

Development and comparison of IFCB classifiers in coastal California





Anna R. McGaraghan, Kendra Hayashi, Raphael M. Kudela Ocean Sciences, University of California Santa Cruz, 1156 High St, Santa Cruz, California, USA

Alexis Fischer (UCSC, NOAA), Patrick Daniel (UCSC), Jamie Walton (UC Berkeley)





Random Forest Model built with ~112,000 images

- 24 group/genus/species classes
- > 90% of total biomass
- Includes major HAB groups

Total of 1,003,334 annotations:

- → 97 genus/species classes
- → Several "super groups"
- \rightarrow Ash, cysts, detritus, etc.

Fischer et al. L&O 65: 2125-2141, 2020





Supervised Classification

Santa Cruz Wharf IFCB

- 78 Classes (46 routinely used)
- Manually classified ~210,000 images
- ~100,000 images both manual and auto
- 38 classes have at least 50 manual IDs, or ~70% of all the images
- 88% accuracy for this subset, 80% accuracy for the full dataset
- Most accurate (>90%) are most abundant or easy to identify: *Akashiwo, Ceratium, Prorocentrum, Pseudo-nitzschia, Lingulodinium*

Examples of Auto-Classification



Examples of Auto-Classification



Examples of Auto-Classification



ACIDD Cruise (UC Santa Barbara)



Alexis Fischer installed an IFCB as part of the cruise—cruise map with average ESD





Latitude



Kramer et al. JGR Oceans, 2020

ACIDD "pure ash in filtered seawater"



NAAMES 3 microlayer "microplastics"

Damariscotta River Estuary "detritus"



Total of 1,003,334 annotations:

- → 97 genus/species classes
- → Several "super groups"
- \rightarrow Ash cysts, detritus, etc.

How Portable are Classifiers?

- Applied SCW Random Forest to Santa Barbara
- Worked OK for some organisms, not others....

- Lingulodinium polyedrum



- 1.4x10⁴ cells/Liter
- >1 SD from mean

- Prorocentrum

- 0.9x10⁴ cells/Liter
- >8 SD from mean



- Cochlodinium

 ~4000 cells/Liter, 4x more during bloom conditions



Moving from Random Forest to CNN



Annotation error







Initial Analysis: F1 score is not particularly dependent on the number of images....

Accuracy:			0.93
Macro avg:	0.82	0.76	0.78
Weighted avg:	0.93	0.93	0.93



- Can we use multiple classifiers to operationally identify HABs?
- How sensitive is it changing IFCBs?
- Two instruments, 4 classifiers:
 - SCW Random Forest (24 classes)
 - San Francisco Bay Random Forest (32 classes)
 - TAMU Random Forest (54 classes)
 - SCW CNN (50 classes)



Figure 3: Performance of RF classifiers at the Santa Cruz Wharf in 2020, on IFCB104/Tina and IFCB113/Miranda. Manual annotation vs MBRF_24 classifier for (a) Miranda and (d) Tina, and SFBRF_32 for (b) Miranda and (e) Tina. Line graphs show total cell counts between the instruments at the beginning of deployment before adjusting Miranda's PMTs to reflect cell sizes in Monterey Bay.



















- Initial performance of SFBRF_32 is equivalent to MBRF_24, with 99.1% overall accuracy
- SFBRF_32 delivered similar performance results as MBRF_24 during the side-by-side IFCB deployment at the Santa Cruz Wharf. All accuracies 94-96%
- IFCB PMT settings have a noticeable impact on how data convey overall phytoplankton community structure
- Choice of classifier influences our perception of community structure
- Out of region classifiers may be applied to effectively assess bloom detection of specific HAB taxa in new IFCB locations. Both classifier accuracies were 99% for the 3 taxa



San Francisco Bay: Four Toxic Groups of Concern









31 cells/mL

Alexandrium – Proportion of qPCR samples for 18S rDNA primers spanning the variable V5 (Euk1132F) and V7 (Euk1423R) regions





• Good correspondence between microscopy, HPLC, IFCB, and Satellite Remote Sensing



HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM MONITORING & ALERT PROGRAM

IFCBs are ready to go for operational monitoring!

Weekly measurements:

- HAB spp. (8-9 taxa)
- Chl-a, Temp, Salinity, Nutrients
- Domoic Acid + SPATT toxins
- Weekly alerts to HABMAP listsery
- Monthly QC'd data now served via ERDDAP
- Synthesis with models: CA HAB Bulletin
- 10 academic institutions

