

Crafting the Future: Machine Learning for Ocean Forecasting

Patrick Heimbach¹, Fearghal O'Donncha², Timothy A. Smith³, Jose Maria Garcia-Valdecasas⁴, Alain Arnaud⁵, Liying Wan⁶

5 ¹Oden Institute for Computational Engineering and Sciences, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, United States

²IBM Research, Dublin, Ireland

³NOAA Physical Sciences Laboratory, Boulder, CO, United States

⁴Nologin Oceanic Weather Systems, Santiago de Compostela, Spain

⁵Mercator Ocean International, Toulouse, France

10 ⁶National Marine Environmental Forecasting Center Beijing, China

Correspondence to: Patrick Heimbach (heimbach@utexas.edu)

Abstract. Artificial intelligence and machine learning are accelerating research in Earth system science, with huge potential
15 for impact and challenges in ocean prediction. Such algorithms are being deployed on different aspects of the forecasting
workflow with the aim of improving its speed and skill. They include pattern classification and anomaly detection, regression
and diagnostics, state prediction from nowcasting to synoptic, sub-seasonal, and seasonal forecasting. This brief review
emphasizes scientific machine learning methods that have the capacity to embed domain knowledge, to ensure interpretability
through causal explanation, to be robust and reliable, to involve effectively high dimensional statistical methods, supporting
20 multi-scale and multi-physics simulations aimed at improving parameterization, and to drive intelligent automation as well as
decision support. An overview of recent numerical developments is discussed, highlighting the importance of fully data-driven
ocean models for future expansion of ocean forecasting capabilities.

1 Introduction

Research into applications of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) in ocean, atmospheric and climate sciences
25 has accelerated at a breathtaking pace over the last 5 years or so (e.g., Schneider et al., 2023; Eyring et al., 2024). With
essentially all these applications concerned with ML, we will drop the more broadly defined “AI” term in most of the following,
except when used by references cited. We will also take the perspective of scientific machine learning (SciML), defined in a
2019 U.S. Department of Energy report on “Basic Research Needs for Scientific Machine Learning” (Baker et al., 2019),
which emphasizes six key elements of SciML algorithms: (i) ML approaches that incorporate domain knowledge, such as
30 physical principles, symmetries, constraints, expert feedback, computational simulations, and formal uncertainties; (ii) ML
approaches that are interpretable, such that user’s confidence in ML-based model predictions may be bolstered by causal
explanations based on a user’s domain knowledge; (iii) ML approaches that are robust and reliable as a prerequisite for making
high-stakes, high-regret decisions; (iv) ML approaches that are data-intensive, i.e., that ingest high-dimensional, noisy, and
uncertain input data which contain complex structures and which require statistical and probabilistic methods to deal with ill-

35 conditioning, non-uniqueness, and over-fitting; (v) ML approaches that enhance modeling and simulation to support, e.g., multi-scale, multi-physics simulations in terms of improved model parameterization or model acceleration; and (vi) ML approaches to support intelligent automation and decision support, which can range from quality control to application-oriented post-processing workflows. Arguably, all of these criteria are fundamental to the uses of ML in ocean prediction.

Next, following the review by Reichstein et al. (2019), it is useful to distinguish different categories of ML applications, (A) 40 classification and anomaly detection, which is concerned with, e.g., finding extreme event patterns or the classification of important structures or regimes; (B) regression, which is concerned with state reconstruction of important state variables, parameters, or diagnostics (metrics) from available data; and (C) state prediction, ranging from nowcasting to operational forecasting, to sub-seasonal to seasonal prediction. A comprehensive collection of review articles on deep learning in Earth sciences is Camps-Valls et al. (2021), covering both algorithmic foundations as well as examples of all three categories.

45 Because the subject of this document is on ocean prediction, we will focus the following on the third category, state prediction or forecasting. To keep this review manageable, we will not review the interesting subjects of ML applications for state reconstruction, downscaling, or classification.

2 State prediction

The workflow of operational ocean prediction largely follows that of numerical weather prediction (NWP). Its core engine is 50 a data assimilation (DA) framework, consisting of a physical model, i.e., a complex algorithm for solving a set of partial differential equations (PDEs), a workflow for quality-controlling and ingesting diverse observational data streams into the DA system (ideally in near-real time), and an optimal estimation algorithm that combines models and data in a formal manner that produces statistically optimal forecasts (e.g., Park and Zupanski, 2022). As pointed out by S. Penny in a 2022 U.S. National Academy of Sciences workshop on Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence to Advance Earth System Science (NASEM, 55 2022), ML approaches hold the prospect for accelerating various elements of the DA workflow. We briefly summarize ML approaches targeting the physical model as well as the DA algorithm. Opportunities in the application of ML for partial differential equation (PDE) based models fall into two main categories, one concerned with targeted insertion of ML within a physical model, the other with the complete replacement of the physical model by a surrogate model. In the former, certain elements or subcomponents of a physical model are replaced by a surrogate model (e.g., a neural network), whereas in the 60 latter, the entire model is emulated. Chantry et al. (2021) have used the terms “soft AI” versus “hard AI”. We avoid the somewhat non-descriptive or ambiguous terminology in order not to give a false sense of which of these approaches is “harder” to realize.

2.1 Hybrid physics-ML models: enhancing forecast models and data assimilation with ML algorithms

A major source of model uncertainty is the parameterization of subgrid-scale (SGS) processes, both in terms of structural errors 65 (formulation of functional representations of parameterizations) as well as parametric uncertainties (calibrating empirical

parameters in the functional representations). Exciting efforts are underway to apply machine learning to replace conventional functional representations subgrid-scale (SGS) turbulent oceanic processes with surrogate models that are based on machine learning and that have been learned either offline or online (Bolton and Zanna, 2019; Frezat et al., 2021a, 2021b; Zhang et al., 2023; Sane et al., 2023; Perezhogin et al., 2023b). This follows on early ideas in the context of climate model parameterization (e.g., Schneider et al., 2017; Rasp et al. 2018). Similarly, equation discovery has proven successful to infer the functional form of such SGS ocean parameterization schemes (Zanna and Bolton, 2020, 2021; Perezhogin et al., 2023a). A longer list of related efforts exists for numerical weather prediction and has been reviewed by Dueben et al. (2021) and Boualègue et al. (2024). These surrogates, mostly some form of neural networks, have been trained on (i.e., fit to) what are considered simulations of much higher fidelity where these processes are resolved (e.g., large eddy simulations). Related efforts aim at learning improved parameterizations from online bias correction or analysis increments incurred in sequential data assimilation (e.g., Gregory et al., 2023, 2024; Storto et al., 2024). Rapid progress is expected on this front in the coming years.

A second important application of hybrid approaches is the desire to replace specific numerical algorithms within PDE-based models by surrogate models to accelerate the simulation’s time-to-solution. Studies exist within the generic field of computational fluid dynamics (Kochkov et al. (2021) and atmospheric modelling (Arcomano et al., 2023; Kochkov et al., 2024), and with ocean-specific applications currently underway. Most of these take advantage of the concept of differentiable programming (Gelbrecht et al., 2023; Shen et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023; Sapienza et al., 2024). The underlying idea is to be able to generate code for the derivative of the physical model, in particular the adjoint model that enables efficient “online” (or “full model”) learning of model parameters (or neural network weights).

There is a strong conceptual correspondence between machine learning and data assimilation (e.g., Abarbanel et al., 2018). This provides various opportunities for embedding ML approaches within operational data assimilation workflows deployed in ocean prediction. Examples in ocean modeling so far are largely restricted to “toy problems” (such as the “Lorenz 96 model”) or reduced-order versions of Earth system models but targeting eventual applications for ocean prediction (Bocquet et al., 2020; Brajard et al., 2021; Penny et al., 2022). The use of hybrid DA/ML approaches, be it in the context of ensemble DA or adjoint-based methods (e.g., 4DVar) presents substantial algorithmic hurdles (e.g., availability of a differentiable dynamical core in the context of adjoint-based DA), which explains the relative paucity of such studies to date compared to purely data-driven methods.

2.2 Purely data-driven models: replacing numerical simulations with surrogate models

Over the last decade, with the acceleration of AI based solutions in other fields, a number of approaches to model the atmosphere and ocean using different hard AI have been developed. The overwhelming majority of these cases have so far been realized in weather prediction or computational fluid dynamics.

2.2.1 Deterministic applications in weather prediction

Arguably, the field of data-driven weather forecasting has seen the strongest advances over the last five years, or so. This is a strong incentive for providing a very brief review organized in terms of approaches as a function of underlying “blocks” of

ML architectures employed. In a number of cases these architectural blocks are being combined. For example, the European
100 Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecast’s AIFS (Lang et al., 2024) uses an overall “encode-process-decode” architecture,
with a graph-based encoder and decoder, but a sliding window transformer as the processor.

Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs): Perhaps among the first serious endeavours using ML for emulating weather
forecast models have been the uses of CNNs by Weyn et al., 2019; Weyn et al., 2020; Weyn et al., 2021; Karlbauer et al.,
2023. CNNs use a mathematical operation called convolution to compress information, learning features or patterns in the
105 input. Most recently, CNNs have been used by Cresswell-Clay et al., (2024) to create a coupled atmosphere-ocean emulator
which produces a stable climate for 1,000-year periods and appears to be competitive with many CMIP6 models.

Graph Neural Networks: Among the leading emulators for medium-range weather forecasts is the work by Lam et al. (2023).
Based on graph neural networks, the GraphCast model was trained on atmospheric reanalysis data to produce autoregressive
forecasts for up to 10 days.

110 **Transformers:** These have been revolutionary in other ML/AI fields, such as natural language processing and image
recognition/generation. They serve as the backbone for some of the leading atmospheric emulators, including Pangu Weather
(Bi et al., 2023), FuXi (L. Chen et al., 2023), and FengWu (K. Chen et al., 2023).

Fourier Neural Operators (FNOs): FNOs have been designed to move toward mesh-independent operators using Fourier
bases (Li et al. 2020). FourCastNet (Pathak et al., 2022, Kurth et al. 2023) is based on a variant, the Adaptive FNO (AFNO).
115 Another variant, the Spherical FNO (SFNO, Bonev et al. 2023; Watt-Meyer et al., 2023) seeks to take advantage of the
spherical geometry (and underlying symmetries) in representing operator kernels for global-scale applications. Very recently,
the use of SFNOs has been extended to coupled atmosphere-ocean modeling targeting seasonal prediction (C. Wang et al.,
2024).

Recurrent Neural Networks (including Long Short-Term Memory LSTM and Reservoir Computing): Recurrent neural
120 networks (RNNs) are well-suited for sequential data processing, such as time series. Among special cases of RNNs, Long
Short-term Memory (LSTM) networks use a special type of neuron that keeps track of previous inputs (short-term memory)
and are especially useful for predicting time-series with memory, such as is the case for the atmosphere and ocean. Reservoir
Computing (RC), another method based on RNNs with a pool of interconnected neurons forming the “reservoir”, is particularly
well adapted to the emulation of time series (e.g., Arcomano et al., 2020, Penny et al., 2022, Platt et al., 2023, Smith et al.,
125 2023).

2.2.2 Probabilistic approaches – generative models

Most examples sketched in Section 2.2.1 describe emulators that are trained to be deterministic forecast models. Recent
developments in ML have considered generative frameworks, i.e., models that are designed to be probabilistic. Such
frameworks would include Variational Auto Encoders, Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), and Diffusion Models.
130 However, we note that GANs can suffer from a lack of sample diversity (Bayat 2023) and they are notoriously challenging to
train, requiring careful setup to avoid training instabilities (e.g., Miyato et al., 2018). Moreover, in recent years Diffusion
Models have started to outperform GANs in image classification (Dhariwal and Nichol, 2021). For these reasons, Diffusion

Models have become popular in generative modeling, despite their relatively high computational cost. Recent examples of Diffusion Models include GenCast (Price et al., 2024). Finally, we note a very recently developed technique DYffusion (Cachay et al., 2023; 2024), which is a generative framework that aims to reduce the computational cost of Diffusion Modeling by encoding the temporal evolution expected in physical systems into the generative process.

2.2.3 Physics-informed machine learning

The results of purely data-driven solutions may potentially produce meaningless output, as the training strategy of a neural network is to minimize a mathematical loss function, e.g., the mean squared error (i.e., L2 norm) between the prediction and the original target. Similar issues, e.g., producing overly blurred output, may arise with other choices of the loss function, such as an L1 norm. An evolution of this approach is to include some physical constraints in the loss function in order to force the ML algorithm to produce more consistent outputs, as the Navier-Stokes equation (Ma et al., 2022; Daw et al., 2021). This class of methods is known as physical-informed neural networks (PINNs). However, the performance of PINNs for extrapolation remains subject to debate (e.g., Du et al., 2023 for a cautionary example). Recently, another approach, which tries to solve differential equations using neural networks, is under development. Although this method is mostly developed for other physics fields, the methodology and knowledge can be applied to ocean modeling (Zubov et al., 2021; Smets et al., 2023).

2.2.4 Applications in ocean surface state forecasting

With previous examples mostly limited to weather prediction and computational fluid dynamics (in a few cases), we turn our attention to applications in the context of predicting ocean surface properties. They include the use of multi-layer perceptrons (James et al., 2018, Gracia et al., 2021) and LSTMs (Minuzzi and Farina, 2023; Lawal et al, 2024) for surface wave prediction, surface wave-current interaction forecasting, storm surge forecasting (Xie et al., 2023) and sea surface temperature prediction via deep learning (Wolff et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2023); the use of neural networks for accelerating resonant nonlinear wave-wave interaction in an ocean surface wave model (Puscasu, 2014), for regional to coastal sea level prediction (Nieves et al., 2021), for ocean color mapping (S. Chen et al., 2019), and for statistical downscaling (Accarino et al., 2021). Other applications include estimating ocean surface circulation (Sinha and Abernathey, 2021; Subel and Zanna, 2024) and predicting dissolved oxygen across scales (O'Donncha et al., 2022).

2.3 ML-based Ocean Circulation Prediction

Among the challenges of fully realizing the opportunities of ML approaches in ocean circulation prediction is the fact that, in the absence of adequate, densely sampled observational data, most ML applications rely on the use of data obtained from high-fidelity model simulations as training data sets. These data sets are very expensive to generate, limited in the temporal ranges that they can represent, remain subject to unquantified structural and parametric model uncertainty, require vast amounts of storage (order of Petabytes), and are thus challenging to query. Cloud-based solutions are the most promising approach for ubiquitous data access and analysis capabilities “close to the data” (Abernathey et al., 2020).

Within the realm of machine learning (ML) applications for ocean forecasting, progress has been somewhat limited. Recent developments have marked a shift in this landscape, particularly with the introduction of Fourier Neural Operators for modeling

oceanic processes, as suggested by Bire et al. (2023), Chattopadhyay et al. (2023), and Sun et al. (2024). These studies present fully data-driven ocean models that match the capabilities of traditional numerical ocean models in predicting high-resolution sea surface height (SSH) fields. FNOs are attractive for their performance in learning complex, high-dimensional mappings and their ability to incorporate physical laws and constraints, which are prominently observable in the spectral domain. A drawback of FNOs applied to ocean (unlike atmospheric) modelling is the existence of land-covered portions of the domain, which renders challenging the use of periodic basis functions and may create artifacts near land-ocean boundaries. Concurrently, Wang et al. (2024) introduced a transformer-based model tailored for oceanic applications, demonstrating performance that rivals that of leading operational global ocean forecasting systems. Similar advances are being made in data-driven prediction of sea ice cover in the polar oceans (Anderson et al., 2021; see also Bertino et al., this issue). This body of work signifies the emergence of a promising research avenue in fully data-driven ocean modeling, despite it still lagging considerably behind the advancements seen in weather forecasting. We posit that the drive of fully data-driven solutions in NWP by private sector companies is related to the prospect of high-stakes / high-reward applications. Such applications for ocean predictions should be better articulated to attract similar research efforts. Careful evaluation of skill, such as now being discussed more comprehensively in NWP (e.g., Charlton-Perez et al., 2024) will also be required for operational ocean prediction. Another challenge presents the extension of ML applications to seasonal, inter-annual and multi-decadal - i.e. climate - time scales (see e.g., the discussion in Gentine et al., 2021; Beucler et al., 2024; Subel and Zanna, 2024). Here, the increased need of models or invariant operators (physics-based or surrogates) to conserve fundamental properties (mass, energy, momentum, active tracers) puts severe demands on ML approaches. Arguably, as these approaches increasingly incorporate physical knowledge, they will converge to the realm of classical inverse methods (Willcox et al., 2021).

2.4 Benchmarking forecast models

Data-driven forecasting in meteorology - and to some extent in oceanography - is proceeding at a breathtaking pace. The use of different approaches, different training data, and different performance metrics complicates objective assessment of the different works at the present time. Recognizing the need for standardized evaluation has led to the proposition of common evaluation benchmarks that encompass both data-driven and “traditional” forecasting in weather prediction (Dueben et al., 2022; Rasp et al., 2020, 2024), as well as climate model emulation (Yu et al., 2024). These benchmarks comprise common data sets, open-source evaluation workflows, and common evaluation metrics. Similar benchmarking efforts in ML-driven ocean circulation and surface wave forecasting will be equally important to advance the field and establish standardized evaluation metrics.

The concept of digital twins (DTs) is rapidly gaining traction within the ocean science community and Earth system science more broadly (e.g., Bauer et al., 2021a, 2021b). Because of the differing view of what constitutes a DT in the recent literature, we here adopt and emphasize the definition from NASEM (2022) (see also Niederer et al., 2021; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2023), a DT is “a set of virtual information constructs that mimics the structure, context and behaviour of an individual/unique physical asset, or a group of physical assets, is dynamically updated with data from its physical twin throughout its life cycle and informs decisions that realize value. A digital twin is highly dynamical, mimicking the time evolution of its physical asset (PA) via advanced simulation and emulation capabilities; it is updated by ingesting vast amounts of observational data of diverse types; and it enables WHAT-IF queries and multiple realizations to support prediction of responses of the PA to hypothetical perturbations with quantified uncertainties.”

Virtually all aspects of ocean forecasting – and ML opportunities therein – may be viewed through the DT lens, from the need to generate high-fidelity simulations or digital representations, ingesting, i.e., assimilating large, heterogeneous data streams, the development of fast surrogates or emulators to either accelerate simulations or provide comprehensive uncertainty estimates, to the generation of diagnostic data that create value for (possibly rapid) decision support.

References

- 210 Abarbanel, H. D. I., Rozdeba, P. J. & Shirman, S.: Machine Learning: Deepest Learning as Statistical Data Assimilation Problems. *Neural Computation*, 30(8), 2025–2055. https://doi.org/10.1162/neco_a_01094, 2018.
- Abernathy, R. P., Augspurger, T., Banihirwe, A., Blackmon-Luca, C. C., Crone, T. J., Gentemann, C. L., Hamman, J. J., Henderson, N., Lepore, C., McCaie, T. A., Robinson, N. H. & Signell, R. P.: Cloud-Native Repositories for Big Scientific Data. *Computing in Science & Engineering*, 23(2), 26–35. <https://doi.org/10.1109/mcse.2021.3059437>, 2020.
- 215 Accarino, G., Chiarelli, M., Immorlano, F., Aloisi, V., Gatto, A., Aloisio, G.: MSG-GAN-SD: A Multi-Scale Gradients GAN for Statistical Downscaling of 2-Meter Temperature over the EURO-CORDEX Domain. *AI*. 2021; 2(4):600-620. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ai2040036>, 2021.
- Andersson, T.R., Hosking, J.S., Pérez-Ortiz, M. et al.: Seasonal Arctic sea ice forecasting with probabilistic deep learning. *Nature Communications*, 12, 5124. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-25257-4>, 2021.
- 220 Arcomano, T., Szunyogh, I., Pathak, J., Wikner, A., Hunt, B. R., & Ott, E.: A Machine Learning-Based Global Atmospheric Forecast Model. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(9), e2020GL087776. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL087776>, 2020.
- Arcomano, T., Szunyogh, I., Wikner, A., Hunt, B. R., & Ott, E.: A Hybrid Atmospheric Model Incorporating Machine Learning Can Capture Dynamical Processes Not Captured by Its Physics-Based Component. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 50(8), e2022GL102649. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL102649>, 2023.
- 225 Baker, N., Alexander, F., Bremer, T., Hagberg, A., Kevrekidis, Y., Najm, H., Parashar, M., Patra, A., Sethian, J., Wild, S. & Willcox, K.: Workshop Report on Basic Research Needs for Scientific Machine Learning: Core Technologies for Artificial Intelligence (pp. 1–109). <https://doi.org/10.2172/1478744>, 2019.
- Bauer, P., Dueben, P. D., Hoefler, T., Quintino, T., Schulthess, T. C. & Wedi, N. P.: The digital revolution of Earth-system science. *Nature Computational Science*, 1(2), 104–113. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-021-00023-0>, 2021b.

- 230 Bauer, P., Stevens, B. & Hazeleger, W.: A digital twin of Earth for the green transition. *Nature Climate Change*, 5, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-00986-y>, 2021a.
- Bayat, R. A Study on Sample Diversity in Generative Models: GANs vs. Diffusion Models. The First Tiny Papers Track at ICLR 2023, Tiny Papers @ ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 5, 2023. , 2023.
- 235 Bertino, L. and Heimbach, P.: Numerical Models for Monitoring and Forecasting Sea Ice: a short description of present status. *State of the Planet*, submitted, 2024.
- Beucler, T., Gentine, P., Yuval, J., Gupta, A., Peng, L., Lin, J., Yu, S., Rasp, S., Ahmed, F., O’Gorman, P. A., Neelin, J. D., Lutsko, N. J. & Pritchard, M.: Climate-invariant machine learning. *Science Advances*, 10(6), eadj7250. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adj7250>, 2024.
- 240 Bi, K., Xie, L., Zhang, H., Chen, X., Gu, X., & Tian, Q. Accurate medium-range global weather forecasting with 3D neural networks. *Nature*, 619(7970), 533–538. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06185-3>, 2023.
- Bire, S., Lütjens, B., Azizzadenesheli, K., Anandkumar, A. & Hill, C. N.: Ocean Emulation with Fourier Neural Operators: Double Gyre. <https://doi.org/10.22541/essoar.170110658.85641696/v1>, 2023.
- Bocquet, M., Brajard, J., Carrassi, A. & Bertino, L.: Bayesian inference of chaotic dynamics by merging data assimilation, machine learning and expectation-maximization. *Foundations of Data Science*, 2(1), 55–80. 245 <https://doi.org/10.3934/fods.2020004>, 2020.
- Bolton, T., and Zanna, L.: Applications of Deep Learning to Ocean Data Inference and Subgrid Parameterization. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11(1), 376–399. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018ms001472>, 2019.
- Brajard, J., Carrassi, A., Bocquet, M. & Bertino, L.: Combining data assimilation and machine learning to infer unresolved scale parametrization. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 379(2194), 20200086. 250 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2020.0086>, 2021.
- Bonavita, M., 2023: On some limitations of data-driven weather forecasting models. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2309.08473>, 2023.
- Bonev, B., Kurth, T., Hundt, C., Pathak, J., Baust, M., Kashinath, K. & Anandkumar, A.: Spherical Fourier Neural Operators: Learning Stable Dynamics on the Sphere. *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*. 255 <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/bonev23a.html>, 2023.
- Bouallègue, Z. B., Weyn, J. A., Clare, M. C. A., Dramsch, J., Dueben, P. & Chantry, M.: Improving Medium-Range Ensemble Weather Forecasts with Hierarchical Ensemble Transformers. *Artificial Intelligence for the Earth Systems*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1175/aies-d-23-0027.1>, 2024.
- Cachay, S. R., Zhao, B., Joren, H., & Yu, R. DYffusion: A Dynamics-informed Diffusion Model for Spatiotemporal 260 Forecasting. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.01984>, 2023.
- Cachay, S. R., Henn, B., Watt-Meyer, O., Bretherton, C. S. & Yu, R.: Probabilistic Emulation of a Global Climate Model with Spherical DYffusion. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2406.14798>, 2024.
- Camps-Valls, G. G. D. Tuia, Xiao X. Zhu, & M. Reichstein, Eds.: *Deep Learning for the Earth Sciences: A Comprehensive Approach to Remote Sensing, Climate Science, and Geosciences*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd. 265 <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119646181>, 2021.
- Chantry, M., Christensen, H., Dueben, P. and Palmer, T.: Opportunities and challenges for machine learning in weather and climate modelling: hard, medium and soft AI. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 379(2194), 20200083–20200088. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2020.0083>, 2021.
- 270 Charlton-Perez, A. J., Dacre, H. F., Driscoll, S., Gray, S. L., Harvey, B., Harvey, N. J., Hunt, K. M. R., Lee, R. W., Swaminathan, R., Vandaele, R. & Volonté, A.: Do AI models produce better weather forecasts than physics-based models? A quantitative evaluation case study of Storm Ciarán. *Npj Climate and Atmospheric Science*, 7(1), 93. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41612-024-00638-w>, 2024.

- Chattopadhyay, A., Gray, M., Wu, T., Lowe, A.B., and He, R.: OceanNet: A principled neural operator-based digital twin for regional oceans. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00813. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.00813>, 2023.
- 275 Chen, K., Han, T., Gong, J., Bai, L., Ling, F., Luo, J.-J., Chen, X., Ma, L., Zhang, T., Su, R., Ci, Y., Li, B., Yang, X. & Ouyang, W.: FengWu: Pushing the Skillful Global Medium-range Weather Forecast beyond 10 Days Lead. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2304.02948>, 2023.
- Chen, L., Zhong, X., Zhang, F., Cheng, Y., Xu, Y., Qi, Y., & Li, H.: FuXi: a cascade machine learning forecasting system for 15-day global weather forecast. Npj Climate and Atmospheric Science, 6(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41612-023-00512-1>, 2023.
- 280 Chen, S., Hu, C., Barnes, B.B., Xie, Y., Lin, G., and Qiu, Z.: Improving ocean color data coverage through machine learning. Remote Sensing of Environment, 222, 286–302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2018.12.023>, 2019
- Cresswell-Clay, N., Liu, B., Durran, D., Liu, A., Espinosa, Z. I., Moreno, R., & Karlbauer, M. A Deep Learning Earth System Model for Stable and Efficient Simulation of the Current Climate. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2409.16247>, 2024.
- 285 Daw, A., Maruf, M., & Karpatne, A.: PID-GAN: A GAN Framework based on a Physics-informed Discriminator for Uncertainty Quantification with Physics. In Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining (pp. 237–247), 2021.
- Dhariwal, P., & Nichol, A. Diffusion Models Beat GANs on Image Synthesis. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 34, 8780–8794. <https://proceedings.nips.cc/paper/2021/hash/49ad23d1ec9fa4bd8d77d02681df5cfa-Abstract.html>, 2021.
- 290 Du, Y., Wang, M. & Zaki, T. A.: State estimation in minimal turbulent channel flow: A comparative study of 4DVar and PINN. International Journal of Heat and Fluid Flow, 99, 109073. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatfluidflow.2022.109073>, 2023.
- Dueben, P. D., Bauer, P. & Adams, S.: Deep Learning to Improve Weather Predictions. In: Deep learning for the Earth Sciences (pp. 204–217). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119646181.ch14>, 2021.
- 295 Dueben, P., Schultz, M. G., Chantry, M., Gagne, D. J., Hall, D. M. & McGovern, A.: Challenges and benchmark datasets for machine learning in the atmospheric sciences: Definition, status and outlook. Artificial Intelligence for the Earth Systems, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1175/aies-d-21-0002.1>, 2022.
- Frezat, H., Balarac, G., Sommer, J. L., Fablet, R. & Lguensat, R.: Physical invariance in neural networks for subgrid-scale scalar flux modeling. Physical Review Fluids, 6(2), 024607. <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevfluids.6.024607>, 2021.
- 300 Eyring, V., Collins, W. D., Gentine, P., Barnes, E. A., Barreiro, M., Beucler, T., Bocquet, M., Bretherton, C. S., Christensen, H. M., Dagon, K., Gagne, D. J., Hall, D., Hammerling, D., Hoyer, S., Iglesias-Suarez, F., Lopez-Gomez, I., McGraw, M. C., Meehl, G. A., Molina, M. J., ..., and Zanna, L.: Pushing the frontiers in climate modelling and analysis with machine learning. Nature Climate Change, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-024-02095-y>, 2024.
- 305 Gelbrecht, M., White, A., Bathiany, S. & Boers, N. Differentiable programming for Earth system modeling. Geoscientific Model Development, 16(11), 3123–3135. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-16-3123-2023>, 2023.
- Gentine, P., Eyring, V. & Beucler, T.: Deep Learning for the Parametrization of Subgrid Processes in Climate Models. In Deep learning for the Earth Sciences (pp. 307–314). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119646181.ch21>, 2021.
- 310 Gracia, S., Olivito, J., Resano, J., Martin-del-Brio, B., de Alfonso, M., & Álvarez, E.: Improving accuracy on wave height estimation through machine learning techniques. Ocean Engineering, 236, 108699. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2021.108699>, 2021.
- Gregory, W., Bushuk, M., Adcroft, A., Zhang, Y. & Zanna, L.: Deep Learning of Systematic Sea Ice Model Errors From Data Assimilation Increments. Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems, 15(10). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023ms003757>, 2023.

- 315 Gregory, W., Bushuk, M., Zhang, Y., Adcroft, A. & Zanna, L.: Machine Learning for Online Sea Ice Bias Correction Within Global Ice-Ocean Simulations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 51(3). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023gl106776>, 2024.
- Irrgang, C., Boers, N., Sonnewald, M., Barnes, E. A., Kadow, C., Staneva, J. & Saynisch-Wagner, J.: Towards neural Earth system modelling by integrating artificial intelligence in Earth system science. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 3(8), 667–674. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-021-00374-3>, 2021.
- 320 Lang, S., Alexe, M., Chantry, M., Dramsch, J., Pinault, F., Raoult, B., Clare, M. C. A., Lessig, C., Maier-Gerber, M., Magnusson, L., Bouall  gue, Z. B., Nemesio, A. P., Dueben, P. D., Brown, A., Pappenberger, F., & Rabier, F. AIFS - ECMWF’s data-driven forecasting system arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2406.01465>, 2024.
- Lawal, Z. K., Yassin, H., Teck Ching Lai, D., & Che Idris, A. (2024). Understanding the Dynamics of Ocean Wave-Current Interactions Through Multivariate Multi-Step Time Series Forecasting. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, 38(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/08839514.2024.2393978>
- 325 Li, Z., Kovachki, N., Aizzadenesheli, K., Liu, B., Bhattacharya, K., Stuart, A. & Anandkumar, A.: Fourier Neural Operator for Parametric Partial Differential Equations. arXiv.Org, 1–16. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.08895v1>, 2020.
- James, S. C., Zhang, Y., and O’Donncha, F.: A machine learning framework to forecast wave conditions. *Coastal Engineering*, 137, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2018.03.004>, 2018.
- 330 Karlbauer, M., Cresswell-Clay, N., Moreno, R. A., Durran, D. R., Kurth, T., & Butz, M. V.: Advancing Parsimonious Deep Learning Weather Prediction using the HEALPix Mesh. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.06253>, 2023.
- Kochkov, D., Yuval, J., Langmore, I., Norgaard, P., Smith, J., Mooers, G., Kl  wer, M., Lottes, J., Rasp, S., D  ben, P., Hatfield, S., Battaglia, P., Sanchez-Gonzalez, A., Willson, M., Brenner, M. P. & Hoyer, S.: Neural general circulation models for weather and climate. *Nature*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07744-y>, 2024.
- 335 Kochkov, D., Smith, J. A., Alieva, A., Wang, Q., Brenner, M. P. & Hoyer, S.: Machine learning–accelerated computational fluid dynamics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(21), e2101784118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2101784118>, 2021.
- Kurth, T., Subramanian, S., Harrington, P., Pathak, J., Mardani, M., Hall, D., Miele, A., Kashinath, K. & Anandkumar, A.: FourCastNet: Accelerating Global High-Resolution Weather Forecasting Using Adaptive Fourier Neural Operators. *Proceedings of the Platform for Advanced Scientific Computing Conference*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3592979.3593412>, 2023.
- 340 Ma, H., Zhang, Y., Thuerey, N., X. H., and Haidn, O. J.: Physics-Driven Learning of the Steady Navier-Stokes Equations using Deep Convolutional Neural Networks. *Communications in Computational Physics*, 32(3), 715–736. doi:10.4208/cicp.OA-2021-0146, 2022.
- 345 Lam, R., Sanchez-Gonzalez, A., Willson, M., Wirsberger, P., Fortunato, M., Pritzel, A., Ravuri, S., Ewalds, T., Alet, F., Eaton-Rosen, Z., Hu, W., Meroze, A., Hoyer, S., Holland, G., Stott, J., Vinyals, O., Mohamed, S. & Battaglia, P. (2022). GraphCast: Learning skillful medium-range global weather forecasting. *Science* 382(6677), 1416-1421. <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.adi2336>, 2023.
- Lang, S., Alexe, M., Chantry, M., Dramsch, J., Pinault, F., Raoult, B., Clare, M. C. A., Lessig, C., Maier-Gerber, M., Magnusson, L., Bouall  gue, Z. B., Nemesio, A. P., Dueben, P. D., Brown, A., Pappenberger, F., & Rabier, F. AIFS - ECMWF’s data-driven forecasting system. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.01465>, 2024.
- 350 Minuzzi, F. C., & Farina, L.: A deep learning approach to predict significant wave height using long short-term memory. *Ocean Modelling*, 181, 102151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2022.102151>, 2023.
- Miyato, T., Kataoka, T., Koyama, M., & Yoshida, Y. Spectral Normalization for Generative Adversarial Networks. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1802.05957>, 2018,
- 355 NASEM: Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence to Advance Earth System Science: Opportunities and Challenges: Proceedings of a Workshop. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/26566>, 2022.

- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine: Foundational Research Gaps and Future Directions for Digital Twins. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/26894>, 2023.
- 360 Niederer, S. A., Sacks, M. S., Girolami, M. & Willcox, K.: Scaling digital twins from the artisanal to the industrial. *Nature Computational Science*, 1(5), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-021-00072-5>, 2021.
- Nieves, V., Radin, C. & Camps-Valls, G.: Predicting regional coastal sea level changes with machine learning. *Sci Rep* 11, 7650, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-87460-z>, 2021.
- 365 O'Donncha, F., Hu, Y., Palmes, P., Burke, M., Filgueira, R., and Grant, J.: A spatio-temporal LSTM model to forecast across multiple temporal and spatial scales. *Ecological Informatics*, 69, 101687. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2022.101687>. 2022.
- Park, S. K., and Zupanski, M.: *Principles of Data Assimilation*. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- Pathak, J., Subramanian, S., Harrington, P., Raja, S., Chattopadhyay, A., Mardani, M., Kurth, T., Hall, D., Li, Z., Azizzadenesheli, K., Hassanzadeh, P., Kashinath, K. & Anandkumar, A.: FourCastNet: A Global Data-driven High-resolution
370 Weather Model using Adaptive Fourier Neural Operators. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2202.11214>, 2022.
- Penny, S. G., Smith, T. A., Chen, T. -C., Platt, J. A., Lin, H. -Y., Goodliff, M. & Abarbanel, H. D. I.: Integrating Recurrent Neural Networks With Data Assimilation for Scalable Data-Driven State Estimation. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 14(3). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021ms002843>, 2022.
- 375 Perezhogin, P., Zhang, C., Adcroft, A., Fernandez-Granda, C. & Zanna, L.: Implementation of a data-driven equation-discovery mesoscale parameterization into an ocean model. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2311.02517>, 2023a.
- Perezhogin, P., Zanna, L., & Fernandez-Granda, C. Generative Data-Driven Approaches for Stochastic Subgrid Parameterizations in an Idealized Ocean Model. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 15(10), e2023MS003681. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023MS003681>, 2023b.
- 380 Platt, J. A., Penny, S. G., Smith, T. A., Chen, T.-C. & Abarbanel, H. D. I.: Constraining chaos: Enforcing dynamical invariants in the training of reservoir computers. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 33(10), 103107. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0156999>, 2023.
- Price, I., Sanchez-Gonzalez, A., Alet, F., Andersson, T. R., El-Kadi, A., Masters, D., Ewalds, T., Stott, J., Mohamed, S., Battaglia, P., Lam, R. & Willson, M.: Probabilistic weather forecasting with machine learning. *Nature*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-08252-9>, 2024.
- 385 Puscasu, R. M.: Integration of artificial neural networks into operational ocean wave prediction models for fast and accurate emulation of exact nonlinear interactions. *Procedia Computer Science*, 29, 1156-1170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2014.05.104>, 2014.
- 390 Rasp, S., Pritchard, M. S. & Gentine, P.: Deep learning to represent subgrid processes in climate models. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 7, 201810286–6. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1810286115>, 2018.
- Rasp, S., Dueben, P. D., Scher, S., Weyn, J. A., Mouatadid, S. & Thuerey, N.: WeatherBench: A Benchmark Data Set for Data-Driven Weather Forecasting. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 12(11). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020ms002203>, 2020.
- 395 Rasp, S., Hoyer, S., Meroze, A., Langmore, I., Battaglia, P., Russell, T., Sanchez-Gonzalez, A., Yang, V., Carver, R., Agrawal, S., Chantry, M., Bouallegue, Z. B., Dueben, P., Bromberg, C., Sisk, J., Barrington, L., Bell, A. & Sha, F.: WeatherBench 2: A Benchmark for the Next Generation of Data-Driven Global Weather Models. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 16(6). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023ms004019>, 2024.
- 400 Reichstein, M., Camps-Valls, M., Stevens, G., Jung, B., Denzler, M., Carvalhais, J. & Prabhat, N.: Deep learning and process understanding for data-driven Earth system science. *Nature*, 566(7743), 195–204. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0912-1>, 2019.

- Sane, A., Reichl, B. G., Adcroft, A. & Zanna, L.: Parameterizing Vertical Mixing Coefficients in the Ocean Surface Boundary Layer Using Neural Networks. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 15(10). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023ms003890>, 2023.
- 405 Sapienza, F., Bolibar, J., Schäfer, F., Groenke, B., Pal, A., Boussange, V., Heimbach, P., Hooker, G., Pérez, F., Persson, P.-O. & Rackauckas, C.: Differentiable Programming for Differential Equations: A Review. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2406.09699>, 2024.
- Schneider, R., Bonavita, M., Geer, A., Arcucci, R., Dueben, P., Vitolo, C., Saux, B. L., Demir, B. & Mathieu, P.-P.: ESA-ECMWF Report on recent progress and research directions in machine learning for Earth System observation and prediction. *Npj Climate and Atmospheric Science*, 5(1), 51. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41612-022-00269-z>, 2022.
- 410 Schneider, T., Lan, S., Stuart, A. & Teixeira, J.: Earth System Modeling 2.0: A Blueprint for Models That Learn From Observations and Targeted High-Resolution Simulations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44(24), 12,396-12,417. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017gl076101>, 2017.
- Schneider, T., Behera, S., Boccaletti, G., Deser, C., Emanuel, K., Ferrari, R., Leung, L. R., Lin, N., Müller, T., Navarra, A., Ndiaye, O., Stuart, A., Tribbia, J. and Yamagata, T.: Harnessing AI and computing to advance climate modelling and prediction. *Nature Climate Change*, 13(9), 887–889. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-023-01769-3>, 2023.
- 415 Sinha, A., and Abernathy, R.: Estimating ocean surface currents with machine learning. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 8, 672477. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.672477>, 2021.
- Smets, B. M., Portegies, J., Bekkers, E. J., & Duits, R.: PDE-based group equivariant convolutional neural networks. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 65(1), 209-239, 2023.
- 420 Smith, T. A., Penny, S. G., Platt, J. A., & Chen, T.-C.: Temporal Subsampling Diminishes Small Spatial Scales in Recurrent Neural Network Emulators of Geophysical Turbulence. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 15(12), e2023MS003792. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023MS003792>, 2023.
- Subel, A. & Zanna, L. (2024). Building Ocean Climate Emulators. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2402.04342>
- Sun, Y., Sowunmi, O., Egele, R., Narayanan, S. H. K., Roedel, L. V. & Balaprakash, P.: Streamlining Ocean Dynamics Modeling with Fourier Neural Operators: A Multiobjective Hyperparameter and Architecture Optimization Approach. *Mathematics*, 12(10), 1483. <https://doi.org/10.3390/math12101483>, 2024.
- 425 Wang, C., Pritchard, M. S., Brenowitz, N., Cohen, Y., Bonev, B., Kurth, T., Durran, D. & Pathak, J.: Coupled Ocean-Atmosphere Dynamics in a Machine Learning Earth System Model. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.08632>, 2024.
- Wang, X., Wang, R., Hu, N., Wang, P., Huo, P., Wang, G., Wang, H., Wang, S., Zhu, J., Xu, J., Yin, J., Bao, S., Luo, C., Zu, Z., Han, Y., Zhang, W., Ren, K., Deng, K. & Song, J.: XiHe: A Data-Driven Model for Global Ocean Eddy-Resolving Forecasting. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2402.02995>, 2024.
- 430 Watt-Meyer, O., Dresdner, G., McGibbon, J., Clark, S. K., Henn, B., Duncan, J., Brenowitz, N. D., Kashinath, K., Pritchard, M. S., Bonev, B., Peters, M. E. & Bretherton, C. S.: ACE: A fast, skillful learned global atmospheric model for climate prediction. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2310.02074>, 2023.
- 435 Willcox, K. E., Ghattas, O. & Heimbach, P.: The imperative of physics-based modeling and inverse theory in computational science. *Nature Computational Science*, 1(3), 166–168. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-021-00040-z>, 2021.
- Weyn, J. A., Durran, D. R., & Caruana, R.: Can Machines Learn to Predict Weather? Using Deep Learning to Predict Gridded 500-hPa Geopotential Height From Historical Weather Data. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11(8), 2680–2693. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001705>, 2019.
- 440 Weyn, J. A., Durran, D. R., & Caruana, R.: Improving Data-Driven Global Weather Prediction Using Deep Convolutional Neural Networks on a Cubed Sphere. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 12(9), e2020MS002109. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020MS002109>, 2020.

Weyn, J. A., Durran, D. R., Caruana, R., & Cresswell-Clay, N.: Sub-Seasonal Forecasting With a Large Ensemble of Deep-Learning Weather Prediction Models. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 13(7), e2021MS002502.

445 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021MS002502>, 2021.

Wolff, S., O'Donncha, F., and Chen, B.: Statistical and machine learning ensemble modelling to forecast sea surface temperature. *Journal of Marine Systems*, 208, 103347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2020.103347>, 2020.

Xie, W., Xu, G., Zhang, H., & Dong, C.: Developing a deep learning-based storm surge forecasting model. *Ocean Modelling*, 182, 102179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2023.102179>, 2023.

450 Xu, S., Dai, D., Cui, X., Yin, X., Jiang, S., Pan, H., & Wang, G.: A deep learning approach to predict sea surface temperature based on multiple modes. *Ocean Modelling*, 181, 102158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2022.102158>, 2023.

Yu, S., Hannah, W., Peng, L., Lin, J., Bhouri, M. A., Gupta, R., Lütjens, B., Will, J. C., Behrens, G., Busecke, J., Loose, N., Stern, C. I., Beucler, T., Harrop, B., Hillman, B. R., Jenney, A., Ferretti, S., Liu, N., Anandkumar, A., ... Pritchard, M.: ClimSim: A large multi-scale dataset for hybrid physics-ML climate emulation. *arXiv*.
455 <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2306.08754>, 2023.

Zanna, L. & Bolton, T.: Data-Driven Equation Discovery of Ocean Mesoscale Closures. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(17), e2020GL088376-33. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020gl088376>, 2020.

Zanna, L. & Bolton, T.: Deep Learning of Unresolved Turbulent Ocean Processes in Climate Models. In: *Deep Learning for the Earth Sciences* (pp. 298–306). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119646181.ch20>, 2021.

460 Zhang, C., Perezhogin, P., Gultekin, C., Adcroft, A., Fernandez-Granda, C. & Zanna, L.: Implementation and Evaluation of a Machine Learned Mesoscale Eddy Parameterization Into a Numerical Ocean Circulation Model. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 15(10). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023ms003697>, 2023.

Zubov, K., McCarthy, Z., Ma, Y., Calisto, F., Pagliarino, V., Azeglio, S., ... & Rackauckas, C.: Neuralpde: Automating physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) with error approximations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.09443*, 2021.

465 **Competing interests**

The contact author has declared that none of the authors has any competing interests.

Data and/or code availability

This can also be included at a later stage, so no problem to define it for the first submission.

Authors contribution

470 This can also be included at a later stage, so no problem to define it for the first submission.

Acknowledgements

This can also be included at a later stage, so no problem to define it for the first submission.