

PhyTracker: An Online Tracker for Phytoplankton

Yang Yu, Qingxuan Lv, Yuezun Li, *Member, IEEE*, Zhiqiang Wei, Junyu Dong, *Member, IEEE*,

Abstract—Phytoplankton, a crucial component of aquatic ecosystems, requires efficient monitoring to understand marine ecological processes and environmental conditions. Traditional phytoplankton monitoring methods, relying on non-in situ observations, are time-consuming and resource-intensive, limiting timely analysis. To address these limitations, we introduce PhyTracker, an intelligent in situ tracking framework designed for automatic tracking of phytoplankton. PhyTracker overcomes significant challenges unique to phytoplankton monitoring, such as constrained mobility within water flow, inconspicuous appearance, and the presence of impurities. Our method incorporates three innovative modules: a Texture-enhanced Feature Extraction (TFE) module, an Attention-enhanced Temporal Association (ATA) module, and a Flow-agnostic Movement Refinement (FMR) module. These modules enhance feature capture, differentiate between phytoplankton and impurities, and refine movement characteristics, respectively. Extensive experiments on the PMOT dataset validate the superiority of PhyTracker in phytoplankton tracking, and additional tests on the MOT dataset demonstrate its general applicability, outperforming conventional tracking methods. This work highlights key differences between phytoplankton and traditional objects, offering an effective solution for phytoplankton monitoring.

Index Terms—Phytoplankton Observing and Analysis, Object Tracking

I. INTRODUCTION

PHYTOPLANKTON is a general term for plant microorganisms, particularly referring to microalgae (see Fig. 1) [1]. Phytoplankton is a vital component of aquatic ecosystems, with their activities serving as key indicators for marine ecological processes and environmental conditions [2]. Consequently, monitoring phytoplankton holds significant importance in maintaining the stability of aquatic ecosystems, safeguarding water resources, and advancing scientific exploration [3].

Traditional efforts on monitoring phytoplankton mainly rely on the so-called *non-in situ observation* approach, that is to collect water samples and bring them back to the laboratory with manual observation [4]. This approach not only consumes considerable time and human resources but also fails to analyze phytoplankton timely. To overcome this limitation, we develop an intelligent tracking framework, called *PhyTracker*, that can be deployed on the ocean to monitor phytoplankton in a way of *in situ observations*. This framework is designed to automatically localize and categorize phytoplankton and then track them constantly observed in the microscope. The results can provide versatile information in monitoring phytoplankton, and can be utilized for further analysis such as density estimation, action recognition, pose estimation, etc.

Yuezun Li and Junyu Dong are *corresponding authors*.

Yang Yu, Qingxuan Lv, Yuezun Li, Zhiqiang Wei, and Junyu Dong are with the College of Computer Science and Technology, Ocean University of China, China. e-mail: (oucyuyang@stu.ouc.edu.cn; lvqingxuan@stu.ouc.edu.cn; liyuezun@ouc.edu.cn; weizhiqiang@ouc.edu.cn; dongjunyu@ouc.edu.cn).




Fig. 1. The pedestrian dataset (on the left) and the planktonic dataset (on the right) have different characteristics.

However, tracking phytoplankton is significantly more challenging compared to the scenario of tracking general objects on the ground, which mainly lies in the following three aspects:

- 1) **Inconspicuous appearance:** Phytoplankton commonly exhibit tiny sizes, light colors, erratic forms, and straight-forward textures. These characteristics significantly increase the challenge of identification than general objects on the ground.
- 2) **Complex monitor scenario:** The water samples usually contain impurities dispersed throughout the entire view of observation. These impurities look very similar to phytoplankton, posing challenges to the accurate monitoring of phytoplankton.
- 3) **Different monitor pipeline:** Tracking objects on the ground, particularly pedestrians and vehicles, typically utilizes general video cameras and is performed under a wild scenario. However, the pipeline of our task is notably different, which involves extracting water samples from the ocean and gradually passing them through the microscopes for analysis. Under this scenario, the mobility of phytoplankton is highly constrained, and their movement within this pipeline is mainly driven by water flow, resulting in a highly uniform trajectory of these phytoplankton.

These differences greatly limit the application of conventional tracking methods for ground monitoring to phytoplankton monitoring [5]–[7]. As such, developing a tracking framework devoted to this task is necessary.

In this paper, we conduct an in-depth analysis of the unique characteristics of phytoplankton and proposes a new method called *PhyTracker* devoted to accomplishing the tracking of phytoplankton. Our method achieves tracking in an online manner, which continuously track the phytoplankton alongside water flows with a meticulously designed architecture. Specifically, our method features three designs: **1)** Since the appearance of phytoplankton is inconspicuous, we describe a Texture-enhanced Feature Extraction (TFE) module to improve the capture of appearance features, with the incorporation of dilated

convolutions and SRM filters. **2)** Floating impurities likely disrupt the temporal association of phytoplankton, causing the chaotic target correlation between frames before and after the tracking process. To mitigate this, we propose an Attention-enhanced Temporal Association (ATA) module to tell apart phytoplankton and impurities. The core of this module is an attention mechanism, which can effectively associate corresponding features from consecutive frames, eliminating the interference caused by impurities. **3)** Trajectories are an important characteristic of phytoplankton. However, in our monitor pipeline, trajectories of phytoplankton are highly consistent, concealing the characteristic of phytoplankton movement. Therefore, we describe a Flow-agnostic Movement Refinement (FMR) module, which can recover the characteristics of each phytoplankton movement, making phytoplankton more discriminative.

Extensive experiments are conducted on a large-scale public phytoplankton tracking dataset (PMOT) [8], demonstrating the superiority of our method in tracking phytoplankton. Moreover, we validate our method on the general object tracking dataset (MOT) [9] in comparison to recent conventional tracking methods. The results surprisingly corroborate that our method can still outperform others.

The contributions of this paper can be summarized in three-fold:

- 1) We thoroughly examine the major differences between traditional objects (such as pedestrians and vehicles) and phytoplankton, highlighting three key aspects: different monitor pipelines, inconspicuous appearance, and complex monitor scenarios.
- 2) To address these challenges, we propose an online tracker with three key improvements: a Texture-enhanced Feature Extraction (TFE) module, an Attention-enhanced Temporal Association (ATA) module and a Flow-agnostic Movement Refinement (FMR) module. Each module is developed to handle corresponding challenge.
- 3) We conduct comprehensive experiments on both the phytoplankton dataset and the general object tracking dataset. The results demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed method, particularly in the context of phytoplankton tracking.

II. BACKGROUNDS AND RELATED WORKS

Phytoplankton. Phytoplankton are plant-like life forms (see Fig.1) that play an indispensable role in marine ecosystems. Through photosynthesis, they absorb carbon dioxide and release oxygen, providing a crucial source of oxygen for marine life, while also fixing carbon in organic matter [10]. When they die, some of the organic carbon settles to the ocean floor, forming sediments and participating in long-term carbon storage and the Earth's carbon cycle [11]. Phytoplankton are also the foundation of the marine food chain. They are consumed by zooplankton and other organisms, thereby supporting the entire marine ecosystem [12]. Additionally, phytoplankton play a role in regulating the global climate by modulating the reflectivity of the ocean surface, and by absorbing and releasing heat. They

also impact the chemical composition of the atmosphere, thus affecting atmospheric circulation and climate.

Monitoring Phytoplankton. Observing and real-time monitoring of phytoplankton species, density, and concentration have significant implications for humans and nature [13]–[15]. Firstly, changes in phytoplankton species and density can reflect the ecological health of water bodies. By monitoring phytoplankton, we can promptly detect abnormal changes in ecosystems and take appropriate measures [16]. Secondly, phytoplankton are very sensitive to environmental factors such as light, temperature, and carbon dioxide. Monitoring changes in phytoplankton can provide valuable data on climate change [17]. Moreover, phytoplankton form the base of the marine food chain. Their density and distribution directly affect the reproduction and survival of other marine organisms. By monitoring phytoplankton, fishery managers can predict the density and distribution of fish resources, thereby formulating more effective fishery management strategies [13]. Additionally, certain species of phytoplankton can proliferate under specific conditions, forming harmful algal blooms (such as red tides), which lead to oxygen depletion in water bodies, release toxins, and pose threats to aquatic life and human health. Real-time monitoring of phytoplankton can provide early warnings of harmful algal blooms, reducing their negative impacts [18].

Traditional monitoring methods, referred to as *non-in-situ observation*, involve the collection of water samples and their observation under microscopes by trained personnel [4], [19], [20]. However, these techniques require a lot of time and human resources and lack the ability for timely phytoplankton analysis. Recently, advancements in hardware have made *in-situ observation* feasible by integrating digital microscopes, flow pumps, and computational chips into a single device [21]. While this device shows promising potential for phytoplankton monitoring, the algorithms specifically dedicated to this task remains unexplored. Typically, tracking is the prerequisite task for monitoring phytoplankton. Given the tracking results, we can further analyze the activities of phytoplankton. However, existing tracking algorithms are designed for ground scenario. Compared to the ground scenario, tracking phytoplankton poses unique challenges due to the different monitor pipelines, the inconspicuous appearance of phytoplankton, and the complexity of monitoring scenario. Therefore, there is an urgent need to develop a devoted tracking framework for phytoplankton.

Object Tracking. The existing tracking methods are mainly designed for ground scenarios, focusing on tracking general objects such as vehicles and pedestrians [22]–[26]. To obtain the trajectory of objects, Object extraction, temporal association and motion prediction are three important aspects in multi-object tracking within video sequences. According to the tracking pipeline, existing methods can be divided into two categories: Offline tracking and Online tracking.

Offline Tracking. Offline tracking allows the use of information from subsequent frames and is formulated as a graph model for a globally optimal solution [27]–[29]. However, this setup makes it not suitable for practical applications due to its reliance on future frame data.

Online Tracking. Online multi-object tracking involves




Fig. 2. Overview of *PhyTracker*. *PhyTracker* receives the current frame picture and the previous frame picture at a time, as well as the trajectory information integrated from all previous frames, to assist in the tracking of the current frame.




Fig. 3. Each row displays the focus points of the algorithm on a single target only. The first column is the original image, the second column is DLA34+ByteTrack, and the third column is *PhyTracker*.

calculating the match between current object detection and existing trajectories based on the available data [30]–[33]. The nature of online tracking requires that the decision for each frame’s tracking outcome must rely solely on information from the current and previous frames. It is imperative that the algorithm cannot use the current frame’s data to alter the results of previous frames. Therefore, this paper focuses on the setting of online tracking.

III. MOTIVATION AND PRELIMINARY VALIDATION

The straightforward solution for tracking phytoplankton is to directly adapt existing tracking methods into this task. However, these methods are designed for ground scenarios and focus on tackling common challenges such as occlusions, target matching between frames, and camera jitters. Thus they do not align with the scenario of phytoplankton in aquatic environments. Unlike conventional tracking targets such as pedestrian and vehicles, phytoplankton exhibits significant

differences in data characteristics, including their unique low-contrast color features, the stark contrast between aquatic and ground environments, and their distinct movement patterns compared to other organisms. These differences significantly hinder the application of existing methods to phytoplankton monitoring. To validate this, we adopt the recent tracking methods ByteTrack [34] to our task. As shown in Fig. 3, it can be seen that the generated attention heatmaps of ByteTrack can hardly concentrate on the phytoplankton, indicating the infeasibility of directly adopting existing tracking methods.

IV. METHOD

This paper describes an online tracker, *PhyTracker*, devoted to monitoring phytoplankton. Compared to existing tracking methods, our method features three major improvements. First, we introduce a Texture-enhanced Feature Extraction (TFE) module to enhance the appearance distinction of phytoplankton. This improvement enables the phytoplankton becoming more detectable. Second, we propose an Attention-enhanced Temporal Association (ATA) module, which optimizes the feature distances between targets in adjacent frames, enhancing the capacity of model to distinguish between similar phytoplankton, as well as impurities and phytoplankton. Furthermore, we introduce a Flow-agnostic Movement Refinement (FMR) module, which effectively reduces feature confusion from similar motion trajectories between different tracking entities and preserves original movement offset information, thereby enhancing sensitivity to individual movement characteristics. These three improvements correspond to solving the three difficulties in phytoplankton monitoring, as described in Sec.1.

A. Problem Setup

Denote a video sequence with total N frames as $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{I}_t\}_{t=1}^N$, where $\mathcal{I}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times w \times 3}$ refers to the t -th frame. Suppose this video sequence contains \mathcal{D} phytoplankton. The goal of




Fig. 4. We use three consecutive SIE modules (Semantic Information Extraction module) to extract semantic feature. The core of the SIE network is the SRM filter.

our method is to output the trajectories of all phytoplankton $\{\mathcal{T}_i\}_{i=1}^D$ within the video sequence \mathcal{V} . The i -th trajectory is a collection of bounding boxes at corresponding frames and its class label, defined as $\mathcal{T}_i = \{(b_{i,t_1}, \dots, b_{i,t_N}), y_i\}$, where b_{i,t_j} is the bounding box of i -th phytoplankton at temporal index t_j , t_N is the length of trajectory and y_i represents category.

B. Framework Workflow

The workflow of our method is inspired by TraDes [35]. Given a frame \mathcal{I}_t , it is first passed into Texture-enhanced Feature Extraction (TFE) module to extract appearance features of phytoplankton as $f^t \in \mathbb{R}^{\frac{h}{4} \times \frac{w}{4} \times 64}$. Then the feature of current frame f^t and the one of previous frame f^{t-1} are sent into the Attention-enhanced Temporal Association (ATA) module, to build the correlations between these two features. Based on the correlations, ATA can predict the movement offsets of phytoplankton. Then the movement offsets are forwarded into Flow-agnostic Movement Refinement (FMR) module, which eliminates the effect of water flows and fuses the knowledge from previous frames into the head network for final prediction.

C. Texture-enhanced Feature Extraction

Phytoplankton often exhibit appearance similar to their natural aquatic environments, making it difficult for traditional methods to capture discriminative features. In light of this, we propose a Texture-enhanced Feature Extraction (TFE) module to enhance feature extraction of phytoplankton (see Fig. 4). Inspired by [36], [37], this module extracts the noise information combined with semantic information to enrich the representation of phytoplankton features. Specifically, to amplify the subtle textures, we employ dilated convolutions [38] to expand the receptive field without increasing computational load. Then several SIE blocks are proposed to refine the features. SIE block is composed of convolution layers and SRM layers. SRM filters were originally designed to address the issues of image denoising and edge preservation in image processing. Under the microscope, there are situations where the flow image is unclear and there are many impurities. In response to this, we have modified the SRM filter to match the effectiveness of extracting additional information from phytoplankton data.

The SRM layer is three 5×5 convolutional kernels with fixed values that remain unchanged, the kernels are:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & -4 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 2 & -2 & 2 & -1 \\ 2 & -6 & 8 & -6 & 2 \\ -2 & 8 & -12 & 8 & -2 \\ 2 & -6 & 8 & -6 & 2 \\ -1 & 2 & -2 & 2 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 8 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

The features from SIE blocks are then integrated with the original images, which are sent into a DLA34 network [39]. This module can reveal differences in textures between phytoplankton and the aquatic environment, which are not easily observable in the RGB space.

D. Attention-enhanced Temporal Association

Effectively associating the features of phytoplankton across frames is crucial for accurate tracking results. However, temporal association in our task is challenging, due to the widespread impurities in observing scenario and similar-appearance phytoplankton of different types.

To address this issue, we propose an Attention-enhanced Temporal Association (ATA) module, which is designed to effectively find the feature association of same target across consecutive frames. The core of this module is a newly proposed Two-Stage Cross-Attention (TSCA) operations based on existing self-attention mechanism [40], [41]. As shown in Fig. 5, the first stage is a feature refinement block, which enhances the features of current frame f^t and previous frame f^{t-1} . Then the enhanced features are executed a cross-attention operation to model the temporal associations.

Specifically, in the first stage, the feature f^{t-1} is sent into the CP and CB modules, and then added with f^{t-1} for refinement. Different from f^{t-1} , the feature f^t is separately processed by Conv and CP modules, and calculates attention by matrix multiplication. The multiplication result is then sent into CB block, and perform residual connection with f^t for refinement. In the second stage, the refined features are performed similar operations. But the difference is that we performance cross-attention operations to obtain the intermediate feature ω^t . Let Q represent query features obtained from f^{t-1} , and K, V represent key and value features obtained from f^t . Inspired by [41], the cross-attention operation can be defined as

$$\text{CA}(Q, K, V) = \phi_q(Q)(\phi_k(K)^T V), \quad (2)$$

where ϕ_q and ϕ_k are the normalization functions for query and key features, implementing by normalization methods:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_q(Q) &= \text{softmax}_{row}(Q) \\ \phi_k(K) &= \text{softmax}_{col}(K), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

note that softmax_{row} , softmax_{col} denotes the application of the softmax function along each row or column of the corresponding input.

It is important to note that the feature ω^t represents a feature that enhances the association of the same tracking target in the current frame feature f^t and the past frame feature f^{t-1} .




Fig. 5. We take the basic features of three consecutive frames as input and output the similarity information between frames.




Fig. 6. Each line in the graph represents the similarity between points.




Fig. 7. The figure shows the calculation process of generating offsets from the Similarity Map, and the generated offsets are stored in the \mathcal{O}_t in FMR.

Inspired by [35], we then seek the similarity between adjacent features ω^{t-1} and ω^t to obtain higher level associations. These two features are sent into a convolution block σ and then perform matrix multiplication with each other to create a four-dimensional similarity matrix $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{h' \times w' \times h' \times w'}$, where $h' = \frac{h}{8}$, $w' = \frac{w}{8}$. The element $\mathcal{S}(i, j, k, l)$ denotes the similarity between the location of (i, j) in the current frame t and the location of (k, l) in the previous frame $t-1$ (see Fig. 6).

Based on this similarity matrix \mathcal{S} , we can generate the offset information following [35]. As shown in Fig. 7, for a phytoplankton centered at the location of (i, j) in the current frame t , we can fetch its two-dimensional similarity map $\mathcal{C}_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{h' \times w'}$ from matrix \mathcal{S} . This similarity map $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ stores the similarities among the phytoplankton and all locations in the previous frame $t-1$. To calculate the offset, $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ is first max pooled by $1 \times w'$ and $h' \times 1$ kernels and then normalized by a softmax function to obtain two vectors, $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}^X \in [0, 1]^{1 \times w'}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}^Y \in [0, 1]^{h' \times 1}$, respectively. These two vectors represent the likelihood of this phytoplankton appearing on horizontal and vertical locations in frame t . Then we create two offset templates $\mathcal{T}_{i,j}^X \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times w'}$, $\mathcal{T}_{i,j}^Y \in \mathbb{R}^{h' \times 1}$ in the horizontal and vertical directions, respectively, which are calculated by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{i,j}^X(l) &= (l - j) \times s, \quad 1 \leq l \leq w' \\ \mathcal{T}_{i,j}^Y(k) &= (k - i) \times s, \quad 1 \leq k \leq h' \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where s is the feature stride of ω_s^t . $\mathcal{T}_{i,j}^X(l)$ refers to the horizontal offset when the phytoplankton appears at the location of $(:, l)$ in frame $t-1$. Let $\mathcal{O}_t = [\mathcal{O}_t^X, \mathcal{O}_t^Y]$ be the offset information, containing the horizontal and vertical offsets respectively. Each offset can be inferred by the dot product between the likelihoods and actual offset values as

$$\mathcal{O}_t^X = \mathcal{C}_{i,j}^X \mathcal{T}_{i,j}^X, \quad \mathcal{O}_t^Y = \mathcal{C}_{i,j}^Y \mathcal{T}_{i,j}^Y. \quad (5)$$

By applying this offset information, we can obtain the temporal association between the previous frame and the current frame. This offset information is then sent into the third module FMR to eliminate the impact of displacement caused by phytoplankton in the past frames.

E. Flow-agnostic Movement Refinement

The motion characteristics of phytoplankton under this scenario are mainly driven by water currents, exhibiting




Fig. 8. The interior of the dashed line represents the FMR module at frame t , while the rest represents external variables.

highly consistent movement trajectory characteristics within the pipeline. This phenomenon may lead to an undue reduction of feature differences of different phytoplankton classes, degrading the tracking performance.

To this end, we propose a Flow-agnostic Movement Refinement (FMR) module (see Fig. 8). This module aims to eliminate the effect of similar motion trajectories caused by water flow and amplify the differentiation between different phytoplankton individuals at the feature level. To achieve this, we need to first estimate the movement of water flow. Since the movement of all phytoplankton is driven by water flow, we can average the movement of all phytoplankton over all frames to represent water movement. Nevertheless, our framework is running online, which means it is impossible to access the future frames. To compensate, we maintain an offset memory bank and store the offset O_t constantly. Then we can average the offset in the bank as $\lambda_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum (O_t + \dots + O_0)$. In the current frame t , we subtract λ from the offset O_t to obtain the movement characteristics of phytoplankton, which serves as an extra feature added with the original offset O_t to form flow-agnostic feature Ω_t . This process can be written as $\Omega_t = 2O_t - \lambda_t$.

Then we propagate the features \mathcal{H}^{t-1} from the previous frame to the current refined offset Ω_t using a deformable convolution [42], inspired by [35]. The feature \mathcal{H}^{t-1} is calculated as

$$\mathcal{H}^{t-1} = \omega^{t-1} \circ \mathcal{P}^{t-1}, \quad (6)$$

where \circ is the Hadamard product, \mathcal{P}^{t-1} is the class-agnostic center heatmap produced from the head network (we use the same head network as CenterNet [43]).

V. EXPERIMENTS

A. Experimental Settings

Datasets. Our method is validated on two public datasets, PMOT [8] and MOT [9].

- 1) The PMOT dataset is a synthetic dataset specifically designed for phytoplankton tracking tasks, encompassing a total of 21 categories. It simulates video footage of plankton observed in flowing pipes under a microscope, making it the first synthetic dataset of its kind. Tracking phytoplankton in real-world environments involves much more complex scenes compared to laboratory settings.

Therefore, we expanded our dataset to simulate the presence of noise found in real-world scenarios. The phytoplankton dataset we use is derived from modifications to the PMOT2023 dataset. We integrated data collected over the years from our laboratory, selecting the most suitable portions for inclusion. Based on this, we applied transformations such as occlusions, gray processing, blurring and salt-and-pepper noise to simulate complex underwater environmental conditions. Depending on the degree of added noise, we classified the entire phytoplankton dataset into three difficulty levels: no noise for easy difficulty; a lower degree of noise for medium difficulty; and a higher degree of noise for hard difficulty. As shown in Fig. 9. This allowed us to validate the model's generalization capabilities under more realistic conditions. The entire dataset consists of 9 original video segments and 63 noise-added video segments, with the length of the transformed videos matching that of the original videos. The composition of the dataset is shown in Table I. The ablation studies were evaluated using the phytoplankton dataset.

- 2) To fully demonstrate the effectiveness of our method, we conducted experiments on the MOT dataset, a widely recognized benchmark in the field of multi-object tracking. The MOT dataset is designed to present a range of complex scenarios, including busy streets, shopping malls, parks, and other environments, and is provided by the MOT Challenge organization. The MOT17 dataset includes annotations for the training set but does not provide annotations for the test set; performance metrics can only be obtained by uploading the tracking results to the MOTChallenge website for evaluation. In our experiments with the MOT17 dataset, we performed an overall algorithm evaluation using only the training set. Specifically, we divided the training set into two halves: one half was used for training, and the other half was used for testing.

Evaluation Metrics. Following previous methods [35], we employ CLEAR-MOT metrics [44] to evaluate the tracking performance. This metric consists of various indicators, including MOTA, IDF1, IDs, FP, FN. The explanation of each indicator is introduced as follows:

- MOTA is a comprehensive evaluation metric used to measure the overall performance of a tracker across the entire dataset;
- IDF1 measures a tracker's ability to maintain correct identity labels throughout an entire sequence;
- False Positives (FP) refer to instances where the tracking algorithm erroneously detects the presence of a target that does not exist in reality;
- False Negatives (FN) refer to instances where the tracking algorithm fails to detect a target that is actually present;
- Identity switches (IDs) occur when the tracking algorithm mistakenly changes the identifier of a target during the tracking process.

Among these indicators, MOTA and IDF1 stand out as the most important for evaluating tracking performance.

TABLE I
DURING TRAINING, WE ONLY USE THE ORIGINAL IMAGES FROM THE TRAINING SET FOR TRAINING.

Number of Frame Images		TRAIN			VAL			TEST		
State	Total number	Video 1	Video 2	Video 3	Video 1	Video 2	Video 3	Video 1	Video 2	Video 3
initial	36000	9000	9000	9000	1800	1800	1800	1200	1200	1200
noise	252000	63000	63000	63000	12600	12600	12600	8400	8400	8400




Fig. 9. The three rows represent easy, medium, and hard difficulty levels, with no noise added in the easy level. Each column represents a type of added noise, with no gray processing present in moderate difficulty.

TABLE II
PERFORMANCE OF DIFFERENT ALGORITHMS ON THE NO-NOISE PHYTOPLANKTON DATASET.

Method	IDF1 \uparrow	MOTA \uparrow	FP \downarrow	FN \downarrow	IDs \downarrow
Sort (ICIP'16) [45]	69.3	55.4	171	3829	392
DeepSort (ICIP'17) [46]	24.7	39.1	1906	4032	53
DeepMot (CVPR'20) [47]	16.9	40.8	2038	3737	52
TraDeS (CVPR'21) [35]	85.4	78.3	417	1641	81
BotSort (Arxiv'22) [48]	57.9	40.0	594	5239	70
ByteTrack (ECCV'22) [34]	84.6	71.8	588	2183	2
UAVMot (CVPR'22) [49]	83.2	69.7	601	2375	11
StrongSort (TMM'23) [50]	48.3	37.0	792	4612	794
UCMCTrack (AAAI'24) [51]	61.2	56.4	153	2467	425
BoostTrack (MVA'24) [52]	86.4	75.6	306	1746	6
TLTDMOT (CVPR'24) [53]	85.2	74.3	307	1557	46
<i>PhyTracker</i>	88.4	80.8	356	1482	55

Implementation Details. For training, the input image size was uniformly adjusted to 860×640 , and the learning rate was decreased at the 40th and 50th epochs. We utilized the DLA34 network [39] for feature extraction and trained on a single 4080 GPU for 60 epochs, with a batch size set to 5 and an initial learning rate of 2.5×10^{-4} . In the inference phase, the tracking confidence threshold was set to 0.4, the input image size was set to 640×960 , and input was based on the previous two consecutive frames simultaneously. In the comparative analysis of tracking-by-detection approaches, CenterNet is consistently utilized as the detection framework, with DLA34 serving as its backbone architecture. The remaining parts follow the default settings of TraDeS [35].

To enhance generalization capabilities and prevent overfitting, we incorporated data augmentation into our training process with a certain probability for each set of data. The primary techniques used include flipping, cropping, scaling, and translating, among others. Regarding training duration, both our method and the comparison method adhere to the same number of training epochs, which is 60. When training *PhyTracker*, we standardized the input image size to 860×640 and reduced the learning rate at the 40th and 50th epochs.

We use the general objectives as in [35], which is defined

as $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{det}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{mask}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{CVA}}$, where \mathcal{L}_{det} is the detection loss [43], $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mask}}$ is the instance segmentation loss [54], and a ReID loss [55].

Compared Methods. To ensure the thoroughness of our experiments, we selected several methods with differing focuses for comparative analysis: SORT [45], DeepSORT [46], StrongSORT [50], BotSORT [48], DeepMOT [47], ByteTrack [34], and UAVMOT [49]. The introduction of each method is as follows:

- SORT (ICIP'16) [45]: SORT is a simple and real-time multi-object tracking algorithm that uses a Kalman filter and the Hungarian algorithm for data association, significantly enhancing tracking accuracy and speed.
- DeepSORT (ICIP'17) [46]: DeepSORT is an algorithm that builds upon SORT by incorporating ReID (Re-identification) and appearance features of detection boxes. It utilizes a Matching Cascade approach to reduce the number of target ID switches.
- DeepMOT (CVPR'20) [47]: DeepMOT introduces a deep Hungarian network that uses dual bidirectional recurrent neural networks (BRNN) [56] to convey global information within the cost matrix. Its loss function is designed based on two differentiable evaluation metrics, which optimize the network's output allocation matrix to enhance accuracy.
- TraDeS (CVPR'21) [35]: TraDeS is an online joint detection and tracking model that utilizes tracking cues to aid in end-to-end detection. It infers target tracking offsets from cost measures, which are used to propagate previous target features to improve current target detection and segmentation.
- BotSORT (Arxiv'22) [48]: BotSORT integrates the advantages of motion and appearance information with camera motion compensation and a more precise Kalman filter state vector, achieving accurate tracking results.
- ByteTrack (ECCV'22) [34]: ByteTrack employs a multi-match approach during tracking. It initially matches

TABLE III

GRAY PROCESSING IS NOT APPLIED IN THE MEDIUM DIFFICULTY LEVEL. IN THE HARD DIFFICULTY LEVEL OF GRAY PROCESSING, WE CONVERT ALL IMAGES TO GRAYSCALE. IN THE TABLE BELOW, IF THE VALUE OF THE MOTA METRIC IS LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO 0, IT IS REPRESENTED BY "-".

MOTA	EASY	MEDIUM			HARD			
	NONE	Occlusion	Blurring	Salt and Pepper	Occlusion	Gray Processing	Blurring	Salt and Pepper
Sort (ICIP'16) [45]	55.4	28.5	43.0	0.7	18.5	12.4	18.4	0.3
DeepSort (ICIP'17) [46]	39.1	-	24.1	-	-	-	-	-
DeepMot (CVPR'20) [47]	40.8	2.8	32.3	0.2	-	-	-	-
TraDeS (CVPR'21) [35]	78.3	52.0	44.1	0.7	45.1	27.5	-	-
BotSort (Arxiv'22) [48]	40.0	16.4	9.5	0.3	9.7	9.5	-	-
ByteTrack (ECCV'22) [34]	71.8	36.2	56.8	1.1	24.4	17.1	12.1	0.5
UAVMot (CVPR'22) [49]	69.7	35.7	57.0	1.1	24.7	17.8	12.7	0.6
StrongSort (TMM'23) [50]	37.0	27.0	35.1	0.9	3.2	10.5	-	0.2
UCMCTrack (AAAI'24) [51]	56.4	11.5	31.3	0.1	8.6	15.3	-	-
BoostTrack (MVA'24) [52]	75.6	44.5	58.6	1.3	36.4	28.1	26.1	0.6
TLTDMOT (CVPR'24) [53]	74.3	45.0	54.2	0.9	32.6	17.7	17.7	-
<i>PhyTracker</i>	80.8	52.4	53.2	1.4	45.4	31.9	24.9	0.8

TABLE IV

IN MOT17, *PhyTracker* OUTPERFORMS TRADES IN IDF1, MOTA, AND FN METRICS.

Method	IDF1 \uparrow	MOTA \uparrow	FP \downarrow	FN \downarrow	IDs \downarrow
TraDeS [35]	58.2	51.8	1091	2554	38
<i>PhyTracker</i>	60.4	53.6	1123	2465	41

high-scoring detection boxes with existing tracks, then matches lower-scoring boxes with tracks that were not matched in the first round, addressing the scenario of object occlusions. Additionally, it solely uses the Kalman filter and Hungarian algorithm, eliminating the need for a ReID model.

- UAVMOT (CVPR'22) [49]: UAVMOT is an algorithm for drone viewpoints, based on improvements over FairMOT. It incorporates three key components: an ID feature update module, an adaptive motion filter, and gradient balanced focal loss. These enhancements respectively strengthen the reID feature connections between adjacent frames, address the complex motion in drone video footage, and optimize the training of heatmaps.
- StrongSORT (TMM'23) [50]: StrongSORT has made a series of improvements over DeepSORT, such as improving the appearance feature extractor, introducing an inertia term to smooth feature updates, utilizing a Kalman filter designed for nonlinear motion, and adding a cost matrix that incorporates motion information.
- UCMCTrack (AAAI'24) [51]: In multi-object tracking, irregular camera motion has always been a challenge. This is because the rapid movement of the camera can cause abrupt changes in the positions of the objects in the frame, making it difficult to associate them with their past trajectories. UCMCTrack establishes a connection between the motion state of the objects and the ground in the image. It employs a mapped Mahalanobis Distance as an alternative to IoU to measure the similarity between

the objects and their trajectories.

- BoostTrack (MVA'24) [52]: Handling unreliable detections and avoiding identity switches are crucial for the success of multi-object tracking. BoostTrack incorporates a confidence score for detection tracklets and utilizes it to scale the similarity measure. To reduce ambiguities caused by using IoU, BoostTrack proposes a novel addition of Mahalanobis distance and shape similarity to enhance the overall similarity measure.
- TLTDMOT (CVPR'24) [53]: TLTDMOT introduces a series of strategies to address the long-tail distribution problem in the field of multi-object tracking. These strategies include two data augmentation techniques, namely Static Camera Viewpoint Augmentation and Dynamic Camera Viewpoint Augmentation. Additionally, TLTDMOT incorporates a Group Softmax module for re-identification purposes.

These methods include both tracking by detection and end-to-end tracking approaches. Their improvement directions vary, with some focusing on filtering detection boxes and some on addressing camera shake issues. All these methods are trained and tested under a same configuration with our method.

B. Experimental Analysis

We evaluated 12 different methods on the phytoplankton dataset and the MOT17 dataset. For detailed metrics of the testing performance of the twelve methods on the phytoplankton dataset without noise, refer to Table II. MOTA and IDF1 metrics reflect the overall tracking performance, while FN and FP indicate detection performance. Among the five evaluation metrics, *PhyTracker* achieved the best results in IDF1, MOTA, and FN. Our ratings in FP and IDs are also better than most algorithms. The overall comparison results in the phytoplankton dataset are illustrated in Table III. *PhyTracker* achieved the best results in the dataset under noise-free conditions, as well as in scenarios with added noise, including occlusion, gray




Fig. 10. Each row in the figure represents four consecutive frames. The first row is *PhyTracker*, the second row is *ByteTrack*, and the third row is *UCMCTrack*. The category names from top to bottom are: *sanguinea*, *chaetoceros curvisetus*, *cladocera*, *sanguinea*, *eucampia zooidicus*.

processing and salt-and-pepper noise. In the blurring data, *PhyTracker* performs slightly worse than *BoostTrack* [52]. This is because the blurring process degrades the image quality, leading to poorer feature extraction by the network. End-to-end algorithms like *PhyTracker* directly track using the extracted features, making them more susceptible to the effects of blurring. In contrast, tracking-by-detection algorithms like *BoostTrack* first generate bounding boxes and then pass them to the tracking component for further processing. During this process, bounding boxes with low confidence are not completely discarded, which reduces the impact of blurring on tracking-by-detection algorithms. In contrast to earlier methods such as *DeepSort* [46], our approach employs an end-to-end model, eliminating reliance on detection accuracy. Unlike recent methods like *TLDMOT* [53], *PhyTracker* focuses more on the unique characteristics of phytoplankton data. By enhancing the feature representation and association of phytoplankton while mitigating the impact of moving features on overall recognition, *PhyTracker* consistently outperforms other methods.

To represent the differences between *PhyTracker* and other methods, we tested the data without added noise using *PhyTracker*, *ByteTrack* [34] and *UCMCTrack* [51], with the results shown in Fig. 10. As evident from the comparison, mainstream multi-object tracking methods do not perform well on phytoplankton data. The tracking performance of *PhyTracker*, *ByteTrack*, and *UCMCTrack* under occlusion conditions is shown in Fig. 11. After adding occlusion, the performance of *ByteTrack* and *UCMCTrack* decreased, but *PhyTracker* still performed well. Compared to these two methods, *PhyTracker*, which relies on the FMR module capable of associating all previous frames, is better suited for tracking

plankton under more challenging conditions.

We conducted a comparison between *TraDeS* [35] and *PhyTracker* in MOT17 dataset, with the results illustrated in the provided Table IV. Training under the same conditions, *PhyTracker* performs better than *TraDeS*. This indicates that our improvements based on the characteristics of phytoplankton are still effective in pedestrian data, especially regarding the strategies for feature enhancement and strengthened association for tracking objects.

TABLE V
WE TESTED THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE THREE MODULES UNDER DIFFERENT EMBEDDING SCENARIOS, VALIDATING THE EFFICACY OF EACH MODULE.

Scheme	TFE	ATA	FMR	IDF1 \uparrow	MOTA \uparrow
1 Baseline				85.4	78.3
2	✓			87.2	80.2
3	✓	✓		87.2	80.4
4	✓		✓	87.5	80.5
5		✓	✓	86.7	79.5
6 <i>PhyTracker</i>	✓	✓	✓	88.4	80.8

C. Ablation Study

In this section, we validate the effectiveness of *PhyTracker* through ablation studies. All experiments were conducted on the phytoplankton dataset and its noise-augmented sections. To ensure a fair evaluation of each component's performance, our training and testing details are consistent with those described in the Implementation Details section above. When testing a specific module, no changes were made to the remaining modules. Compared to *TraDeS*, *PhyTracker* focuses




Fig. 11. Each row in the figure shows four consecutive frames: the first row is *PhyTracker*, the second row is *ByteTrack*, and the third row is *UCMTrack*. The category names from top to bottom are: *sanguinea*, *skeletonema*, *thalassionema nitzschioides*, *protoperidinium*, *tintinnid*.

more on the feature representation, enhanced association, and trajectory influence of plankton. We implemented these aspects respectively in TFE, ATA, and FMR. To verify the effectiveness of the three modules we proposed, we conducted five sets of experiments. These involved incorporating only TFE under the same conditions, adding both TFE and ATA, adding both TFE and FMR, adding both ATA and FMR, and finally integrating all three modules. As shown in the Table V, there is a noticeable increase in scores after incorporating each module, compared to the baseline alone. With all three modules integrated, in comparison to the baseline, MOTA and IDF1 scores increased by 2.5% and 3%, respectively.

Effect of TFE. We tested the effectiveness of the TFE module details using phytoplankton data and conducted three sets of experiments for comparison:

1) *Study on SRM Filters.* In the TFE module, we employed three fixed SRM convolutional kernels for detecting weak edges, strong edges, and sharpening, respectively. As shown in Eq. 1. To validate the effectiveness of this combination, we compared it with another set of three fixed commonly used SRM convolutional kernels: horizontal edge detection, vertical edge detection, and sharpening. The results are shown in Table VI. Compared to commonly used SRM convolution kernels, the improved SRM convolution kernel we use has improved IDF1 and MOTA metrics by 1.9% and 1.2%, respectively. The commonly used convolution kernels for comparison are as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & -2 & -4 & -2 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 & 4 & 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ -4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 9 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

TABLE VI
MODE1 IS OURS, AND MODE2 IS ANOTHER SET OF CONVOLUTIONAL KERNELS USED FOR COMPARISON.

<i>PhyTracker</i>	Mode1	Mode2	IDF1 \uparrow	MOTA \uparrow
SRM		✓	86.5	79.6
SRM	✓		88.4	80.8

2) *Study on TFE module.* To validate the significant effectiveness of the TFE module on phytoplankton data, we conducted a comparison using the CBAM module, which integrates channel and spatial attention mechanisms. In this experiment, we replaced the TFE module in the model with the CBAM module, keeping all other parts unchanged. Using the TFE module compared to the CBAM module improved IDF1 and MOTA by 3.1% and 2.7%, respectively. As shown in the Table VII. Compared to other commonly used modules, the TFE module has advantages in extracting plankton features due to its unique structure and specifically designed SRM.

TABLE VII
THE FIRST LINE INDICATES THE USE OF CBAM, AND THE SECOND LINE INDICATES THE USE OF TFE.

Baseline+ATA+FMR	CBAM	TFE	IDF1 \uparrow	MOTA \uparrow
+	✓		85.3	78.1
+		✓	88.4	80.8

3) *Study on SIE module.* In the TFE module, we utilize the SIE module to extract semantic information and enhance the feature representation of tracking targets. To validate the effectiveness of the SIE module, we removed it from the TFE module and conducted training under the same conditions. The results, as shown in the Table VIII, indicate that after

removing the SIE module, the IDF1 and MOTA scores dropped by 1.4% and 0.9%, respectively. Compared to using backbone network alone for image feature extraction in TraDeS, the SIE module first employs 3×3 convolutions and SRM convolutions to extract semantic information specific to phytoplankton. This enriched information is then passed into the backbone network for further feature extraction, resulting in more comprehensive corresponding features.

TABLE VIII

WE REMOVED THE SIE SUB-MODULE FROM THE TFE MODULE WHILE KEEPING ALL OTHER CONDITIONS UNCHANGED TO VERIFY THE EFFECT OF SIE.

<i>PhyTracker</i>	SIE	IDF1 \uparrow	MOTA \uparrow
TFE	×	87.0	79.9
TFE	✓	88.4	80.8

Effect of ATA. In the ATA module, we refine the past frame feature f^{t-1} to compute query, and refine the current frame feature f^t to compute key and value. Attention computation is then performed in the second layer. To verify the effectiveness of this structure, we conducted two sets of experiments. **1)** The overall structure is modified to sequentially perform attention computation twice, with the input to the second layer being the single tensor output from the first layer. **2)** We exchanged the query, key, and value calculated for the past and current frames. As shown in Table IX, after altering the structure, the IDF1 and MOTA scores dropped by 1.1% and 0.4%, respectively. After swapping the variables corresponding to the two frames, the IDF1 and MOTA scores dropped by 2.0% and 0.7%, respectively. This indicates that simply applying or stacking transformer does not effectively suit the application of phytoplankton data and can cause the algorithm's focus to shift. To eliminate this bias, we first refine the features of each frame and then apply attention calculations only to the refined features, thereby minimizing the influence of non-tracking targets as much as possible.

TABLE IX

EXP1 CORRESPONDS TO **1)**, EXP2 CORRESPONDS TO **2)**, AND EXP3 IS OUR METHOD.

<i>PhyTracker</i>	Exp1	Exp2	Exp3	IDF1 \uparrow	MOTA \uparrow
ATA	✓			87.3	80.4
ATA		✓		86.4	80.1
ATA			✓	88.4	80.8

Effect of FMR. To verify the necessity of the dual-branch structure in the FMR module and the rationality of its computational design, we conducted two sets of experiments. **1)** We removed the tracking offset branch for the current frame, retaining only the branch used to eliminate past motion characteristics. **2)** We modified the matrix calculation for removing past characteristics, specifically changing the calculation of memory offset to $\lambda_t = \mathcal{O}_t + \lambda_{t-1}$. Removing one branch resulted in IDF1 and MOTA scores dropping by 1.0% and 0.5%, respectively. After modifying the matrix calculation, IDF1 and MOTA scores dropped by 0.4% and 0.3%, respectively. As shown in Table X, When we remove the tracking offset of the

current frame, the tracker's performance significantly declines due to the lack of this feature. However, unreasonable feature fusion can also negatively impact the tracker. Our method has achieved optimal results overall.

TABLE X

EXP1 CORRESPONDS TO **1)**, EXP2 CORRESPONDS TO **2)**, AND EXP3 IS OUR METHOD.

<i>PhyTracker</i>	Exp1	Exp2	Exp3	IDF1 \uparrow	MOTA \uparrow
FMR	✓			87.4	80.3
FMR		✓		88.0	80.5
FMR			✓	88.4	80.8

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we develop PyTracker, an intelligent in situ tracking framework to address the critical challenges of phytoplankton monitoring. Unlike traditional non-in situ methods, PyTracker offers an automated and timely solution for monitoring phytoplankton, thereby enhancing the efficiency and accuracy of ecosystem analysis. Confronting difficulties in this task, including their constrained mobility, inconspicuous appearance, and the presence of impurities in water samples, our method proposes three novel modules: the Texture-enhanced Feature Extraction (TFE) module for improved feature capture, the Attention-enhanced Temporal Association (ATA) module for distinguishing phytoplankton from impurities, and the Flow-agnostic Movement Refinement (FMR) module for refining movement characteristics. These innovations collectively enhance the tracking performance and reliability of the system.

Through extensive experiments on the PMOT dataset, PyTracker has demonstrated superior performance in tracking phytoplankton. Moreover, our method has shown its versatility and effectiveness on the MOT dataset, surpassing conventional tracking methods. This work not only underscores the importance of tailored tracking solutions for aquatic environments but also sets a foundation for future advancements in marine ecological monitoring and scientific exploration.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the National Key R&D Program of China under Grant 2022ZD0117201.

REFERENCES

- [1] Tadashi Matsunaga, Haruko Takeyama, Hideki Miyashita, and Hiroko Yokouchi. Marine microalgae. *Marine biotechnology* 1, pages 165–188, 2005.
- [2] Yimin Chen, Changan Xu, and Seetharaman Vaidyanathan. Microalgae: a robust “green bio-bridge” between energy and environment. *Critical reviews in biotechnology*, 38(3):351–368, 2018.
- [3] I Ahmad, A Yuzir, SE Mohamad, K Iwamoto, and N Abdullah. Role of microalgae in sustainable energy and environment. In *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, volume 1051, page 012059. IOP Publishing, 2021.
- [4] Eva Álvarez, Ángel López-Urrutia, Enrique Nogueira, and Santiago Fraga. How to effectively sample the plankton size spectrum? a case study using flowcam. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 33(7):1119–1133, 2011.
- [5] Yanwu Zhang, Brian Kieft, Robert McEwen, Jordan Stanway, James Bellingham, John Ryan, Brett Hobson, Douglas Pargett, James Birch, and Christopher Scholin. Tracking and sampling of a phytoplankton patch by an autonomous underwater vehicle in drifting mode. In *OCEANS 2015-MTS/IEEE Washington*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2015.

- [6] Yanwu Zhang, Michael A Godin, Brian Kieft, Ben-Yair Raanan, John P Ryan, and Brett W Hobson. Finding and tracking a phytoplankton patch by a long-range autonomous underwater vehicle. *IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering*, 47(2):322–330, 2021.
- [7] Ryan N Smith, Jnaneshwar Das, Yi Chao, David A Caron, Burton H Jones, and Gaurav S Sukhatme. Cooperative multi-robot tracking of phytoplankton blooms based on ocean model predictions. In *OCEANS'10 IEEE SYDNEY*, pages 1–10. IEEE, 2010.
- [8] Jiaao Yu, Qingxuan Lv, Yuezun Li, Junyu Dong, Haoran Zhao, and Qiong Li. Pmot2023: A large-scale multi-object tracking (mot) dataset with application to phytoplankton observation. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering*, 11(6):1141, 2023.
- [9] Anton Milan, Laura Leal-Taixé, Ian Reid, Stefan Roth, and Konrad Schindler. Mot16: A benchmark for multi-object tracking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.00831*, 2016.
- [10] Laurence A Anderson. On the hydrogen and oxygen content of marine phytoplankton. *Deep sea research part I: Oceanographic research papers*, 42(9):1675–1680, 1995.
- [11] Kevin G Sellner and Michael E Kachur. Phytoplankton: relationships between phytoplankton, nutrients, oxygen flux and secondary producers. *Ecological studies in the middle reach of Chesapeake Bay*, 23:11–37, 1987.
- [12] Tom Fenchel. Marine plankton food chains. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 19(1):19–38, 1988.
- [13] Daniel G Boyce and Boris Worm. Patterns and ecological implications of historical marine phytoplankton change. *Marine Ecology progress series*, 534:251–272, 2015.
- [14] CS Reynolds. Phytoplankton periodicity: the interactions of form, function and environmental variability. *Freshwater biology*, 14(2):111–142, 1984.
- [15] Andrew J Irwin, Zoe V Finkel, Frank E Müller-Karger, and Luis Troccoli Ghinaglia. Phytoplankton adapt to changing ocean environments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(18):5762–5766, 2015.
- [16] P Tett, C Carreira, DK Mills, S Van Leeuwen, J Foden, E Bresnan, and RJ Gowen. Use of a phytoplankton community index to assess the health of coastal waters. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 65(8):1475–1482, 2008.
- [17] Monika Winder and Ulrich Sommer. Phytoplankton response to a changing climate. *Hydrobiologia*, 698:5–16, 2012.
- [18] Theodore J Smayda. Harmful algal blooms: their ecophysiology and general relevance to phytoplankton blooms in the sea. *Limnology and oceanography*, 42(5part2):1137–1153, 1997.
- [19] Malgorzata Ciesielska, Katarzyna W Boström, and Magnus Öhlander. Observation methods. *Qualitative methodologies in organization studies: Volume II: Methods and possibilities*, pages 33–52, 2018.
- [20] George J McCall. Systematic field observation. *Annual review of sociology*, 10(1):263–282, 1984.
- [21] Ian Joint and Stephen B Groom. Estimation of phytoplankton production from space: current status and future potential of satellite remote sensing. *Journal of experimental marine Biology and Ecology*, 250(1-2):233–255, 2000.
- [22] Zhihong Sun, Jun Chen, Liang Chao, Weijian Ruan, and Mithun Mukherjee. A survey of multiple pedestrian tracking based on tracking-by-detection framework. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 31(5):1819–1833, 2021.
- [23] Chong Sun, Fu Li, Huchuan Lu, and Gang Hua. Visual tracking via joint discriminative appearance learning. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 27(12):2567–2577, 2016.
- [24] Yabin Zhu, Chenglong Li, Jin Tang, Bin Luo, and Liang Wang. Rgbt tracking by trident fusion network. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 32(2):579–592, 2021.
- [25] Rui Yao, Guosheng Lin, Chunhua Shen, Yanning Zhang, and Qinfeng Shi. Semantics-aware visual object tracking. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 29(6):1687–1700, 2018.
- [26] Chenglong Li, Chengli Zhu, Jian Zhang, Bin Luo, Xiaohao Wu, and Jin Tang. Learning local-global multi-graph descriptors for rgb-t object tracking. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 29(10):2913–2926, 2018.
- [27] Michael I Jordan. Graphical models. 2004.
- [28] E. Trucco and K. Plakas. Video tracking: A concise survey. *IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering*, 31(2):520–529, 2006.
- [29] Li Wang, Ting Liu, Gang Wang, Kap Luk Chan, and Qingxiong Yang. Video tracking using learned hierarchical features. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 24(4):1424–1435, 2015.
- [30] Weijiang Feng, Long Lan, Yong Luo, Yue Yu, Xiang Zhang, and Zhigang Luo. Near-online multi-pedestrian tracking via combining multiple consistent appearance cues. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 31(4):1540–1554, 2021.
- [31] Xiankai Lu, Chao Ma, Bingbing Ni, and Xiaokang Yang. Adaptive region proposal with channel regularization for robust object tracking. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 31(4):1268–1282, 2021.
- [32] Peng Zhang, Shujian Yu, Jiamiao Xu, Xinge You, Xiubao Jiang, Xiaoyuan Jing, and Dacheng Tao. Robust visual tracking using multi-frame multi-feature joint modeling. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 29(12):3673–3686, 2019.
- [33] Minghua Zhang, Qiuyang Zhang, Wei Song, Dongmei Huang, and Qi He. Promptvt: Prompting for efficient and accurate visual tracking. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, pages 1–1, 2024.
- [34] Yifu Zhang, Peize Sun, Yi Jiang, Dongdong Yu, Fucheng Weng, Zehuan Yuan, Ping Luo, Wenyu Liu, and Xinggong Wang. Bytetrack: Multi-object tracking by associating every detection box. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 1–21. Springer, 2022.
- [35] Jialian Wu, Jiale Cao, Liangchen Song, Yu Wang, Ming Yang, and Junsong Yuan. Track to detect and segment: An online multi-object tracker. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 12352–12361, 2021.
- [36] Yu Quan, Dong Zhang, Liyan Zhang, and Jinhui Tang. Centralized feature pyramid for object detection. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 2023.
- [37] Khurram Azeem Hashmi, Goutham Kallempudi, Didier Stricker, and Muhammad Zeshan Afzal. Featenhancer: Enhancing hierarchical features for object detection and beyond under low-light vision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 6725–6735, 2023.
- [38] Fisher Yu, Vladlen Koltun, and Thomas Funkhouser. Dilated residual networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 472–480, 2017.
- [39] Fisher Yu, Dequan Wang, Evan Shelhamer, and Trevor Darrell. Deep layer aggregation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2403–2412, 2018.
- [40] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [41] Zhuoran Shen, Mingyuan Zhang, Haiyu Zhao, Shuai Yi, and Hongsheng Li. Efficient attention: Attention with linear complexities. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pages 3531–3539, 2021.
- [42] Jifeng Dai, Haozhi Qi, Yuwen Xiong, Yi Li, Guodong Zhang, Han Hu, and Yichen Wei. Deformable convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 764–773, 2017.
- [43] Xingyi Zhou, Dequan Wang, and Philipp Krähenbühl. Objects as points. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.07850*, 2019.
- [44] Keni Bernardin and Rainer Stiefelwagen. Evaluating multiple object tracking performance: the clear mot metrics. *EURASIP Journal on Image and Video Processing*, 2008:1–10, 2008.
- [45] Alex Bewley, Zongyuan Ge, Lionel Ott, Fabio Ramos, and Ben Uppcroft. Simple online and realtime tracking. In *2016 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP)*, pages 3464–3468. IEEE, 2016.
- [46] Nicolai Wojke, Alex Bewley, and Dietrich Paulus. Simple online and realtime tracking with a deep association metric. In *2017 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP)*, pages 3645–3649. IEEE, 2017.
- [47] Yihong Xu, Yutong Ban, Xavier Alameda-Pineda, and Radu Horaud. Deepmot: A differentiable framework for training multiple object trackers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.06618*, 10(11), 2019.
- [48] Nir Aharon, Roy Orfaig, and Ben-Zion Bobrovsky. Bot-sort: Robust associations multi-pedestrian tracking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.14651*, 2022.
- [49] Shuai Liu, Xin Li, Huchuan Lu, and You He. Multi-object tracking meets moving uav. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8876–8885, 2022.
- [50] Yunhao Du, Zhicheng Zhao, Yang Song, Yanyun Zhao, Fei Su, Tao Gong, and Hongying Meng. Strongsort: Make deepsort great again. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2023.
- [51] Kefu Yi, Kai Luo, Xiaolei Luo, Jianguo Huang, Hao Wu, Rongdong Hu, and Wei Hao. Ucmtrack: Multi-object tracking with uniform camera

- motion compensation. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(7):6702–6710, Mar. 2024.
- [52] Vukasin D Stanojevic and Branimir T Todorovic. Boosttrack: boosting the similarity measure and detection confidence for improved multiple object tracking. *Machine Vision and Applications*, 35(3), 2024.
- [53] Sijia Chen, En Yu, Jinyang Li, and Wenbing Tao. Delving into the trajectory long-tail distribution for multi-object tracking. *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024.
- [54] Zhi Tian, Chunhua Shen, and Hao Chen. Conditional convolutions for instance segmentation. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part I 16*, pages 282–298. Springer, 2020.
- [55] Hao Luo, Youzhi Gu, Xingyu Liao, Shenqi Lai, and Wei Jiang. Bag of tricks and a strong baseline for deep person re-identification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 0–0, 2019.
- [56] Mike Schuster and Kuldip K Paliwal. Bidirectional recurrent neural networks. *IEEE transactions on Signal Processing*, 45(11):2673–2681, 1997.