



# 1. Abstract

Deep Convolution Neural Networks have been adopted for pansharpening and achieved state-of-the-art performance. However, most of the existing works mainly focus on single-scale feature fusion, which leads to failure in fully considering relationships of information between high-level semantics and low-level features, despite the network is deep enough. In this paper, we propose a dynamic cross feature fusion network (DCFNet) for pansharpening. Specifically, DCFNet contains multiple parallel branches, including a highresolution branch served as the backbone, and the low-resolution branches progressively supplemented into the backbone. Thus our DCFNet can represent the overall information well. In order to enhance the relationships of inter-branches, dynamic cross feature transfers are embedded into multiple branches to obtain high-resolution representations. Then contextualized features will be learned to improve the fusion of information. Experimental results indicate that DCFNet significantly outperforms the prior arts in both quantitative indicators and visual qualities.



PAN

LRMS

**FusionNet** 



2. Introduction

**Motivation:** high-resolution representation and better inter-branch information fusion A family of pansharpening networks only adopts single-scale feature fusion to generate final HRMS; Existing multiscale network always reduces the spatial resolution of features in the process of feature extraction, e.g. U-shaped network and pyramidal network.

Thus, we reform HRNet with proposed modules to achieve better inter-branch information fusions.

$$\Box \text{ Loss function: } \mathcal{L}oss = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left\| \mathcal{F}_{\Theta_{DCFNet}} \left( \mathbf{I}^{\{k\}} \right) - \mathbf{GT}^{\{k\}} \right\|_{F}^{2}$$
$$\Box \text{ Formulation on Dynamic Branch Fusion: } O = \sum_{i} \frac{w_{i}}{\sum_{j} w_{j} + \epsilon} \cdot I_{i}$$

# **Dynamic Cross Feature Fusion for Remote Sensing Pansharpening**

Xiao Wu, Ting-Zhu Huang<sup>\*</sup>, Liang-Jian Deng<sup>\*</sup>, Tian-Jing Zhang University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chendu, China



DCFNet

## **Pre-fusion Units and Building blocks:**

They play complete stages to deepen the network to extract better features.

**Pyramid Cross Feature Transfer:** 

It maintains the high-resolution branch and aggregates features from high-to-low and lowto-high branches, then transfers the cross-scale features back to high-resolution branches.

### **Dynamic Branch Fusion:**

It mitigates the unequal effects of different resolutions on the final result.

**Diverse Structure Deformation:** 

DCFNet has superior foundations for feature extraction and fusion.

**Pyramid Cross Feature Transfer** 



(k) DCFNet



| Δ                                   | 0                                   | 1                                   | 1                                   |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| $\textbf{3.377} \pm \textbf{1.200}$ | $\textbf{2.257} \pm \textbf{0.910}$ | $\textbf{0.926} \pm \textbf{0.107}$ | $\textbf{0.967} \pm \textbf{0.043}$ |
| $3.743 \pm 1.225$                   | $2.567\pm0.944$                     | $0.913\pm0.112$                     | $0.958\pm0.045$                     |
| $3.971 \pm 1.248$                   | $2.857\pm0.966$                     | $0.900\pm0.114$                     | $0.952\pm0.044$                     |
| $4.092 \pm 1.273$                   | $2.952\pm0.977$                     | $0.894 \pm 0.117$                   | $0.949\pm0.046$                     |
| $3.980 \pm 1.318$                   | $2.736 \pm 1.015$                   | $0.909 \pm 0.111$                   | $0.951\pm0.047$                     |
| $4.401 \pm 1.329$                   | $3.228 \pm 1.004$                   | $0.888 \pm 0.112$                   | $0.921\pm0.046$                     |
| $SAM \ (\pm \text{ std})$           | ERGAS ( $\pm$ std)                  | $Q8~(\pm \text{std})$               | SCC ( $\pm$ std)                    |
|                                     |                                     |                                     |                                     |

Visual comparisons on Tripoli dataset (WV3), GF-2 and QB with natural colors/absolute error maps.



(e) DMDNet (a) EXP (b) PNN (c) DiCNN1 (d) PanNet (f) Fusion-Net (g) DCFNet Visual comparisons on Tripoli-OS dataset (WV3) at the original scale. Table3: 50 full-resolution samples (WV3). Table 5: network generalization on Stockholm datacat (Marld)(iaw2)

|  |                           |                           |                                      |                          |        |                 | vv∠j.     |        |        |           |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|
| Met                                    | hod                       | $QNR \ (\pm \text{ std})$ | $D_{\lambda} \ (\pm \ \mathrm{std})$ | $D_s \ (\pm \ { m std})$ | ł)     | Method          | SAM       | ERGAS  | Q8     | SCC       |
| PNN                                    | N <mark>13</mark>         | $0.946 \pm 0.022$         | $0.023 \pm 0.023$                    | 14 $0.032 \pm 0.0$       | 012    |                 | 7 8500    | 0 6703 | 0.6540 | 0.4505    |
| DiC                                    | NN1 [10]                  | $0.939\pm0.024$           | $0.026 \pm 0.02$                     | 16 $0.035 \pm 0.0$       | 011    |                 | 1.8500    | 9.0795 | 0.0340 | 0.4303    |
| Pan                                    | Net [28]                  | $0.948 \pm 0.017$         | $0.029\pm0.02$                       | 1 0.022 $\pm$ 0.0        | )09    | BDSD-PC [20]    | 7.0953    | 6.3233 | 0.8819 | 0.8578    |
| DM                                     | DNet <mark>6</mark>       | $0.945\pm0.020$           | $0.024 \pm 0.02$                     | $12  0.030 \pm 0.0$      | 013    | GLP-HPM [2, 24] | 7.2988    | 6.9965 | 0.8527 | 0.8355    |
| Fus                                    | ionNet [ <mark>4</mark> ] | $0.941 \pm 0.022$         | $0.024 \pm 0.02$                     | $13  0.031 \pm 0.000$    | 013    | <b>CVPR19</b> 5 | 7.1098    | 6.5434 | 0.8752 | 0.8457    |
| DC                                     | FNet                      | $0.956 \pm 0.013$         | $\underline{0.022\pm0.00}$           | $09  0.022 \pm 0.020$    | )06    |                 | 7 1 1 0 5 | 6 1008 | 0 8776 | 0 8 1 5 2 |
| Idea                                   | al value                  | 1                         | 0                                    | 0                        |        | GLP-Keg [2, 25] | 1.1195    | 0.4998 | 0.8770 | 0.8433    |
| Table 6. Ablation study on some fusion |                           |                           | PNN [13]                             | 6.8624                   | 5.6259 | 0.8642          | 0.8539    |        |        |           |
| operations on Tripoli dataset          |                           |                           | DiCNN1 [10]                          | 6.8159                   | 5.9773 | 0.8802          | 0.8797    |        |        |           |
| ΟÞ                                     | Method                    |                           | $\frac{1}{ERGAS} O$                  | 8 SCC                    |        | PanNet [28]     | 6.3916    | 5.6302 | 0.8897 | 0.8895    |
| =                                      |                           | 2 202                     | $\frac{2}{2826}$                     | 71 0.050                 |        | DMDNet 6        | 6.1986    | 5.5692 | 0.8903 | 0.8965    |
|  |                           | 5.895                     | 2.830 0.9                            | /1 0.939                 |        | FusionNet [4]   | 6 2784    | 5 5400 | 0 8969 | 0 8897    |
|  | w/o PCF                   | <b>F</b> 4.001            | 2.852 0.9                            | 72 0.959                 |        |                 | 0.2704    | 5.5477 | 0.0909 | 0.0097    |
| ĺ                                      | DCFNet                    | 3.852                     | 2.825 0.9                            | 72 0.960                 |        | DCFNet          | 6.6871    | 5.1682 | 0.9175 | 0.9125    |
| -                                      | Ideal valu                | ue 0                      | 0 1                                  | 1                        |        | Ideal value     | 0         | 0      | 1      | 1         |



- **Units and Pyramid Cross Feature.**
- generalization capability in pansharpening.



Table 4: Quantitative metrics of the compared CNN-based methods for the GF-2 testing dataset (81 samples) and the QB testing dataset (48 samples).

| $SAM (\pm std)$                                 | ERGAS ( $\pm$ std)                  | $Q8 (\pm  \mathrm{std})$                        | $SCC (\pm std)$               |  |  |  |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Guangzhou (GF-2)                                |                                     |   |                               |  |  |  |  |
| $1.659 \pm 0.360$                               | $1.570\pm0.324$                     | $0.927 \pm 0.020$                               | $0.928\pm0.020$               |  |  |  |  |
| $1.494\pm0.381$                                 | $1.320\pm0.354$                     | $0.944 \pm 0.021$                               | $0.945\pm0.022$               |  |  |  |  |
| $1.395 \pm 0.326$                               | $1.223\pm0.282$                     | $0.946 \pm 0.022$                               | $0.955\pm0.012$               |  |  |  |  |
| $1.297\pm0.315$                                 | $1.128\pm0.266$                     | $0.952\pm0.021$                                 | $0.964 \pm 0.010$             |  |  |  |  |
| $1.179\pm0.271$                                 | $1.002\pm0.227$                     | $0.962\pm0.016$                                 | $0.971\pm0.007$               |  |  |  |  |
| $0.994 \pm 0.185$                               | $\textbf{0.811} \pm \textbf{0.144}$ | $\underline{\textbf{0.971} \pm \textbf{0.016}}$ | $\underline{0.982 \pm 0.004}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Indi  | anapolis dataset (                  | QB)   |                               |  |  |  |  |
| $5.799 \pm 0.947$                               | $5.571 \pm 0.458$                   | $0.857\pm0.148$                                 | $0.902 \pm 0.048$             |  |  |  |  |
| $5.307 \pm 0.995$                               | $5.231\pm0.541$                     | $0.882\pm0.143$                                 | $0.922\pm0.050$               |  |  |  |  |
| $5.314 \pm 1.017$                               | $5.162\pm0.681$                     | $0.883\pm0.139$                                 | $0.929 \pm 0.058$             |  |  |  |  |
| $5.119\pm0.939$                                 | $4.737\pm0.648$                     | $0.890\pm0.146$                                 | $0.134 \pm 0.065$             |  |  |  |  |
| $4.540 \pm 0.778$                               | $4.050\pm0.266$                     | $0.910\pm0.136$                                 | $0.954 \pm 0.045$             |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{\textbf{4.342} \pm \textbf{0.719}}$ | $\underline{3.749 \pm 0.266}$       | $\underline{\textbf{0.920} \pm \textbf{0.129}}$ | $\underline{0.961 \pm 0.046}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 0                                   | 1   | 1                             |  |  |  |  |

## 4. Conclusions

• We introduce a novel inter-branch dynamic feature fusion with dynamic Pre-fusion

• Propose a dynamic cross feature fusion network (DCFNet), which significantly improves the effects of feature fusion in pansharpening.

• Proposed DCFNet achieves state-of-the-art performance and have a reliable