UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

Oceanic internal wave amplitude retrieval from satellite images based on a data-driven transfer learning model

Wang, Xudong; Wang, Haoyu; Wang, Shuo; Liu, Yanliang; Yu, Weidong; Wang, Jing; Xu, Qing; Li, Xiaofeng

DOI: 10.1016/j.rse.2022.112940

License: Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard): Wang, X, Wang, H, Wang, S, Liu, Y, Yu, W, Wang, J, Xu, Q & Li, X 2022, 'Oceanic internal wave amplitude retrieval from satellite images based on a data-driven transfer learning model', Remote Sensing of the Environment, vol. 272, 112940. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2022.112940

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

•Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.

•Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.

•User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?) •Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1	Oceanic Internal wave amplitude retrieval from satellite images based on a data-
2	driven transfer learning model
3	Xudong Zhang ^a , Haoyu Wang ^a , Shuo Wang ^b , Yanliang Liu ^{c,d} , Weidong Yu ^{e,f} , Jing Wang ^g , Qing Xu ^g ,
4	Xiaofeng Li ^{a*}
5	^a CAS Key Laboratory of Ocean Circulation and Waves, Institute of Oceanology, Chinese
6	Academy of Sciences and Center for Ocean Mega-Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences. No.7
7	Nanhai Road, 266071 Qingdao, China
8	^b School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham, UK
9	^c Center for Ocean and Climate Research, First Institute of Oceanography, Ministry of Natural
10	Resources, Qingdao, China
11	^d Laboratory for Regional Oceanography and Numerical Modeling, Pilot National Laboratory for
12	Marine Science and Technology (Qingdao), Qingdao, China.
13	^e School of Atmospheric Sciences, Sun Yat-Sen University, Zhuhai, China
14	^f Key Laboratory of Tropical Atmosphere-Ocean System (Sun Yat-Sen University), Ministry of
15	Education, China
16	^g Facult of Information Science and Engineering, Ocean University of China, China
17	Corresponding author: X. Li (lixf@qdio.ac.cn)
18	Highlights:

19 • Lab experiment and satellite-field measurements are used to build two IW datasets.

- A transfer-learning model was developed based on the datasets.
- The model can retrieve IW amplitudes from satellite images.
- The model's MRE can be expected to be 10% for an IW amplitude of 100 m.
- Application of the model in the Andaman Sea shows IW amplitude spatial variations.

24 Abstract

Internal waves (IW) are characterized by a large-amplitude, long-wave crest, and long-propagation 25 distance. They are widespread in the global ocean. Amplitude is an essential IW parameter and is 26 difficult to derive from the IW surface signatures in satellite images. A laboratory experiment and 27 28 combined satellite/in-situ measurements were carried out to build two internal wave datasets (888 pairs of lab data and 121 pairs of synchronous in-situ data and satellite images). To efficiently use 29 the lab data, we implemented a transfer learning model to retrieve IW amplitude from satellite 30 images. The model is a purely data-driven model pre-trained with lab data and re-trained with 31 satellite/in-situ data. A short connection was incorporated into the transfer learning framework to 32 reduce information loss. Bias correction was adopted to improve the model performance. After the 33 34 correction, the root mean square error (RMSE) of the estimated IW amplitude decreased from 12.09 m (17.84 m) to 9.59 m (11.59 m), the mean relative error decreased from 21% (27%) to 18% (16%), 35 and the correlation coefficients improved from 0.81 (0.72) to 0.89 (0.90) on the test (training) 36 dataset. For IWs with amplitude exceeding 100 m, the model can be expected to get an absolute 37 error of 10 m. The mean relative error decreased with the increase in IW amplitudes. Comparisons 38 with other algorithms demonstrate that the proposed model is efficient for IW studies. We applied 39 40 the model to 156 satellite images containing IW signatures in the Andaman Sea, finding that largeamplitude IWs were mainly located at the water depth between 200 m and 1,000 m on the 41 continental slope. When considering one-pixel input errors for the peak-to-peak (PP) distance, the 42

43 model shows large tolerance with the errors. Compared with the KdV equation-based method, the
44 developed model was more accurate.

Keywords: Internal wave, amplitude, transfer learning, remote sensing, in-situ measurement,
laboratory experiment

47 **1 Introduction**

Internal waves (IW) are a ubiquitous phenomenon in the global ocean (Apel et al., 1985; Guo et 48 al., 2012; Kozlov et al., 2014; Lavrova and Mityagina, 2017; Lindsey et al., 2018; Liu et al., 1998; 49 Osborne and Burch, 1980; Scotti et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2014; Xu et al., 2008). 50 IWs are characterized by their large amplitudes and long wave crests compared with surface waves. 51 Field observations have shown that IW amplitudes range from tens of meters to hundreds of meters. 52 For example, IW amplitude in the South China Sea reaches over 240 m (Huang et al., 2016). Large-53 54 amplitude IWs can propagate over several hundred kilometers before dissipating on the continental shelf. As a result, they cause sizeable vertical motion and strong shear forces of ocean currents, 55 threatening marine navigation, transportation, and oil rig operation safety and affecting ocean 56 environments, such as sediment resuspension and ocean mixing. Therefore, the accurate inversion 57 of IW amplitude is necessary for IW studies. 58

Field observation is one of the best ways to obtain amplitudes of IWs and has developed very fast in recent years (Alford et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2019). In addition, IW characteristics, ocean mixing, and interactions between IWs or between IW and mesoscale processes have been studied based on in-situ observations (Liu et al., 2004; Shroyer et al., 2011; Zhao et al., 2004). However,

63	the in-situ dataset is usually small in number and collected at fixed locations. Thus, they mainly
64	serve as an independent test dataset to validate satellite observations or numerical results.
65	Remote sensing has already shown its potential and advantages in studying IWs for decades
66	(Alpers, 1985; da Silva et al., 2012; Guo et al., 2012; Li et al., 2013; Li et al., 2008; Liu and Hsu,
67	2004; Marghany, 1999; Magalhaes and da Silva, 2018; Serebryany et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021;
68	Marghany, 2021). Satellite images, both acquired by active microwave sensors, such as synthetic
69	aperture radar image (SAR image), or passive optical sensors, such as the Moderate Resolution
70	Imaging Spectroradiometer image (MODIS image), have become an important data source for IW
71	studies. The benefit of combining the high spatial resolution and day-night imaging capabilities of
72	SAR and high temporal resolution and a wide swath of MODIS sensors has led researchers to gain
73	valuable knowledge of IWs in the past two decades. The spatiotemporal distributions (Liu and Hsu,
74	2004; Zubkova and Kozlov, 2020), generation mechanism (Magalhaes et al., 2020), propagation
75	characteristics (Bai et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2014; Tensubam et al., 2021), interactions (Magalhaes
76	et al., 2021; Xue et al., 2014), automatic detections (Li et al., 2020; Marghany, 2018), and the
77	forecast of IWs (Zhang and Li, 2021; Zhang et al., 2021) have been extensively studied using
78	satellite images. IW-induced currents will modulate the sea surface and produce convergence and
79	divergence regions. The signal received by SAR images will be enhanced/weakened in the
80	convergence/divergence region by the Bragg backscatter mechanism (Alpers, 1985). Passive
81	optical images show clear IW signatures due to the specular reflection mechanism in areas with
82	sun glitter. So surface signatures related to IWs can be clearly observed from satellite images.

In the literature, retrieval of IW amplitudes from satellite images has been mainly based on the 83 Korteweg-De Vries (KdV) equation and the IW half-width characteristic (Zheng et al., 2001). The 84 KdV equation is a simple form to describe IWs in shallow oceans. Since it has an analytical solution, 85 researchers have used it to gain first-order knowledge of IW. However, in most cases, IW has far 86 more complicated characteristics than those modeled using the KdV or extended KdV equations. 87 Machine learning techniques have recently shown their potential in oceanographic studies in 88 various aspects (Li et al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2020), with different techniques proposed for different 89 oceanic studies. Machine learning algorithms' strong nonlinear mapping ability is promising for 90 building the relationship between IW surface signatures extracted from satellite images and IW 91 92 amplitudes. Some machine learning methods have been applied to retrieve IW amplitude from optical satellite images by Pan et al. (2018) and lab data by Wang et al. (2021). Their models were 93 trained using numerical or lab results, which are not the same as in-situ data. The accuracy of the 94 95 provided true value was the upper limit of a machine learning model, so their results were limited by the truth they provided to the model and were mainly validated in shallow oceans with IW 96 amplitudes less than 30 m. 97

The matched dataset between the in-situ data and satellite images was small, while the IW lab experiment provided a larger dataset. To fully utilize the two datasets, this study proposes a transfer learning model to retrieve the amplitudes of IWs from satellite images. First, we trained the model using the laboratory data collected in a water tank (Wang et al., 2021). We then applied the transfer learning technique to fine-tune the pre-trained model using limited in-situ data and synchronous satellite images. The transfer learning technique is an effective method in the machine learning

field to solve the problem of small training datasets (Pan and Yang, 2009). Finally, to improve the 104 model's performance further, we introduced a bias correction method in the model establishment 105 that allows considering density information in real oceans. Because the lab experiment has 106 107 unrealistic density differences to make the experiment easier to observe by the camera. The bias correction method can correct the pre-model results using density information in the actual oceans. 108 The paper is organized as follows. The data description are presented in section 2. In section 3, 109 we show the model development and results. Applications of the model are presented in section 4. 110 Discussions are presented in section 5, then we summarized the paper in section 6. 111

112 **2 Data**

113 2.1 Experimental lab data

IW lab experiments were conducted in a tank with a two-layer fluid system. The tank is 3 m 114 long, 0.15 m wide, and 0.3 m tall. Two cameras were placed on the side and top of the tank to 115 capture the IW waveform and surface signature images simultaneously. A baffle was placed 0.2 m 116 away from the left side of the tank to generate the IW using the gravity collapse method (Du et al., 117 2019). On the left side of the baffle, the interface level of the water is higher than the right side. 118 The IW was generated by the evolution of propagating vortex developed from the vertical shear 119 movements on the left side of the tank after the baffle was removed. The generated waveform was 120 usually consistent with the KdV equation described as: 121

122
$$\eta_t + c_0 \eta_x + \alpha \eta \eta_x + \gamma \eta \eta_{xxx} = 0, \tag{1}$$

123
$$c_0 = \sqrt{\frac{2g(\rho_2 - \rho_1)h_1h_2}{(\rho_2 + \rho_1)H}}, \quad \alpha = \frac{3c_0(h_1 - h_2)}{2h_1h_2}, \quad \gamma = \frac{c_0h_1h_2}{6}.$$
 (2)

Here, g is the gravity acceleration, η is the amplitude of the solitary wave, α is the nonlinear coefficient, γ is the dispersion coefficient, c_0 is the linear phase speed, x is in the spatial variable, t is the time, $h_1(h_2)$ is the depth of the upper (lower) layer with smaller (larger) density water, and H is the total water depth. Some validations have been performed between the KdV equation and the experiment-generated IW waveform. Kao et al. (1985) presented an empirical equation to estimate the generated numbers of internal solitons in the tank, which is described as:

130
$$N \leq \frac{L}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2} \left| \frac{h_1 - h_2}{h_1^2 h_2^2} \right| \eta_0} + 1$$
 (3)

Here, L is the distance between the baffle and the left side of the tank, η_0 is the difference in the interface level of either side of the baffle. IW lab experiments have been carried out widely to study IW characteristics, such as its generation, breaking, and validation of the KdV equation (Du et al., 2019; Kao et al., 1985).

In our study, only one internal soliton was generated each time. Different amplitudes of IWs were 135 generated under different collapse heights or stratifications, so IW data generated at different 136 conditions could be collected. More details of the IW experiments can be found in Wang et al. 137 (2021). During the experiment, the side-looking camera captured the waveform (amplitude) of IWs, 138 139 and the down-looking camera provided synchronous surface information on the water surface where bright and dark bands were observed. A photo of the IW lab experiment is shown in Fig. 1. 140 The side-looking camera served the in-situ data role. The down-looking camera served the satellite 141 142 observation role for IWs in the natural ocean, so synchronous observation was achieved. A total of 888 pairs of IW lab data were collected. 143





145 **Fig. 1.** Photo of the IW lab experiments and views of the two cameras.

- 146 2.2 Satellite images, in-situ data, and matched dataset
- 147 2.2.1 Satellite images

MODIS image has a swath of 2,330 km and spatial resolutions of 250 m, 500 m, and 1,000 m. 148 Cooperation between the Terra and Aqua satellites permits two observations of the same ocean 149 area in one day. Clear IW signatures, wide swath, and high temporal resolution make satellite 150 151 observation a good choice for synchronous dataset collection. SAR images are widely used in IW observations but with a smaller swath and long revisit period. Therefore, SAR images are more 152 difficult to match with in-situ data. In this study, MODIS images with a spatial resolution of 250 153 154 m were mainly used for collecting the synchronous observation dataset. Several synthetic aperture radar (SAR) images, such as ENVISAT ASAR images and Radarsat-2 images, collected in the 155 South China Sea were also used to build the matched dataset (Zhang et al., 2016). 156

An IW will induce divergence and convergence regions on the ocean surface and hence manifest 157 as bright or dark bands on satellite imagery. If one extracts the profiles perpendicular to the wave 158 crest, the bright or dark bands on satellite images manifest as positive or negative peaks on the 159 profile. The distance between the positive and negative peaks, i.e., peak-to-peak (PP) distance, can 160 be extracted from satellite images. Previous studies have proven that the PP distance is closely 161 related to IW amplitude (Zheng et al., 2001; Zhang et al., 2016). Therefore, the PP distance 162 extracted from satellite images is expected to build the relationship with IW amplitude extracted 163 from in-situ data. 164

165 2.2.2 In-situ data

In-situ data is one of the best ways to get the IW amplitude. The Andaman Sea has active IW occurrences across the ocean and multiple IW generation sites. A buoy was placed at (95.6°E, 9.6°N) to measure temperature profiles from 18 November 2012 to 28 May 2014 in the Andaman Sea (Liu et al., 2018). The underwater part of the buoy had 13 sensors continuously measuring the temperature at 1, 10, 20, 40, 60, 80, 100, 120, 140, 200, 300, 500, and 700 m depth. When an IW passed by the buoy location, the buoy observed IW-induced temperature variations. 2.2.3 Synchronous dataset – matching the in-situ data with satellite images

The total working period of the buoy in the Andaman Sea was 557 days. An IW passed by the sensor and the satellite flew over the ocean; a synchronous observation was achieved. A case of synchronous observation of IWs in the Andaman Sea using the buoy and a satellite image is shown in Fig. 2. The red dot indicates the location of the field observation. A MODIS image was collected on 11 March 2011 showing multiple IW packets propagating in different directions, with one IW

178	packet right on the field observation spot. Corresponding field observations are shown in the lower
179	panel of Fig. 2, where a large vertical movement of an isotherm is clearly seen. Besides the buoy
180	placed in the Andaman Sea, in-situ observation in other oceans with matched satellite images was
181	also collected from previous studies, such as the observations in the South China Sea (Chen et al.,
182	2018, 2019; Huang et al., 2016; Ramp et al., 2004; Yang et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2016), the Malin
183	Shelf (Small et al., 1999), and the Mid-Atlantic Bight (Xue et al., 2012). Only 121 IW observation
184	matches between in-situ data and satellite images were collected with these in-situ observations.
185	Field observation is costly and local, and these restrictions make it difficult to collect a large
186	synchronous dataset. Transfer learning techniques could be an excellent option to help with this
187	problem.



Fig. 2. Observation of IWs in the Andaman Sea using MODIS images (upper) acquired on 11 March 2011 and corresponding filed observations (lower). The red dot in the MODIS image represents the in-situ location. The solid black lines in the lower panel represent an isotherm of 25°C. The black arrow indicates the location of an IW.





Fig. 3. Histogram of the IW amplitude, month, time window between satellite observation and insitu observation, and the peak-to-peak distance of IWs in the collected in-situ dataset.

As shown in Fig. 3, IW amplitudes in the collected dataset range from 10 m to over 100 m, 196 indicating both small-amplitude and large-amplitude IWs are included. The temporal distribution 197 198 of collected samples shows that most samples were taken between April and August. This result is reasonable because most IWs are observed in the summer in the South China Sea and the Andaman 199 Sea because of a stronger stratification in the summer. The in-situ data and satellite images are not 200 201 perfectly synchronous, and a time window exists between them. Most of the synchronous pairs were collected with a time window of fewer than 6 hours, while some were over 10 hours. IWs are 202 mainly periodically generated by the semi-diurnal tide in the Andaman Sea and many other oceans 203

(Apel et al., 1985; Zhang et al., 2021). A time window of 12 hours means an IW was generated by
the successive semi-diurnal tide and might have a similar amplitude with previous ones at the exact
location. This window makes it possible to match the in-situ data and satellite images in a more
significant time. The PP distance of IWs is mainly between 1,000 m and 2,000 m.

3. Transfer learning model for IW amplitude retrieval

209 3.1 The transfer learning model

Transfer learning, which was specially proposed to solve the problem of a small dataset by utilizing a large dataset sharing similar characteristics with the target dataset, has been widely used in computer vision. For example, transfer learning has proven to be efficient for Web document classification and Wi-Fi localization when facing the problems of a few manual labels (small target dataset) and outdated data (Pan and Yang, 2009).

Here, we adopt a transfer learning technique to solve the problem of a small IW in-situ dataset. 215 IW lab experiments were designed to study IW generation or propagation characteristics in actual 216 217 oceans (Wang et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2019). IWs data collected in the natural ocean and generated in a tank show differences, although they share similar features. This allows lab collected 218 IW to serve as an additional data source but not as an enhanced dataset to the in-situ dataset directly. 219 To effectively transfer the features contained in the lab data, we used transfer learning techniques. 220 First, the lab data was used to obtain a pre-trained model; then, the pre-trained model parameters 221 were used to initialize the final model parameters, and the in-situ data was used to fine-tune the 222

final model. The initial parameters of the pre-trained model were randomly initialized and adjusted
based on the lab data using the back-propagation algorithm, which can be described as:

225
$$w'_{\text{pretrain,ki}} = w_{\text{pretrain,ki}} - \alpha \frac{\partial \text{loss}_{\text{pretrain}}}{\partial w_{\text{pretrain,ki}}}, \qquad (4)$$

$$loss_{pretrain} = (lab_truth-model_predicted_{pretrain})^2.$$
(5)

Here, α =0.015 is the learning rate in our study, w is the weight of kth node in the ith layer of the neural network, the loss is used to evaluate the performance of the model prediction using truth data and its back-propagation can adjust the weights of the neural network as shown in equation (4) and (5). After the pre-trained model was established, the weights of all neural network nodes were obtained. The weights of the pre-trained model will serve as the initial weights in the finetuning process and the weights will be readjusted based on the in-situ data. This process can be described as:

$$W_{ft_initial} = W_{pretrain_final}$$
(6)

$$\mathbf{w}_{\text{ft,ki}}^{'} = \mathbf{w}_{\text{ft,ki}} - \alpha \frac{\partial \log_{\text{ft}}}{\partial w_{\text{ft,ki}}}$$
(7)

236
$$loss_{ft} = (in-situ_truth-model_predicted_{ft})^2$$
(8)

Here, W is the weights of all nodes in the neural network, and the subscript 'ft' means the finetuning process. The fine-tuning process made the model-learned features shift from the lab data to the in-situ data. The transfer learning technique made it possible to build a relationship between insitu IW amplitude and satellite IW signatures (PP distance) with limited synergy with in-situ observations.

242 3.2 Two modifications - short connection and bias correction

We made two specially tailored modifications to the transfer learning model based on transfer 243 learning's verified effectiveness in various fields. The first modification is the short connection 244 between layers to avoid information loss in input parameters and promote the fitting process with 245 a small dataset. The in-situ data used to train the model was limited. To avoid information loss 246 during the model training process, we used the framework of a fully connected neural network 247 incorporated with a shortcut connection to build the inversion model part. The 'shortcut connection' 248 method was inspired by the residual module of the deep residual network (He et al., 2016). This 249 idea has also been recently applied to image classification tasks, showing the surprisingly excellent 250 performance (Touvron et al., 2021). The shortcut connections (blue arrows in Fig. 4) between 251 252 different layers can merge features extracted in different layers, thus reducing the input information loss and ensuring better model performance. The shortcut connections can be described as: 253

254 v_{ki} =Relu($w_{ki}x_{ki}+b_{ki}+x_{ki-n}$).

Here, v_{ki} is the output, w_{ki} is the weight, x_{ki} is the input value, and b_{ki} is the bias value of the kth node in the ith layer, x_{ki-n} is the input value of the kth node in the (i-n)th layer, n is the distance of the short connections, which indicates how many nodes are skipped to merge the inputs with the kth node, and Relu is the activation function. The nonlinear effect of the activation function will cause information loss. By merging inputs from nodes in different layers, the information loss between these layers can be reduced. The shortcut connections also benefit the model fitting process, which can help the model converge more efficiently when the dataset is small.

(9)

The second modification is to incorporate a bias correction model with the transfer learning technique to improve the model performance by introducing density information of the natural

ocean. The inversion model that predicted IW amplitude was bias-corrected using two additional 264 input parameters: the density of the upper and lower layer in actual oceans. Compared with real 265 ocean situations, the lab experiment had unrealistic density information to make IWs easier to 266 generate and observe by the camera. IW amplitude is affected by the ocean stratification 267 information. The depth of the upper layer and density difference are used in the inversion model, 268 the density information of the upper and lower layer can serve as additional information for the IW 269 amplitude retrieval. Thus, the density information in the real ocean was used to bias correct model 270 results. The density of the upper and lower layer and the unbias-corrected IW amplitude were 271 inputted into the bias correction model. The relationship between the real IW amplitude and the 272 273 density information can be built during the training process, so the density information can help increase the IW amplitude inversion accuracy. 274

Based on these two specially designed modifications, this study proposed a two-stage model, including a transfer learning inversion model and a bias correction model, to retrieve IW amplitude from satellite images. The model's loss function is the mean square error which is an appropriate indicator to evaluate the model performance in regression tasks. The detailed model structure is shown in Fig. 4.

280 3.3 Model inputs and outputs

IW amplitudes are relevant to ocean environment factors, such as the stratification, topography, and IW characteristics. The inputs of the first-stage model include the water depth, depth of the upper layer, relative density difference, and the PP distance extracted from satellite images (Zheng et al., 2001). The relative density difference is defined as the density difference of the upper and

285	lower layer divided by the average density under a two-layer ocean assumption. The introduction
286	of relative density difference aims to reduce differences between the lab and real oceans by several
287	orders of magnitude. The PP distance is closely related to the IW amplitude, which can be extracted
288	from satellite images and has been used to estimate IW amplitude in previous works (Zheng et al.,
289	2001). The density and stratification information can be calculated from the publicly available
290	monthly-mean World Ocean Atlas (WOA) 2018 dataset based on the satellite image's time, and
291	location of an IW detected. The WOA 2018 dataset has a grid resolution of 0.25° and follows a
292	standard depth level in the vertical direction. The water depth was extracted from the ETOPO1
293	dataset based on the IW locations. The output of the transfer learning model is the bias-corrected
294	amplitude of IW.



296

Fig. 4. Flowchart of the proposed transfer learning model to retrieve amplitude of IWs. The blue 297 arrows indicate the shortcut connections between different layers. The width of the Block 1 and 298 Block 2 modules is 64 (32) neurons for the inverse (bias correction) model. Two specially tailored 299 modifications, the short connection, and the bias correction are highlighted. The IW lab and in-situ 300 data were inputted into Input Layer 1, and the density information was inputted into Input Layer 2. 301 In the input layers, H is the water depth, h_1 is the depth of the upper layer, dp is the density 302 difference of upper and lower layer, PP is the IW PP distances extracted from the satellite images, 303 p_1 (p_2) is the density of the upper (lower) layer. In the insert figure, x indicates the layer input, y 304

indicates the layer output, w indicates the weight of the layer, and b indicates the bias of the layer.
Two different connection types are indicated with two red boxes.

307 3.4 Model results

The developed transfer learning IW amplitude retrieval (TLIAR) model results are shown in Fig. 5. Generally, the TLIAR model shows good agreement with the in-situ IW amplitudes in both the training and test dataset, with root mean square error (RMSE) values of 11.59 m and 9.59 m, mean relative error (MRE) values of 16% and 18%, and correlation coefficients of 0.90 and 0.89, respectively. The RMSE and MRE are defined as:

313
$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (True \text{ amplitude-Model predicted amplitude})^2}$$
(10)

314
$$MRE = \sum \frac{Model \text{ predicted amplitude} - True \text{ amplitude}}{True \text{ amplitude}} / N \times 100$$
(11)

Here, N represents the number of samples included in the calculation. The bias correction helps establish the model; the model performance improved after the bias correction was implemented. The RMSE on the test dataset decreased from 12.09 m to 9.59 m, the MRE decreased from 21% to 18%, and the correlation coefficients improved from 0.81 to 0.89. The results of the training dataset and the test dataset are very close, indicating the model is not over-fitted.



Fig. 5. TLIAR Model performance on the training (a, c) and test (b, d) dataset before (a, b) and after (c, d) bias correction. The solid black line indicates the 1-to-1 line.

Fig. 6 shows the distributions of the absolute error and the MRE with the actual IW amplitudes. A fitted line is represented with the blue line, and the red shaded area indicates the 95% confidence intervals. One can find that the absolute error increases with the increase in IW amplitude; for an IW with an amplitude of 100 m, the absolute error can be expected to be around 10 m. The fitted line for the relative error rate shows that it decreases with increased IW amplitudes; this promises

329	that the TLIAR model still has a good performance for large-amplitude IWs. Fig. 7 shows the
330	statistical results for IW amplitudes in different ranges, and one can find that with the increase in
331	the IW amplitude, MRE decreases. A larger MRE for an IW amplitude of 20 m may be attributed
332	to the smaller IWs having fewer modulations on the ocean surface and hence less prominent
333	features on satellite images. Errors may be introduced to the PP distance of IWs. Smaller IWs may
334	also be affected by the strong background information. For large-amplitude IWs, the IW signal is
335	more obvious in satellite observations and ocean environments, which promise a lower MRE.





Fig. 6. Absolute error and the relative error rate of the TLIAR model. The solid blue line indicatesthe fitted line for the distribution, and the red shaded area indicates the 95% confidence interval.





Fig. 7. The relative error rate of the TLIAR model for different IW amplitude ranges.

341 **4.** Application of the TLIAR model for IW amplitude retrieval in the Andaman Sea

The TLIAR model can retrieve IW amplitudes based on two-dimensional information extracted 342 from satellite observations and corresponding publicly available datasets, so the three-dimensional 343 344 structure of IWs was rebuilt. As shown in Fig. 8, multiple IW packets propagating eastward are observed clearly in the Andaman Sea. Three leading IWs were selected to retrieve the amplitudes 345 using the TLIAR model. The PP distances for IW-A, IW-B, IW-C are 1,391.5 m, 731.5 m, and 346 517.2 m, respectively. The A, B, and C locations are shown in Fig. 8 b, and the water depth is 347 3,277.7 m, 1,225.5 m, and 1,592.0 m, respectively. The distance between successive IW packets is 348 99.02 km and 90.85 km. The amplitudes retrieved using the proposed TLIAR model are 45.8 m, 349 350 36.0 m, and 38.9 m, respectively. The three-dimensional structure of IW-A, IW-B, and IW-C are

351	presented in Fig. 8 b. When propagating from A to B, the IW experiences a dispersion process due
352	to the deep water, and the amplitude becomes smaller in location B than location A. When
353	propagating from B to C, the water depth decrease gradually. The IW experiences a nonlinear
354	process due to the nonlinear enhancing effect, so the waveform becomes steeper, and the amplitude
355	becomes larger.



357	Fig. 8. (a) Three IW packets observed by MODIS image taken on 19 August 2019; (b) three-
358	dimensional structure of IWs can be obtained with model predicted amplitudes and satellite-
359	observed PP distances with the KdV-type solutions. The underwater topography is also presented.
360	The proposed TLIAR model can be used to study IW amplitudes in different areas. We collected
361	1,097 samples from 156 satellite images in the Andaman Sea to retrieve IW amplitudes from
362	satellite observations; a detailed description can be found in (Zhang et al., 2021). The spatial
363	distribution of IW amplitudes and histogram of IW amplitudes are presented in Fig. 9. We can find
364	that IW amplitudes in the Andaman Sea are mainly located at 40 m. When the IWs propagate into
365	shallow areas with water depth less than 1,000 m, IW amplitudes increase due to the strong
366	nonlinear effect. The nonlinear steepening of the waveform can also be found in Fig. 8. Large-
367	amplitude IWs are mainly found at a water depth between 200 m and 1,000 m. Osborne and Burch
368	(1980) conducted field observations in the Andaman Sea at (6.9°N, 97.0°W). They observed an
369	IW with an amplitude of 60 m. The TLIAR model predicts IW amplitudes of about 50 m in the
370	same location. As described in section 2, a buoy was placed at (95.6°E, 9.6°N) and field
371	observation shows that IW amplitudes ranged from 20 m to 55 m, which is also consistent with
372	model-predicted results (20 m to 40 m). These match results demonstrate that the proposed TLIAR
373	model can be used to study the amplitude evolution and distribution of IWs.



Fig. 9. Amplitude distributions (upper panel) of IWs estimated from satellite images using the
TLIAR model in the Andaman Sea and corresponding histograms (lower panel).

377 **5. Discussion**

5.1 TLIAR model performance against typical machine learning models

To demonstrate the performance of our TLIAR model, we carried out more experiments 379 comparing TLIAR with other traditional machine learning approaches. These approaches are Back-380 propagation neural network (BPNN), support vector machine (SVM), Random Forest (RF), and 381 XGBoost. We firstly compare them trained by only in-situ data and then compare them trained by 382 both lab and in-situ data. Finally, they were tested using only the in-situ data. The parameter setting 383 and model results for different algorithms are shown in Table 1. The results show that, when only 384 using the in-situ data to train the model, the XGboost algorithm had the best performance on the 385 independent test dataset with the smallest RMSE of 18.70 m. On the other hand, as shown in section 386 3, the TLIAR model has an RMSE of 9.59 m, and this result demonstrates that the introduction of 387 the lab data is valuable and necessary. 388

Models	Parameter setting	RMSE_train(m)	RMSE_test(m)		
BPNN	Four-hidden-layer structure: 32, 16, and 8	24 24	24.53		
DITU	activation function: relu	21.21			
SVM	C=40, Kernel=rbf, gamma=0.6	20.50	21.64		
RF	n_estimators=100, max_depth=30	7.31	19.59		
VCPoost	max_depth=5, min_child_weight=3, learning_	12.26	19.70		
AUDOUSI	rate=0.15, n_estimators=120, gamma=0.18	12.30	18.70		

Table 1. Performance of different algorithms trained by only the in-situ data

390 Seven different fusion data/model strategies were applied to compare their performance to 391 combine the lab collected data and in-situ data. The details of combining the lab and in-situ data 392 are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptions of different fusion strategies to combine the lab and in-situ data.

Strategy	Index	Description				
	F1	Lab data and observational data were trained together directly.				
	52	Lab data and observational data were normalized separately and then put together				
	F2	for the model training.				
	E2	The amplitudes and PP distances were normalized using the water depth for both				
	F3	the lab data and observational data, then put together for the model training.				
One model		A scaling factor was calculated based on the median or average IW amplitudes				
	F4	in the lab data and observational data. The lab data were rescaled before putting				
		the data together.				
		The IW amplitudes were normalized using the water depth, and the PP distances				
	F5	were normalized using the upper water depth; then the data were put together for				
		the model training.				
64 - 1 1 - 1		A lab model was trained using the lab data; the lab model predicted IW amplitude				
Stacking	F6	served as one of the input parameters of the observational model; the				
model		observational model produced the final predicted IW amplitudes.				

 F7
 A lab model and an observational model were trained separately using the lab

 data and observational data. The predicted IW amplitudes served as input

 parameters for a third emerged model, which produced the final predicted IW

 amplitudes.

The fusion strategies include five one-model strategies and two stacking-model strategies. The 394 one-model strategy combined the data and was used for training in a single model. The stacking-395 model strategy built multiple models using different data sources as a stacking model. As shown 396 in Table 1, the XGBoost has the best performance among those models; we tested different fusion 397 strategies based on the XGboost model. The performance of different fusion strategies is shown in 398 Table 3. The performance of different strategies had similar RMSE values on the test dataset, all 399 over 20.0 m. Compared with the models trained only using in-situ data, the fusion strategies do not 400 401 show apparent improvements when more lab data were included in the training dataset. However, the proposed transfer learning TLIAR model showed much better performance than models F1-F7, 402 403 with RMSE of 11.59 m and 9.59 m on the training and test dataset. The comparison demonstrates that the transfer learning technique is an efficient way to overcome small dataset problems for IW 404 studies. 405

406 **Table 3.** Model performance for different fusion strategies.

Fusion Strategy		RMSE_train (m)	RMSE_test (m)			
Onemadal	F1	4.57	20.84			
One model	F2	3.77	23.48			

	F3	3.82	24.63
	F4	12.39	20.09
	F5	16.38	22.66
Stacking model	F6	12.79	20.99
Stacking model	F7	9.62	21.68

407 5.2 Influence of input parameter noise

408 The TLIAR model has many input parameters, and errors may be introduced. The water depth was extracted from ETOPO1, and stratification data was extracted from the WOA 2018 dataset. 409 Errors should not be very substantial for input parameters extracted from these publicly published 410 datasets. The PP distance was measured from satellite images and may have been affected by 411 complex imaging conditions and backgrounds. Therefore, errors in the PP distance extracted from 412 satellite images were more easily introduced. The MODIS images used in this study had a spatial 413 resolution of 250 m. Here we consider an error of two pixels (± 500 m) on the MODIS image to 414 investigate its influence on the model performance, and the results are shown in Fig. 10. The model 415 416 performance degraded from 10 m to less than 20 (25) m with an error of 250 m (500 m). As shown in Fig. 3, the PP distance mainly ranged from 1,000 m to 2,000 m. An error of 500 m indicates a 417 32 - 50% error rate on the PP distance measurements. The correlation coefficient and MRE 418 419 degraded to over 0.7 (0.4) and 30% (40%), respectively, with an error of 250 m (500 m). With a one-pixel-error on the PP distance, the model generally produces a reliable result, while with two-420 pixel-error, the model shows relatively large deviations. Although the TLIAR model shows good 421 tolerance on the PP distance error, we can still further reduce the error of PP distance measurements. 422

SAR images have a higher spatial resolution (tens of meters), which reduces the PP distance error. The PP distance error was also reduced when we extracted multiple profiles and obtained the average measurement. Therefore, while the TLIAR model shows strong robustness on PP distance errors, we can still take several measurements to further reduce the measurement error, which promised good performance from the TLIAR model.





429 **Fig. 10.** The TLIAR model performance for PP distance input errors.

430 5.3 Comparison with the KdV equation-based method

The KdV equation has been widely applied to retrieve internal solitary wave amplitude (Zhao 431 et al., 2004; Zheng et al., 2001). The KdV equation for the propagation of the internal solitary 432 wave is described in equation (1). Equation (1) has a soliton solution described as: 433

(12)

- $\eta(\mathbf{x},t) = \eta_0 \operatorname{sech}^2 \left[\frac{\mathbf{x} \mathbf{v}t}{L} \right]$ 434 $L = \sqrt{\frac{12\gamma}{\alpha n_0}}$
- 435

where η_0 is the maximum amplitude, and L is the characteristic half-width. Zheng et al. (2001) 436 proposed the relationship between the internal solitary wave half-width and the PP distance 437 extracted from satellite images. As shown in Fig.2, an IW was observed on the MODIS image near 438 the buoy. The IW has a PP distance of 1,241.93 m with an in-situ amplitude of 35 m. The TLIAR 439 440 model-predicted amplitude is 38.45 m, while the KdV-predict amplitude is 25.01 m. Another case is shown in Fig. 11, a MODIS image was acquired at 06:59 on 27 March 2013, and the PP distance 441 is 1,916.13 m. The buoy captured the IW about 1 hour later with an amplitude of 43 m. The TLIAR 442 model-predicted IW amplitude is 38.45 m, while the KdV-predicted amplitude is 10.50 m. The 443 KdV prediction show much more significant deviations than the proposed TLIAR model. As shown 444 in Fig.3, the PP distance of IWs mainly ranges from 1,000 m to 2,000 m, and the KdV equation 445 446 generally produces minimal amplitude inversion results.



Fig. 11. Observation of IWs in the Andaman Sea using MODIS images (a) acquired at 06:59 on
27 March 2013 and the corresponding in-situ data (b). The red dot indicates the buoy location.

The KdV equation is mainly suitable for small-amplitude internal solitary waves in shallow oceans. Now we analyze which regimes the collected dataset fell in. Considering the average results, the horizontal length scale (L) was 2,000 m, the depth of the upper layer (h) was 60 m, the total water depth (H) was 1,258 m, and the amplitude (A) was 50 m. We calculated L/H~O(1), $h/H\ll1$, $AL^2/H^3\ll1$, $AL/h^2\gg1$. This result does not fall in the regime of the shallowwater theory, deep-water theory, or the finite-depth theory demonstrating that IWs in the ocean are more complicated than can be modeled using the KdV or extended equations.

457 5.4 TLIAR model applicability for extra-large-amplitude IWs

447

As shown in Fig. 3, IW amplitude in the collected matched dataset ranged from tens of meters to over 100 meters. The largest IW amplitude in the matched in-situ dataset was 116 m. IW amplitudes in the South China Sea and other oceans reached over 200 m. The performance of the TLIAR model for extra-large-amplitude IWs was not validated in this study because we did not find such data to train or test the model. However, according to the results shown in Fig. 6, the relative error rate decreased with increased IW amplitudes. If more data is collected in the future,

the model could be tested or even re-trained based on the same approach.

465 5.5 Model application to other ocean areas

The TLIAR model was developed mainly based on the matched dataset in the Andaman Sea, while some data in other ocean areas were also included. The water depth variations for the developed model ranges from 75 m to 2789 m, the mixed layer depth ranges from 13 m to 95 m, the density of the upper layer ranges from 1021 kg/m³ to 1023 kg/m³, and the density of the lower layer ranges from 1024 kg/m³ to 1027 kg/m³. The model was trained and tested under a wide range of ocean conditions. The model should not apply to only one region. We show a few examples below.

A MODIS image acquired on 28 August 2014 showing clear IW signatures in the South China Sea was reported in the work of Xu et al. (2020), as shown in Fig. 12. The water depth at the observation location is 1180 m. The depth of the upper layer extracted from the WOA2018 is 65 m, close to in-situ data. The PP distance of the nearest leading IW in Fig. 12 is 647.83 m. The TLIAR model estimated IW amplitude is 99.6 m, while the in-situ IW amplitude is close to 100 m (Fig. 6i in Xu et al., 2020), which shows good agreements between the model result and in-situ data. This result indicates that the developed TLIAR model works well in the South China Sea.



Fig. 12. MODIS image acquired on 28 August 2014 showing clear IW signatures in the South
China Sea. The red symbol indicates the in-situ observation location reported in Xu et al. (2020).
The insert map shows the extracted profiles indicated by the solid red line.

Data in the South China Sea is included during the model establishment, no sample is located 484 in the Sulu Sea in the matched in-situ dataset. To test the model applicability in the Sulu Sea, we 485 used MODIS images reported in Zhang et al. (2020) to inverse IW amplitudes, and the results are 486 487 shown in Fig. 13. Historical in-situ data were used to validate the model results because no in-situ data is found in the Sulu Sea. The black box in Fig. 13 represents the in-situ observation station, 488 SS3, reported in Apel et al. (1985). IWs in the SS3 station observed 18 solitons with amplitudes 489 490 ranging from 20 m to 80 m (Fig. 20 in Apel et al., 1985). The histogram of TLIAR model results of IWs in this area is shown in the right panel of Fig. 13, where IW amplitudes show good 491

492 agreements with historical in-situ observations in the Sulu Sea. Although we do not test the model



493 applicability further, existing results show the model works reasonably well.

494

Fig. 13. Amplitude distributions (left) of IWs estimated using the TLIAR model in the Sulu Sea.
The black box indicates the SS3 station in Apel et al. (1985). The right panel shows the
corresponding IW amplitude histograms in the black box.

498 6 Conclusions

Amplitude is an important parameter for IW studies. In this study, a transfer learning model was proposed to invert IW amplitudes from satellite images. To develop the model, we built two datasets, including 888 pairs of IW lab data and 121 pairs of satellite/in-situ matched datasets. The TLIAR model is a two-stage model including an inversion model and a bias correction model. We introduced the transfer learning technique and short connection in the inversion model. The transfer learning helps to utilize two datasets fully, and the short connection helps to reduce the information loss and makes the model convergence easier. The bias correction used the density information in

the natural ocean to correct the results of the inversion model. The model has an RMSE of 9.59 m, 506 an MRE of 18%, and a correlation coefficient of 0.89 on an independent test dataset, which shows 507 good consistency between the model predictions and field observations. Analysis shows that for an 508 IW with a large amplitude of 100 m, the absolute error is expected to be around 10 m. Relative 509 error rate analysis shows that the TLIAR model still has good performance for large-amplitude 510 IWs. The model was applied to IW amplitude retrievals in the Andaman Sea. The spatial 511 512 distributions and variations of IW amplitude were revealed: IW amplitudes in the Andaman Sea are mainly located at 40 m, and large-amplitude IWs are mainly found at a water depth between 513 200 m and 1,000 m. 514

Five other machine learning algorithms also join the experiments. Each algorithm built one model trained with only in-situ data, and seven fusion models trained with lab and in-situ data were tested. The XGBoost model has the best performance for models trained with only in-situ data, with an RMSE of 18.70 m. Considering an RMSE of 9.59 m for the TLIAR model, the introduction of the lab data was necessary. Seven fusion models did not improve, while the TLIAR model showed far better performance. These results demonstrate that the lab data serves as an excellent additional data source, and the transfer learning technique is efficient for this study.

The error distribution with the IW amplitudes was also presented, and the results indicate that the model can still have a small error for IW amplitude over 100 m. However, the error rate was reduced for large-amplitude IWs. Noise sensitivity analysis shows that while the noise is most easily introduced to the PP distance, the model shows large tolerance for the PP distance error, with a one-pixel error and RMSE still less than 20 m. Compared with the KdV equation, the TLIAR model shows a much better result. Model applicability in the Sulu Sea was also discussed, the
model results show good agreements with historical in-situ results.

529 Author responsibility

Xudong Zhang and Xiaofeng Li designed the study. Xudong Zhang, Haoyu Wang, and Shuo Wang
contributed to the model realization. Weidong Yu, Yanliang Liu, and Jing Wang contribute to the
in-situ and lab data processing. All authors contributed to the writing, discussion, and revision of
the paper.

534 Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the CAS (Chinese Academy of Sciences) Program [grant number 535 Y9KY04101L], the Strategic Priority Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences 536 [grant number XDB42000000]; Key Project of Center for Ocean Mega-Science [grant number 537 COMS2019R02]; the National Natural Science Foundation for Young Scientists of China [grant 538 number 41906157]; National Natural Science Foundation of China [grant numbers U2006211, 539 42090044, 41776183]; Major scientific and technological innovation projects in Shandong 540 Province [grant number 2019JZZY010102]; and supported by UK Royal Society International 541 Exchange Project [grant number IES\R1\211036]. 542 The buoy data were provided by the regional international cooperation project Monsoon Onset 543 Monitoring and its Social and Ecosystem Impact (MOMSEI). MODIS images of Terra and Aqua 544

- 545 were downloaded from NASA's LAADS Web (<u>https://ladsweb.modaps.eosdis.nasa.gov/search/</u>).
- 546 The water depth data were downloaded from the ETOPO1 Global Relief Model

547	(https://maj	ps.ngdc.noaa.	gov/viewers/	/wcs-client/)	. The	stratification	data	was	obtained	from	the
			-								

548 World Ocean Atlas 2018 (https://www.nodc.noaa.gov/OC5/woa18/).

549 **References**

- Alford, M.H., Lien, R.C., Simmons, H., Klymak, J., Ramp, S., Yang, Y.J., Tang, D., Chang, M.H.,
- 2010. Speed and evolution of nonlinear internal waves transiting the South China Sea. J.
 Phys. Oceanogr. 40, 1338-1355.
- Alpers, W., 1985. Theory of radar imaging of internal waves. Nature 314, 245-247.
- Apel, J.R., Holbrook, J.R., Liu, A.K., Tsai, J.J., 1985. The Sulu Sea internal soliton experiment. J.
 Phys. Oceanogr. 15, 1625-1651.
- Bai, X., Li, X., Lamb, K.G., Hu, J., 2017. Internal solitary wave reflection near Dongsha Atoll, the
 South China Sea. J. Geophys. Res. Oceans 122, 7978-7991.
- Chen, L., Zheng, Q., Xiong, X., Yuan, Y., Xie, H., 2018. A new type of internal solitary waves
 with a re-appearance period of 23 h observed in the South China Sea. Acta Oceanol. Sin.
 37, 116-118.
- Chen, L., Zheng, Q., Xiong, X., Yuan, Y., Xie, H., Guo, Y., Yu, L., Yun, S., 2019. Dynamic and
 statistical features of internal solitary waves on the continental slope in the northern South
- 563 China Sea derived from mooring observations. J. Geophys. Res. Oceans 124, 4078-4097.
- da Silva, J., Magalhaes, J., Gerkema, T., Maas, L., 2012. Internal solitary waves in the Red Sea: an
- 565 unfolding mystery. Oceanography 25, 96-107.

566	Du H., Wei G., Wang S., Wang, X., 2019. Experimental study of elevation-and depression-type
567	internal solitary waves generated by gravity collapse. Phys. Fluids, 31(10): 102104.
568	Guo, C., Vlasenko, V., Alpers, W., Stashchuk, N., Chen, X., 2012. Evidence of short internal waves
569	trailing strong internal solitary waves in the northern South China Sea from synthetic
570	aperture radar observations. Remote Sens. Environ. 124, 542-550.
571	He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., Sun, J., 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In,
572	Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (pp.
573	770-778)
574	Huang, X., Chen, Z., Zhao, W., Zhang, Z., Zhou, C., Yang, Q., Tian, J., 2016. An extreme internal
575	solitary wave event observed in the northern South China Sea. Sci. Rep. 6, 30041.
576	Xu, J., He, Y., Chen, Z., Zhan, H., Wu, Y., Xie, J., Shang, X., Ning, D., Fang, W., Cai, S., 2020.
577	Observations of different effects of an anti-cyclonic eddy on internal solitary waves in the
578	South China Sea. Prog. Oceanogr., 188, 102422.
579	Kao T.W., Pan F.S., Renouard D., 1985. Internal solitons on the pycnocline: generation,
580	propagation, and shoaling and breaking over a slope. J. Fluid Mech., 159: 19-53.
581	Kozlov, I., Romanenkov, D., Zimin, A., Chapron, B., 2014. SAR observing large-scale nonlinear
582	internal waves in the White Sea. Remote Sens. Environ. 147, 99-107.
583	Lavrova, O., Mityagina, M., 2017. Satellite survey of internal waves in the Black and Caspian Seas.
584	Remote Sens. 9, 892.
585	Li, X., Jackson, C.R., Pichel, W.G., 2013. Internal solitary wave refraction at Dongsha Atoll, South
586	China Sea. Geophys. Res. Lett. 40, 3128-3132.

587	Li, X., Liu, B., Zheng, G., Ren, Y., Zhang, S., Liu, Y., Gao, L., Liu, Y., Zhang, B., Wang, F., 2020.
588	Deep-learning-based information mining from ocean remote-sensing imagery. Natl. Sci.
589	Rev. 7, 1584-1605.
590	Li, X., Zhao, Z., Pichel, W.G., 2008. Internal solitary waves in the northwestern South China Sea
591	inferred from satellite images. Geophys. Res. Lett. 35, L13605.
592	Lindsey, D.T., Nam, S., Miller, S.D., 2018. Tracking oceanic nonlinear internal waves in the
593	Indonesian seas from geostationary orbit. Remote Sens. Environ. 208, 202-209.
594	Liu, A.K., Chang, Y.S., Hsu, M.K., Liang, N.K., 1998. Evolution of nonlinear internal waves in
595	the East and South China Seas. J. Geophys. Res. Oceans 103, 7995-8008.
596	Liu, A.K., Hsu, M.K., 2004. Internal wave study in the South China Sea using Synthetic Aperture
597	Radar (SAR). Int. J. Remote Sens. 25, 1261-1264.
598	Liu, A.K., Ramp, S.R., Zhao, Y.H., Tang, T.Y., 2004. A case study of internal solitary wave
599	propagation during ASIAEX 2001. IEEE J. Ocean. Eng. 29, 1144-1156.
600	Liu, B., Yang, H., Zhao, Z., Li, X., 2014. Internal solitary wave propagation observed by tandem
601	satellites. Geophys. Res. Lett. 41, 2077-2085.
602	Liu, Y., Li, K., Ning, C., Yang, Y., Wang, H., Liu, J., Skhokiattiwong, S., Yu, W., 2018. Observed
603	seasonal variations of the upper ocean structure and air-sea interactions in the Andaman
604	Sea. J. Geophys. Res. Oceans 123, 922-938.
605	Marghany, M., 1999. Internal wave detection and wavelength estimation. In: IEEE 1999 Int.
606	Geosci. Remote Sen. Symp. 1999-June, 163-165.
	12
	40

607	Marghany, M., 2018. Automatic detection of internal wave using particle swarm optimization
608	algorithm. In: IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science. 2018-June,169
609	(1), 012049.
610	Marghany, M., 2021. Nonlinear Ocean Dynamics: Synthetic Aperture Radar, first ed. Elsevier.
611	Magalhaes, J., da Silva, J., 2018. Internal solitary waves in the Andaman Sea: new insights from
612	SAR imagery. Remote Sens. 10, 861.
613	Magalhaes, J., Pires, A., da Silva, J., Buijsman, M., Oliveira, P., 2021. Using SAR imagery to
614	survey internal solitary wave interactions: a case study off the Western Iberian shelf. Cont.
615	Shelf Res. 220, 104396.
616	Magalhaes, J.M., da Silva, J.C.B., Buijsman, M.C., 2020. Long lived second mode internal solitary
617	waves in the Andaman Sea. Sci. Rep. 10, 10234.
618	Osborne, A.R., Burch, T.L., 1980. Internal solitons in the Andaman Sea. Science 208, 451-460.
619	Pan, S.J., Yang, Q., 2009. A survey on transfer learning. IEEE T. Knowl. Data En. 22, 1345-1359.
620	Pan, X., Wang, J., Zhang, X., Mei, Y., Shi, L., Zhong, G., 2018. A deep-learning model for the
621	amplitude inversion of internal waves based on optical remote-sensing images. Int. J.
622	Remote Sens. 39, 607-618.
623	Ramp, S.R., Tang, T.Y., Duda, T.F., Lynch, J.F., Liu, A.K., Chiu, C.S., Bahr, F.L., Kim, H.R.,
624	Yang, Y.J., 2004. Internal solitons in the northeastern South China Sea. Part I: Sources and
625	deep water propagation. IEEE J. Ocean. Eng. 29, 1157-1181.
626	Scotti, A., Beardsley, R.C., Butman, B., Pineda, J., 2008. Shoaling of nonlinear internal waves in
627	Massachusetts Bay. J. Geophys. Res. Oceans 113, C08031.
	44

628	Serebryany, A., Khimchenko, E., Popov, O., Denisov, D., Kenigsberger, G., 2020. Internal waves
629	study on a narrow steep shelf of the Black Sea using the spatial antenna of line temperature
630	sensors. J. Mar. Sci. Eng. 8(11), 833.
631	Shroyer, E.L., Moum, J.N., Nash, J.D., 2011. Nonlinear internal waves over New Jersey's

- continental shelf. J. Geophys. Res. Oceans 116, C03022.
- 633 Small, J., Hallock, Z., Pavey, G., Scott, J., 1999. Observations of large amplitude internal waves at
 634 the Malin Shelf edge during SESAME 1995. Cont. Shelf Res. 19, 1389-1436.
- Tensubam, C.M., Raju, N.J., Dash, M.K., Barskar, H., 2021. Estimation of internal solitary wave
 propagation speed in the Andaman Sea using multi–satellite images. Remote Sens. Environ.
- 637 252, 112123.
- Touvron, H., Bojanowski, P., Caron, M., Cord, M., El-Nouby, A., Grave, E., Joulin, A., Synnaeve,
- G., Verbeek, J., Jégou, H., 2021. Resmlp: Feedforward networks for image classification
 with data-efficient training. arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03404.
- Wang, J., Zhang, M., Mei, Y., Lu, K., Chen, X., 2021. Study on inversion amplitude of internal
 solitary waves applied to shallow sea in the laboratory. IEEE Geosci. Remote. Sens. Lett.
 18, 577-581.
- Kue, J., Graber, H.C., Lund, B., Romeiser, R., 2012. Amplitudes estimation of large internal
 solitary waves in the Mid-Atlantic Bight using synthetic aperture radar and marine X-band
 radar images. IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sensing 51, 3250-3258.

647	Xue, J., Graber, H.C., Romeiser, R., Lund, B., 2014. Understanding internal wave-wave
648	interaction patterns observed in satellite images of the Mid-Atlantic Bight. IEEE Trans.
649	Geosci. Remote Sensing 52, 3211-3219.
650	Xu, Q., Zheng, Q., Lin, H., Liu, Y., Song, Y.T., Yuan, Y., 2008. Dynamical analysis of mesoscale
651	eddy-induced ocean internal waves using linear theories. Acta Oceanol. Sin. 27, 60-69.
652	Yang, Y.J., Fang, Y.C., Chang, M.H., Ramp, S.R., Kao, C.C., Tang, T.Y., 2009. Observations of
653	second baroclinic mode internal solitary waves on the continental slope of the northern
654	South China Sea. J. Geophys. Res. Oceans 114
655	Zhang, X., Wang, J., Sun, L., Meng, J., 2016. Study on the amplitude inversion of internal waves
656	at Wenchang area of the South China Sea. Acta Oceanol. Sin. 35(7), 14-19.
657	Zhang, M., Wang, J., Chen, X., Mei, Y., Zhang, X., 2019. An experimental study on the
658	characteristic pattern of internal solitary waves in optical remote-sensing images. Int. J.
659	Remote Sens. 40, 7017-7032.
660	Zhang, X., Li, X., 2021. Combination of satellite observations and machine learning method for
661	internal wave forecast in the Sulu and Celebes Seas. IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sensing
662	59, 2822-2832.
663	Zhang, X., Li, X., Zhang, T., 2020. Characteristics and generations of internal wave in the Sulu
664	Sea inferred from optical satellite images. J. Oceanol. Limnol. 38, 1435-1444.
665	Zhang, X., Li, X., Zheng, Q., 2021. A machine-learning model for forecasting internal wave
666	propagation in the Andaman Sea. IEEE J. Sel. Top. Appl. Earth Obs. Remote Sens. 14,
667	3095-3106.

668	Zhao, Z., Klemas, V., Zheng, Q., Li, X., Yan, X., 2004. Estimating parameters of a two-layer
669	stratified ocean from polarity conversion of internal solitary waves observed in satellite
670	SAR images. Remote Sens. Environ. 92, 276-287.
671	Zhao, Z., Liu, B., Li, X., 2014. Internal solitary waves in the China seas observed using satellite
672	remote-sensing techniques: a review and perspectives. Int. J. Remote Sens. 35, 3926-3946.
673	Zheng, G., Li, X., Zhang, R., Liu, B., 2020. Purely satellite data-driven deep learning forecast of
674	complicated tropical instability waves. Sci. Adv. 6, eaba1482.
675	Zheng, Q., Yuan, Y., Klemas, V., Yan, X., 2001. Theoretical expression for an ocean internal
676	soliton synthetic aperture radar image and determination of the soliton characteristic half
677	width. J. Geophys. Res. Oceans 106, 31415-31423.
678	Zubkova, E. V., Kozlov, I. E., 2020. Characteristics of short-period internal waves in the Chukchi
679	Sea based on spaceborne SAR observations. Sovrem. Probl. Distantsionnogo
680	Zondirovaniya Zemli iz Kosm. 17(4), 221-230.

List of Figure Captions

682	Fig. 1. Photo of the IW lab experiments and views of the two cameras.
683	Fig. 2. Observation of IWs in the Andaman Sea using MODIS images (upper) acquired on 11
684	March 2011 and corresponding filed observations (lower). The red dot in the MODIS image
685	represents the in-situ location. The solid black lines in the lower panel represent an isotherm of
686	25°C. The black arrow indicates the location of an IW.
687	Fig. 3. Histogram of the IW amplitude, month, time window between satellite observation and in-
688	situ observation, and the peak-to-peak distance of IWs in the collected in-situ dataset.
689	Fig. 4. Flowchart of the proposed transfer learning model to retrieve amplitude of IWs. The blue
690	arrows indicate the shortcut connections between different layers. The width of the Block 1 and
691	Block 2 modules is 64 (32) neurons for the inverse (bias correction) model. Two specially tailored
692	modifications, the short connection, and the bias correction are highlighted. The IW lab and in-situ
693	data were inputted into Input Layer 1, and the density information was inputted into Input Layer 2.
694	In the input layers, H is the water depth, h_1 is the depth of the upper layer, dp is the density
695	difference of upper and lower layer, PP is the IW PP distances extracted from the satellite images,
696	p_1 (p_2) is the density of the upper (lower) layer. In the insert figure, x indicates the layer input, y
697	indicates the layer output, w indicates the weight of the layer, and b indicates the bias of the layer.
698	Two different connection types are indicated with two red boxes.
699	Fig. 5. TLIAR Model performance on the training (a, c) and test (b, d) dataset before (a, b) and

700 after (c, d) bias correction. The solid black line indicates the 1-to-1 line.

701	Fig. 6. Absolute error and the relative error rate of the TLIAR model. The solid blue line indicates
702	the fitted line for the distribution, and the red shaded area indicates the 95% confidence interval.
703	Fig. 7. The relative error rate of the TLIAR model for different IW amplitude ranges.
704	Fig. 8. (a) Three IW packets observed by MODIS image taken on 19 August 2019; (b) three-
705	dimensional structure of IWs can be obtained with model predicted amplitudes and satellite-
706	observed PP distances with the KdV-type solutions. The underwater topography is also presented.
707	Fig. 9. Amplitude distributions (upper panel) of IWs estimated from satellite images using the
708	TLIAR model in the Andaman Sea and corresponding histograms (lower panel).
709	Fig. 10. The TLIAR model performance for PP distance input errors.
710	Fig. 11. Observation of IWs in the Andaman Sea using MODIS images (a) acquired at 06:59 on
711	27 March 2013 and the corresponding in-situ data (b). The red dot indicates the buoy location.
712	Fig. 12. MODIS image acquired on 28 August 2014 showing clear IW signatures in the South
713	China Sea. The red symbol indicates the in-situ observation location reported in Xu et al. (2020).
714	The insert map shows the extracted profiles indicated by the red solid line.
715	Fig. 13. Amplitude distributions (left) of IWs estimated using the TLIAR model in the Sulu Sea.
716	The black box indicates the SS3 station in Apel et al. (1985). The right panel shows the
717	corresponding IW amplitude histograms in the black box.