

$$\tilde{x} = x \cdot v_a \cdot e^{v_p},\tag{1}$$

where v_a is the speckle amplitude noise, modeled as $v_a \sim \mathcal{N}(1, \sigma^2)$. The intensity of speckle noise varies based on terrain features such as surface roughness, vegetation coverage, ocean currents, and wave activity, making noise modeling a complex task. To address this, we propose a speckle noise sample generation based on Gray-Level Co-occurrence Matrix (GLCM) [17], [20]. GLCM is a widely used texture analysis technique that extracts key features—such as Contrast (C), Entropy (E), and Homogeneity (H)—which represent the complexity and roughness of image blocks. These features allow us to account for terrain-induced noise variations in SAR images.

By using a variety of mathematical transformations to smooth the terrain and complexity effects, the final adjustment function F is as follows:

$$F = \alpha \cdot log(1 + \beta_1 \cdot C) + \gamma \cdot \sqrt{\beta_2 \cdot E} + \delta \cdot exp(\beta_3 \cdot H),$$
(2)



Fig. 2. The images represent a comparison of five noise processing effects: (1) is original image, (2) is GLCM-based speckle noise, (3) is regular speckle noise, (4) is Gaussian noise(Commonly used in optical images), and (5) is scattering masking noise, (6) is time-shift noise. Among these, (3), (4), and (6) all significantly disrupt the semantic information of the original image, (5) will cover up the real texture and edge features in the image, which can negatively impact model training.

where C, E, and H are the GLCM-derived features, and α , γ , δ , and β_1 , β_2 , β_3 are tunable parameters. The variance of the speckle noise amplitude is adjusted using $\sigma' = \sigma_0 \cdot F$, leading to an adjusted amplitude distribution $v'_a \sim \mathcal{N}(1, (\sigma')^2)$. The modified speckle noise intensity is then injected into the original image block to generate noise samples for contrastive learning tasks:

$$\tilde{x} = x \cdot v'_a \cdot e^{v_p},\tag{3}$$

where $v_a \prime$ is the adjusted noise amplitude based on F. This process produces a noise sample \tilde{x} that closely approximates

real-world SAR noise conditions.

2) Semantic-aware Sample Generation(SSG): A single sample generation method may result in overfitting or underfitting of the model on some specific features, and building a high-quality sample space requires combining multiple sample generation schemes. Considering semantic information of SAR image is less and concentrated, we design an unsupervised local sampling scheme based on semantic perception.

Semantic-aware detection. For a SAR image x, H(x) is heat map, bring the heat threshold T into the activation function l to generate a binary mask M:

$$M = l(H(x), T) = \begin{cases} 1, & if \quad H(x) \ge T \\ 0, & if \quad H(x) < T, \end{cases}$$
(4)

the region in x with brightness higher than T is filtered out by a binary mask M, and the detection box B is generated:

$$B = boundingbox\left(x, M\right),\tag{5}$$

the resulting B is a quadruple containing the coordinates of the four vertices of the detection box.

Decentralization sampling. Using the Poisson disk sampling algorithm to generate sample points p in the detection frame:

$$p = \{p_i \mid p_i \in B, \forall_{j \neq i}, \|p_i - p_j\| > r, \\ p_i = random(p_k + d_i \cdot \beta, \beta \sim \beta(\mathbb{S}^1))\},$$
(6)

where p_k are valid sampling points from the previous iteration, r is the minimum distance constraint ensuring even distribution, β is a random vector sampled from the specific distribution, and d_i is a direction vector for randomization. The generated points p serve as the central coordinates for sampling boxes, ensuring that the sampling process is both decentralized and comprehensive. This approach generates a diverse set of localized samples that reflect the semantic and structural characteristics of SAR images.

By combining NSG and SSG, the sample space becomes more diverse and representative, encompassing various noise and local semantic conditions encountered in real-world SAR data. This enriched sample space improves the model's sensitivity to local details and enhances its ability to generalize across complex SAR image features.

B. Mutil-level Feature Fusion(FF) Based on Mutual Learning

1) Feature Fusion Process: As show in Fig.3, the feature fusion mechanism integrates local and global features to enhance the model's representation capability. Specifically, the projection head combines local features f_1 and global features f_4 , where f'_1 is derived from f_1 via global average pooling. These are concatenated to form f_{cat} , a comprehensive feature vector representing both local and contextual information. To refine feature interactions, the projection head uses learnable parameter matrices W^Q , W^K , and W^V to compute the query (Q), key (K), and value (V) vectors, respectively. An attention mechanism calculates the output as:

$$\hat{z}_{b2} = \operatorname{softmax}\left(\frac{\left(W^{Q}f_{1}\right)\left(W^{K}f_{4}\right)^{T}}{\sqrt{d_{k}}}\right) \cdot \left(W^{V} \cdot f_{cat}\right)\right), \quad (7)$$



Fig. 3. The feature fusion process inside the projection head.

where d_k is the dimension of the key vector. Through this feature fusion process, the weights of the generated vectors are redistributed, enabling the model to have stronger global information capture capabilities and further enhancing feature extraction capabilities, and better integrates the physical mechanisms of SAR images into the sample space. By integrating local and global features, noise and raw features, the model can more accurately simulate real SAR images, thus better reflecting the essential characteristics in the sample space.

2) Loss Calculation: The loss calculation process involves two primary components: CL Loss and ML Loss. In Fig.3, representations f_1 and f_2 are processed through the projection head to produce embeddings z_{a1} and z_{a2} , where $z_{a1}, z_{a2} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and k is the output dimension. The embeddings are normalized using the softmax function:

$$z_{a1}^{i} = \frac{exp\left(z_{a1}^{i}/t\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^{K} exp\left(z_{a1}^{k}/t\right)},$$
(8)

where t is a temperature scaling parameter. The contrastive loss for each embedding pair is calculated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{cl1} = -\frac{1}{2} \left(z_{a1} log \left(z_{a2} \right) + z_{a2} log \left(z_{a1} \right) \right), \tag{9}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{cl2} = -\frac{1}{2} \left(z_{b1} log \left(z_{b2} \right) + z_{b2} log \left(z_{b1} \right) \right), \qquad (10)$$

Similarly, for the mutual learning process, the enhanced vector \hat{z} , which integrates shared semantic information, is incorporated to compute the ML loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{ml}^{1} = -\frac{1}{2} (z_{a1} log(\hat{z}_{b2}) + \hat{z}_{b2} log(z_{a1})), \qquad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{ml}^2 = -\frac{1}{2} (z_{a2} log(\hat{z}_{b1}) + \hat{z}_{b1} log(z_{a2})), \qquad (12)$$

where \hat{z} incorporates shared semantic information between global and local features.

The total loss for each model is the weighted sum of CL loss and ML loss:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_1 = \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{cl1} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{ml}^1 \\ \mathcal{L}_2 = \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{cl2} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{ml}^2 \end{cases},$$
(13)

where $\lambda_1 \in [0, 1]$ and $\lambda_2 \in [0, 1]$ are tunable hyperparameters that control the balance between the CL loss and ML loss. λ_1 emphasizes the alignment of positive and negative sample pairs, while λ_2 focuses on refining features through multi-level mutual learning.

 TABLE I

 The test accuracy (%) comparisons of proposed PCM-SAR with traditional GLCM methods and ordinary speckle noise sample generation schemes on OpenSARShip and FUSARShip datasets.

| Methods | Baseline | Gaussian Noise [6] | Texture Extraction [12] | Speckle Noise [8] | PCM-SAR(Ours) | Improvement(%) |
|-------------|----------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------|----------------|
| OpenSARShip | 69.43 | 69.87 | 70.07 | 71.22 | 72.32 | 1.10 ↑ |
| FUSARShip | 75.31 | 75.18 | 76.24 | 77.12 | 88.64 | 11.52 ↑ |

TABLE II THE TEST ACCURACY (%) COMPARISONS OF PROPOSED PCM-SAR WITH SOTA CONTRASTIVE LEARNING METHODS.

| Methods | FUSA | R-Ship | OpenSARShip | | | |
|----------------|------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | K-NN | LP | K-NN | LP | | |
| Baseline | 77.45 ± 2.56 | 75.32 ± 1.45 | 68.06 ± 1.12 | 69.45 ± 0.92 | | |
| SimCLR [10] | 80.77 ± 0.33 | 78.23 ± 0.53 | 69.34 ± 2.06 | 68.99 ± 1.51 | | |
| Disco [21] | 79.09 ± 0.96 | 81.45 ± 0.42 | 68.18 ± 1.88 | 68.53 ± 1.14 | | |
| PCL [8] | 86.26 ± 2.11 | 86.79 ± 0.45 | 69.94 ± 1.88 | 70.21 ± 1.95 | | |
| CSFL [6] | 87.09 ± 0.48 | 86.24 ± 0.74 | 70.36 ± 2.20 | 70.18 ± 1.67 | | |
| DCPN [5] | 87.94 ± 0.76 | 85.32 ± 0.40 | 70.33 ± 2.27 | $\frac{71.17}{\pm} \pm 0.81$ | | |
| SAIM [22] | 85.23 ± 0.45 | $\underline{86.87}\pm0.77$ | $\underline{71.03} \pm 1.23$ | 70.99 ± 0.64 | | |
| PCM-SAR(Ours) | 88.23 ± 0.47 | $\textbf{88.48} \pm \textbf{0.29}$ | $\textbf{72.10} \pm \textbf{1.63}$ | $\textbf{72.48} \pm \textbf{2.04}$ | | |
| Improvement(%) | 0.29 ↑ | 1.61 ↑ | 1.07 ↑ | 1.31 ↑ | | |

III. EXPERIMENT AND RESULT ANALYSIS

The experiments are conducted on the OpenSARShip [23] and FUSAR-Ship [24] datasets. Following pre-training, Linear Probing (LP) and K-Nearest Neighbor (K-NN) are performed to evaluate the model's effectiveness. The results are reported as "mean±std" accuracy. For all experiments, ResNet series models [25] are employed as the backbone network.

A. Compared with traditional GLCM methods and ordinary speckle noise sample generation schemes

As shown in the Table I, the sample generation method using Gaussian random noise yields the worst performance, as the noise in SAR is predominantly speckle noise. The second is the sample generation scheme using texture extraction via GLCM and the ordinary speckle noise generation scheme. The former simply performs ordinary texture enhancement, and the latter does not make targeted improvements based on its physical characteristics in the process of generating speckle noise. After using the GLCM matrix to obtain the texture information of the image, our method designs an adjustment function for the speckle noise amplitude, integrating the physical characteristics of the SAR image into the samples of contrastive learning, the final classification accuracy is improved by 2.89% on OpenSARShip and 13.33% on FUSARShip compared to the baseline.

B. Comparison with the SOTA CL Methods

In order to further prove the advantage of our PCM-SAR method, we compared with many recent CL methods on SAR images. As show in Table II, we have observed that schemes used on general-purpose optical datasets often do not yield better classification results on SAR image datasets,

TABLE III IMPACT OF DIFFERENT WEIGHT COMBINATIONS OF CL AND ML LOSS (λ_1, λ_2) ON TEST ACCURACY FOR VARIOUS RESNET BACKBONES

| Backbone $ \lambda_1 = 1.0, \lambda_2 = 0 \lambda_1 = 1.0, \lambda_2 = 0.5 \lambda_1 = 1.0, \lambda_2 = 1.0$ | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Resnet50 | 74.25 | 74.56 | 74.58 | | | | | |
| Resnet34 | 73.34 | 75.11 | 76.11 | | | | | |
| Resnet18 | 72.25 | 75.16 | 76.21 | | | | | |

for example, compared with Disco and SimCLR for general optical datasets. PCM-SAR achieved up to 9.14% and 7.46% improvement on the FUSARShip dataset (K-NN), and 3.92% and 3.51% improvement on the OpenASARShip dataset (K-NN), because these methods often adopt sampling methods for optical data, they lack attention to the physical characteristics and semantic information of SAR images. Compared with the PCL method using ordinary speckle noise samples, our method improves 1.97% (K-NN) and 1.67% (LP) on the FUSARShip dataset, because the ordinary speckle noise model assumes that the variance of its amplitude follows a normal distribution without considering its changes from the perspective of its true physical properties. Compared with CSFL, DCPN that use random cropping to generate local samples, our method improves by 1.14% and 0.29% (K-NN) on the FUSARShip dataset and by 2.30% and 1.31% (LP) on the OpenSARShip dataset. This is because random sample generation is difficult to capture the pivotal semantic information of SAR images and is prone to generate poor quality comparison samples.

C. Effect of hyper-parameters λ_1 and λ_2

As shown in Table III, we found that with the increase of ML loss weight λ_2 , the performance of all models was improved. Among them, in the large parameter scale model Resnet50, as the ML loss weight λ_2 increases from 0 to 1, the accuracy is improved by 0.31% and 0.33%, respectively. On the contrary, for Resnet34 and Resnet18 with smaller parameter scale, as the ML loss weight increases, the improvement in accuracy is significantly increased. We find when λ_2 increases from 0 to 1, the accuracy of Resnet34 is improved by 0.68% and 2.78%, respectively, and the accuracy of Resnet18 is improved by 2.91% and 3.96%, respectively.

D. Ablation experiments

As shown in Table IV, our proposed PCM-SAR can improve the accuracy of almost all backbones. In the K-NN [26], the combination of Resnet50 and Resnet34 has achieved the highest accuracy improvement, and the accuracy has increased by

TABLE IV Ablation Study of the PCM-SAR Framework on OpenSARShip Dataset with Baseline Models and Downstream Tasks K-NN and LP

| Backbone | | Baseline | | Without NSG | | Without SSG | | Without FF | | PCM-SAR (Ours) | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|
| Basenet 1 | Basenet 2 | K-NN | LP | K-NN | LP | K-NN | LP | K-NN | LP | K-NN | LP |
| Resnet5 Resnet50 Resnet3 | D | 68.06±1.12 | 68.25±0.92 | 70.35±0.88 | 71.46±1.12 | 70.59±0.25 | 69.54±5.77 | 69.24±2.07 | 68.48±3.52 | 71.10±1.63 | 72.67±2.04 |
| | Resnet50 | _ | _ | (+2.29) | (+3.40) | (+2.53) | (+1.48) | (+1.18) | (+0.48) | (+3.04) | (+4.42) |
| | Deemet24 | 70.81±0.12 | 71.06 ± 1.33 | 72.65 ± 0.89 | $71.99 {\pm} 3.87$ | 71.23 ± 3.61 | $71.35{\pm}4.02$ | 71.39 ± 3.58 | $71.55 {\pm} 1.89$ | 74.90±0.62 | 74.06±1.39 |
| | Keshet54 | _ | _ | (+1.82) | (+0.93) | (+0.42) | (+0.29) | (+0.49) | (+0.49) | (+4.09) | (+3.26) |
| | Pospot19 | 70.56±1.19 | $69.06 {\pm} 1.55$ | 72.09 ± 0.45 | 71.61 ± 3.87 | 70.89 ± 2.51 | $69.88 {\pm} 2.77$ | $70.82{\pm}1.84$ | $69.62 {\pm} 2.73$ | 73.26±1.88 | 73.75±2.32 |
| | Resilet16 | — | — | (+1.53) | (+2.55) | (+0.33) | (+0.82) | (+0.26) | (+0.26) | (+2.77) | (+3.26) |
| | Dognat24 | 69.99±2.16 | 67.81±2.82 | 71.32±2.03 | 71.28±2.93 | 71.89±1.29 | 70.62±3.16 | 70.03±3.08 | 68.72±1.12 | 73.26±2.42 | 73.04±1.86 |
| Docnat24 | Keshet54 | _ | _ | (+1.33) | (+3.42) | (+1.90) | (+2.82) | (+0.33) | (+0.87) | (+3.27) | (+3.05) |
| Resnet54 | Desmat19 | 69.92±0.77 | $69.09 {\pm} 2.11$ | 71.26 ± 0.11 | $70.63 {\pm} 3.87$ | 70.66 ± 1.42 | $70.48 {\pm} 1.12$ | $70.96 {\pm} 0.82$ | $72.42{\pm}1.39$ | 72.96±0.82 | 72.42±1.39 |
| K | Keshetro | _ | — | (+1.36) | (+1.54) | (+0.74) | (+1.39) | (+0.10) | (+0.75) | (+3.04) | (+2.50) |
| Resnet18 Re | Pagnat18 | 69.23±1.47 | 70.01±1.39 | 70.85±1.12 | $70.69 {\pm} 3.87$ | 69.52±1.81 | $70.06 {\pm} 2.24$ | 70.88±1.75 | $70.36{\pm}2.52$ | 72.44±1.38 | 72.63±2.24 |
| | Keshet18 | — | — | (+1.72) | (+0.68) | (+0.29) | (+0.29) | (+1.65) | (+0.35) | (+3.21) | (+3.40) |

TABLE V THE PERFORMANCE OF PCM-SAR WITH DIFFERENT BACKBONES AND LABEL RATIOS (10% AND 30% LABELS) IN SEMI-SUPERVISED SCENARIOS ON FUSARSHIP DATASET.

| Back | | 10% I | abels | | 30% Labels | | | | |
|----------|----------|---------------------|-------|-------|------------|---------|-------|-------|-------|
| Basenet1 | Basenet2 | Independent PCM-SAR | | Indep | endent | PCM-SAR | | | |
| Resnet50 | Resnet50 | 47.44 | 43.16 | 54.32 | 46.21 | 69.01 | 66.89 | 69.17 | 68.02 |
| Resnet34 | Resnet34 | 49.31 | 57.05 | 59.28 | 59.03 | 67.35 | 72.94 | 71.20 | 75.03 |
| Resnet18 | Resnet18 | 54.89 | 43.96 | 58.91 | 43.88 | 70.72 | 67.63 | 71.80 | 67.08 |
| Resnet50 | Resnet34 | 48.95 | 43.66 | 49.67 | 43.81 | 67.39 | 62.98 | 67.39 | 69.05 |
| Resnet50 | Resnet18 | 49.85 | 38.98 | 51.24 | 41.88 | 67.37 | 56.09 | 67.33 | 69.87 |
| Resnet34 | Resnet18 | 35.89 | 35.08 | 39.25 | 36.46 | 57.02 | 55.90 | 59.32 | 56.31 |

4.09%. In the linear detection [27], resnet-50 as the backbone achieved the best result, with an accuracy improvement of 4.42%. Correspondingly, we found that models with larger parameter sizes do not necessarily perform better.

E. Transfer to Semi-Supervised Learning Scenarios

We established two semi-supervised learning scenarios to simulate SAR image classification in settings with limited labeled samples. As shown in Table V, all models trained under the PCM-SAR framework achieved higher accuracy than those trained independently. More importantly, we found that the isomorphic combination of ResNet34 and ResNet18, which have smaller parameter scales, achieved the highest accuracies (75.03% and 71.80%) on the 30% labeled dataset. Compared to the ResNet50 model with a larger parameter scale under the same conditions, the performance improved by 2.63% and 7.01%, respectively. In the training setting with 10% labeled data, the ResNet18 and ResNet34 models again demonstrated better performance (59.28% and 58.91%), improving by 4.96% and 4.59%, respectively, compared to the ResNet50 model. These results show that our method alleviates the burden of extracting and understanding complex features for small parameter scale models by refining SAR image representation, offering superior performance and

TABLE VI

PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF PCM-SAR AND OTHER METHODS ON DETECTION AND SEGMENTATION TASKS WITH DIFFERENT BACKBONES ON FUSARSHIP. MASK R-CNN [28] IS ADOPTED AS THE DETECTOR.

| Method | Basenet1 | Basenet2 | I | Detectio | n | Segmentation | | |
|-------------|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | AP^b | AP^b_{50} | AP_{75}^b | AP^{s} | AP^s_{50} | AP_{75}^s |
| Simclr [19] | Resnet18 | Resnet18 | 38.45 | 57.28 | 42.08 | 33.44 | 53.39 | 34.80 |
| Disco [9] | Resnet18 | Resnet18 | 38.94 | 57.92 | 41.81 | 35.03 | 56.16 | 35.99 |
| PCL [3] | Resnet18 | Resnet18 | 40.07 | 59.01 | 42.92 | 34.88 | 56.63 | 36.45 |
| PCM-SAR | Resnet18 | Resnet18 | 41.73 | 59.97 | 61.22 | 35.09 | 58.59 | 38.12 |
| Simclr [19] | Resnet50 | Resnet50 | 38.05 | 56.93 | 41.42 | 33.68 | 54.04 | 35.77 |
| Disco [9] | Resnet50 | Resnet50 | 39.22 | 58.29 | 42.04 | 34.38 | 55.66 | 36.12 |
| PCL [3] | Resnet50 | Resnet50 | 39.49 | 59.08 | 42.36 | 34.68 | 56.98 | 36.59 |
| PCM-SAR | Resnet50 | Resnet50 | 40.33 | 59.36 | 43.57 | 34.85 | 57.99 | 36.95 |

improvement rates compared to baseline and large parameter scale models in most environmental settings.

F. Transfer to Detection and Segmentation Tasks

As shown in Table VI, by different IOU settings, PCM-SAR achieved the highest accuracy in both object detection and semantic segmentation. Among them, The object detection task, using the ResNet18 model as the backbone with AP_{75}^b , and the semantic segmentation task, using the ResNet18 model as the backbone with AP_{50}^s , achieved the highest accuracies of 61.22% and 58.59%, respectively. These results were 19.14% and 5.20% higher than the traditional Simclr method, and also surpassed the ResNet50 model under the PCM-SAR by 2.95% and 3.95%. Compared with the common speckle noise sample generation method, our method improves the target detection task by 19.76% by AP_{75}^b , and the semantic segmentation task by 1.96% by AP_{50}^s . This further reflects the advantage of PCM-SAR in improving the performance of smaller parameter scale models, and proves that PCM-SAR can improve the positive and negative samples of contrastive learning by integrating physical insights and semantic information capture, and has good generalization ability on dense prediction tasks.

IV. CONCLUSION

We propose PCM-SAR which is a specially designed for SAR image classification by leveraging the physical mechanisms of SAR. PCM-SAR employs a GLCM-based approach to generate realistic noise samples and incorporates semanticaware localization to obtain diverse local samples with higher coverage. This enhances the quality and diversity of positive and negative samples in contrastive learning. Additionally, the introduction of a mutual learning framework with a multi-level feature fusion mechanism enables models to share and refine feature representations, significantly improving feature extraction and alignment with the demands of SAR-specific data. Experimental results demonstrate that PCM-SAR consistently outperforms existing contrastive learning methods.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We appreciate constructive feedback from anonymous reviewers and meta-reviewers. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (62172442, 62172451), China Scholarship Council, and High Performance Computing Center of Central South University.

REFERENCES

- Hao Zheng, Zhigang Hu, Jianjun Liu, Yuhang Huang, and Meiguang Zheng, "Metaboost: A novel heterogeneous dcnns ensemble network with two-stage filtration for sar ship classification," *IEEE Geoscience* and Remote Sensing Letters, vol. 19, pp. 1–5, 2022.
- [2] Bo Xu, Hao Zheng, Zhigang Hu, Liu Yang, Meiguang Zheng, Xianting Feng, and Wei Lin, "Double reverse regularization network based on self-knowledge distillation for sar object classification," in *ICASSP* 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). IEEE, 2024, pp. 7800–7804.
- [3] Hao Zheng, Zhigang Hu, Liu Yang, Aikun Xu, Meiguang Zheng, Ce Zhang, and Keqin Li, "Multi-feature collaborative fusion network with deep supervision for sar ship classification," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 2023.
- [4] Wei Lin, Hao Zheng, Zhigang Hu, Meiguang Zheng, and Liu Yang, "Coarse-to-fine granularity in multiscale featurefusion network for sar ship classification," in *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*. Springer, 2024, pp. 31–45.
- [5] Xianting Feng, Hao Zheng, Zhigang Hu, Liu Yang, and Meiguang Zheng, "Dual-stream contrastive predictive network with joint handcrafted feature view for sar ship classification," in *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP).* IEEE, 2024, pp. 7810–7814.
- [6] Meijuan Yang, Licheng Jiao, Fang Liu, Biao Hou, Shuyuan Yang, Yake Zhang, and Jianlong Wang, "Coarse-to-fine contrastive self-supervised feature learning for land-cover classification in sar images with limited labeled data," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 31, pp. 6502–6516, 2022.
- [7] Hao Pei, Mingjie Su, Gang Xu, Mengdao Xing, and Wei Hong, "Selfsupervised feature representation for sar image target classification using contrastive learning," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 2023.
- [8] Zuzheng Kuang, Haixia Bi, Fan Li, Chen Xu, and Jian Sun, "Polarimetry-inspired contrastive learning for class-imbalanced polsar image classification," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 2024.
- [9] Yangqin Jiang, Chao Huang, and Lianghao Huang, "Adaptive graph contrastive learning for recommendation," in *Proceedings of the 29th* ACM SIGKDD conference on knowledge discovery and data mining, 2023, pp. 4252–4261.
- [10] Zheng Cao, Liming Xu, Danny Z Chen, Honghao Gao, and Jian Wu, "A robust shape-aware rib fracture detection and segmentation framework with contrastive learning," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 25, pp. 1584–1591, 2023.

- [11] Pramod KB Rangaiah, BP Pradeep Kumar, and Robin Augustine, "Histopathology-driven prostate cancer identification: A vbir approach with clahe and glcm insights," *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, vol. 182, pp. 109213, 2024.
- [12] Johannes Balling, Martin Herold, and Johannes Reiche, "How textural features can improve sar-based tropical forest disturbance mapping," *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*, vol. 124, pp. 103492, 2023.
- [13] Şaban Öztürk and Bayram Akdemir, "Application of feature extraction and classification methods for histopathological image using glcm, lbp, lbglcm, glrlm and sfta," *Procedia computer science*, vol. 132, pp. 40–46, 2018.
- [14] Chongqi Zhang, Ziwen Zhang, Yao Deng, Yueyi Zhang, Mingzhe Chong, Yunhua Tan, and Pukun Liu, "Blind super-resolution for sar images with speckle noise based on deep learning probabilistic degradation model and sar priors," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 330, 2023.
- [15] Aikun Xu, Zhigang Hu, Xi Li, Rongti Tian, Xinyu Zhang, Bolei Chen, Hui Xiao, Hao Zheng, Xianting Feng, Meiguang Zheng, et al., "Transedge: Task offloading with gnn and drl in edge computing-enabled transportation systems," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2024.
- [16] Shiyu Wang, Zhanchuan Cai, and Jieyu Yuan, "Automatic sar ship detection based on multifeature fusion network in spatial and frequency domains," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 61, pp. 1–11, 2023.
- [17] Ronghua Shang, Pei Peng, Fanhua Shang, Licheng Jiao, Yifei Shen, and Rustam Stolkin, "Semantic segmentation for sar image based on texture complexity analysis and key superpixels," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 12, no. 13, pp. 2141, 2020.
- [18] Deliang Xiang, Yihao Xu, Jianda Cheng, Yuzhen Xie, and Dongdong Guan, "Progressive keypoint detection with dense siamese network for sar image registration," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 5847–5858, 2023.
- [19] Deliang Xiang, Yuzhen Xie, Jianda Cheng, Yihao Xu, Han Zhang, and Yanpeng Zheng, "Optical and sar image registration based on feature decoupling network," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 60, pp. 1–13, 2022.
- [20] Jasperine James, Arunkumar Heddallikar, Pranali Choudhari, and Smita Chopde, "Analysis of features in sar imagery using glcm segmentation algorithm," *Data Science: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications*, pp. 253–266, 2021.
- [21] Yuting Gao, Jia-Xin Zhuang, Shaohui Lin, Hao Cheng, Xing Sun, Ke Li, and Chunhua Shen, "Disco: Remedying self-supervised learning on lightweight models with distilled contrastive learning," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2022, pp. 237–253.
- [22] Kaiyou Song, Shan Zhang, and Tong Wang, "Semantic-aware autoregressive image modeling for visual representation learning," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2024, vol. 38, pp. 4925–4933.
- [23] Lanqing Huang, Bin Liu, Boying Li, Weiwei Guo, Wenhao Yu, Zenghui Zhang, and Wenxian Yu, "Opensarship: A dataset dedicated to sentinel-1 ship interpretation," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 195–208, 2017.
- [24] Xiyue Hou, Wei Ao, Qian Song, Jian Lai, Haipeng Wang, and Feng Xu, "Fusar-ship: Building a high-resolution sar-ais matchup dataset of gaofen-3 for ship detection and recognition," *Science China Information Sciences*, vol. 63, pp. 1–19, 2020.
- [25] 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.
- [26] Debo Cheng, Shichao Zhang, Zhenyun Deng, Yonghua Zhu, and Ming Zong, "k nn algorithm with data-driven k value," in Advanced Data Mining and Applications: 10th International Conference, ADMA 2014, Guilin, China, December 19-21, 2014. Proceedings 10. Springer, 2014, pp. 499–512.
- [27] Ananya Kumar, Aditi Raghunathan, Robbie Jones, Tengyu Ma, and Percy Liang, "Fine-tuning can distort pretrained features and underperform out-of-distribution," arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.10054, 2022.
- [28] K He and G Gkioxari, "Doll' ar p, girshick r (2017) mask r-cnn," in Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision, pp. 2961–2969.