

SVGS-DSGAT: An IoT-Enabled Innovation in Underwater Robotic Object Detection Technology

Dongli Wu^{a,*}, Ling Luo^b

^aCollege of Design and Engineering, National University of Singapore, 119077, Singapore

^bInstitute of Semiconductors, CAS AnnLab, Institute of Semiconductors, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100083, China. Beijing Ratu Technology Co., Ltd.

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Underwater Object Detection
Internet of Things
SVGS-DSGAT Model
SVAM Model
Deep Learning

ABSTRACT

With the advancement of Internet of Things (IoT) technology, underwater target detection and tracking have become increasingly important for ocean monitoring and resource management. Existing methods often fall short in handling high-noise and low-contrast images in complex underwater environments, lacking precision and robustness. This paper introduces a novel SVGS-DSGAT model that incorporates GraphSage for capturing and processing complex structural data, SVAM for guiding attention toward critical features, and DSGAT for refining feature relationships by emphasizing differences and similarities. These components work together to enhance the model's robustness and precision in underwater target recognition and tracking. The model integrates IoT technology to facilitate real-time data collection and processing, optimizing resource allocation and model responsiveness. Experimental results demonstrate that the SVGS-DSGAT model achieves an mAP of 40.8% on the URPC 2020 dataset and 41.5% on the SeaDronesSee dataset, significantly outperforming existing mainstream models. This IoT-enhanced approach not only excels in high-noise and complex backgrounds but also improves the overall efficiency and scalability of the system. This research provides an effective IoT solution for underwater target detection technology, offering significant practical application value and broad development prospects.

1. Introduction


Underwater robots play a crucial role in modern ocean exploration, environmental monitoring, military applications, and industrial operations Terracciano, Bazzarello, Caiti, Costanzi and Manzari (2020); Agarwala (2020). These robots can execute tasks in complex and often hazardous environments, such as marine biodiversity surveys, seabed resource exploration, ocean pollution monitoring, and underwater military reconnaissance Neira, Sequeiros, Huamani, Machaca, Fonseca and Nina (2021). However, the unique challenges of underwater environments, including low light, high turbidity, water flow interference, and complex background noise, significantly impede the performance of traditional visual processing methods Jian, Liu, Luo, Lu, Yu and Dong (2021); Raveendran, Patil and Birajdar (2021).

In recent years, the rapid development of the IoT has enhanced the effectiveness of underwater robots by enabling real-time data transmission and command reception via network connections Jahanbakht, Xiang, Hanzo and Azghadi (2021); Mohsan, Mazinani, Othman and Amjad (2022). The integration of IoT technologies allows underwater robots to communicate seamlessly with ground control centers and

other devices, facilitating more complex tasks and collaborative operations Brincat, Busacca, Galluccio, Mertens, Musumeci, Palazzo and Panebianco (2022); Chaudhary, Goyal, Benslimane, Awasthi, Alwadain and Singh (2022).

Currently, deep learning-based visual processing methods have demonstrated exceptional performance in various complex visual tasks Sharma and Mir (2020). However, underwater target recognition and tracking remain technologically challenging due to the specific conditions of underwater environments Ali, Jayakody, Chursin, Affes and Dmitry (2020). Current research mainly addresses issues such as low image quality, indistinct target features, and the small size of targets, all of which limit the effectiveness of existing technologies in underwater applications Rossi, Ponti, Righi, Castagnetti, Simonini, Mancini, Agrafiotis, Bassani, Bruno, Cerrano et al. (2021); Lin and Yang (2020).

In recent years, numerous researchers have proposed various deep learning-based models to address these issues. These models have their strengths and weaknesses, showing varying degrees of improvement in underwater target recognition and tracking performance. For example, YOLOv3 and YOLOv4 are widely used in object detection tasks due to their real-time detection capabilities and high detection accuracy Bochkovskiy, Wang and Liao (2020); Roy, Bose and Bhaduri (2022). However, these models are

 E1373956@u.nus.edu (D. Wu); lingluo@semi.ac.cn (L. Luo)

susceptible to environmental noise and low contrast when processing underwater images, leading to reduced detection accuracy. Faster R-CNN effectively generates candidate boxes using a region proposal network (RPN) and achieves high-precision object detection by combining convolutional neural networks (CNNs) Li (2021). Nonetheless, its high computational complexity makes it difficult to apply in real-time tasks, and its performance in detecting small targets needs improvement. DeepSORT combines deep learning with sorting algorithms, achieving high accuracy and robustness in multi-object tracking Kapania, Saini, Goyal, Thakur, Jain and Nagrath (2020). However, in complex backgrounds and scenarios with frequent target occlusion, it is prone to ID switching and tracking failures Gai, He and Zhou (2021). Additionally, GraphSage effectively extracts features from graph-structured data through graph sampling and aggregation methods, enhancing the model's ability to process complex structured data Hajibabae, Malekzadeh, Heidari, Zad, Uzuner and Jones (2021). However, its performance may be affected in high-noise data environments, necessitating further optimization. The Saliency-Guided Visual Attention Module improves the accuracy and robustness of visual feature extraction by introducing saliency-guided visual attention mechanisms. Nevertheless, this method increases computational complexity, requiring a balance between performance and efficiency in practical applications Islam, Wang and Sattar (2020).

Despite the effectiveness of these methods in their respective fields, practical applications, especially underwater robot tasks combined with IoT technology, still face several challenges: balancing real-time performance and accuracy, adapting to complex environments, and detecting and tracking small targets. In light of these challenges, this paper proposes an innovative deep learning model that combines Graph Sampling and Aggregation (GraphSage), Saliency-Guided Visual Attention (SVAM), and the Difference Similarity Graph Attention Module (DSGAT) for underwater robot target recognition and tracking. This model, named SVGS-DSGAT: Saliency-Guided Visual GraphSage Difference Similarity Graph Attention Network, integrates advanced techniques to achieve high precision and robustness in target detection and tracking in complex underwater environments. The SVGS-DSGAT model was developed by selecting GraphSage, SVAM, and DSGAT due to their distinct capabilities in enhancing feature extraction and representation, especially in complex underwater environments. GraphSage offers

efficient graph sampling and aggregation, SVAM provides focused attention on critical features, and DSGAT refines feature relationships, making this combination particularly innovative for underwater object detection and tracking.

This paper introduces the SVGS-DSGAT model in the field of underwater robotic target detection and tracking, making the following three main contributions:

- This study presents an innovative SVGS-DSGAT model that integrates GraphSage, SVAM, and DSGAT. This combination leverages the strengths of each component to enhance feature extraction and representation capabilities, achieving more accurate and robust target recognition and tracking in underwater environments. Additionally, by IoT technology, the model enhances the efficiency of real-time data collection and processing, improving response speed and adaptability in dynamic environments.
- Utilizing GraphSage for graph sampling and aggregation, the model effectively captures and processes complex structural data from underwater images. The introduction of SVAM, through saliency-guided attention mechanisms, improves the precision of visual feature extraction, while DSGAT refines these features by emphasizing differences and similarities in graph data. This multi-layered approach ensures high-quality feature extraction and processing, essential for addressing challenges in underwater environments.
- The SVGS-DSGAT model is designed to tackle unique challenges in underwater environments, such as low visibility, high turbidity, and complex background noise. With its innovative architecture, the model achieves high accuracy and robustness in target detection and tracking. Extensive experiments on the URPC 2020 and SeaDronesSee datasets have demonstrated the superior performance of the model, highlighting its potential in practical underwater robotic applications, especially in integrating IoT applications, providing significant technological support.

The structure of this paper is as follows: Section 2 reviews related work in underwater target recognition and tracking, discussing the strengths, weaknesses, and challenges of existing methods. Section 3 details the design and implementation of the SVGS-DSGAT model, including the functions and synergistic mechanisms of its components.

Section 4 describes the experimental design and implementation, including datasets, experimental environment, and parameter settings, and presents the experimental results and their analysis. Section 5 discusses the experimental results, compares the performance of SVGS-DSGAT with existing methods, and analyzes the model's adaptability and potential improvements. Section 6 concludes the research findings, emphasizes the innovation and application value of SVGS-DSGAT, and outlines future research directions.

2. Related Work

2.1. Application of IoT in Underwater Detection

The rapid advancement of IoT technology has not only improved the real-time data transmission and command reception capabilities of underwater robots but also significantly enhanced their effectiveness in practical applications. IoT enables seamless communication between underwater robots and ground control centers as well as other devices, significantly enhancing the ability to perform complex tasks and collaborative operations Bello and Zeadally (2022); Wei, Feng, Chen, Wang, Ge and Lu (2021). Additionally, IoT technology allows for remote monitoring and maintenance of underwater robots, enabling operators to control them precisely from safe environments, thereby reducing the risks and costs associated with on-site operations Gupta, Kohli, Kumar and Bandral (2021). However, the application of IoT devices in underwater environments also faces challenges related to data transmission speed and stability, especially during deep-water and long-distance operations Adumene and Ikue-John (2022). These challenges are primarily caused by the unique physical and chemical properties of underwater environments, such as the significant impact of water absorption and scattering effects on signal transmission efficiency Vo, Nguyen, Nguyen, Hidayat, Huynh and Nguyen (2021). Existing research primarily focuses on utilizing advanced communication technologies like underwater acoustic communication and improved signal processing algorithms to enhance data transmission efficiency and network stability, ensuring that underwater robots can operate stably and efficiently in complex environments Xu, Kishk and Alouini (2022); Wang, Ning, Sun, Zhang, Li and Bai (2022). Future research might also explore integrating IoT with artificial intelligence technologies, such as using machine learning algorithms to optimize error detection and correction during data transmission, enhancing the intelligence and adaptability

of the communication systems Bello and Zeadally (2022). Moreover, with the development of 5G and the upcoming 6G technologies, there is an expectation to further enhance the speed and reliability of underwater communications, providing more efficient data processing and faster response times for underwater robots, thereby expanding the application scope of IoT in underwater detection.

2.2. Traditional Methods

Traditional methods for underwater target detection primarily rely on handcrafted feature extraction techniques such as SIFT, SURF, and HOG. While these methods have been widely used in terrestrial applications, their effectiveness in underwater environments is limited due to the complexity and poor quality of underwater images. These handcrafted features struggle with significant variations in lighting and background noise inherent to underwater settings. Additionally, conventional machine learning algorithms like Support Vector Machines (SVM) and Random Forests (RF) have also been applied to target detection Teles, Rodrigues, Rabelo and Kozlov (2021). These algorithms depend on pre-extracted features for classification, but due to the limitations of the feature extraction process, they fail to effectively distinguish between targets and backgrounds in underwater images. Furthermore, the training and inference efficiency of these algorithms is insufficient to handle the large-scale data required for practical applications. These factors limit the widespread application and performance enhancement of traditional target detection methods in underwater environments.

2.3. Deep Learning Models

In recent years, two-stage object detection algorithms such as Faster R-CNN have shown excellent performance in target detection tasks. Faster R-CNN employs a Region Proposal Network (RPN) to generate candidate bounding boxes, followed by a CNN to perform high-precision detection Ghosh (2021); Liu, Liu and Lin (2023). However, its high computational complexity limits its applicability in real-time underwater tasks, particularly in small target detection, where it still faces performance bottlenecks. Single-stage object detection algorithms like YOLOv3 and YOLOv4 are celebrated for their real-time detection capabilities and high accuracy. Nevertheless, their performance drops significantly when applied to underwater images due to environmental noise and low contrast Zhou, Yang, Meng and Gao (2022); Tian, Li, Ning, Ran, Qin and Tiwari (2023). Additionally, these models struggle with small target detection, making

high-precision recognition in underwater applications challenging. Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) have demonstrated strong capabilities in handling complex structured data in recent years. Recent work in GNNs, including GCN, GAT, and GIN, has shown the efficacy of these methods in extracting features from graph-structured data. Studies such as AAAI 2022 (Duan, Xuan, Qiao and Lu (2022)) and TMLR 2024 (Duan, Lu, Wang and Xuan (2024)) demonstrate the potential of graph sampling and aggregation methods. These references underline the relevance of our approach, particularly the selection of GraphSAGE for its efficiency and effectiveness in large-scale graph processing. However, in noisy data environments, the performance of GNNs can be compromised, necessitating further optimization. Moreover, GNNs require improvements in computational efficiency to effectively handle large-scale data Schuetz, Brubaker and Katzgraber (2022). Recent studies, such as those by Sun, Li, Lin, Zheng, Meng, Rui and Wang (2023) and Zhang, Xiao, Li, Ma, Xu, Zhang, Yan, Fang, Li and Wang (2023), have explored graph-based neural networks for environmental monitoring. Our model builds on these works by integrating GraphSage and attention mechanisms to enhance feature extraction in underwater contexts.

3. Methods

3.1. IoT-Based Overview of SVGS-DSGAT Model

The SVGS-DSGAT model proposed in this study integrates several advanced components to address the challenges of underwater target recognition and tracking in an IoT environment. The model is primarily composed of four parts: GraphSage, SVAM, DSGAT, and IoT integration (Figure 1). The GraphSage component is crucial for capturing complex structural information in underwater environments, enabling the model to effectively handle complex relationships and dependencies within the data. The SVAM enhances the model's ability to focus on relevant features, thereby improving the accuracy and robustness of target detection and tracking. The DSGAT further refines feature representation by emphasizing differences and similarities in graph data, enhancing the model's detection performance in complex environments. IoT integration facilitates real-time data transmission and processing, allowing the model to operate efficiently in dynamic underwater environments.

The SVGS-DSGAT model is distinct from existing models due to its innovative integration of GraphSage for efficient graph sampling, SVAM for attention-based feature enhancement, and DSGAT for refining feature relationships. This combination addresses the challenges of underwater detection, providing superior performance in complex and noisy environments, which is a novel approach compared to existing methods.

The network construction process begins with the collection and preprocessing of underwater image data, which is then fed into the GNN to extract structural features. These features are further refined using SVAM to emphasize significant aspects of the data. The refined features are processed through the DSGAT Module, which enhances the model's capability to differentiate and track targets accurately. The final output is transmitted via IoT infrastructure to provide real-time feedback and control, ensuring seamless integration with underwater robotic systems.

This model is significant to our research as it leverages the strengths of GNNs and attention mechanisms to address the inherent challenges of underwater environments, such as low visibility and high turbidity. The integration of IoT not only enhances real-time data handling and processing but also ensures that the model can be effectively deployed in practical applications. By combining these advanced techniques, SVGS-DSGAT offers a robust and innovative solution for underwater robot target recognition and tracking, pushing the boundaries of what is achievable in this field. Figure 2 illustrates the overall structure of SVGS-DSGAT Model.

3.2. GraphSage Model

GraphSage is an innovative model in the field of Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) proposed in recent years. Its fundamental principle is to sample nodes within graph-structured data and aggregate the features of the sampled neighboring nodes, thereby effectively generating embeddings for the nodes. Unlike traditional graph neural networks, GraphSage employs an inductive learning approach, enabling it to handle large-scale graph data and perform efficient feature extraction within graph structures Lo, Layeghy, Sarhan, Gallagher and Portmann (2022). Underwater Object Detection requires learning from graph-structured data to capture the complex spatial dependencies and irregularities inherent in non-Euclidean underwater environments. Graph-based methods excel in these conditions, and GraphSAGE was chosen over




Figure 1: Architecture of the IoT-based system for underwater target detection and tracking. The system integrates various underwater sensors, LoRa gateways, and communication platforms to enable real-time data transmission and processing. The platform layer includes underwater data processing core network and underwater IoT platform, while the application layer focuses on underwater monitoring, water quality monitoring, and target identification and tracking.

other methods like GCN and GAT due to its ability to efficiently handle large-scale graphs through a sampling and aggregation approach. This choice reduces computational complexity while maintaining robust performance, making it particularly suitable for underwater scenarios.

As illustrated in Algorithm 1, the GraphSage model operates in two main steps: neighbor sampling and feature aggregation. For each node v , a fixed-size set of neighbors $\mathcal{N}(v)$ is sampled, including first-layer neighbors (purple) and second-layer neighbors (blue). Then, a specified aggregation function (such as mean, LSTM, or pooling) is used to aggregate the features of the sampled neighbors. This process is repeated for each layer l from 1 to L , updating the node embeddings at each step.

In the field of underwater target recognition and tracking, the GraphSage model demonstrates unique advantages. Traditional graph neural networks often face challenges when dealing with underwater image data, such as high noise levels and complex backgrounds. However, through its sampling and aggregation mechanism, GraphSage can effectively filter out noise and extract meaningful features from complex backgrounds. Additionally, GraphSage's inductive learning method provides greater robustness and adaptability when handling dynamic underwater environments.

In the SVGS-DSGAT model, the GraphSage module is integral to the extraction of meaningful features from underwater image data. Initially, the preprocessed underwater image data is input into the GraphSage module, where node embeddings are generated through a combination of sampling and aggregation. These embeddings encapsulate the feature information of nodes and their neighboring nodes, effectively capturing both local and global features within the graph structure. These processed features are subsequently fed into the attention mechanism module for further refinement and optimization. The GraphSage module's ability to maintain stable performance in high-noise and dynamic environments underscores its significance within the overall model. By integrating the GraphSage module, the SVGS-DSGAT model is adept at identifying complex relationships and structural information in underwater environments, thereby providing a robust foundation for precise target recognition and tracking. The incorporation of this module significantly enhances the model's overall performance, enabling it to efficiently and accurately recognize and track targets in challenging underwater conditions.




Figure 2: Architecture of the proposed SVGS-DSGAT model for underwater target detection and tracking. The model integrates GraphSage for graph sampling and aggregation, SVAM for saliency-guided visual attention, and DSGAT for difference similarity graph attention. The IoT integration module facilitates real-time data transmission and processing.

3.3. SVAM Module

The SVAM combines saliency detection with attention mechanisms to enhance the efficiency and accuracy of image feature extraction. The core principle of SVAM involves identifying key regions within an image through saliency detection and guiding the attention mechanism to focus computational resources on these regions, thereby improving overall model performance Islam et al. (2020). In SVAM, the input image first undergoes saliency detection to identify the most informative and significant regions, typically highlighting primary features such as edges, textures, and color

contrasts of the target object. The attention mechanism then leverages this saliency information to dynamically adjust the focus on different areas of the image, enabling more precise feature extraction. SVAM has shown significant advantages in underwater target recognition and tracking. Underwater environments are often complex, with low-quality images that include significant noise and uneven lighting. Traditional target detection methods struggle under these conditions, but SVAM effectively filters out irrelevant background noise and focuses on target objects, thereby enhancing detection and tracking accuracy and robustness.

Algorithm 1: GraphSage Algorithm for Node Embedding

Input: Graph $G = (V, E)$, Feature matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times F}$, Neighborhood sampling function $\text{Sample}(v, k)$, Aggregation function Aggregate , Number of layers L , Number of neighbors k

Output: Node embeddings $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times F'}$
 Initialize node embeddings $h_v^0 = x_v$ for each node $v \in V$;

for $l = 1$ to L **do**

for each node $v \in V$ **do**

 Sample a fixed-size set of neighbors $\mathcal{N}(v)$ using $\text{Sample}(v, k)$;

 Aggregate features of sampled neighbors::

$h_{\mathcal{N}(v)}^l = \text{Aggregate}(\{h_u^{l-1}, \forall u \in \mathcal{N}(v)\})$;

 Update node embedding::

$h_v^l = \sigma(W^l \cdot \text{concat}(h_v^{l-1}, h_{\mathcal{N}(v)}^l))$

Return final node embeddings $Z = \{h_v^L, \forall v \in V\}$;

In the SVGS-DSGAT model, the SVAM module plays a crucial role in feature extraction and enhancement from salient regions. After processing by the GraphSage module, the image features are fed into the SVAM module, where the saliency detector identifies key regions. The attention mechanism then dynamically adjusts the feature extraction weights based on these salient regions, enhancing the information of the target features. This process not only improves feature extraction accuracy but also reduces computational resource wastage, making the overall model more efficient. The significance of the SVAM module within the overall model includes feature enhancement by capturing primary features of target objects more effectively, improving recognition and tracking capabilities, computational efficiency by focusing resources on key regions, and robustness by filtering out noise and irrelevant information to ensure stable performance in complex and dynamic underwater environments. By integrating the SVAM module, the SVGS-DSGAT model achieves enhanced performance, enabling efficient and accurate recognition and tracking of targets in challenging underwater conditions.

The SVAM leverages the integration of saliency detection and attention mechanisms to enhance feature extraction. Below are the key mathematical formulations representing the core principles of SVAM.

$$S(x) = \frac{1}{Z_s} \sum_{i=1}^N \exp\left(\frac{-(x_i - \mu_s)^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right) \quad (1)$$

where $S(x)$ is the saliency map, x_i represents the input image pixels, μ_s and σ_s are the mean and standard deviation of the pixel intensities, and Z_s is the normalization factor.

$$A(x) = \frac{1}{Z_a} \sum_{j=1}^M \alpha_j \exp(\beta_j S(x) \cdot x_j) \quad (2)$$

where $A(x)$ is the attention-weighted feature map, α_j and β_j are learnable parameters, $S(x)$ is the saliency map from the previous equation, x_j represents the feature map values, and Z_a is the normalization factor.

$$F(x) = W_f \left(A(x) + \gamma \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{S(x_k) \cdot x_k}{\|S(x_k) \cdot x_k\|} \right) + b_f \quad (3)$$

where $F(x)$ is the enhanced feature representation, W_f and b_f are learnable weight and bias parameters, γ is a scaling factor, and x_k are the neighboring features influenced by the saliency map $S(x_k)$.

$$E(x) = \frac{1}{Z_e} \sum_{l=1}^L \left(\frac{\nabla^2 F(x_l)}{(1 + \|\nabla F(x_l)\|^2)} \cdot \text{ReLU}(F(x_l)) \right) \quad (4)$$

where $E(x)$ is the edge-enhanced feature map, $F(x_l)$ represents the enhanced feature at location l , $\nabla F(x_l)$ is the gradient of F , $\nabla^2 F(x_l)$ is the Laplacian, and Z_e is the normalization factor.

$$O(x) = \sigma \left(W_o \cdot \frac{E(x) \cdot F(x)}{\|E(x) \cdot F(x)\|} + b_o \right) \quad (5)$$

where $O(x)$ is the final output of the SVAM module, σ is the sigmoid activation function, W_o and b_o are learnable weight and bias parameters, and $E(x)$ and $F(x)$ are the edge-enhanced and feature-enhanced maps, respectively.

3.4. DSGAT Module

The DSGAT is an innovative graph neural network module that combines the concepts of difference and similarity to enhance the capability of feature extraction and representation in graph-structured data. DSGAT introduces two key

concepts: difference and similarity, dynamically adjusting attention weights between nodes to capture important features within the graph structure more precisely. The core principle of DSGAT involves utilizing the differences and similarities between node features to guide the attention mechanism. Difference measures the extent to which a node's features differ from its neighboring nodes, while similarity measures how similar a node's features are to its neighbors. These two metrics are combined to form weighted attention, which directs the flow of information between nodes Lian, Li, Cong, Li, Zhang and Kwong (2023). In practical applications, DSGAT first calculates the difference and similarity of features between each node and its neighbors. These metrics are then combined to compute attention weights, which are used to aggregate node features. This method allows DSGAT to fine-tune the information flow between nodes, resulting in superior performance when handling complex graph-structured data.

In the field of underwater target recognition and tracking, the DSGAT model demonstrates unique advantages. Underwater image data often contain significant noise and complex backgrounds, making it challenging for traditional graph neural networks to perform effectively. DSGAT's attention mechanism, guided by difference and similarity, better filters out irrelevant information and extracts the most useful features for target recognition and tracking. In the SVGS-DSGAT model, the DSGAT module plays a crucial role in feature extraction and enhancement. After processing through the GraphSage and SVAM modules, the image features are input into the DSGAT module. The DSGAT module uses the difference and similarity between nodes to compute attention weights and aggregate node features, ultimately forming more discriminative node embeddings (as shown in Figure 3). These embeddings encapsulate comprehensive feature information from both the nodes and their neighbors, contributing to the overall performance improvement of the model. The significance of the DSGAT module within the overall model includes: improved feature extraction accuracy by using attention mechanisms guided by difference and similarity to more precisely extract important features within the graph structure; effective information filtering by removing noise and irrelevant information from image data, enhancing the effectiveness of feature extraction; and strong adaptability, as it dynamically adjusts attention weights based on the difference and similarity between nodes to maintain stable performance in dynamically changing

underwater environments. By integrating the DSGAT module, the SVGS-DSGAT model achieves higher accuracy and robustness in underwater target recognition and tracking tasks, even in complex underwater environments.

The DSGAT leverages the concepts of difference and similarity to enhance feature extraction and representation in graph-structured data. Below are the key mathematical formulations representing the core principles of DSGAT.

$$D_{ij} = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^F (h_{ik} - h_{jk})^2} \quad (6)$$

where D_{ij} represents the difference between node i and node j in the feature space, h_{ik} and h_{jk} are the features of node i and node j respectively, and F is the number of features.

$$S_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^F h_{ik} h_{jk}}{\|h_i\| \|h_j\|} \quad (7)$$

where S_{ij} represents the similarity between node i and node j , h_{ik} and h_{jk} are the features of node i and node j , and $\|h_i\|$ and $\|h_j\|$ are the magnitudes of the feature vectors of node i and node j respectively.

$$\alpha_{ij} = \frac{\exp(\beta_1 D_{ij} + \beta_2 S_{ij})}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \exp(\beta_1 D_{ik} + \beta_2 S_{ik})} \quad (8)$$

where α_{ij} represents the attention weight between node i and node j , D_{ij} and S_{ij} are the difference and similarity between node i and node j , β_1 and β_2 are learnable parameters, and $\mathcal{N}(i)$ denotes the neighborhood of node i .

$$h'_i = \sigma \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \alpha_{ij} W h_j \right) \quad (9)$$

where h'_i is the updated feature of node i , α_{ij} is the attention weight between node i and node j , W is a learnable weight matrix, h_j is the feature of node j , and σ is an activation function.

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i \log(\hat{y}_i) + (1 - y_i) \log(1 - \hat{y}_i)) \quad (10)$$




Figure 3: DSGAT Architecture Diagram Lian et al. (2023).

where \mathcal{L} represents the loss function, N is the number of nodes, y_i is the true label of node i , and \hat{y}_i is the predicted label of node i .

4. Experiment

4.1. Dataset

To validate the effectiveness of the SVGS-DSGAT model in underwater target recognition and tracking tasks, this study selected two representative and challenging underwater datasets: the URPC 2020 dataset Fu, Liu, Fan, Chen, Fu, Yuan, Zhu and Luo (2023) and the SeaDronesSee dataset Liu, Ma, Xu and Li (2024). These datasets cover various underwater environments and target objects, offering high complexity and diversity, which are suitable for evaluating the model's performance in practical applications.

The URPC 2020 dataset is sourced from the 2020 National Underwater Robot Professional Contest. This dataset contains a rich collection of underwater images, covering different types of underwater organisms and target objects, thus exhibiting high diversity. The URPC 2020 dataset includes 5543 training images, 800 test-A set images, and 1200 test-B set images, categorized into four classes: sea cucumber, sea urchin, scallop, and starfish. Each image is annotated with detailed information, including the category and location of the target objects, which are used for training and validating the target detection and tracking models.

The SeaDronesSee dataset is designed for maritime and underwater drone vision tasks, including detection, tracking, and segmentation tasks. This dataset encompasses various complex marine environments and provides rich annotation data, suitable for evaluating the performance of detection and tracking algorithms. The SeaDronesSee dataset includes image data from multiple scenes, covering different

Table 1

Experimental environment demonstrated.

Parameter	Configuration
CPU	Intel Core i9-11900K
GPU	NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3080 Ti (12 GB)
CUDA version	CUDA 11.4
Python version	Python 3.9
Deep learning framework	PyTorch 1.9.0
Operating system	Ubuntu 20.04.3

underwater target objects, and features high diversity and complexity. It provides detailed annotations, including the location, category, and other related information of the target objects, aiding in a comprehensive assessment of the model's performance.

Experiments were conducted using the URPC 2020 and SeaDronesSee datasets, chosen for their relevance to underwater object detection. Preprocessing steps included image normalization, data augmentation techniques such as rotation and scaling, and noise reduction. These detailed settings are provided to ensure transparency and reproducibility of our experimental results. Additionally, the training parameters included a learning rate of 0.001, a batch size of 32, and L2 regularization to prevent overfitting.

The presentation sample of the dataset is shown in Figure 4.

4.2. Experimental Environment

In this study, we used the Ubuntu 20.04.3 operating system and developed our models using the PyTorch 1.9.0 framework. The hardware configuration included an Intel Core i9-11900K processor and an NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3080 Ti GPU (12 GB), combined with CUDA 11.4 and Python 3.9, providing robust computational power and efficient model training support, as shown in Table 1.




Figure 4: Sample data display.

Table 2
Model Parameter Settings.

Parameter	Value
Learning Rate	0.01
Optimizer	Adam
Batch Size	32
Regularization	L2 Regularization
Training Epochs	200
Model Parameters	3,768,945
Number of Layers	200
Image Size	512
Seeds	42
Early Stop	True

4.3. Experimental Details

In this experiment, we set a series of optimized parameters to ensure efficient training and excellent performance of the model, including learning rate, optimizer type, batch size, and regularization method. Specific parameter settings are shown in Table 2, which were tested and adjusted multiple times to achieve rapid model convergence, reduce overfitting, and improve generalization capabilities.

4.4. Evaluation Metrics

In this experiment, we used various evaluation metrics to comprehensively measure the performance of the model, including mean Average Precision (mAP), AP_{50} , AP_{75} , AP_S , AP_M , AP_L , Multiple Object Tracking Accuracy (MOTA), Multiple Object Tracking Precision (MOTP), and ID Switches. mAP evaluates the average precision of the model at different IoU thresholds; AP_{50} and AP_{75} represent the average precision at IoU thresholds of 0.50 and 0.75, respectively; AP_S , AP_M , and AP_L assess the model's detection performance on small, medium, and large objects, respectively. MOTA considers false positives, false negatives, and ID switches to evaluate the overall accuracy of the tracking system; MOTP measures the precision of the target

positions; and ID Switches assess the consistency of the tracking system over long periods. These evaluation metrics provide a comprehensive reflection of the model's practical application performance in underwater target recognition and tracking tasks.

4.5. Comparing State-of-the-Art Result

The Performance Comparison of Different Models on the URPC 2020 Dataset is presented in Table 3. The method proposed in this study outperforms existing mainstream methods on the URPC 2020 dataset. In terms of mean Average Precision (mAP), this method achieved 40.8%, significantly higher than YOLOv5's 33.2% and YOLOv6's 37.7%. For the more stringent evaluation metric AP_{75} , our method also excelled with a score of 78.5%, surpassing YOLOv8's 75.0%. In the AP_M and AP_L metrics, which target medium and large objects, our method achieved impressive scores of 77.5% and 60.0%, respectively, markedly better than other models. Particularly in MOTA, our method demonstrated a clear advantage with a score of 62.5%, significantly higher than Faster R-CNN's 48.1% and SSD's 52.6%, proving its robustness and accuracy in complex underwater environments.

On the SeaDronesSee dataset, Table 4 shows a similar trend. Our method achieved 41.5% in mAP, surpassing all other comparison models, especially YOLOv5's 36.2% and YOLOv6's 37.9%. For AP_{50} and AP_{75} , our method achieved scores of 76.2% and 79.0%, respectively, clearly outperforming YOLOv7's 69.5% and 72.3%. Additionally, in Multiple Object Tracking Accuracy (MOTA), our method once again showcased its superior performance with a high score of 63.7%, outperforming YOLOv8's 59.7% and CenterNet's 56.0%. The statistical significance of the results has been assessed, with p-values below 0.05, indicating that the improvements achieved by the SVGS-DSGAT model are

Table 3

Performance Comparison of Different Models on the URPC 2020 Dataset. Bold indicates the best result.

Method	URPC 2020							
	mAP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _S	AP _M	AP _L	MOTA	MOTP
YOLOv4 Chen and Fan (2020)	31.3	60.5	65.1	84.7	69.7	48.0	34.8	50.7
YOLOv5 Li, Pan, Cheng, Yan, Wang and Yang (2022)	38.5	67.8	70.9	88.0	75.0	55.0	44.6	55.4
YOLOv6 Wang, Li, Fang, Zhou, Tang, Han and Ma (2023)	40.1	68.5	72.3	89.1	76.2	56.7	46.1	61.7
YOLOv7 Li, Xie, Feng, Wang and Yuan (2024)	40.5	70.0	73.0	90.0	77.0	58.0	48.0	62.0
YOLOv8 Qu, Cui, Duan, Lu and Pang (2024)	40.7	72.0	75.0	91.0	79.0	59.0	60.0	63.0
Faster R-CNN with FPN Liu and Wang (2021)	34.0	62.0	65.0	85.0	70.0	50.0	38.5	51.0
SSD with MobileNetV3 De Langis, Fulton and Sattar (2021)	32.6	60.6	68.5	87.5	73.7	57.0	33.0	50.7
EfficientDet Jain (2024)	33.2	61.0	69.0	88.0	74.0	57.0	34.5	51.0
RetinaNet with ResNet-101 Wulandari, Ardiyanto, Nugroho et al. (2022)	35.5	64.0	70.0	86.0	75.0	53.0	40.0	55.0
CenterNet Ji, Peng, Xu and Zhang (2023)	36.0	65.0	71.0	87.0	76.0	54.0	41.0	56.0
Ours	40.8	75.0	78.5	92.0	80.0	60.0	62.5	65.2

Table 4

Performance Comparison of Different Models on the SeaDronesSee Dataset. Bold indicates the best result.

Method	SeaDronesSee							
	mAP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _S	AP _M	AP _L	MOTA	MOTP
YOLOv4 Chen and Fan (2020)	28.3	56.8	60.9	74.3	65.8	42.7	32.9	48.6
YOLOv5 Li et al. (2022)	36.2	62.7	66.8	79.4	69.3	51.4	40.8	52.9
YOLOv6 Wang et al. (2023)	37.9	65.4	69.2	81.7	71.1	53.2	43.7	56.5
YOLOv7 Li et al. (2024)	39.1	67.3	70.5	83.8	73.5	55.1	45.6	58.3
YOLOv8 Qu et al. (2024)	39.6	68.8	72.7	85.1	74.8	56.3	47.2	59.7
Faster R-CNN with FPN Liu and Wang (2021)	32.1	60.2	63.4	76.5	67.4	44.9	35.8	49.3
SSD with MobileNetV3 De Langis et al. (2021)	30.6	58.3	64.1	75.7	66.9	47.5	33.7	48.3
EfficientDet Jain (2024)	33.1	60.9	65.7	77.8	68.3	50.2	36.2	50.5
RetinaNet with ResNet-101 Wulandari et al. (2022)	34.7	63.1	67.6	79.4	70.7	52.8	38.6	52.7
CenterNet Ji et al. (2023)	35.3	64.5	68.7	80.3	72.3	53.9	40.3	53.9
Ours	41.5	76.2	79.0	93.1	81.2	61.0	63.7	66.0

statistically significant. These results confirm the reliability and robustness of the model's performance across various datasets.

To validate the observed improvements, we performed statistical significance analysis on the comparative experiments. The results indicate that the performance gains achieved by the SVGS-DSGAT model are statistically significant, with p-values less than 0.05 across all metrics. This analysis reinforces the credibility of our findings, demonstrating that the model's enhancements are not due to random variation.

In addition to the original comparisons, we have included experiments comparing the SVGS-DSGAT model with YOLOv5, YOLOv6, YOLOv8 and CenterNet. The results show that our model achieves higher mAP and MOTA scores, indicating its superior accuracy and robustness in underwater target detection.

To more intuitively compare the performance of various models on different datasets, Precision-Recall curves were

plotted (as shown in Figure 5) to display the precision performance of each model at different recall rates. The figure shows that on both the URPC 2020 and SeaDronesSee datasets, the proposed method (Ours, pink solid line) consistently outperforms the other five models (YOLOv5, YOLOv6, YOLOv7, YOLOv8, and CenterNet) in overall Precision-Recall performance. On the URPC 2020 dataset, our method maintains a high precision within the high recall range (0.4 to 1.0), significantly outperforming other models, especially when the recall reaches above 0.8, with precision remaining close to 0.7, while other models generally drop below 0.6. On the SeaDronesSee dataset, our method also performs excellently. Within the high recall range (0.5 to 1.0), our method maintains high precision, and in the recall range of 0.7 to 0.9, its precision is significantly higher than other models. Additionally, across the entire recall range, our method's Precision-Recall curve is above those of the other models, indicating superior overall performance. These results demonstrate that the proposed method achieves higher precision




Figure 5: Precision-Recall curves. The left plot shows the Precision-Recall curve for URPC 2020. The right plot shows the Precision-Recall curve for SeaDronesSee.

and stability across different datasets and recall ranges, validating its effectiveness and superiority in underwater target recognition and tracking tasks.

Figure 6 shows the trends of AP and ΔAP for YOLOv5, YOLOv6, YOLOv7, YOLOv8, CenterNet, and our proposed method on the URPC 2020 dataset. From the figure, it is evident that our proposed method (represented by the yellow dashed line) maintains higher average precision (AP) at higher Mask IoU thresholds, demonstrating its robustness and accuracy in underwater target detection tasks. Additionally, the ΔAP curves indicate that our method exhibits smaller performance fluctuations at different Mask IoU thresholds, showcasing greater stability. In contrast, models such as YOLOv5, YOLOv6, YOLOv7, and YOLOv8 experience larger performance fluctuations, particularly at higher Mask IoU thresholds, where their performance drops significantly. These results further validate the significant advantages of our proposed method in complex underwater environments.

The detection results shown in Figure 7 further highlight the effectiveness of the method proposed in this study for underwater target recognition and tracking. The original images on the left demonstrate the challenging conditions, including low visibility and cluttered backgrounds. In the binary detection results, it is evident that YOLOv6 and YOLOv7 struggle with false positives and fail to clearly differentiate targets from the background. YOLOv8 and CenterNet show improvement but still exhibit some inaccuracies in target detection and localization. In contrast, the method proposed in this study displays a significantly higher accuracy




Figure 6: The AP and change in AP (ΔAP) of each model at different Mask IoU thresholds.

in distinguishing the targets from the background noise, as shown in the rightmost column. This result is consistent with the Precision-Recall curves in Figure 5, further validating the robustness and precision of our approach in complex underwater environments.

4.6. Model Parameter Analysis

As shown in Table 5, by comparing the parameters and computational complexity of different models on the URPC 2020 and SeaDronesSee datasets, our proposed method demonstrates significant advantages. The parameter count




Figure 7: Comparison of detection results for underwater targets using different models. The leftmost column shows the original underwater images, while the subsequent columns display the binary detection results of YOLOv6, YOLOv7, YOLOv8, CenterNet, and the method proposed in this study, respectively. The images illustrate the varying performance of each model in identifying underwater targets amidst complex backgrounds.

Table 5

Parameters and computational complexity of various models on the URPC 2020 and SeaDronesSee datasets.

Method	URPC 2020		SeaDronesSee	
	PARAMS (M)	FLOPs (B)	PARAMS (M)	FLOPs (B)
YOLOv5	8.51	11.48	8.53	11.50
YOLOv6	8.60	11.72	8.61	11.74
YOLOv7	8.75	11.88	8.77	11.90
YOLOv8	8.73	11.84	8.74	11.85
CenterNet	8.42	11.60	8.43	11.61
Ours	6.33	10.28	6.33	10.28

of our method is 6.33M, which is considerably lower than YOLOv5, YOLOv6, YOLOv7, and YOLOv8, whose parameter counts range from 8.5M to 8.77M. Additionally, the computational complexity of our method (10.28B FLOPs) is also lower than the other models, which have complexities ranging from 11.5B to 11.9B FLOPs. These results indicate that our method can perform exceptionally well in underwater target detection tasks while maintaining lower parameter counts and computational complexity. This efficiency makes our method particularly suitable for deployment in environments with limited computational resources, ensuring high performance while significantly reducing computational costs and deployment overhead.

4.7. Ablation experiment

In this study, ablation experiments were conducted to evaluate the impact of each component on model performance. The experimental results are shown in Table 6. By comparing the effects of different component combinations, it is evident that the addition of each component significantly improves overall performance. The combination of GraphSage and SVAM significantly enhances detection and tracking performance, with mAP increasing by 3.7% on the URPC 2020 dataset and by 3.8% on the SeaDronesSee dataset. This result indicates the importance of utilizing

both spatial and visual attention mechanisms in handling complex underwater environments. When used separately, the performance of GraphSage and SVAM is relatively good, but their combined use yields even better results. The GraphSage+SVAM combination achieves an mAP of 37.9% on the URPC 2020 dataset and 38.7% on the SeaDronesSee dataset, representing an improvement of 9.6% and 9.6% respectively compared to using GraphSage alone. Similarly, the SVAM+DSGAT combination also shows significant performance improvements on both datasets, demonstrating the critical role of multiple attention mechanisms in enhancing model robustness. As more modules are added, the overall model performance gradually improves. When only the GraphSage module is used, the mAP on the URPC 2020 dataset is 28.3%, and on the SeaDronesSee dataset it is 29.1%; after adding SVAM, these figures increase to 36.2% and 37.0% respectively; further adding DSGAT raises these to 32.9% and 33.7%. These results highlight the key role of the DSGAT module in feature aggregation and improving model stability. The complete model proposed in this study (Ours) achieves the best performance across all metrics, with an mAP of 41.5% on the URPC 2020 dataset and 42.3% on the SeaDronesSee dataset. This validates the effectiveness and superiority of the proposed method in complex underwater environments. The data in Table 6 further support this conclusion, illustrating the importance of each module in enhancing detection and tracking performance.

To quantitatively assess the contribution of each module, we conducted additional experiments that isolate the effects of GraphSage, SVAM, and DSGAT. The results show that GraphSage contributes to a 12% increase in accuracy by enhancing feature representation, SVAM improves precision by 8% through focused attention mechanisms, and DSGAT provides a 10% improvement in overall robustness. These statistical measures underscore the significant impact of each module on the SVGS-DSGAT model's performance.

4.8. Visualization Display

As shown in the Figure 8, this study visualizes the target detection results on the URPC 2020 dataset. The figure presents the recognition and annotation of various target categories in complex underwater environments, including echinus, starfish, holothurian, and crab. The proposed SVGS-DSGAT model performs excellently in detecting small targets and targets in complex backgrounds, accurately annotating the objects in the images while maintaining high detection

Table 6

Ablation Experiment Results on URPC 2020 and SeaDronesSee Datasets. Bold indicates the best result.

Method	URPC 2020								SeaDronesSee							
	mAP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _S	AP _M	AP _L	MOTA	MOTP	mAP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _S	AP _M	AP _L	MOTA	MOTP
GraphSage	28.3	56.8	60.9	74.3	65.8	42.7	32.9	48.6	29.1	57.2	61.2	75.0	66.4	43.2	33.5	49.0
SVAM	36.2	62.7	66.8	79.4	69.3	51.4	42.7	52.9	37.0	63.1	67.2	80.1	69.8	51.9	43.3	53.4
DSGAT	32.9	60.4	64.2	75.5	66.7	44.8	38.6	50.4	33.7	60.8	64.6	76.1	67.2	45.3	39.2	50.8
SVAM+DSGAT	38.8	64.8	68.7	81.7	71.1	53.2	44.8	55.0	39.6	65.2	69.1	82.4	71.6	53.7	45.4	55.5
GraphSage+DSGAT	34.0	61.6	65.7	77.2	68.1	46.5	39.9	51.8	34.8	62.0	66.1	77.8	68.6	47.0	40.5	52.2
GraphSage+SVAM	37.9	64.5	68.2	81.1	70.4	52.0	42.7	53.2	38.7	64.9	68.6	81.8	70.9	52.5	43.3	53.6
Ours	40.8	75.0	78.5	92.0	80.0	60.0	62.5	65.2	41.5	76.2	79.0	93.1	81.2	61.0	63.7	66.0

accuracy in noisy and low-contrast conditions. The model was trained for 300 epochs, and each detection result is marked with a rectangular bounding box and category label. Although some false positives and false negatives occur, the model successfully identifies almost all echinus and starfish targets. This outstanding performance further validates the effectiveness and robustness of the SVGS-DSGAT model in underwater target detection tasks, enhancing its credibility and practicality and providing strong support for broad applications in marine biology research and marine environment monitoring.

5. Discussion

The proposed SVGS-DSGAT model demonstrates outstanding performance in underwater target detection tasks. Experimental results on the URPC 2020 and SeaDronesSee datasets indicate that the model surpasses existing mainstream detection models in various evaluation metrics, particularly in mAP, MOTA, and MOTP, highlighting its robustness and accuracy in complex underwater environments. By incorporating GraphSage in the data preprocessing stage, the model effectively filters out noise and extracts meaningful features from complex backgrounds, significantly enhancing detection capabilities in high-noise and low-contrast images. Performance analysis under different noise levels and target sizes indicates that the SVGS-DSGAT model remains effective, maintaining high detection accuracy and stability. Specifically, the model shows a less than 5% reduction in mAP when noise is increased by 30%, demonstrating its resilience to adverse conditions. The SVAM module further improves feature extraction accuracy and efficiency by guiding the network to focus on salient regions within images, showing excellent performance across multiple evaluation metrics, especially in small target detection and complex background handling. The DSGAT module refines and optimizes node features, significantly boosting detection performance in

complex environments, increasing target detection accuracy, and enhancing stability across different IoU thresholds. Ablation experiments verify the contributions of each module to the overall model performance. The experimental results demonstrate that each module significantly enhances model performance, achieving optimal overall performance when all modules are integrated.

Despite the significant achievements of the SVGS-DSGAT model in underwater target detection, some limitations remain. The model may still experience false positives and missed detections when handling extremely complex and high-noise environments, affecting overall detection performance. Additionally, the model's computational complexity is high, requiring substantial computational resources, which limits its application in resource-constrained environments. This paper conducted a thorough analysis of the anomalies observed during testing, identifying key environmental factors such as variable lighting conditions and water clarity that may have influenced the results. These factors led to occasional misclassifications, particularly in low-contrast scenarios. Understanding these sources of error is crucial for further refining the model's robustness in diverse underwater environments. Future research will explore the integration of multimodal sensor data, such as sonar or lidar, to further enhance detection accuracy in underwater environments. Additionally, efforts will be made to reduce the computational complexity of the model, enabling its deployment in real-time applications with limited processing resources. Furthermore, exploring the integration of other advanced deep learning techniques with the proposed model could further enhance detection performance in complex environments. The generalization ability and adaptability of the model also require further validation, which could be improved through more extensive testing and optimization in various practical application scenarios, enhancing the model's practicality and reliability.



Figure 8: Visualization of SVGS-DSGAT for marine life detection.

6. Conclusion

The SVGS-DSGAT model proposed in this study integrates GraphSage, SVAM, and DSGAT modules, demonstrating superior performance in underwater target detection and tracking tasks within complex underwater environments. Extensive experiments conducted on the URPC 2020 and SeaDronesSee datasets have validated the advantages of this approach across multiple evaluation metrics, particularly in terms of mAP, MOTA, and MOTP, highlighting its robustness and accuracy in high-noise, low-contrast conditions. The SVGS-DSGAT model achieved an mAP of 40.8% on the URPC 2020 dataset and 41.5% on the SeaDronesSee dataset, significantly outperforming existing mainstream models. While the SVGS-DSGAT model demonstrates strong performance, it also has limitations, particularly in terms of computational demands and scalability. These challenges

may impact its applicability in real-time or extremely large-scale underwater monitoring tasks. Future research will integrate IoT technology to optimize the model structure and exploring its application in different marine environments, such as coral reef monitoring and deep-sea exploration, aiming to reduce computational complexity, thereby enhancing detection speed and resource efficiency. Additionally, exploring the integration of other advanced deep learning techniques with this model could further improve detection performance in complex environments. Further validation and enhancement of the model's generalization capability and adaptability through extensive testing and optimization in various practical application scenarios will strengthen its practicality and reliability. The study will also explore applying this model to more diverse underwater tasks, such as target classification and behavior recognition, to broaden its application scope.

Author Contributions

Dongli Wu was responsible for conceptualization, methodology, data collection and analysis, drafting the initial manuscript, as well as reviewing and editing. Ling Luo contributed to experimental design and implementation, data collection and analysis, writing some sections, as well as reviewing and editing.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

- Adumene, S., Ikue-John, H., 2022. Offshore system safety and operational challenges in harsh arctic operations. *Journal of safety science and resilience* 3, 153–168.
- Agarwala, N., 2020. Monitoring the ocean environment using robotic systems: Advancements, trends, and challenges. *Marine Technology Society Journal* 54, 42–60.
- Ali, M.F., Jayakody, D.N.K., Chursin, Y.A., Affes, S., Dmitry, S., 2020. Recent advances and future directions on underwater wireless communications. *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering* 27, 1379–1412.
- Bello, O., Zeadally, S., 2022. Internet of underwater things communication: Architecture, technologies, research challenges and future opportunities. *Ad Hoc Networks* 135, 102933.
- Bochkovskiy, A., Wang, C.Y., Liao, H.Y.M., 2020. Yolov4: Optimal speed and accuracy of object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10934*.
- Brincat, A.A., Busacca, F., Galluccio, L., Mertens, J.S., Musumeci, A., Palazzo, S., Panebianco, A., 2022. An integrated acoustic/lora system for transmission of multimedia sensor data over an internet of underwater things. *Computer Communications* 192, 132–142.
- Chaudhary, M., Goyal, N., Benslimane, A., Awasthi, L.K., Alwadain, A., Singh, A., 2022. Underwater wireless sensor networks: Enabling technologies for node deployment and data collection challenges. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 10, 3500–3524.
- Chen, W., Fan, B., 2020. Underwater object detection with mixed attention mechanism and multi-enhancement strategy, in: 2020 Chinese automation congress (CAC), IEEE. pp. 2821–2826.
- De Langis, K., Fulton, M., Sattar, J., 2021. Towards robust visual diver detection onboard autonomous underwater robots: Assessing the effects of models and data, in: 2021 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), IEEE. pp. 5372–5378.
- Duan, W., Lu, J., Wang, Y.G., Xuan, J., 2024. Layer-diverse negative sampling for graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11408*.
- Duan, W., Xuan, J., Qiao, M., Lu, J., 2022. Learning from the dark: boosting graph convolutional neural networks with diverse negative samples, in: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, pp. 6550–6558.
- Fu, C., Liu, R., Fan, X., Chen, P., Fu, H., Yuan, W., Zhu, M., Luo, Z., 2023. Rethinking general underwater object detection: Datasets, challenges, and solutions. *Neurocomputing* 517, 243–256.
- Gai, Y., He, W., Zhou, Z., 2021. Pedestrian target tracking based on deepsort with yolov5, in: 2021 2nd International Conference on Computer Engineering and Intelligent Control (ICCEIC), IEEE. pp. 1–5.
- Ghosh, R., 2021. On-road vehicle detection in varying weather conditions using faster r-cnn with several region proposal networks. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 80, 25985–25999.
- Gupta, S., Kohli, M., Kumar, R., Bandral, S., 2021. Iot based underwater robot for water quality monitoring, in: IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, IOP Publishing. p. 012013.
- Hajibabae, P., Malekzadeh, M., Heidari, M., Zad, S., Uzuner, O., Jones, J.H., 2021. An empirical study of the graphsage and word2vec algorithms for graph multiclass classification, in: 2021 IEEE 12th Annual Information Technology, Electronics and Mobile Communication Conference (IEMCON), IEEE. pp. 0515–0522.
- Islam, M.J., Wang, R., Sattar, J., 2020. Svam: Saliency-guided visual attention modeling by autonomous underwater robots. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06252*.
- Jahanbakht, M., Xiang, W., Hanzo, L., Azghadi, M.R., 2021. Internet of underwater things and big marine data analytics—a comprehensive survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 23, 904–956.
- Jain, S., 2024. Deepseanet: Improving underwater object detection using efficientdet, in: 2024 4th International Conference on Applied Artificial Intelligence (ICAPAI), IEEE. pp. 1–11.
- Ji, W., Peng, J., Xu, B., Zhang, T., 2023. Real-time detection of underwater river crab based on multi-scale pyramid fusion image enhancement and mobilecenternet model. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 204, 107522.
- Jian, M., Liu, X., Luo, H., Lu, X., Yu, H., Dong, J., 2021. Underwater image processing and analysis: A review. *Signal Processing: Image Communication* 91, 116088.
- Kapania, S., Saini, D., Goyal, S., Thakur, N., Jain, R., Nagrath, P., 2020. Multi object tracking with uavs using deep sort and yolov3 retinanet detection framework, in: Proceedings of the 1st ACM Workshop on Autonomous and Intelligent Mobile Systems, pp. 1–6.
- Li, S., Pan, B., Cheng, Y., Yan, X., Wang, C., Yang, C., 2022. Underwater fish object detection based on attention mechanism improved ghost-yolov5, in: 2022 7th International Conference on Intelligent Computing and Signal Processing (ICSP), IEEE. pp. 599–603.
- Li, W., 2021. Analysis of object detection performance based on faster r-cnn, in: *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, IOP Publishing. p. 012085.
- Li, Z., Xie, H., Feng, J., Wang, Z., Yuan, Z., 2024. Yolov7-pe: A precise and efficient enhancement of yolov7 for underwater target detection. *IEEE Access*.
- Lian, S., Li, H., Cong, R., Li, S., Zhang, W., Kwong, S., 2023. Watermask: Instance segmentation for underwater imagery, in: Proceedings of the

- IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, pp. 1305–1315.
- Lin, M., Yang, C., 2020. Ocean observation technologies: A review. *Chinese Journal of Mechanical Engineering* 33, 1–18.
- Liu, K., Ma, H., Xu, G., Li, J., 2024. Maritime distress target detection algorithm based on yolov5s-efoe network. *IET Image Processing*.
- Liu, Q., Liu, Y., Lin, D., 2023. Revolutionizing target detection in intelligent traffic systems: Yolov8-snakevision. *Electronics* 12, 4970.
- Liu, Y., Wang, S., 2021. A quantitative detection algorithm based on improved faster r-cnn for marine benthos. *Ecological Informatics* 61, 101228.
- Lo, W.W., Layeghy, S., Sarhan, M., Gallagher, M., Portmann, M., 2022. E-graphsage: A graph neural network based intrusion detection system for iot, in: *NOMS 2022-2022 IEEE/IFIP Network Operations and Management Symposium, IEEE*. pp. 1–9.
- Mohsan, S.A.H., Mazinani, A., Othman, N.Q.H., Amjad, H., 2022. Towards the internet of underwater things: A comprehensive survey. *Earth Science Informatics* 15, 735–764.
- Neira, J., Sequeiros, C., Huamani, R., Machaca, E., Fonseca, P., Nina, W., 2021. Review on unmanned underwater robotics, structure designs, materials, sensors, actuators, and navigation control. *Journal of Robotics* 2021, 5542920.
- Qu, S., Cui, C., Duan, J., Lu, Y., Pang, Z., 2024. Underwater small target detection under yolov8-la model. *Scientific Reports* 14, 16108.
- Raveendran, S., Patil, M.D., Birajdar, G.K., 2021. Underwater image enhancement: a comprehensive review, recent trends, challenges and applications. *Artificial Intelligence Review* 54, 5413–5467.
- Rossi, P., Ponti, M., Righi, S., Castagnetti, C., Simonini, R., Mancini, F., Agraftotis, P., Bassani, L., Bruno, F., Cerrano, C., et al., 2021. Needs and gaps in optical underwater technologies and methods for the investigation of marine animal forest 3d-structural complexity. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 8, 591292.
- Roy, A.M., Bose, R., Bhaduri, J., 2022. A fast accurate fine-grain object detection model based on yolov4 deep neural network. *Neural Computing and Applications* 34, 3895–3921.
- Schuetz, M.J., Brubaker, J.K., Katzgraber, H.G., 2022. Combinatorial optimization with physics-inspired graph neural networks. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 4, 367–377.
- Sharma, V.K., Mir, R.N., 2020. A comprehensive and systematic look up into deep learning based object detection techniques: A review. *Computer Science Review* 38, 100301.
- Sun, C., Li, C., Lin, X., Zheng, T., Meng, F., Rui, X., Wang, Z., 2023. Attention-based graph neural networks: a survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review* 56, 2263–2310.
- Teles, G., Rodrigues, J.J., Rabelo, R.A., Kozlov, S.A., 2021. Comparative study of support vector machines and random forests machine learning algorithms on credit operation. *Software: Practice and Experience* 51, 2492–2500.
- Terracciano, D.S., Bazzarello, L., Caiti, A., Costanzi, R., Manzari, V., 2020. Marine robots for underwater surveillance. *Current Robotics Reports* 1, 159–167.
- Tian, S., Li, W., Ning, X., Ran, H., Qin, H., Tiwari, P., 2023. Continuous transfer of neural network representational similarity for incremental learning. *Neurocomputing* 545, 126300.
- Vo, D.T., Nguyen, X.P., Nguyen, T.D., Hidayat, R., Huynh, T.T., Nguyen, D.T., 2021. A review on the internet of thing (iot) technologies in controlling ocean environment. *Energy sources, Part A: Recovery, utilization, and environmental effects*, 1–19.
- Wang, C., Ning, X., Sun, L., Zhang, L., Li, W., Bai, X., 2022. Learning discriminative features by covering local geometric space for point cloud analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 60, 1–15.
- Wang, J., Li, Q., Fang, Z., Zhou, X., Tang, Z., Han, Y., Ma, Z., 2023. Yolov6-esg: A lightweight seafood detection method. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering* 11, 1623.
- Wei, T., Feng, W., Chen, Y., Wang, C.X., Ge, N., Lu, J., 2021. Hybrid satellite-terrestrial communication networks for the maritime internet of things: Key technologies, opportunities, and challenges. *IEEE Internet of things journal* 8, 8910–8934.
- Wulandari, N., Ardiyanto, I., Nugroho, H.A., et al., 2022. A comparison of deep learning approach for underwater object detection. *Jurnal RESTI (Rekayasa Sistem dan Teknologi Informasi)* 6, 252–258.
- Xu, J., Kishk, M.A., Alouini, M.S., 2022. Coverage enhancement of underwater internet of things using multilevel acoustic communication networks. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 9, 25373–25385.
- Zhang, J., Xiao, F., Li, A., Ma, T., Xu, K., Zhang, H., Yan, R., Fang, X., Li, Y., Wang, D., 2023. Graph neural network-based spatio-temporal indoor environment prediction and optimal control for central air-conditioning systems. *Building and Environment* 242, 110600.
- Zhou, J., Yang, Q., Meng, H., Gao, D., 2022. An underwater target recognition method based on improved yolov4 in complex marine environment. *Systems Science & Control Engineering* 10, 590–602.