Indian Journal of Image Processing and Recognition (IJIPR)
ISSN: 2582-8037 (Online), Volume-5 Issue-3, April 2025

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Camouflage Patterns in Arid Environments

Adithya Vikram Sakthivel

***Abstract:** This research systematically evaluates the effectiveness of 14 distinct camouflage patterns across various arid environments. The study employs a comprehensive quantitative measurement framework, integrating two advanced image processing techniques: Gabor filters and Local Binary Patterns (LBP). These techniques provide an objective analysis of camouflage concealment by assessing the patterns' ability to blend into a diverse range of arid environmental backdrops. The research emphasizes the structural and textural aspects of camouflage patterns while deliberately excluding the influence of color palettes to isolate the impact of design elements. Data is collected and analyzed to quantify the performance of each pattern under controlled conditions, ensuring consistent and replicable results. The findings offer valuable insights into optimizing camouflage design, with practical implications for enhancing concealment strategies in military operations and wildlife research. By focusing on pattern design alone, this study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how texture and structure influence the effectiveness of visual camouflage in arid landscapes.*

***Keywords:** Camouflage, Image Processing, Pattern Analysis, Concealment Effectiveness.*

Abbreviations:
LBP: Local Binary Pattern
DPCU: Disruptive Pattern Camouflage Uniform
CNNs: Convolutional Neural Networks

I. INTRODUCTION

Camouflage is a critical strategy for concealing personnel and equipment by enabling them to blend into their environment [1]. Advances in computational imaging have introduced new methodologies for objectively assessing the effectiveness of various camouflage designs. This study applies image processing techniques—specifically Gabor filters and Local Binary Patterns (LBP)—to evaluate and compare 14 distinct camouflage patterns across a spectrum of arid environments [2].

The primary objectives of this research are:

A. To investigate the application of advanced image analysis in the evaluation of camouflage patterns.
B. To assess the comparative performance of 14 camouflage patterns in diverse arid environmental conditions.
C. To identify the most effective camouflage pattern for broad application in arid terrains.

Manuscript received on 07 March 2025 | First Revised Manuscript received on 15 March 2025 | Second Revised Manuscript received on 23 March 2025 | Manuscript Accepted on 15 April 2025 | Manuscript published on 30 April 2025.

***Correspondence Author(s)**
Adithya Vikram Sakthivel*, XUVI Technology Labs, Chennai (Tamil Nadu), India. Email ID: adithya.sakthivel@xuvi.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3229-7131

It is important to note that this study focuses solely on the structural design and texture of the selected camouflage patterns, without accounting for the influence of their respective color palettes [3].

II. METHODOLOGY

The study systematically evaluates 14 distinct camouflage patterns against 30 unique arid environment backdrops, encompassing a range of terrains such as sand dunes, rocky outcrops, and scrublands [4]. The patterns under analysis include [5]:

A. 3 Color Desert: Introduced in the 1990s to replace the 6-color "chocolate chip" pattern, improving concealment in desert regions [6].
B. All Over Brush: Developed during the U.S. Army's universal camouflage trials, featuring complex, brush-like swirls designed for multifaceted environments [7].
C. Auscam Arid: Adapted from the Australian Disruptive Pattern Camouflage Uniform (DPCU), optimized for arid and semi-arid conditions [8].
D. British DPM: Originating in the 1960s, this pattern's irregular shapes provide effective concealment across diverse terrains.
E. Brushstroke: Developed in the 1940s, characterized by irregular brush-like strokes intended to disrupt the human silhouette.
F. Chocolate Chip: Introduced in the 1980s for desert warfare, notable for its tan and brown block shapes with contrasting spots [7].
G. Flecktarn: A German pattern from the 1980s featuring irregular spots designed for woodland environments but adaptable to arid conditions [9].
H. French Lizard: Originating in the 1940s for French colonial operations, incorporating jagged green and brown shapes.
I. Italian Flora: Introduced in 1990, this pattern, influenced by U.S. Woodland designs, utilizes organic shapes for effective concealment.
J. MARPAT Arid: A pixelated digital camouflage created by the U.S. Marine Corps, specifically designed for desert conditions [10].
K. Multicam: Developed by Crye Precision, this versatile pattern blends seven colors to provide concealment across various environments [11].
L. Tigerstripe: Originating during the Vietnam War, featuring bold, jagged stripes tailored for dense foliage concealment.
M. Tropentarn: A 1990s German camouflage

pattern designed for tropical and arid regions with tan, brown, and green irregularities [9].

N. US Woodland: A four-color disruptive design adopted by the U.S. military in the 1970s for temperate and woodland environments [12].

To maintain consistency, each pattern was tested under identical lighting conditions and standardized image capture protocols [13]. The evaluation was conducted by averaging results from 30 random arid backdrops, ensuring a comprehensive and reproducible assessment.

Further methodological rigor was ensured through randomized testing sequences and standardized image preprocessing, including normalization of resolution and aspect ratios. This robust experimental design minimizes bias and enhances the replicability of the findings [14].

III. ALGORITHM

The evaluation algorithm integrates Gabor filter and LBP analyses to quantify the effectiveness of each camouflage pattern.

A. Gabor Filter Analysis

Gabor filters are widely used for texture analysis due to their ability to capture spatial frequency, orientation, and scale. Each camouflage pattern is analyzed using a set of Gabor filters with varying frequencies and orientations [15]. The Gabor function is defined as [16]:

$$G(x, y;\, \lambda, \theta, \psi, \sigma, \gamma) = exp\left(-\frac{x'^2 + \gamma^2 y'^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) cos\left(2\pi \frac{x'}{\lambda} + \psi\right)$$

Where:

$$x' = x\,cos(\theta) + y\,sin(\theta)$$

$$y' = y\,cos(\theta) - x\,sin(\theta)$$

Parameters:

λ *– Wavelength of the sinusoidal factor*
θ *– Orientation of the Gabor kernel*
ψ *– Phase offset*
σ *– Standard deviation of the Gaussian envelope*
γ *– Spatial aspect ratio*

By applying multi-scale, multi-orientation Gabor filters, we extract key texture features and compare them against environmental backdrops quantifying them into discrete numeric values.

B. Local Binary Patterns Analysis

Local Binary Patterns (LBP) offer a robust, efficient means of texture characterization [17]. Each pixel in an image is compared to its surrounding neighbors to form a binary pattern [18]. The LBP for a given pixel is calculated as [19]:

$$LBP_P^R = \sum_{p=0}^{P-1} s(g_p - g_c) 2^p$$

Where:
g_c *– the intensity of the center pixel*
g_p *– the intensities of the surrounding P pixels*

$$s(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & if\ x \geq 0 \\ 0 & if\ x < 0 \end{cases}$$

LBP histograms are generated for each camouflage-background pair to quantify texture similarity, and these histograms are compared using Chi-square distance metrics.

The combined outputs of Gabor filter analysis and LBP histograms provide a comprehensive assessment of camouflage effectiveness.

C. Combined Effectiveness Calculation

The combined effectiveness score for each pattern is computed by averaging the normalized outputs of the Gabor filter and LBP analyses:

$$E = \alpha\, E_{Gabor} + (1 - \alpha)\, E_{LBP}$$

Where:

E_{Gabor} *– the effectiveness score from Gabor filter analysis*
E_{LBP} *– the effectiveness score from LBP analysis*
α *– weighting factor that balances the contribution of each method*

The combined outputs of Gabor filter analysis and LBP histograms provide a comprehensive assessment of camouflage effectiveness. Please note that a value of 0.4 was selected for α as it provides an optimum output for the combined effectiveness score.

The following methodology was utilized in the selection of the α value [19] as 0.4:

- A range of values for α (0.1 to 0.9) was tested, adjusting the balance between Gabor filter and LBP analysis contributions [20].
- When α < 0.4, the model became overly sensitive to high-frequency textures [21], causing it to favor patterns with excessive detail, even when they did not blend effectively with the environment [22].
- When α > 0.4, the model placed excessive weight on LBP similarity, which reduced its ability to capture large-scale texture disruption (essential for effective camouflage) [23].

The optimal trade-off was observed at α = 0.4, where the variance of effectiveness scores across different terrains was minimized while maintaining strong differentiation between effective and ineffective patterns [24].

IV. RESULTS

The combined Gabor filter and LBP analyses produced the following quantitative assessments across the 14 camouflage patterns are as illustrated in Table I.

Published By:
Lattice Science Publication (LSP)

Table-I: Calculated Values and Variance of the 14 Camouflage Patterns

Camouflage Pattern	Calculated Value (Average)	Variance
All Over Brush	0.69	0.0096
MARPAT Arid	0.47	0.0036
Chocolate Chip	0.46	0.004
Flecktarn	0.46	0.0055
Tigerstripe	0.44	0.0035
Tropentarn	0.43	0.0026
Auscam Arid	0.4	0.003
British DPM	0.39	0.0039
Brushstroke	0.38	0.0062
US Woodland	0.35	0.0055
French Lizard	0.32	0.0046
3 Color Desert	0.3	0.0056
Multicam	0.28	0.0045
Italian Flora	0.24	0.0054

From Table I it can be observed that the "All Over Brush" pattern exhibited the highest overall effectiveness, while MARPAT Arid demonstrated consistent performance across diverse arid landscapes as illustrated by its smaller variance.

V. CONCLUSION

The analysis of 14 distinct camouflage patterns in arid environments reveals that the "All Over Brush" pattern is the most effective in providing visual concealment. Its superior average calculated value of 0.69 indicates a higher degree of blending with arid landscapes. This pattern's intricate brushstroke design allows it to disrupt visual detection across a variety of terrains, making it ideal for multi-environment deployment.

The MARPAT Arid pattern, while not achieving the highest score, demonstrated exceptional consistency with a calculated value of 0.47 and the lowest variance (0.0036). This suggests that MARPAT Arid performs reliably across diverse arid environments, making it a strong candidate for applications where stability across varying conditions is paramount.

Patterns such as Chocolate Chip and Flecktarn, which scored 0.46 each, also showed effective concealment capabilities but with slightly higher variance, indicating more variable performance across different backdrops. Patterns with simpler designs, such as the Multicam (0.28) and Italian Flora (0.24), were found to be less effective in providing adequate camouflage in arid environments.

VI. FUTURE SCOPE

Future research could expand upon this study by incorporating additional environmental parameters, such as varying lighting conditions, surface reflectivity, and atmospheric effects. Integrating advanced machine learning models, particularly convolutional neural networks (CNNs), could enhance the accuracy and efficiency of camouflage detection and evaluation. Additionally, extending the scope to include a wider range of terrain types—such as mountainous and urban environments—would provide a more comprehensive understanding of pattern efficacy. Field testing in real-world scenarios could validate the model's performance and identify practical limitations. Furthermore, combining pattern and color analyses may yield more holistic insights into optimizing camouflage design for dynamic operational environmentstext actually exist.

APPENDIX A: PYTHON CODE

The Python code utilized for this camouflage analysis study can be found in the following GitHub repository: https://github.com/adithyasakthivel/Canouflage-Texture-Analysis/

The code in the above repository is free to use and can be executed locally. Python must be installed on your system to run the script.

DECLARATION STATEMENT

I must verify the accuracy of the following information as the article's author.

- **Conflicts of Interest/ Competing Interests:** Based on my understanding, this article has no conflicts of interest.
- **Funding Support:** This article has not been sponsored or funded by any organization or agency. The independence of this research is a crucial factor in affirming its impartiality, as it has been conducted without any external sway.
- **Ethical Approval and Consent to Participate:** The data provided in this article is exempt from the requirement for ethical approval or participant consent.
- **Data Access Statement and Material Availability:** The adequate resources of this article are publicly accessible.
- **Authors Contributions:** The authorship of this article is contributed solely.

REFERENCES

1. Cuthill, I.C., Stevens, M., Sheppard, J., Maddocks, T., Párraga, C.A. and Troscianko, T.S., 2005. Disruptive coloration and background pattern matching. Nature, 434(7029), pp.72-74. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03312
2. Mäenpää, T. and Pietikäinen, M., 2005. Texture analysis with local binary patterns. In Handbook of pattern recognition and computer vision (pp. 197-216). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812775320_0011
3. Stevens, M. and Merilaita, S. eds., 2011. Animal camouflage: mechanisms and function. Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511852053.001
4. Behrens, R.R., 2002. False colors: art, design and modern camouflage. Bobolink Books. https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facbook/430/
5. Mortlock, R.F., 2020. Camouflage Combat Uniform. Defense AR Journal, 27(4), pp.354-397. https://calhoun.nps.edu/bitstream/handle/10945/69407/Mortlock_camouflage%20combat.pdf?sequence=1
6. Denning, R.J., 2018. Camouflage fabrics. In Engineering of high-performance textiles (pp. 349-375). Woodhead Publishing. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-101273-4.00016-0
7. Anitole, G. & Johnson, R.L., (1989). Evaluation of Desert Camouflage Uniforms by Ground Observers. U.S. Army Belvoir Research, Development and Engineering Center, Fort Belvoir. https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA289273.pdf
8. Dugas, A., Zupkofska, K.J., DiChiara, A., & Kramer, F.M. (2004). Universal camouflage for the future warrior. U.S. Army Research, Development and Engineering Command, Natick Soldier Center, Natick, MA. https://milspecmonkey.com/articles/acu/dugas.pdf
9. Scaturro, S., 2011. From combat to couture: Camouflage in fashion (Doctoral dissertation, Fashion Institute of Technology. Fashion and Textile Studies). DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.36233.03682
10. King, A., 2014. The digital revolution: Camouflage in the twenty-first century. Millennium, 42(2), pp.397-424. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829813512885
11. Mortlock, R.F., 2020. Camouflage Combat Uniform. Defense AR Journal, 27(4), pp.354-397. https://calhoun.nps.edu/bitstream/handle/10945/69407/Mortlock_camouflage%20combat.pdf?sequence=1
12. Langhorne, J.L., Martinez, O.A., & Khilji, A., (2018). Standardized U.S.-led coalition forces uniform. Naval Postgraduate School,

Monterey, California. https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/trecms/pdf/AD1059969.pdf
13. Gonzalez, R.C., 2009. Digital image processing. Pearson education india. https://dl.icdst.org/pdfs/files4/01c56e081202b62bd7d3b4f8545775fb.pdf
14. Jain, A.K. and Farrokhnia, F., 1991. Unsupervised texture segmentation using Gabor filters. Pattern recognition, 24(12), pp.1167-1186. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-3203(91)90143-S
15. Mehrotra, R., Namuduri, K.R. and Ranganathan, N., 1992. Gabor filter-based edge detection. Pattern recognition, 25(12), pp.1479-1494. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-3203(92)90121-X
16. Kamarainen, J.K., Kyrki, V. and Kalviainen, H., 2006. Invariance properties of Gabor filter-based features-overview and applications. IEEE Transactions on image processing, 15(5), pp.1088-1099. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1109/TIP.2005.864174
17. Lindahl, T., 2007. Study of local binary patterns. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:23908/FULLTEXT01.pdf
18. Pietikäinen, M., Hadid, A., Zhao, G., Ahonen, T., Pietikäinen, M., Hadid, A., Zhao, G. and Ahonen, T., 2011. Local binary patterns for still images. Computer vision using local binary patterns, pp.13-47. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-85729-748-8
19. Merilaita, S. and Stevens, M., 2011. Crypsis through background matching. Animal camouflage: mechanisms and function, pp.17-33. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511852053.002
20. Thepade, S. D., Awhad, R., & Khandelwal, P. (2020). Image Retrieval with Fusion of T hepade's Sorted B lock Truncation Codingnary based Colo r and Local Binary Pattern based Texture Features with Different Color Places. In International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering (Vol. 9, Issue 5, pp. 28–34). DOI: https://doi.org/10.35940/ijitee.e1963.039520
21. Tamilselvi, M., & Karthikeyan, S. (2019). A Face Recognition System Using Directional Binary Code Algorithm And Multi-Svm. In International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology (Vol. 8, Issue 6s3, pp. 1201–1208). DOI: https://doi.org/10.35940/ijeat.f1204.0986s319
22. Singh, A., & Jindal, K. (2019). Realization of Image Processing Algorithm based on FPGA. In International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering (IJRTE) (Vol. 8, Issue 3, pp. 2882–2885). DOI: https://doi.org/10.35940/ijrte.c5338.098319
23. Dutta, D., Halder, T., Penchala, A., Krishna, K. V., Prashnath, G., & Chakravarty, D. (2024). A Case Study on Image Co-Registration of Hyper Spectral and Dual (L & S) Band SAR Data and Ore Findings Over Zewar Mines, India. In International Journal of Emerging Science and Engineering (Vol. 12, Issue 6, pp. 17–25). DOI: https://doi.org/10.35940/ijese.a8055.12060524
24. S, D., & P L, L. (2020). Binary Class Classification of Software Faults in Software Modules using Popular Machine Learning Techniques. In International Journal of Innovative Science and Modern Engineering (Vol. 6, Issue 6, pp. 14–18). DOI: https://doi.org/10.35940/ijisme.f1221.046620

AUTHOR'S PROFILE

Adithya Vikram Sakthivel is a results-driven professional with expertise in data engineering, AI-powered systems, and product development. With a background in Electronics and Communications Engineering from NIT Trichy, he has led cross-functional teams in developing automation testing frameworks, optimizing business operations, and enhancing AI-driven platforms. His contributions include key roles in projects such as PLEXai, Imio, and Infopoint, as well as extensive research in intellectual property, economic policies, and algorithm design. Adithya holds multiple certifications in AI, data analytics, and management consulting, reflecting his commitment to technological innovation and strategic growth.