

A trans-disciplinary review of deep learning research for water resources scientists

Chaopeng Shen¹

Civil and Environmental Engineering

Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA16802

Abstract

Deep learning (DL), a new-generation artificial neural network research, has made profound strides in recent years. This review paper is intended to provide water resources scientists with a simple technical overview, trans-disciplinary progress update, and potentially inspirations about DL. Effective architectures, more accessible data, advances in regularization, and new computing power enabled the success of DL. A trans-disciplinary review reveals that DL is rapidly transforming myriad scientific disciplines including high-energy physics, astronomy, chemistry, genomics and remote sensing, where systematic DL toolkits, innovative customizations, and sub-disciplines have emerged. However, with a few exceptions, its adoption in hydrology has so far been gradual. The literature suggests that novel regularization techniques can effectively prevent high-capacity deep networks from overfitting. As a result, in most scientific disciplines, DL models demonstrated superior predictive and generalization performance to conventional methods. Meanwhile, less noticed is that DL may also serve as a scientific exploratory tool. A new area termed “AI neuroscience”, has been born. This budding sub-discipline is accumulating a significant body of work, *e.g.*, distilling knowledge obtained in DL networks to interpretable models, attributing decisions to inputs via back-propagation of relevance, or visualization of activations. These methods are designed to interpret the decision process of deep networks and derive insights. While scientists so far have mostly been using customized, *ad-hoc* methods for interpretation, vast opportunities await for DL to propel advancement in water science.

¹ Corresponding author: cshen@engr.psu.edu

1. Introduction

Across various corners of the scientific world, scientists have come in contact with the term “deep learning” (DL). Deep learning consists of a collection of advanced Artificial Neural Network research which has gained momentum since 2010. While some hype does exist, DL undeniably delivered unrivaled performance and solved exciting problems that have resisted artificial intelligence (AI) for many years [LeCun *et al.*, 2015; Silver *et al.*, 2016]. Their exhibit “unreasonably” [Baldassi *et al.*, 2016; Sun *et al.*, 2017] strong, generational-leap performance at digesting large quantities of data and generalize to new instances, which has stimulated revolutions in the information science industry. Powered by DL, AI witnesses a “Cambrian explosion” age [Leopold, 2017] and is rapidly reshaping our lives and scientific research. On the daily-life level, AIs and big data machine learning are reinventing the web, logistics, transportation, personal assistance, and other services [Marr, 2016; Metz, 2016]. On the scientific front, DL is transforming many scientific disciplines (Section 4) and is widely adopted and regarded as an indispensable tool in the future.

While the field of hydrology is not a stranger to machine learning, the adoption of DL in water resources or hydrology has so far only been gradual (Section 4.3.3). We face a number of important questions. Just what is deep learning and how is it different from previous machine learning methods? For such large number of network parameters, will the model overfit easily? Where is it applicable and what can we expect to gain by adopting it? For hydrologists concerned about process representation and understanding, does this black box-like tool lead a viable pathway toward the advancement of scientific understanding? Because DL diverges significantly from water resources scientists’ typical educational background, The community may benefit from clarifications of these concepts and a trans-disciplinary synthesis of the basic technical elements as well as frontier research ideas of DL.

The purpose of this review paper is not to give thorough technical descriptions or historical recount of deep learning, which have been accomplished elsewhere, e.g., [Hinton *et al.*, 2012a; Bengio *et al.*, 2013; LeCun *et al.*, 2015; Schmidhuber, 2015]. Rather, the goals of this paper are to (1) provide a concise and simple technical overview for water resources scientists or students who are unfamiliar with machine learning (Section 2 and 3); (2) synthesize the progress in varied disciplines to provide a broad perspective of the state of deep learning research in sciences (Section 4); (3) review two key areas of advances, namely, regularization (Section 5.1) and interpretation of DL networks (Section 5.2) which have powered knowledge discovery. Instead of attempting to be exhaustive, this paper discusses a limited subset of the literature with a level of details that hopefully help hydrologists draw inspirations. Also, because mathematical details have been covered elsewhere, equations have been intentionally minimized in favor of conceptual explanations.

2. Machine learning literature in hydrology

This section briefly describes of the early-generation machine learning methods which have played roles in hydrology. Those who are familiar with machine learning may skip this section. Only a very small fraction of the studies were introduced to provide some background information and terminology for later discussion of DL. The concise outline here cannot possibly do justice, and readers are referred to multiple reviews for more details, *e.g.*, [Dawson and Wilby, 2001; Wang *et al.*, 2009; Fallah-Mehdipour *et al.*, 2013; Raghavendra and Deka, 2014a; Jha and Sahoo, 2015; Yaseen *et al.*, 2015; Tsai *et al.*, 2017].

2.1. Basic machine learning terminology

Machine learning can be broadly categorized into supervised learning, which learns mapping relationships, and unsupervised learning, which learns data representations. Supervised Learning infers functions between input attributes and labeled data (dependent variables, or target). A supervised learner is trained to predict some observed target variables, either categorical or continuous, given some input variables. Unsupervised Learning finds hidden structure in unlabeled data, *e.g.*, principal components, clusters, and outliers [Barlow, 1989]. An unsupervised learner is not given a target to predict. It is often trained to maximize information-theoretic objectives, *e.g.*, the Kullback-Leibler divergence (a measure of the difference between statistical distributions) [Kullback and Leibler, 1951] or information entropy [Shannon, 1948], and may extract invariant features from diverse data points [Becker, 1991]. It is often employed for redundancy reduction [Redlich, 1993] or feature extraction [Ranzato *et al.*, 2007; Coates *et al.*, 2011; Sermanet *et al.*, 2013]. Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) approximate functions by connecting unit functions called neurons, which are equipped with nonlinear transformation functions (call activation functions) and linear weights. These weights are found by minimizing a loss function, typically the distance between data and predictions (see the example in Figure 1). The tuning process is called training [Ratsch, 2004]. Common training methods include back-propagation [Rumelhart *et al.*, 1986], which is a form of gradient descend method to use the loss to update weights in different layers. Testing error refers to errors incurred when the algorithm is applied to data withheld from the training set. The expected testing error for the background population is thus also referred to as the generalization error. It is worth mentioning that while deep networks are also artificial neural networks, the term “ANN” now appears to be more frequently reserved for non-deep networks, and such meaning is used in this paper.




Figure 1. The architecture of components of several neural network structures. Layers are visualized as 1-dimensional arrays but they can be 2D or 3D. (a) A multilayer perceptron network (MLP), sometimes regarded as “vanilla” networks. Here, each circle represents a neuron, which multiplies its input by learnable weights, transform it with a nonlinear activation function and send the result to downstream neurons. The layer in the middle is not connected to input or output, and is thus called the “hidden” layer. The layers are fully connected, meaning that a neuron in a layer is connected to all cells in the layer above or below. (b) Auto-encoder: note the hidden layer has fewer neurons than input layer and output layers, which have the same number of neurons; (c) SADE, formed by stacking auto-encoders: each hidden layer is first trained to reproduce its inputs, then activations from this layer is sent to the next hidden layer, which has fewer neurons, as the “data” to be reconstructed. The layers are fully connected. (d) Deep Belief Net stacks layers of RBMs with specific order in the number of their elements. Each RBM is trained to stochastically reproduce its inputs after going through a forward and reconstruction step. (e) CNN: although it structural resembles SADE, each coarsening stage (reduction in the number of neurons) forward contains multiple convolutional layers and pooling layers (here only one set is illustrated). The convolutional layer convolves a layer-shared filter with the inputs, while the pooling layer employs a reduction operator, e.g., max, to coarsen the layers. There can be many such coarsening stages. Thus a neuron in the upper-level layers have a “field of view” indicated by the dashed black lines. (f) Comparing LSTMs and simple RNNs (reprinted from with permission). \otimes means multiplication by weights. In this plot alone, activation functions are explicitly shown as transformations. The design of gates allows LSTM to learn when to forget past states, and when to output.

Figure 1 shows a multilayer perceptron (MLP) neural network with one hidden layer and two output variables. The input and output layers have direct connections to inputs and outputs and thus are called visible layers, as opposed to hidden layers in the middle. The vanilla MLP have a large number of parameters because every layer is fully connected. In this paper, the input layer is also called the bottom layer, and thus those near the input are “lower-level” layers. An neuron may apply to its input or output activation functions, e.g., sigmoidal, tanh, rectified linear units (essentially a 1:1 linear function with a minimum set to 0) [Nair and Hinton, 2010]. These transformed values are call activations, which are sometimes visualized for interpreting the network (Section 5.2.2).

2.2. Applications of early-generation machine learning in hydrology

Earlier-generation machine learning methods including Support Vector Machine (SVM), e.g., [Raghavendra and Deka, 2014b], Classification and Regression Tree (CART), e.g., [White et al., 2005; Sawicz et al., 2014] and ANNs have been applied extensively in hydrologic and land surface predictions to moderate success. Classification and Regression Tree (CART) is an effective data-driven strategy to split data points into a hierarchy of bins by thresholds in the predictors to reduce variance within bins [Loh, 2011]. CART is not always highly accurate, but it has the advantage of presenting interpretable hypotheses in the form of the hierarchy of decision criteria: by looking at the split criteria, one can form hypotheses about major driving forces that result in different outcomes. In hydrology, Sawicz et al., [2014] used CART to present a coherent classification for the catchments based on their hydrologic signatures; Fang and Shen, [2017] used CART to form hypotheses about possible physical causes that impact the correlations between streamflow and satellite-measured water storage. The CART criterion led them to hypothesize that groundwater controls the full range of streamflows in southeastern continental United States (CONUS) *because of* the thick soils, and thin soils along Applachian Plateau impose limits on water storage (Figure 2). However, one should not attempt to interpret lower-level splits because they often have few data points and are thus unstable. To improve predictive power, one can combine the prediction from an ensemble of classification trees, which is called random forest [Ho, 1995; Zhou and Jiang, 2004]. Chaney et al., [2016] used random forest and environmental co-variates to estimate soil properties at 30-*m* resolution for CONUS. However, random forest normally cannot be interpreted. Xu and Valocchi, [2015] proposed an uncertainty quantification system, where they built a data-driven model (either random forest or SVM) to capture the bias of a calibrated groundwater model. They then apply the bias correction to separate out the epistemic (bias) and aleatory (variance) part of the uncertainty.

ANNs have contributed significantly to rainfall-runoff modeling, streamflow, groundwater management, water quality, rainfall estimate, ocean wave heights and real-time forecasting [Deo and Sridhar Naidu, 1998; Govindaraju and Rao, 2000; Gupta et al., 2000; Sorooshian et al., 2000; Dawson and Wilby, 2001]. Also see the collection of

articles in [Govindaraju and Rao, 2000]. ANN is suitable for preparing inputs for models. Schaap *et al.*, [2001] trained ANNs to store soil pedo-transfer functions, which are widely used in hydrologic models, e.g., [Maxwell *et al.*, 2014; Clark *et al.*, 2015; Fatichi *et al.*, 2016; Shen *et al.*, 2016; Ji and Shen, 2018]. Hsu *et al.*, [2002], proposed self-organizing linear output map for hydrologic modeling and analysis. Abramowitz *et al.* [2006] used ANN to predict the error of a land surface model and reduced annual error by 95%. An ANN trained to work at one biome completely corrects the error for another in a large temperature range [Abramowitz *et al.*, 2007]. Multiple studies used ANNs to retrieve variables from satellite images [Aires *et al.*, 2001; Tapiador *et al.*, 2004; Rodriguez-Fernandez *et al.*, 2014; Kolassa *et al.*, 2017].




Figure 2. Illustration of an application of CART in hydrology, reprinted from [Fang *et al.*, 2016]. (a) location of 676 catchments on a map in Eastern US. (b) 676 data points are split into two branches by the criterion of depth to bedrock (RockDep, in inches), which heavily influence water storage capacity and the flooding mechanisms, timing and magnitude. This split was found by CART to be the best criterion for explaining catchments with different storage-streamflow correlations: catchments with shallow depth to bedrock tend to have low storage-peak streamflow correlations (because when soil is thin, peak flows result in runoff after reaching the storage limit, and have no connection to storage). Catchments with thicker soils tend to have high correlations (when soil is thick, there is substantial groundwater movement that is linked to flood).

For many of the abovementioned ANN studies, the training is specific to a study region or site where data is available. The focus on a regional dataset reduces data demand. However, if the trained networks are applied to regions outside of training set, they tend to degrade heavily in performance. It also means the patterns learned in one region are not universal.

In a unique series of studies, Gong *et al.*, [2013] proposed a quantitative method, grounded in information theory, to separate out uncertainties due to inputs and model

structural error. The main idea is to estimate the best achievable performance (BAP) of *any* model given forcing and benchmark observations, using a model-independent statistical method, in their case the Sparse Gaussian Processes [Snelson *et al.*, 2006]. Nearing *et al.* [2016] further separated out the uncertainty due to parameters by including models that are trained locally. The information resolvable by the BAP is measured by the mutual information (MI , with the same unit as entropy) [Cover and Thomas, 1991] between forcing data and observed diagnostic variables.

3. Deep learning background

3.1. What is deep learning?

Although there is no clear-cut, authoritative definition for deep learning, it is generally referring to neural networks and their supporting algorithms characterized by (1) large capacity: a large amount of neurons and multiple layers; (2) multiple levels of representations and a hierarchy of concept abstractions; and (3) working directly on big, raw data. For non-deep methods, most of the manual design effort and expertise are needed in generating features (i.e. representations of the data) that are strongly correlated with the dependent variable. In contrast, deep networks are designed to automatically learn such features. DL is also distinguished by improved regularization techniques and novel architecture that address previous issues [Glorot *et al.*, 2011]. One major advance is the DL architectures, which now contain unsupervised learning units/structures such as auto-encoders (more in Section 3.2.1), and memory cells and gates for recurrent networks. These architectures, although proposed decades ago, only recently become amenable to efficient computation. They helped address many previous difficulties with during training, namely, overfitting and slow training due to “vanishing gradient” [Hochreiter *et al.*, 2001]. With substantially higher number of neurons than their predecessors, deep networks have large flexibility to approximate complex functions from big and diverse real-world datasets. To avoid such networks from overfitting to noise, there have been significant recent progress in regularization techniques like dropout (more details in Section 5.1) [Srivastava *et al.*, 2014] and norm-based penalty, which are very effective.

3.2. Technical review for popular deep learning network architectures

In this section several popular deep network architectures are reviewed. Two state-of-the-art, widely adopted ones are convolutional neural network (CNN) for image tasks and long short term memory (LSTM) for time series tasks, although CNNs are sometimes used in language modeling as well. Both architectures work directly on raw data, and their use typically does not involve manual extraction of features, such as extracting trends and periodicity using Fourier Transform. Before introducing them, we first discuss stacked auto-encoders, as it is simple to understand and it is closely related to the structure of CNNs. Deep belief network is introduced as a representative of Bayesian networks.

3.2.1. Auto-encoders and stacked denoising auto-encoders

Auto-encoders [Ballard, 1987; Hinton and Salakhutdinov, 2006], whose structure is similar to components in convolutional neural network, are called such as they are trained to reproduce their inputs. However, they have to do so while passing information through a layer with far less neurons (Figure 1). On the output side of the bottleneck, the network needs to reconstruct the inputs with only the limited information from the bottleneck. As a result, the bottleneck layer is forced to retain only crucial information and discard non-essential information. The training of an auto-encoder is said to be unsupervised pre-training because during the process, no target data was provided. It should be noted that the training process is really a conditioning of the network by the entire input dataset to perform dimensional reduction, much like principal component analysis (PCA), but they can work much better than PCA [Hinton and Salakhutdinov, 2006]. What are stored in the hidden layers are abstract feature *representations*, or *latent representations*, and the coefficients learned through training are the optimized way of generating these representations. Auto-encoders are fully connected so that if there are M input nodes and N hidden nodes, the weight matrix to be learned between them is of size $M \times N$ (plus bias).

Denoising auto-encoders [Vincent *et al.*, 2008] extends from auto-encoders. Instead of training the network to reproduce inputs exactly, we train the network to reconstruct noise-corrupted versions of the input, e.g., by randomly setting some inputs to zero. This noise corruption, contrary to our intuition, helps reduce overfitting (because noise may annihilate peculiarities or artifact patterns in the training dataset) and obtain more robust networks. More discussion related to this point is found in Section 5.1.

The stacked denoising auto-encoders (SADEs), as can be understood from its name, stack denoising auto-encoders layer by layer so that the hidden representations from a lower level is fed as inputs to another one on the higher level (Figure 1). They naturally form a cascade of layers that shrink in size going from input to output. The network is trained “greedily”, one layer at a time [Hinton *et al.*, 2006; Bengio *et al.*, 2007], meaning that lower-level auto-encoders are first trained to reproduce their inputs, and then we move to train higher-level layers to reproduce their respective inputs (feature representations sent by the layer below).

3.2.2. Convolutional Neural Network (CNN)

A CNN is also composed of a cascade of layers that shrink in size from input to output (Figure 1). To a hydrologic modeler or a numerical analyst, CNN is reminiscent of geometric multigrid matrix solver [Trottenberg *et al.*, 2000]. Each shrinking stage typically consists of one or multiple convolution layers and corresponding pooling layers: first, a convolutional layer uses a local filter (or sometimes called kernel), whose weights are to be learned, to convolve with its input. The output typically has the same dimension

as input. Each output element results from the convolution between the input pixels in a small geometric neighborhood of this element and the filter; second, a pooling layer subsamples the output from the first step in a small neighborhood. For example, a “max-pooling” layer with a stride of 2 for a 2D image will select the maximum value out of each 2×2 neighborhood, and produce an output image a quarter of its input size. In contrast, the last layer is typically a fully connected one.

CNNs and SADEs look similar but have important differences. While SADE layers are fully connected, the convolutional or pooling layers in CNNs only work in a local neighborhood, so a hidden unit is only connected to a small number of input neurons. As a result, a hidden unit (except output nodes) has a “field of sight” that is smaller than the whole input layer (Figure 1). This hierarchical design helps capture local geometric features and extract larger-scale representations in deeper layers. It also enables localization of input-output relationships which are exploited in interpretive studies (more on this point in Section 5.2). On another note, it is important to note the learnable parameters for the convolutional layer are only those filters. The convolution is achieved by massive, repeated applications of the learnable filters. Because filters (one filter for each convolutional layer) have only a small number of elements and it is shared by all neurons in a convolutional layer (called weight sharing), it greatly reduces the number of parameters compared to a fully connected layer.

3.2.3. Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM)

LSTM [Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997; Greff et al., 2015] is a type of recurrent neural network (RNN) structure that learns directly from time series data. LSTM is “deep-in-time” and can learn when to forget and how long to retain the state information. Previously, simple RNNs iteratively update only a single past state (Figure 1 Lower Right). The cell state, S^t , serves as the memory of the system, somewhat similar to the state in auto-regressive models. S^t is multiplied by learnable weights and then combined with inputs to evolve the state to the next time level. RNNs are trained using the backpropagation through time (BPTT) algorithm [Mozer, 1989; Werbos, 1990], which applies gradient descent after first unrolling the network. As with other backpropagation algorithms, the loss function is propagated backward to determine updates to weights. Unfortunately, with simple recurrent networks, BPTT encounters the *vanishing gradient* problem [Hochreiter, 1998; Hochreiter et al., 2001], a major issue. Concisely, because states from earlier time steps have undergone multiplication by weights many times, the impacts of backpropagation on them become exponentially small. As a result, they train extremely slowly.

The solution to this problem, provided by LSTM and gated recurrent networks (GRUs), is specially designed units, called “*gates*” and *memory cells* (Figure 1). These gates, which are themselves simply neurons with learnable weights, surround the cell memory (S^t) to control the flow of information. The input gate controls what inputs are significant

enough to remember. The forget gate decides how long and what past state memory should be retained. The output gate determines how much of the memory is used to produce the output. Together, they allow the network to remember information from the long past while discard non-essential information.

3.2.4. Deep Belief Network (DBN)

DBN [Hinton *et al.*, 2006] is a variant of multiple layer perceptron networks and it also aim at reducing the dimensionality of input data. Similar to the way SADEs are stacks of auto-encoders, DBNs are stacks of Restricted Boltzmann Machines (RBM), which learns how to reconstruct input distribution after going through a stochastic projection to the hidden layer and a stochastic reconstruction (Figure 1). Without going into much detail about its name, an RBM consists of two layers of neurons, just like the input and hidden layers of an auto-encoder. However, RBM's connections are undirected (bi-directional). During training, the input layer (or visible layer) multiplies the inputs by its weights, and the results are transformed by an activation function to produce the activations at the hidden layer. During reconstruction, the activations are multiplied by the transposed version of the same weights and transformed again to obtain activations at the input layer. Then training process adjusts the weights to minimize the differences between the reconstructed and input data. The reconstruction process is said to be “generative”, as it generates the input data given a set of activations.

Similar to SADEs, DBNs are trained “greedily” layer-by-layer. However, there is no requirement that upper-level layers must have fewer cells than lower ones. Moreover, other than “associative memory” that was gained by learning from input features during pre-training, DBNs are not recurrent networks and do not maintain time dependencies: the previous inputs and states of the network do not influence future predictions. Thus DBNs do not have system memory that is important for modeling time series.

3.3. Hardware innovations and software support

Although it appears to be less relevant to scientific research, the innovations in DL are inseparable from hardware innovations. Without drastic advances in hardware and, more importantly, the recognition of the use of more efficient hardware like Graphical Processing Unit (GPU) for the task, deep learning would not have been plausible and may not have been contemplated [Schmidhuber, 2015]. Although some concepts of deep learning were decades old, their popularity did not grow until 2010, when GPUs were found to be suitable for the task. The GPUs are much more efficient in matrix multiplication tasks than central processing units (CPUs). GPUs now offer thousands of times more matrix computing power than CPUs, and their growth continues [Greengard, 2016] or even surpasses [Hemsoth, 2016] Moore's Law, suggesting there is significant room of growth for larger and more complex networks. However, the computing hardware landscape for DL is evolving rapidly and dynamically. At present, almost all

training tasks take place on GPUs while inferencing tasks (the industrial term for using the trained models to make forward predictions) may occur on either CPUs, GPUs, field-programmable gate arrays (FPGAs), or application-specific integrated circuits (ASICs), which are chips specifically designed for some narrow purposes.

A number of libraries or software platforms are available for building DL models. Like hardware, the software landscape is also evolving rapidly. At the time of writing, Tensorflow is a Google-supported, popular DL package based on the widely used Python programming language. Torch, supported by Facebook with a long history, is based on a simple scripting language called Lua (while it also has a Python interface called PyTorch). Torch enjoys strong optimization support from fast GPU deep learning library cudnn. Other libraries include Theano, Caffe, Keras, MXNet, CNTK, etc.

4. The transformative power of deep learning

4.1. The revolution in the information technology (IT) research

Since 2012, as an indication of advances, DL emerged as a dominant force that break records in most machine learning contests where it is applicable [*Schmidhuber*, 2015]. Some argued that CNN's progress would have normally taken 10 years to achieve. We witness massive conversion of research groups from non-deep to deep machine learning. In 2013, all entrants to the ImageNet competition, an image recognition contest, used deep learning [*Castelvecchi*, 2015]. Deep networks have equaled or superseded humans' performance in image and speech recognition, game playing and many other tasks. While substantial manual effort has been spent on earlier methods such as SVM and Hidden Markov Models, deep neural networks repeatedly show advantages over them and all other statistical methods. These results do not suggest other statistical methods have no value. Rather, data limitations and various constraints often make simpler methods useful. Simple models are also often used as interpretive tools. However, an increasingly apparent trend is that deep learning is showing unrivaled generalization performance when there is big data.

Although it was proven decades ago that neural networks can approximate almost any function [*Hornik et al.*, 1989], many are intrigued by why deep networks generalize so well despite their massive capacity. Most attribute its power to big data, regularization and advanced architecture. *Mehta and Schwab*, [2014] showed that DL (in their case, a restricted Boltzmann machine model) is intimately related to an important theoretical physics technique, the renormalization group, which also extracts features at different length scales. This theory would also apply to CNNs. *Lin et al.*, [2017] argued that the success of deep learning depends not only on mathematics but also on physics of natural phenomena, which favors certain classes simple probability distributions that DL is suited to model. They found when data have hierarchical statistical features, deep networks are more efficient than shallower ones. In a series of debate, *Zhang et al.*, [2016a] showed empirically that deep network can easily memorize even noise, and questioned if

previous interpretation (regularization) was the true cause of generalization. *Arpit et al.*, [2017] presented a rebuttal where they showed deep networks tend to prioritize learning simple patterns first and do not just memorize data. Regularization can degrade network performance on training data and hinder memorization without compromising generalization on test data. *Sun et al.*, [2017] attributed DL's performance to its ability to utilize representations from data. They showed that the performance of deep learning can improve logarithmically as a function of input data, even at a scale of 300M instances. Overall, the fundamental reason for DL's predictive power is still not fully understood, and such research is expected to continue.

4.2. The “Cambrian explosion” of DL uses in industries

Significant research in AI is driven by industrial needs or directly carried out by industrial researchers. Deep learning has gain wide and rapid adoption by all industrial leaders. An average user of Google Translate can attest to its substantial improvement over the past two years. This improvement is mainly attained by Google's transition into an LSTM-powered [*Wu et al.*, 2016] system. Google decided to give up its rule-based machine translation system [*Lewis-Kraus*, 2016] despite the system's 10 years of technical accumulation. The new DL-based system brings in many times more improvement in one year than the older system did in many years.

The proliferation of DL-power applications is compared to the “Cambrian explosion” [*Leopold*, 2017], the geologic period 541 Ma ago when rapid diversification of lifeforms took place. Digital assistant systems from IT companies, e.g., Google, Apple, and Microsoft, all employ LSTM [*Sak et al.*, 2015]. Object identification and image recognition technologies based on CNNs are being deployed in medical imaging [*Greenspan et al.*, 2016; *Shin et al.*, 2016] and autonomous vehicles [*Chen et al.*, 2015; *Mariusz Bojarski et al.*, 2017]. Machines can now understand human-voice instructions and human emotions contained in internet posts thanks to LSTM-powered speech recognition [*Graves et al.*, 2013]. When coupling LSTM and CNN, AI can annotate and comment on images or videos [*Murthy et al.*, 2015] and drones can use the CNN-based method to navigate narrow mountain trails with only visual sensing [*Giusti et al.*, 2016]. Outside of information technology, AIs powered by DL revolutionizing traditional industries like transportation, law, pharmaceutical, communication, manufacturing, healthcare, finance, accounting, nature resources, etc.

4.3. DL in sciences

DL is gaining adoption in a wide range of scientific disciplines, and, in some areas, have started to substantially transform those disciplines. The papers cited below form a representative set that outlines the current state of research.

4.3.1. In Physics, Astronomy, Biology, Chemistry and Remote Sensing

In high-energy physics (HEP), particle accelerators such as the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) produce streams of high energy particles, and the detectors measure direction and momentum of their decay products [ATLAS, 2012]. Scientists analyze these data for the existence of exotic particles to obtain insights about the nature of matter, and it requires machine learning to do so. However, previously, using shallow machine learning, the progress was slow as manual extraction of features was involved. Deep learning can learn more complex functions, and better discriminate between signal and noise [Baldi et al., 2014]. The authors trained auto-encoders to predict the existence of exotic particles using low-level, non-image inputs and they showed that the deep network did not require manual extraction of high-level features yet it attained 8% improvement over previously best approach. Where current analysis techniques lack the statistical power to cross the traditional 5σ significance barrier, the use of deep networks enhanced statistical power and is equivalent to a 25% increase in the experimental dataset [Baldi et al., 2015]. Further, organizing data as images (called jet images), scientists found CNNs to be successful in identifying highly boosted W bosons [de Oliveira et al., 2016], hadronically decaying top quarks [Butter et al., 2017], and gluon jets [Komiske et al., 2017], etc, from LHC data. CNN introduced significant improvement for detecting antihydrogen [Sadowski et al., 2017], and classification of neutrino events from NOvA neutrino detector [Aurisano et al., 2016]. DL helps summarize, visualize high-dimensional data and classify physical events from Daya Bay Neutrino Experiments [Racah et al., 2016].

de Oliverira et al., [2016] visualized the convolutional layers and the convolved data to understand what is learned by the network. They calculated correlation coefficient between deep network activations and pixels on the image, which showed that the locations with the most discriminating information is the subleading subject rather than the leading jet. They devised a transformation scheme to remove features from the image, and by doing so, they measure what CNN has learned beyond standard physics features that have discriminating power. They showed that CNN has uniquely learned features beyond those removed ones, and located where these features on a phase space plot. They determined that part of the unique information “comes from octet versus singlet nature of W bosons and gluon jets”, but some other information utilized by the CNN was previously unknown to physicists. These insights were uniquely offered by the trained CNN and can point scientists to unrecognized features.

In Astronomy, CNNs allowed automatic extraction of parameters for strong gravitational lensing models from telescope images at an accuracy similar to complex approaches but millions of time faster [Hezaveh et al., 2017]. George et al., [2017] employed CNNs pre-training using real-world images to detect artifacts in data collected in Laser Interferometer Gravitational wave Observatory (LIGO), and the results were encouraging. Tuccillo et al., [2016] demonstrated the potential of using CNNs to estimate

galaxy morphology. Although mixed results have been observed in some cases, many are optimistic that DL will become the method of choice for data processing problems in astrophysics and other fields.

DL is quickly becoming a crucial tool in unlocking the secrets of genomic codes in Computational Biology [Park and Kellis, 2015], with a sizable and rapidly growing body of literature summarized in reviews [Angermueller *et al.*, 2016; Min *et al.*, 2016]. DL can learn directly from sequences, to predict sequence specificities of DNA- and RNA-binding proteins, which play a central role in genetic regulation [Alipanahi *et al.*, 2015]. Building on a DL package they call deepBind, they further perturbed the trained model to examine the impacts of mutation. DL can capture nonlinear dependencies that could help span wider sequence context at multiple genomic scales, potentially generalizing beyond available data [Angermueller *et al.*, 2016]. Stacked auto-encoders and DBNs were trained to predict protein structures directly from genome sequence with much better accuracy [Lyons *et al.*, 2014; Heffernan *et al.*, 2015; Spencer *et al.*, 2015]. LSTM also outperforms conventional state-of-the-art methods for predicting subcellular location of proteins [Sønderby *et al.*, 2015].

Similar consistent outperformance of DL was reported in Molecular Chemistry, mostly with more customized architectures [Goh *et al.*, 2017]. Presumably, the customization is because the chemical problems are unlike image or voice recognition. Lusci *et al.*, [2013] used a directed acyclic graph network structure, an established method [Koller and Friedman, 2009], to mimic molecular configurations and predict molecular properties. However, since molecular connections are undirected and thus do not fit the established model, they considered the ensemble of all possible acyclic orientations. Similarly, Schütt *et al.*, [2017] specifically designed a special deep tensor network that resolves the spatial and chemical configurations of chemical to gain insights (more discussion in Section 5.2.4). CNN was used to predict atomic-level molecular interactions directly from atomic coordinates [Gomes *et al.*, 2017]. Moreover, the community has assembled large datasets and standard benchmarks [Wu *et al.*, 2017] and a suite of DL packages like deepChem [Subramanian *et al.*, 2016]. They have combined LSTM structure with graph convolutional networks to reduce data demand for drug discovery [Altae-Tran *et al.*, 2017]. In a different kind of application, Brockherde *et al.*, [2017] built a ridge regression to directly learn the mapping between density and potential, and that between energy and density, which allowed them to by-pass the numerical solution to the Kohn-Sham equation, saving tremendous computational demand.

Because CNN was originally designed for image recognition tasks, applying CNNs to remotely-sensed images is a natural extension. As a result, the field of remote sensing (RS) has already rapidly accumulated a sizable body of literature involving DL, which appears to grow to be a preferred method of choice [Zhang *et al.*, 2016b]. Since CNNs excel in synthesizing information from geometric shapes and spatial patterns, they easily

outperform earlier methods that only utilize spectral signatures or handcrafted features [Makantasis *et al.*, 2015]. Main RS applications, reviewed in [Zhu *et al.*, 2017], include using CNN to classify or segment hyperspectral or Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) images (assigning classes to each pixel on an image for what they are, e.g., land use classes, crops types) [Geng *et al.*, 2015], automatic target recognition (finding targets from a series of images) [Wagner, 2016], and terrain attribute extraction, e.g., sea ice concentration [Wang *et al.*, 2016]. In global change analysis, DL models show advantages in estimating crop yield [Kuwata and Shibasaki, 2015; You *et al.*, 2017]. Pryzant *et al.*, [2017] forgo the conventional spectral features method in favor of a combined CNN-LSTM model to estimate outbreaks of wheat Fungus in Ethiopia. Their LSTM is stacked on CNN-extracted feature representations.

In addition, CNN is used for overall interpretation of image such as scene classification (recognize a theme from the image) [Marmanis *et al.*, 2016; Nogueira *et al.*, 2017], change detection [Zhang *et al.*, 2016c] and object detection, e.g., vehicles [Chen *et al.*, 2014], and has delivered state-of-the-art performance. Such high-level tasks were difficult to achieve using earlier machine learning techniques.

Furthermore, the remote-sensing community is making use of existing trained networks as well as adapting available architecture and augmenting datasets to suit their data quantity and research needs. On one hand, image recognition networks trained from a different context, e.g., online images from GoogLeNet [Szegedy *et al.*, 2015], can be transferred for scene classification for satellite images [Hu *et al.*, 2015; Marmanis *et al.*, 2016; Nogueira *et al.*, 2017]. The rationale is that the abstract notions stored in a trained network can be used in further classification, reducing the data demands for satellite images. Using the pre-trained network is a form of transfer-learning. On the other hand, the RS community has implemented different network architectures and has augmented training images [Morgan, 2015; Ding *et al.*, 2016]. Data augmentation means increasing the training data by making perturbations to data that should not have mattered, such as rotation, translation, interpolation, elastic distortions and affine transformations, etc.

In disaster detection and categorization studies, researchers have started to employ DL to detect wildfire [Zhang *et al.*, 2016d; Lee *et al.*, 2017; Sharma *et al.*, 2017] and landslide from remote sensing images [Liu and Wu, 2016]. Liu and Wu, [2016] applied pre-processing steps including discrete wavelet transformation and noise corruption and trained a SADE to recognize landslides on the transformed image. They argued that the transformation is necessary because the resolution of remote sensing images is too low. However, they did not directly show results that support the necessity.

4.3.2. In Climate, Weather and Hydrometeorology

The number of applications of deep learning in climate modeling starts to rise quickly. In a study carried out at the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, Liu *et al.*, [2016] trained a

CNN with 2 convolutional layers to detect extreme events using thousands of images of tropical cyclones, weather fronts, and atmospheric rivers. This new system achieves 89%-99% of accuracy in detecting extreme events and is useful for benchmarking climate models. A significant amount of attention has been paid to using deep learning for precipitation forecasting, e.g., [Hernández *et al.*, 2016; Shi *et al.*, 2017; Zhang *et al.*, 2017].

For dynamic modeling, researchers trained dynamic convolutional layers, i.e., filters with weights that are dynamically mapped using inputs during forward runs, in short-range weather predictions [Klein *et al.*, 2015]. Vandal *et al.*, [2017] proposed a generalized stacked super-resolution CNN framework for statistical downscaling of climate variables. They argued that a single trained model can downscale spatial heterogeneous regions, and the DL method showed advantages over others. More recently, the climate modeling community is putting together large datasets to enable big data deep learning on large scales.

4.3.3. In Hydrology

Compared to some other disciplines, hydrology has not witnessed wide use of deep learning yet [Marçais and de Dreuzay, 2017]., and the list of papers reviewed in this subsection is, to the author's best knowledge, exhaustive for hydrology Tao *et al.* [2016] utilized a SADE with 4 layer and 1000 hidden nodes to extract precipitation from 15 x 15 pixels² satellite cloud images. They achieved 33% and 43% corrections on false alarm pixels and 98% and 78% bias reduction in precipitation rates compared to an early-generation, non-deep neural network. Bai *et al.*, [2016] applied non-recurrent DBN to predict inflow time series to the Three Gorges reservoir. It's worth noting this work learns from the trend, period and random elements that were extracted from historical inflow time series using Fourier transforms, rather than directly from raw data. Since the sole information used was historical time series, this method should be applied to cases with strong and stable annual cycles and where historical data is sufficient. DBN was used to predict field-measured soil moisture, with observed land surface temperature (LST) and leaf area index (LAI) among inputs [Song *et al.*, 2016]. As discussed above, DBN does not have memory capabilities and earlier forcing does not influence later predictions, which is perhaps why real-time data are needed in the inputs.

Although LSTM is one of the pillars of DL, there are fewer applications of LSTM in sciences. Fang, Shen, Kifer and Yang [2017] (hereafter termed FSKY17) were the first to exploit its ability to build dynamical models with forcings and memory, capable of being used in long-term hindcast or forecast applications. They trained LSTM to reproduce surface soil moisture product from the Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP) mission [Entekhabi, 2010] over continental United States using forcing data and outputs from land surface models. FSKY17 showed that with 2 years of data, LSTM successfully corrects bias from land surface models and reproduces soil moisture dynamics with high

fidelity (Figure 3). The deep network is more robust than traditional statistical methods including regularized linear regression, auto-regressive functions and simple feedforward neural network. Their model can be migrated spatially to generate predictions in regions without observations. Moreover, in a proof-of-concept test, they found decadal-scale hindcast was as good as annual-scale hindcast (Figure 3a-c).




Figure 3. Upper panels: Comparisons between SMAP observations and soil moisture predicted by LSTM, the land surface model Noah, and Auto-regressive model at five locations. We chose sites around 10th, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 90th percentiles as ranked by correlation coefficient between LSTM and SMAP; Lower panels (a-c) proof-of-concept long term hindcasting experiments using noise-contaminated Noah solution as the target. The results indicate long-term hindcasting of soil moisture using LSTM is very promising. Figures are recreated from FSKY17 with permission.

Zhang et al., [2018] collected data from an Internet of Things sensor at a site that monitors a combined sewage overflow (CSO) structure. They build different neural network models, including LSTM, to predict the water level of the CSO structure. They found LSTM to possess the strongest prediction performance. Notably, this advantage is achieved when trained only on one site. In preliminary studies for FSKY17, we also find LSTM to be applicable to one SMAP pixel if the capacity is small and heavy regularization is applied.

5. Important DL advances

This section describes two major DL advances that are relevant to its scientific applications, namely, regularization techniques and AI neuroscience. These techniques should be of great value for extending DL into new disciplines.

5.1. Regularization techniques

A frequent concern about deep learning is that, due to enormous degrees of freedom, deep networks must be prone to overfitting. However, there is significant progress in regularization techniques to address this issue. All evidence and theories suggest that larger models are not necessarily overfitted when they are properly regularized.

Given similar performances, conventional statistical wisdom would always prefer a more parsimonious model, which is reflected in the principle of Occam's Razor and model selection criteria such as the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) [*Akaike*, 1974]. For those unfamiliar with this concept, AIC and its variants allow one to evaluate the quality of alternative models while considering the number of parameters in each model:

$$AIC = 2k - 2\ln(\hat{L}) \quad (1)$$

where k is the number of parameters and L is the likelihood function of the model (how likely it is true). This criterion penalizes overfitting and directs the choice to simpler models given comparable performances. However, while the theory behind such criteria is elegant, discarding predictors entails loss of information, that is, we sacrifice information for model robustness.

Regularization is a necessary and inherent component of machine learning. Instead of completely discarding information, a norm-based regularization techniques apply penalization factors that reduce the importance of predictors. For example, for a linear regression model $y = \mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}$, where y is the predictand, \mathbf{x} is a vector of predictors, and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are the linear coefficients (the bias parameter, β_0 , is omitted), an approach called the least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (lasso) will seek to reduce the sum of the coefficients:

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\beta}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \left(\frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i^o - \mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta})^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n |\boldsymbol{\beta}| \right) \quad (2)$$

where y^o is observation, N is the number of observations, n is the number of coefficients, λ is a regularization parameter that determines how heavily the formulation penalizes large coefficients, and again bias is omitted. The first summation sign contains the optimization problem without regularization.

With a pre-defined λ , the algorithm holistically determines which parameter is more important, and assign less weight to less important parameters, imposing Occam's razor. However, it retains all the predictors instead of completely discarding insignificant ones. Real-world problems are often highly complex, with myriad factors each contributing a small influence on the outcome. Assigning appropriate weights to them appears a more appropriate treatment.

Norm-based regularization has been widely employed in early-generation machine learning including ANN. Another commonly-used regularization is early-stopping [Yao *et al.*, 2007], where the training of a learner is stopped before the learner fully achieves its best performance. Early stopping criteria are often based on a separate validation dataset and some smoothness criteria, e.g., it stops when the error on the validation dataset starts to increase compared to earlier epochs [Prechelt, 2012].

The same techniques are applied to deep networks, but DL has several new techniques that are especially helpful, including Dropout [Hinton *et al.*, 2012b; Srivastava *et al.*, 2014]. Dropout was first introduced as a practical and effective method to reduce overfitting, but was later found to have a solid theoretical underpinning. It randomly sets a fraction (called the dropout rate) of the connections in a network to be 0, as illustrated in Figure 4. For every batch of training instances, Dropout is applied to the network with a new random instantiation of the dropout mask, which puts a different set of connections in the network to 0. One may expect this procedure to introduce noise into the optimization process, and it does, but counter-intuitively, it induces robustness. There are several interpretations of how it works so well: (1) every new dropout mask effectively creates a new, reduced-order subnetwork (Figure 4). These reduced subnetworks form an ensemble of small networks. Making inference using a trained deep network is akin to using the ensemble mean to make more robust decisions [Baldi and Sadowski, 2014; Hara *et al.*, 2016]; (2) because connections are randomly set to 0, they cannot co-adapt with others during training to fit the results [Hinton *et al.*, 2012b]. Coadaptation means weights canceling each other out to produce a final output; and (3) neural network with dropout is in fact mathematically equivalent to variational inference to the deep Gaussian process [Gal and Ghahramani, 2015, 2016], albeit with a much simpler implementation.




Figure 4. An illustration of the dropout regularization. During training, a fraction of the connections to neurons in the dropout operand layer are stochastically set to 0 (indicated by orange color and dashed arrows). A, B, C are three realizations of dropout masks, and can be regarded as sub-networks. The dropout mask changes of the dropout operator, e.g., for training with each batch of instances. All weights are employed during testing, which is equivalent to the ensemble predictions of the subnetworks.

In practice, dropout and its variant dropconnect [Wan *et al.*, 2013] have been found to be miraculously effective [Smirnov *et al.*, 2014]. However, standard dropout schemes that work for CNN do not work for recurrent networks like LSTM. Typically, when dropout is called, it randomly generates a mask for its operand and set where the mask is true to 0. If it is blindly applied to the recurrent connections (between S^t and other cells in Figure 1 Lower Right) in the network, the recurrence amplifies the noise introduced by dropout, leading to loss of memory thus hindering LSTM from encoding long-term information. Therefore, Zaremba *et al.*, [2015] proposed to avoid dropout for recurrent links and apply dropout only forward connections, i.e., the connections between x and all four gates, and between output node and target. Gal and Ghahramani, [2016] proposed to also dropout to recurrent links (except the cell memory). However, for the training of each batch of instances, the dropout masks at each layer must stay constant across time steps. They also showed that this form of dropout is equivalent to variational inference. Semeniuta *et al.*, [2016] further applied dropout to the recurrent link from the input gate to the cell memory, also with a constant-in-time mask. FSKY17 applied the dropout of both Gal and Ghahramani [2016] and Semeniuta *et al.* [2016]. In preliminary studies for FSKY17, if dropout was not applied, the network would achieve almost zero error for training, but the testing error would be very large.

5.2. The budding area of “AI neuroscience”: DL interpretation and knowledge discovery

The biggest criticism against using DL networks is perhaps that they are black boxes that do not help us improve our understanding of the hydrologic system. When we do not understand the inner workings of a tool, we tend to have lower confidence in its use. However, as DL research progresses, it becomes increasingly possible to use DL as a

knowledge discovery tool. Deep networks are not black but gray boxes which can be probed, interrogated and visualized to reveal insights on “what is learned by the network”. A vibrant sub-field that focuses on DL interpretation and understanding, dubbed by some researchers as “*AI neuroscience*” [Voosen, 2017], has been born and it is rapidly accumulating a voluminous literature. Systematic and theoretically well-founded methods started to emerge. On the other hand, in terms of exploring the unknowns, the gray-box nature of deep networks may, in fact, be an advantage: because it is not bound to humans’ pre-conceived notions about how systems function, it might present an opportunity to correct our errors or identify potentially useful rules that we have not noticed. By seeing and understanding the reason why networks make a decision, users of their predictions can become more confident.

Most of these AI neuroscience procedures do posterior analysis, i.e., they seek to obtain insights after the network has been trained. The field has come presented several mathematical formulations for the subjective concepts of “understanding” and “interpretation”. In the following subsections, a small, representative list of such studies is covered with a level of technical information in the interest of disseminating ideas that may be helpful to hydrology.

5.2.1. Attributing decisions to input features

An “Explanation” of model choice can be made by attributing the network’s decision to a certain fraction of inputs. For example, in thematic annotation (the AI algorithm comments on what the main theme is for an image), if an image is annotated by trained network as having “boat” as the theme, whether correctly or incorrectly, methods exist to find the most crucial patch of pixels that influence the decision [Bach et al., 2015; Montavon et al., 2017]. This explanation allows the user to either diagnose why models make mistakes, or learn the defining differences between classes. This problem has been formulated in the following ways, which, again, are only a fraction of the literature.

1. Back-propagation and mapping of relevance to inputs.

The earliest back-propagation of features is a simple deconvolutional network [Zeiler et al., 2011], which operates in reverse order to disaggregate condense features to input space. During a forward run, multiple pixels are convolved by a filter, and the network performs a subsampling, e.g., max-pooling (Section 3.2.2). This operation is not strictly invertible, so authors used a mask to record the position of the maximum value in the lower layer. During their deconvolution, the cell with the recorded location gets assigned the maximum value and other cells get zero. Although simple, the method was able to highlight the most important pixels [Zeiler and Fergus, 2014].

Extending from the above work, Samek et al., [2017] developed the layer-wise relevance propagation scheme, where a forward pass is first applied to the network, and the activations for each neuron are recorded. Then, the relevance score at the output layer is

backpropagated throughout the graph of the network using a set of rules involving recorded activations. Neurons in the lower layers (closer to inputs) that have higher activations will get assigned more relevance, which is conserved from layer to layer. In the end, the procedure generates a heatmap that highlights the importance of each pixel on the input image with respect to the decision of the network (Figure 5).




Figure 5. Using (windowed) layer-wise relevant propagation to identify pixels that contribute to the identification of an image as the class “horse”. Reprinted from [Montavon et al., 2017] under Creative Commons Attribution License.

II. Local approximation by interpretable reduced-order models.

Ribeiro et al., [2016] proposed a perturbation-based explanation system that transfer knowledge from a trained deep model to a human-interpretable model, e.g., regularized linear regression that have only a few predictors. Because these reduced-order models cannot fully describe the complex representations in the deep network, the method is only applied to a region surrounding the instance to be explained in the input space (thus “local”). They first broke an input instance down to interpretable components, e.g., patches of an image. Then they perturbed around an instance and selected other instances that are close to the first one, in the feature space. With these samples and their class annotations from the deep network, they then build a lasso-regression model to find

approximate outputs from the deep network. In the end, they find patches that explain concepts produced by CNN.

5.2.2. Visualization tools

It has been increasingly recognized that the weights and activations of neural networks offer clues as to how deep networks function and what they have learned. Therefore, many visualization tools have been created to help users pry into this gray box. Broadly, the visualization techniques can be divided as direct visualization, inverting information from hidden states, and building prototypes.

I. Inverting representations stored in hidden cells.

Although related to the deconvolutional method of *Zeiler and Fergus*, [2014], the methods mentioned here start from the values stored in the hidden layers. As discussed previously, the trained hidden cells store condensed, abstract representations of data, but they are hardly interpretable. One idea is to invert the network and reconstruct the image using only information from hidden cells [*Mahendran and Vedaldi*, 2015]. By viewing and comparing these reconstructed images, one can draw insights about what is common and invariant across different instances of the same class. This inversion process is unsurprisingly not unique, and the same abstract information can be inverted into many different images. One can use new input instances as a regularization term, and the problem is formulated as an activation maximization problem: given the class, a new regularization instance, and given a hidden-cell representation to be inverted, what is an image that maximizes the output layer’s activation value for that class? Gradient ascent was used to solve the maximization problem. Through this approach, *Mahendran and Vedaldi*, [2015] showed that some network layers store photographically accurate information, with different degrees of geometric and photometric invariance, i.e., some variations these attributes do not influence the network’s decision about the class of an image, much like humans can recognize the image of a building even if the picture is slightly distorted.

II. Building prototypes through activation maximization.

“Interpretation” can be gained by searching for *prototypes*: a prototype is an input pattern that is the “most typical” for a class. For example, for an image recognition network, we can understand what the network considers as a typical cat and what constitutes a typical dog. These prototypes can either help diagnose errors in the model or help study the essential differences between classes. *Simonyan et al.*, [2014] formulated the prototype problem as a maximization problem for output activation functions with a simple regularization term. The idea is that the case that generates the maximum activation function for a class is the most typical case for that class. To solve the maximization

problem, they used back-propagation to optimize the layer weights. They generated images that captures the bare minimal features of different objects. Later, some other works extended this framework and replaced the simple regularization term with another input image, called the “expert”, e.g., [Mahendran and Vedaldi, 2015; Nguyen *et al.*, 2016]. Metaphorically, the essential features of the class are transplanted to the expert to make the prototype look more realistic. Nevertheless, one might argue that the images generated by the simple regularization more simplistically reveal the most fundamental features. Finally, Yosinski *et al.*, [2015] presented an interactive software that integrates visualization of activations, deconvolved images [Zeiler and Fergus, 2014], and prototype images generated from activation maximization. Using this tool, they demonstrated that feature representations on some CNN layers are local. For example, there are layers in the network that track the positions of faces, text, and flowers, etc., even though the network was not trained with the objective to recognize faces. It means that the network implicitly learned that these objects to represent information useful for later classification decisions.

III. Visualization tools for RNNs.

The visualization of RNNs is more complicated than CNNs as an input may arouse response from every neuron, and a hidden-state neuron may be highly responsive to a set of words, forming many-to-many relationships [Ming *et al.*, 2017]. Karpathy *et al.*, [2015] were the first to visualize cell activation functions from a trained LSTM language model, and showed how their values respond to text inputs. The coloring of text revealed that there are interpretable cells: some cell acts as a length counter (on the plot, they increase in color depth as a sentence gets longer, and when it is ended with a period); some respond to opening and closing of quotations, parentheses or punctuations (on the plot, their color turns on inside quotes or parentheses). The neurons are likely to alter other calculations and allow LSTM to “understand” abstract concepts like quotes, which modify the meaning of texts and retain long-range information. LSTM has a large number of neurons.

To locate the abovementioned interpretable neurons perhaps involved the authors searching for hypothesized patterns, e.g., hidden states whose activations are correlated with length of the sentence. Extending from this concept, Strobel *et al.*, [2016] developed a more generic visual analysis tool for LSTM-language models. The tool, based on parallel-coordinate plot, enables users to select hypothesis input range (a time window where the phenomenon of interest occur) and search for hidden states that have high activations within this period but low activation in some other specified periods. Because the selected hidden states can relate to multiple words, the users can then match their input range with other words that could also activate the same highlight hidden states, and by doing so, they can confirm whether they have really selected the event of

interest and interpret what common patterns have been learned between them. Although this tool was originally designed for language models, it has been adopted to analyze business process intelligence and genomic data, where it can serve as a model debugging tool or allow users to see genes related to the same function.

The above studies examined cells that respond to certain inputs. However, a cell's responses to the same input can change when that input is placed in different contexts. Relate this to hydrology: the same amount of rainfall will produce different runoff amounts when modulated by different antecedent soil moisture. Considering these complications, *Ming et al.*, [2017] designed a more advanced visualization system composed of three parts: (1) they calculated expected memory cell responses to each word, which is the average of responses to all occurrences of that word from a training database; (2) they conducted co-clustering between cell responses and words. Co-clustering is a technique to consider two dimensions while doing clustering [*Hartigan*, 1972; *Pontes et al.*, 2015], allowing one instance to appear in multiple clusters; (3) they designed a sequence visualization technique to examine information updates and flows across words. Through these steps, one can observe how a word plays a different role when used in different contexts.

5.2.3. Linking deep networks to human brains

A well-trained deep network may be “interviewed” systematically by varying its inputs, shedding lights on its learned perceptions. The methods accumulated in sociology and psychology become relevant. *Ritter et al.*, [2017] borrowed methods from cognitive psychology, for which infants were the most often subjects, to interrogate deep networks. CNNs were shown objects with different combinations of shapes and colors. They concluded that, just like infants, deep networks have strong bias for shape over color, and that training can incrementally increase this “inductive bias” [*Mitchell and Mitchell*, 1980]. On a side note, their results also alluded that knowledge learned from older tasks, e.g., bias for shape, can contain critical value if they can be transferred to new tasks. In real neuroscience, researchers trained LSTM networks to perform two-dimensional navigation tasks, and visualized hidden unit representations [*Kanitscheider and Fiete*, 2016]. Their objective was to, through examining how LSTM works, generate hypotheses about how the brain solves hard navigation problems. They found that LSTM reproduces some phenomenology of the hippocampus, including stable tuning curves that remap between environments. Although one might use deep networks to help generate hypotheses, it must be noted that these neural networks cannot be treated as accurate models of biological brains.

5.2.4. Interpretative DL studies in sciences

Scientists have so far have mostly focusing on local input-output sensitivity analysis that examine relationships between neuron activations and inputs. Back to the jet image

analysis work in HEP, *Schwartzman et al.*, [2016] calculated correlation coefficient between jet image intensity and activations of hidden states in a trained CNN network. This correlations highlight the pixels on the images with the largest discrimination power. Via this visualization, they found particular radiation patterns that are not exploited in present state-of-the-art physics models. Similar to this approach, in brain imaging (Electroencephalography, or EEG), researchers developed a system that calculates the Pearson's correlations between cell activations and subset input features, in their case EEG envelopes at different frequencies [*Schirrmester et al.*, 2017b]. The correlations reflect which frequency band of the input signal that the trained network is most sensitive to, and, by extension, has learned to utilize in predicting outcomes. Via this approach, they showed that the network has learned to input signal in certain ranges when detecting pathology [*Schirrmester et al.*, 2017a]. This system can help design clinically useful automated EEG diagnosis.

In diagnosing with X-ray images, *Kumar and Menkovski* [2016] employed the deconvolution network approach introduced earlier [*Zeiler and Fergus*, 2014] to highlight pixels on images that are most critically responsible for anatomy classifications. They showed that the trained network relied on similar medical landmarks for the classification as human experts, even though the training targets do not explicitly prescribe these features. *Ziletti et al.*, [2017] used the same approach to learn about crystal structures that are used by the network to classify crystals. They also found the network identified similar structures of interest as human experts. Interestingly, they first converted 3D crystal structures to 2D images via calculating diffraction patterns of the crystal structure under incident radiation.

As reviewed in [*Montavon et al.*, 2017], scientists have shown how carefully design networks can offer novel quantum-chemical insights. *Schütt et al.*, [2017] developed a deep network that structurally represents atoms in the molecule and their interactions. This carefully designed network acquired high predictive power of molecular properties, with the added advantage that the trained network weights can be interpreted. They showed the network grasped chemical concepts such as bond saturation and aromaticity (ring stability), even though it is solely trained to predict total energy of molecules. While one might still question model non-uniqueness, the system indeed shows promise to predict properties and are so far not known to humans.

5.2.5. Syntheses

Many scientific investigations visualize the correlations between hidden activations and inputs. This approach should be valid as a first-order screening for locating potentially important features. However, as the units in a hidden layer stores the representation in a distributed way, and only the combined effects of activation cause the correct outputs. Interpreting the effects of a particular cell activation in isolation can provide incomplete and inconclusive analysis. Therefore, the interpretive tools that holistically consider DL

model, e.g., interpretable reduced orders, may more accurately reflect the inner workings of the DL model than cell activation-based probing methods such as correlations. However, this argument should not prevent us from using the latter as early exploratory tools.

6. Concluding remarks

Deep learning represents a powerful force of disruption for many scientific disciplines. It has addressed a number of key issues, namely, suitable architectures to digest big data and diverse data formats, computing platforms to efficiently prototype and solve problems fast and effective regularization schemes to reduce overfitting. The clearing of these roadblocks has enabled exponential growth in DL-powered applications.

From the literature we can see that DL serves roughly two functionalities: (A) to build models with more accurate predictions, far-greater processing capability and reduced demand for man-power and expertise; and (B) as an exploratory data mining tool to support discoveries that expand present knowledge and capabilities. Functionality (A) arises from DL's large flexibility, new architectures, and improved training procedures. Functionality (B) is due to its nonlinear model structure and regularization techniques, which enable DL to generalize beyond training datasets. For hydrology, both functionalities are vital, even though existing studies are mainly in the phase of testing the performance of DL methods. Our models are still challenged by long-standing issues like scaling [Wood, 1998] and equifinality [Beven, 2006]. There are also substantial unrecognized linkages where AIs can help [Wagener *et al.*, 2010].

The astronomy, remote-sensing, and climate studies primarily utilized aspect (A) of DL. In this regard, the supervised learning aims at reducing human effort. Substantial evidence suggests when these conditions are met, DL has a high likelihood of outperforming existing statistical or earlier machine learning methods. Moreover, with DL-based intelligent algorithms, computers can tirelessly process a deluge of data that far exceeds humans' capability so some previously intractable ideas now become tractable.

One can notice aspect (B) in applications from high-energy Physics, Computational Biology and Chemistry, because there the "supervision" arises from observations of nature. For example, If DL models make predictions about properties of proteins, new compounds, or particles that defy humans' predictions, it may prompt the re-examination of theories and new experiments. DL has some advantages in this regard than shallow methods: (1) Due to its capacity to model large and diverse dataset, DL models do not need to be restricted to specific zones or regimes on the attribute space. It thus has a better chance of learning underlying principles and generalize to new instances. (2) After the network is trained, we can interrogate and perturb the trained network to obtain insights (Section 5.2). (3) For fields who have small signal-to-noise ratios, e.g., HEP or Biology, DL may help break the traditional significance thresholds.

One easily witnesses that the young and energetic field of AI neuroscience is growing rapidly. As these studies arise from AI research, they generally set their focus on understanding how deep networks function. However, scientists have so far relied on *ad-hoc* visualization or interrogation methods for interpretations. On one hand, vast opportunities await domain scientists to adapt and incorporate AI neuroscience methods as regular tools in their inquiries. On the other hand, domain scientists have been creative in devising original methods that suit their particular situations. Both avenues are important. These ideas, architectural or interpretive, may feed back to the computer scientists for developing more advanced interpretive tools. Different disciplines are at different stages of adopting DL. It appears the closer their problems are to the origin of the deep networks, e.g., image recognition for CNN, the more DL-associated literature can be found. Computational biology and chemistry, in particular, have made a significant effort in customizing deep networks. Continued conversations and collaborations between computer scientists and domain scientists will be mutually beneficial.

References

- Abramowitz, G., H. Gupta, A. Pitman, Y. Wang, R. Leuning, H. Cleugh, K. Hsu, G. Abramowitz, H. Gupta, A. Pitman, Y. Wang, R. Leuning, H. Cleugh, and K. Hsu (2006), Neural Error Regression Diagnosis (NERD): A Tool for Model Bias Identification and Prognostic Data Assimilation, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, doi:10.1175/JHM479.1.
- Abramowitz, G., A. Pitman, H. Gupta, E. Kowalczyk, Y. Wang, G. Abramowitz, A. Pitman, H. Gupta, E. Kowalczyk, and Y. Wang (2007), Systematic Bias in Land Surface Models, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, doi:10.1175/JHM628.1.
- Aires, F., C. Prigent, W. B. Rossow, and M. Rothstein (2001), A new neural network approach including first guess for retrieval of atmospheric water vapor, cloud liquid water path, surface temperature, and emissivities over land from satellite microwave observations, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 106(D14), 14887–14907, doi:10.1029/2001JD900085.
- Akaike, H. (1974), A new look at the statistical model identification, *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 19(6), 716–723, doi:10.1109/TAC.1974.1100705.
- Alipanahi, B., A. Delong, M. T. Weirauch, and B. J. Frey (2015), Predicting the sequence specificities of DNA- and RNA-binding proteins by deep learning, *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 33(8), 831–838, doi:10.1038/nbt.3300.
- Altae-Tran, H., B. Ramsundar, A. S. Pappu, and V. Pande (2017), Low Data Drug Discovery with One-Shot Learning, *ACS Cent. Sci.*, 3(4), 283–293, doi:10.1021/acscentsci.6b00367.
- Angermueller, C., T. Pärnamaa, L. Parts, and O. Stegle (2016), Deep learning for computational biology., *Mol. Syst. Biol.*, 12(7), 878, doi:10.15252/MSB.20156651.
- Arpit, D., S. Jastrzębski, N. Ballas, D. Krueger, E. Bengio, M. S. Kanwal, T. Maharaj, A. Fischer, A. Courville, Y. Bengio, and S. Lacoste-Julien (2017), A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks, in *Proceedings of the 34 th International Conference on Machine Learning, Sydney, Australia, PMLR 70*.
- ATLAS, C. (2012), A particle consistent with the Higgs boson observed with the ATLAS detector at the Large Hadron Collider., *Science*, 338(6114), 1576–82, doi:10.1126/science.1232005.
- Aurisano, A., A. Radovic, D. Rocco, A. Himmel, M. D. Messier, E. Niner, G. Pawloski, F. Psihas, A. Sousa, and P. Vahle (2016), A convolutional neural network neutrino event classifier, *J. Instrum.*, 11(9), P09001–P09001, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/11/09/P09001.

- Bach, S., A. Binder, G. Montavon, F. Klauschen, K.-R. Müller, and W. Samek (2015), On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation, edited by O. D. Suarez, *PLoS One*, *10*(7), e0130140, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0130140.
- Bai, Y., Z. Chen, J. Xie, and C. Li (2016), Daily reservoir inflow forecasting using multiscale deep feature learning with hybrid models, *J. Hydrol.*, *532*, 193–206, doi:10.1016/J.JHYDROL.2015.11.011.
- Baldassi, C., C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, A. Ingrosso, C. Lucibello, L. Saglietti, and R. Zecchina (2016), Unreasonable effectiveness of learning neural networks: From accessible states and robust ensembles to basic algorithmic schemes., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, *113*(48), E7655–E7662, doi:10.1073/pnas.1608103113.
- Baldi, P., and P. Sadowski (2014), The dropout learning algorithm, *Artif. Intell.*, *210*, 78–122, doi:10.1016/J.ARTINT.2014.02.004.
- Baldi, P., P. Sadowski, and D. Whiteson (2014), Searching for exotic particles in high-energy physics with deep learning, *Nat. Commun.*, *5*, doi:10.1038/ncomms5308.
- Baldi, P., P. Sadowski, and D. Whiteson (2015), Enhanced Higgs Boson to $\tau^+ \tau^-$ Search with Deep Learning, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, *114*(11), 111801, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.111801.
- Ballard, D. (1987), Modular learning in neural networks, in *Proceedings of the sixth National conference on Artificial intelligence - Volume 1*, p. 838, American Association for Artificial Intelligence.
- Barlow, H. B. (1989), Unsupervised Learning, *Neural Comput.*, *1*(3), 295–311, doi:10.1162/neco.1989.1.3.295.
- Becker, S. (1991), Unsupervised learning procedures for neural networks, *Int. J. Neural Syst.*, *2*(01n02), 17–33, doi:10.1142/S0129065791000030.
- Bengio, Y., P. Lamblin, D. Popovici, and H. Larochelle (2007), Greedy Layer-Wise Training of Deep Networks, , 153–160.
- Bengio, Y., A. Courville, and P. Vincent (2013), Representation Learning: A Review and New Perspectives, *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, *35*(8), 1798–1828, doi:10.1109/TPAMI.2013.50.
- Beven, K. (2006), A manifesto for the equifinality thesis, *J. Hydrol.*, *320*(1–2), 18–36, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2005.07.007.
- Brockherde, F., L. Vogt, L. Li, M. E. Tuckerman, K. Burke, and K.-R. Müller (2017), Bypassing the Kohn-Sham equations with machine learning, *Nat. Commun.*, *8*(1),

872, doi:10.1038/s41467-017-00839-3.

- Butter, A., G. Kasieczka, T. Plehn, and M. Russell (2017), Deep-learned Top Tagging using Lorentz Invariance and Nothing Else, *arXiv:1707.08966*.
- Castelvecchi, D. (2015), Artificial Intelligence Called In to Tackle LHC Data Deluge, *Nat. Mag.* Available from: <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/artificial-intelligence-called-in-to-tackle-lhc-data-deluge/>
- Chaney, N. W., E. F. Wood, A. B. McBratney, J. W. Hempel, T. W. Nauman, C. W. Brungard, and N. P. Odgers (2016), POLARIS: A 30-meter probabilistic soil series map of the contiguous United States, *Geoderma*, 274, 54–67, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.03.025.
- Chen, C., A. Seff, A. Kornhauser, and J. Xiao (2015), DeepDriving: Learning Affordance for Direct Perception in Autonomous Driving, in *ICCV 2015*, pp. 2722–2730.
- Chen, X., Shiming Xiang, Cheng-Lin Liu, and Chun-Hong Pan (2014), Vehicle Detection in Satellite Images by Hybrid Deep Convolutional Neural Networks, *IEEE Geosci. Remote Sens. Lett.*, 11(10), 1797–1801, doi:10.1109/LGRS.2014.2309695.
- Clark, M. P., Y. Fan, D. M. Lawrence, J. C. Adam, D. Bolster, D. J. Gochis, R. P. Hooper, M. Kumar, L. R. Leung, D. S. Mackay, R. M. Maxwell, C. Shen, S. C. Swenson, and X. Zeng (2015), Improving the representation of hydrologic processes in Earth System Models, *Water Resour. Res.*, 51(8), 5929–5956, doi:10.1002/2015WR017096.
- Coates, A., A. Ng, and H. Lee (2011), An Analysis of Single-Layer Networks in Unsupervised Feature Learning, in *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, PMLR, pp. 215–223.
- Cover, T. M., and J. A. Thomas (1991), *Elements of information theory*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.
- Dawson, C. W., and R. L. Wilby (2001), Hydrological modelling using artificial neural networks, *Prog. Phys. Geogr.*, 25(1), 80–108, doi:10.1177/030913330102500104.
- Deo, M. C., and C. Sridhar Naidu (1998), Real time wave forecasting using neural networks, *Ocean Eng.*, 26(3), 191–203, doi:10.1016/S0029-8018(97)10025-7.
- Ding, J., B. Chen, H. Liu, and M. Huang (2016), Convolutional Neural Network With Data Augmentation for SAR Target Recognition, *IEEE Geosci. Remote Sens. Lett.*, 1–5, doi:10.1109/LGRS.2015.2513754.
- Entekhabi, D. (2010), The Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP) mission, *Proc. IEEE*, 98(5), 704–716, doi:10.1109/JPROC.2010.2043918.

- Fallah-Mehdipour, E., O. B. Haddad, and M. A. Mariño (2013), Prediction and simulation of monthly groundwater levels by genetic programming, *J. Hydro-environment Res.*, 7(4), 253–260, doi:10.1016/J.JHER.2013.03.005.
- Fang, K., and C. Shen (2017), Full-flow-regime storage-streamflow correlation patterns provide insights into hydrologic functioning over the continental US, *Water Resour. Res.*, doi:10.1002/2016WR020283.
- Fang, K., C. Shen, J. B. Fisher, and J. Niu (2016), Improving Budyko curve-based estimates of long-term water partitioning using hydrologic signatures from GRACE, *Water Resour. Res.*, 52(7), 5537–5554, doi:10.1002/2016WR018748.
- Fang, K., C. Shen, D. Kifer, and X. Yang (2017), Prolongation of SMAP to Spatio-temporally Seamless Coverage of Continental US Using a Deep Learning Neural Network, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, doi:10.1002/2017GL075619.
- Fatichi, S., E. R. Vivoni, F. L. Ogden, V. Y. Ivanov, B. Mirus, D. Gochis, C. W. Downer, M. Camporese, J. H. Davison, B. Ebel, N. Jones, J. Kim, G. Mascaro, R. Niswonger, P. Restrepo, R. Rigon, C. Shen, M. Sulis, and D. Tarboton (2016), An overview of current applications, challenges, and future trends in distributed process-based models in hydrology, *J. Hydrol.*, 537, 45–60, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.03.026.
- Gal, Y., and Z. Ghahramani (2015), A Theoretically Grounded Application of Dropout in Recurrent Neural Networks, *arxiv Prepr.*
- Gal, Y., and Z. Ghahramani (2016), Dropout as a Bayesian approximation: representing model uncertainty in deep learning, *Proc. 33rd Int. Conf. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn. - Vol. 48*, 1050–1059.
- Geng, J., J. Fan, H. Wang, X. Ma, B. Li, and F. Chen (2015), High-Resolution SAR Image Classification via Deep Convolutional Autoencoders, *IEEE Geosci. Remote Sens. Lett.*, 12(11), 2351–2355, doi:10.1109/LGRS.2015.2478256.
- George, D., H. Shen, and E. A. Huerta (2017), Deep Transfer Learning: A new deep learning glitch classification method for advanced LIGO, *arxiv Prepr.* 1706.07446.
- Giusti, A., J. Guzzi, D. C. Ciresan, F.-L. He, J. P. Rodriguez, F. Fontana, M. Faessler, C. Forster, J. Schmidhuber, G. Di Caro, D. Scaramuzza, and L. M. Gambardella (2016), A Machine Learning Approach to Visual Perception of Forest Trails for Mobile Robots, *IEEE Robot. Autom. Lett.*, 1(2), 661–667, doi:10.1109/LRA.2015.2509024.
- Glorot, X., A. Bordes, and Y. Bengio (2011), Deep Sparse Rectifier Neural Networks, in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 315–323.

- Goh, G. B., N. O. Hodas, and A. Vishnu (2017), Deep learning for computational chemistry, *J. Comput. Chem.*, 38(16), 1291–1307, doi:10.1002/jcc.24764.
- Gomes, J., B. Ramsundar, E. N. Feinberg, and V. S. Pande (2017), Atomic Convolutional Networks for Predicting Protein-Ligand Binding Affinity, *arXiv: 1703.10603*.
- Gong, W., H. V. Gupta, D. Yang, K. Sricharan, and A. O. Hero (2013), Estimating epistemic and aleatory uncertainties during hydrologic modeling: An information theoretic approach, *Water Resour. Res.*, 49(4), 2253–2273, doi:10.1002/wrcr.20161.
- Govindaraju, R. S., and A. R. Rao (Eds.) (2000), *Artificial Neural Networks in Hydrology*, Water Science and Technology Library, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht.
- Graves, A., A. Mohamed, and G. Hinton (2013), Speech recognition with deep recurrent neural networks, in *2013 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pp. 6645–6649, IEEE.
- Greengard, S. (2016), GPUs reshape computing, *Commun. ACM*, 59(9), 14–16, doi:10.1145/2967979.
- Greenspan, H., B. van Ginneken, and R. M. Summers (2016), Deep Learning in Medical Imaging: Overview and Future Promise of an Exciting New Technique, *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging*, 35(5), 1153–1159, doi:10.1109/TMI.2016.2553401.
- Greff, K., R. K. Srivastava, J. Koutník, B. R. Steunebrink, and J. Schmidhuber (2015), LSTM: A Search Space Odyssey, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1503.04069>.
- Gupta, H. V., K. Hsu, and S. Sorooshian (2000), Effective and Efficient Modeling for Streamflow Forecasting, pp. 7–22, Springer, Dordrecht.
- Hara, K., D. Saitoh, and H. Shouno (2016), Analysis of Dropout Learning Regarded as Ensemble Learning, in *Artificial Neural Networks and Machine Learning – ICANN 2016*, pp. 72–79, Springer, Cham.
- Hartigan, J. A. (1972), Direct Clustering of a Data Matrix, *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 67(337), 123–129, doi:10.1080/01621459.1972.10481214.
- Heffernan, R., K. Paliwal, J. Lyons, A. Dehzangi, A. Sharma, J. Wang, A. Sattar, Y. Yang, and Y. Zhou (2015), Improving prediction of secondary structure, local backbone angles and solvent accessible surface area of proteins by iterative deep learning, *Sci. Rep.*, 5(1), 11476, doi:10.1038/srep11476.
- Hemsoth, N. (2016), Nvidia CEO’s “Hyper-Moore’s Law” Vision for Future Supercomputers, *TheNextPlatform*. Available from: <https://www.nextplatform.com/2016/11/28/nvidia-ceos-hyper-moores-law-vision->

future-supercomputers/ (Accessed 30 November 2017)

- Hernández, E., V. Sanchez-Anguix, V. Julian, J. Palanca, and N. Duque (2016), Rainfall Prediction: A Deep Learning Approach, pp. 151–162, Springer, Cham.
- Hezaveh, Y. D., L. P. Levasseur, and P. J. Marshall (2017), Fast automated analysis of strong gravitational lenses with convolutional neural networks, *Nature*, 548(7669), 555–557, doi:10.1038/nature23463.
- Hinton, G., L. Deng, D. Yu, G. Dahl, A. Mohamed, N. Jaitly, A. Senior, V. Vanhoucke, P. Nguyen, T. Sainath, and B. Kingsbury (2012a), Deep Neural Networks for Acoustic Modeling in Speech Recognition: The Shared Views of Four Research Groups, *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, 29(6), 82–97, doi:10.1109/MSP.2012.2205597.
- Hinton, G. E., and R. R. Salakhutdinov (2006), Reducing the dimensionality of data with neural networks., *Science*, 313(5786), 504–7, doi:10.1126/science.1127647.
- Hinton, G. E., S. Osindero, and Y.-W. Teh (2006), A Fast Learning Algorithm for Deep Belief Nets, *Neural Comput.*, 18(7), 1527–1554, doi:10.1162/neco.2006.18.7.1527.
- Hinton, G. E., N. Srivastava, A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and R. R. Salakhutdinov (2012b), Improving neural networks by preventing co-adaptation of feature detectors, *arXiv:1207.0580*.
- Ho, T. K. (1995), Random decision forests, in *Proceeding ICDAR '95 Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition*.
- Hochreiter, S. (1998), The Vanishing Gradient Problem During Learning Recurrent Neural Nets and Problem Solutions, *Int. J. Uncertainty, Fuzziness Knowledge-Based Syst.*, 6(2), 107–116, doi:10.1142/S0218488598000094.
- Hochreiter, S., and J. Schmidhuber (1997), Long Short-Term Memory, *Neural Comput.*, 9(8), 1735–1780, doi:10.1162/neco.1997.9.8.1735.
- Hochreiter, S., Y. Bengio, P. Frasconi, and Jürgen Schmidhuber (2001), Gradient Flow in Recurrent Nets: the Difficulty of Learning Long-Term Dependencies, in *A Field Guide to Dynamical Recurrent Neural Networks*, edited by S. C. Kremer and J. F. Kolen, IEEE Press.
- Hornik, K., M. Stinchcombe, and H. White (1989), Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators, *Neural Networks*, 2(5), 359–366, doi:10.1016/0893-6080(89)90020-8.
- Hsu, K., H. V. Gupta, X. Gao, S. Sorooshian, and B. Imam (2002), Self-organizing linear output map (SOLO): An artificial neural network suitable for hydrologic modeling and analysis, *Water Resour. Res.*, 38(12), 38-1-38–17, doi:10.1029/2001WR000795.

- Hu, F., G.-S. Xia, J. Hu, and L. Zhang (2015), Transferring Deep Convolutional Neural Networks for the Scene Classification of High-Resolution Remote Sensing Imagery, *Remote Sens.*, 7(11), 14680–14707, doi:10.3390/rs71114680.
- Jha, M. K., and S. Sahoo (2015), Efficacy of neural network and genetic algorithm techniques in simulating spatio-temporal fluctuations of groundwater, *Hydrol. Process.*, 29(5), 671–691, doi:10.1002/hyp.10166.
- Ji, X., and C. Shen (2018), The introspective may achieve more: enhancing existing Geoscientific models with native-language structural reflection, *Comput. Geosci.*, 110, doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2017.09.014.
- Kanitscheider, I., and I. Fiete (2016), Training recurrent networks to generate hypotheses about how the brain solves hard navigation problems, in *NIPS 2016*.
- Karpathy, A., J. Johnson, and L. Fei-Fei (2015), Visualizing and Understanding Recurrent Networks, in *ICLR 2016 Workshop*.
- Klein, B., L. Wolf, and Y. Afek (2015), A Dynamic Convolutional Layer for short range weather prediction, in *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 4840–4848, IEEE.
- Kolassa, J., P. Gentile, C. Prigent, F. Aires, and S. H. Alemohammad (2017), Soil moisture retrieval from AMSR-E and ASCAT microwave observation synergy. Part 2: Product evaluation, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 195, 202–217, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2017.04.020.
- Koller, D., and N. Friedman (2009), *Probabilistic graphical models : principles and techniques*, The MIT Press.
- Komisike, P. T., E. M. Metodiev, and M. D. Schwartz (2017), Deep learning in color: towards automated quark/gluon jet discrimination, *J. High Energy Phys.*, 2017(1), 110, doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2017)110.
- Kullback, S., and R. A. Leibler (1951), On Information and Sufficiency, *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 22(1), 79–86, doi:10.1214/aoms/1177729694.
- Kumar, D., and V. Menkovski (2016), Understanding Anatomy Classification Through Visualization, in *30th NIPS Machine learning for Health Workshop*.
- Kuwata, K., and R. Shibasaki (2015), Estimating crop yields with deep learning and remotely sensed data, in *2015 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS)*, pp. 858–861, IEEE.
- LeCun, Y., Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton (2015), Deep learning, *Nature*, 521(7553), 436–444, doi:10.1038/nature14539.

- Lee, W., S. Kim, Y.-T. Lee, Hyun-Woo Lee, and Min Choi (2017), Deep neural networks for wild fire detection with unmanned aerial vehicle, in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Consumer Electronics (ICCE)*, pp. 252–253, IEEE.
- Leopold, G. (2017), Nvidia’s Huang Sees AI “Cambrian Explosion,” *Datanami*. Available from: <https://www.datanami.com/2017/05/24/nvidias-huang-sees-ai-cambrian-explosion/> (Accessed 6 July 2017)
- Lewis-Kraus, G. (2016), The Great A.I. Awakening, *N. Y. Times Mag.* Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/14/magazine/the-great-ai-awakening.html>
- Liu, Y., and L. Wu (2016), Geological Disaster Recognition on Optical Remote Sensing Images Using Deep Learning, *Procedia Comput. Sci.*, *91*, 566–575, doi:10.1016/J.PROCS.2016.07.144.
- Liu, Y., E. Racah, Prabhat, J. Correa, A. Khosrowshahi, D. Lavers, K. Kunkel, M. Wehner, and W. Collins (2016), Application of Deep Convolutional Neural Networks for Detecting Extreme Weather in Climate Datasets, in *ACM SIGKDD 2016 Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*.
- Loh, W.-Y. (2011), Classification and regression trees, *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Data Min. Knowl. Discov.*, *1*(1), 14–23, doi:10.1002/widm.8.
- Lusci, A., G. Pollastri, and P. Baldi (2013), Deep Architectures and Deep Learning in Chemoinformatics: The Prediction of Aqueous Solubility for Drug-Like Molecules, *J. Chem. Inf. Model*, *53*(7).
- Lyons, J., A. Dehzangi, R. Heffernan, A. Sharma, K. Paliwal, A. Sattar, Y. Zhou, and Y. Yang (2014), Predicting backbone C α angles and dihedrals from protein sequences by stacked sparse auto-encoder deep neural network, *J. Comput. Chem.*, *35*(28), 2040–2046, doi:10.1002/jcc.23718.
- Mahendran, A., and A. Vedaldi (2015), Understanding deep image representations by inverting them, in *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 5188–5196, IEEE.
- Makantasis, K., K. Karantza, A. Doukakis, and N. Doukakis (2015), Deep supervised learning for hyperspectral data classification through convolutional neural networks, in *2015 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS)*, pp. 4959–4962, IEEE.
- Marçais, J., and J.-R. de Dreuzy (2017), Prospective Interest of Deep Learning for Hydrological Inference, *Groundwater*, *55*(5), 688–692, doi:10.1111/gwat.12557.
- Mariusz Bojarski, Larry Jackel, Ben Firner, and Urs Muller (2017), Explaining How End-

- to-End Deep Learning Steers a Self-Driving Car | Parallel Forall, *NVidia Dev. Blog*. Available from: <https://devblogs.nvidia.com/parallelforall/explaining-deep-learning-self-driving-car/> (Accessed 1 December 2017)
- Marmanis, D., M. Datcu, T. Esch, and U. Stilla (2016), Deep Learning Earth Observation Classification Using ImageNet Pretrained Networks, *IEEE Geosci. Remote Sens. Lett.*, 13(1), 105–109, doi:10.1109/LGRS.2015.2499239.
- Marr, B. (2016), Why Artificial Intelligence Will Change Our World And Why It Needs To Be Purposeful, *Forbes*. Available from: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/bernardmarr/2016/05/25/why-artificial-intelligence-will-change-our-world-and-why-it-needs-to-be-purposeful/#716b6060596e> (Accessed 12 July 2016)
- Maxwell, R. M., M. Putti, S. Meyerhoff, J.-O. Delfs, I. M. Ferguson, V. Ivanov, J. Kim, O. Kolditz, S. J. Kollet, M. Kumar, S. Lopez, J. Niu, C. Paniconi, Y.-J. Park, M. S. Phanikumar, C. Shen, E. A. Sudicky, and M. Sulis (2014), Surface-subsurface model intercomparison: A first set of benchmark results to diagnose integrated hydrology and feedbacks, *Water Resour. Res.*, 50(2), 1531–1549, doi:10.1002/2013WR013725.
- Mehta, P., and D. J. Schwab (2014), An exact mapping between the Variational Renormalization Group and Deep Learning, *arXiv:1410.3831*.
- Metz, C. (2016), AI Is Transforming Google Search. The Rest of the Web Is Next, *Wired*. Available from: <http://www.wired.com/2016/02/ai-is-changing-the-technology-behind-google-searches/>
- Min, S., B. Lee, and S. Yoon (2016), Deep learning in bioinformatics, *Brief. Bioinform.*, 18(5), bbw068, doi:10.1093/bib/bbw068.
- Ming, Y., S. Cao, R. Zhang, Z. Li, Y. Chen, Y. Song, and H. Qu (2017), Understanding Hidden Memories of Recurrent Neural Networks, in *IEEE Conference on Visual Analytics Science and Technology (IEEE VAST 2017)*.
- Mitchell, T. M., and T. M. Mitchell (1980), The Need for Biases in Learning Generalizations, in *Readings in Machine Learning*, edited by J. W. Shavlik and T. G. Dietterich, pp. 184--191.
- Montavon, G., W. Samek, and K.-R. Müller (2017), Methods for Interpreting and Understanding Deep Neural Networks, *Digit. Signal Process.*, doi:10.1016/J.DSP.2017.10.011.
- Morgan, D. A. E. (2015), Deep convolutional neural networks for ATR from SAR imagery, vol. 9475, edited by E. Zelnio and F. D. Garber, p. 94750F, International

Society for Optics and Photonics.

- Mozer, M. C. (1989), A Focused Backpropagation Algorithm for Temporal Pattern Recognition, in *Complex Systems (3)*, edited by Y. Chauvin and D. E. Rumelhart, pp. 349–381, L. Erlbaum Associates Inc., Hillsdale, NJ.
- Murthy, V. N., S. Maji, and R. Manmatha (2015), Automatic Image Annotation using Deep Learning Representations, in *Proceedings of the 5th ACM on International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval - ICMR '15*, pp. 603–606, ACM Press, New York, New York, USA.
- Nair, V., and G. E. Hinton (2010), Rectified linear units improve restricted boltzmann machines, in *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 807–814, Association for Computing Machinery.
- Nearing, G. S., D. M. Mocko, C. D. Peters-Lidard, S. V. Kumar, Y. Xia, G. S. Nearing, D. M. Mocko, C. D. Peters-Lidard, S. V. Kumar, and Y. Xia (2016), Benchmarking NLDAS-2 Soil Moisture and Evapotranspiration to Separate Uncertainty Contributions, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, 17(3), 745–759, doi:10.1175/JHM-D-15-0063.1.
- Nguyen, A., J. Clune, Y. Bengio, A. Dosovitskiy, and J. Yosinski (2016), Plug and Play Generative Networks: Conditional Iterative Generation of Images in Latent Space, in *CVPR 2016*.
- Nogueira, K., O. A. B. Penatti, and J. A. dos Santos (2017), Towards better exploiting convolutional neural networks for remote sensing scene classification, *Pattern Recognit.*, 61, 539–556, doi:10.1016/j.patcog.2016.07.001.
- de Oliveira, L., M. Kagan, L. Mackey, B. Nachman, and A. Schwartzman (2016), Jet-images — deep learning edition, *J. High Energy Phys.*, 2016(7), 69, doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2016)069.
- Park, Y., and M. Kellis (2015), Deep learning for regulatory genomics, *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 33(8), 825–826, doi:10.1038/nbt.3313.
- Pontes, B., R. Giráldez, and J. S. Aguilar-Ruiz (2015), Biclustering on expression data: A review, *J. Biomed. Inform.*, 57, 163–180, doi:10.1016/J.JBI.2015.06.028.
- Prechelt, L. (2012), Early Stopping — But When?, in *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade*, edited by M. G., O. G.B., and M. KR., pp. 53–67, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Pryzant, R., S. Ermon, and D. Lobell (2017), Monitoring Ethiopian Wheat Fungus with Satellite Imagery and Deep Feature Learning, in *2017 IEEE Conference on*

Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW), pp. 1524–1532, IEEE.

- Racah, E., S. Ko, P. Sadowski, W. Bhimji, C. Tull, S.-Y. Oh, P. Baldi, and Prabhat (2016), Revealing Fundamental Physics from the Daya Bay Neutrino Experiment Using Deep Neural Networks, in *2016 15th IEEE International Conference on Machine Learning and Applications (ICMLA)*, pp. 892–897, IEEE.
- Raghavendra, S., and P. C. Deka (2014a), Support vector machine applications in the field of hydrology: A review, *Appl. Soft Comput.*, *19*, 372–386, doi:10.1016/J.ASOC.2014.02.002.
- Raghavendra, S., and P. C. Deka (2014b), Support vector machine applications in the field of hydrology: A review, *Appl. Soft Comput.*, *19*, 372–386, doi:10.1016/j.asoc.2014.02.002.
- Ranzato, M., F. J. Huang, Y.-L. Boureau, and Y. LeCun (2007), Unsupervised Learning of Invariant Feature Hierarchies with Applications to Object Recognition, in *2007 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 1–8, IEEE.
- Ratsch, G. (2004), A Brief Introduction into Machine Learning, Available from: <https://events.ccc.de/congress/2004/fahrplan/files/105-machine-learning-paper.pdf>
- Redlich, A. N. (1993), Redundancy Reduction as a Strategy for Unsupervised Learning, *Neural Comput.*, *5*(2), 289–304, doi:10.1162/neco.1993.5.2.289.
- Ribeiro, M. T., S. Singh, and C. Guestrin (2016), “Why Should I Trust You?” and “Why Should I Not Trust You?”, in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining - KDD '16*, pp. 1135–1144, ACM Press.
- Ritter, S., D. G. T. Barrett, A. Santoro, and M. M. Botvinick (2017), Cognitive Psychology for Deep Neural Networks: A Shape Bias Case Study, in *Proceedings of the 34 th International Conference on Machine Learning*. *arXiv:1706.08606*.
- Rodriguez-Fernandez, N., P. Richaume, F. Aires, C. Prigent, Y. Kerr, J. Kolassa, C. Jimenez, F. Cabot, and A. Mahmoodi (2014), Soil moisture retrieval from SMOS observations using neural networks, in *2014 IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium*, pp. 2431–2434, IEEE.
- Rumelhart, D. E., G. E. Hinton, and R. J. Williams (1986), Learning representations by back-propagating errors, *Nature*, *323*(6088), 533–536, doi:10.1038/323533a0.
- Sadowski, P., B. Radics, Ananya, Y. Yamazaki, and P. Baldi (2017), Efficient antihydrogen detection in antimatter physics by deep learning, *J. Phys. Commun.*, *1*(2), 25001, doi:10.1088/2399-6528/aa83fa.

- Sak, H., A. Senior, K. Rao, F. Beaufays, and J. Schalkwyk (2015), Google voice search: faster and more accurate, *Google Speech Team - Google Res. Blog*. Available from: <https://research.googleblog.com/2015/09/google-voice-search-faster-and-more.html> (Accessed 30 November 2017)
- Samek, W., A. Binder, G. Montavon, S. Lapuschkin, and K.-R. Muller (2017), Evaluating the Visualization of What a Deep Neural Network Has Learned, *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks Learn. Syst.*, 28(11), 2660–2673, doi:10.1109/TNNLS.2016.2599820.
- Sawicz, K. A., C. Kelleher, T. Wagener, P. Troch, M. Sivapalan, and G. Carrillo (2014), Characterizing hydrologic change through catchment classification, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 18(1), 273–285, doi:10.5194/hess-18-273-2014.
- Schaap, M. G., F. J. Leij, and M. T. van Genuchten (2001), Rosetta: a Computer Program for Estimating Soil Hydraulic Parameters With Hierarchical Pedotransfer Functions, *J. Hydrol.*, 251(3–4), 163–176, doi:10.1016/S0022-1694(01)00466-8.
- Schirrmester, R. T., L. Gemein, K. Eggenberger, F. Hutter, and T. Ball (2017a), Deep learning with convolutional neural networks for decoding and visualization of EEG pathology, *arXiv:1708.08012*.
- Schirrmester, R. T., J. T. Springenberg, L. D. J. Fiederer, M. Glasstetter, K. Eggenberger, M. Tangemann, F. Hutter, W. Burgard, and T. Ball (2017b), Deep learning with convolutional neural networks for EEG decoding and visualization, *Hum. Brain Mapp.*, 38(11), 5391–5420, doi:10.1002/hbm.23730.
- Schmidhuber, J. (2015), Deep learning in neural networks: An overview, *Neural Networks*, 61, 85–117, doi:10.1016/j.neunet.2014.09.003.
- Schütt, K. T., F. Arbabzadah, S. Chmiela, K. R. Müller, and A. Tkatchenko (2017), Quantum-chemical insights from deep tensor neural networks, *Nat. Commun.*, 8, 13890, doi:10.1038/ncomms13890.
- Schwartzman, A., M. Kagan, L. Mackey, B. Nachman, and L. De Oliveira (2016), Image Processing, Computer Vision, and Deep Learning: new approaches to the analysis and physics interpretation of LHC events, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, 762(1), 12035, doi:10.1088/1742-6596/762/1/012035.
- Semeniuta, S., A. Severyn, and E. Barth (2016), Recurrent Dropout without Memory Loss, *arxiv Prepr.*
- Sermanet, P., K. Kavukcuoglu, S. Chintala, and Y. Lecun (2013), Pedestrian Detection with Unsupervised Multi-stage Feature Learning, in *The IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2013*, pp. 3626–3633.

- Shannon, C. E. (1948), A mathematical theory of communication., *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, 27.
- Sharma, J., O.-C. Granmo, M. Goodwin, and J. T. Fidge (2017), Deep Convolutional Neural Networks for Fire Detection in Images, pp. 183–193, Springer, Cham.
- Shen, C., W. J. Riley, K. M. Smithgall, J. M. Melack, and K. Fang (2016), The fan of influence of streams and channel feedbacks to simulated land surface water and carbon dynamics, *Water Resour. Res.*, 52(2), 880–902, doi:10.1002/2015WR018086.
- Shi, X., Z. Gao, L. Lausen, H. Wang, D.-Y. Yeung, W. Wong, and W. Woo (2017), Deep Learning for Precipitation Nowcasting: A Benchmark and A New Model, in *31st Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS 2017)*.
- Shin, H.-C., H. R. Roth, M. Gao, L. Lu, Z. Xu, I. Nogues, J. Yao, D. Mollura, and R. M. Summers (2016), Deep Convolutional Neural Networks for Computer-Aided Detection: CNN Architectures, Dataset Characteristics and Transfer Learning, *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging*, 35(5), 1285–1298, doi:10.1109/TMI.2016.2528162.
- Silver, D., A. Huang, C. J. Maddison, A. Guez, L. Sifre, G. van den Driessche, J. Schrittwieser, I. Antonoglou, V. Panneershelvam, M. Lanctot, S. Dieleman, D. Grewe, J. Nham, N. Kalchbrenner, I. Sutskever, T. Lillicrap, M. Leach, K. Kavukcuoglu, T. Graepel, and D. Hassabis (2016), Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search, *Nature*, 529(7587), 484–489, doi:10.1038/nature16961.
- Smirnov, E. A., D. M. Timoshenko, and S. N. Andrianov (2014), Comparison of Regularization Methods for ImageNet Classification with Deep Convolutional Neural Networks, *AASRI Procedia*, 6, 89–94, doi:10.1016/J.AASRI.2014.05.013.
- Snelson, E., E. Snelson, and Z. Ghahramani (2006), Sparse Gaussian Processes using Pseudo-inputs, *Adv. NEURAL Inf. Process. Syst.*, 18, 1257--1264.
- Sønderby, S. K., C. K. Sønderby, H. Nielsen, and O. Winther (2015), Convolutional LSTM Networks for Subcellular Localization of Proteins, pp. 68–80, Springer, Cham.
- Song, X., G. Zhang, F. Liu, D. Li, Y. Zhao, and J. Yang (2016), Modeling spatio-temporal distribution of soil moisture by deep learning-based cellular automata model, *J. Arid Land*, 8(5), 734–748, doi:10.1007/s40333-016-0049-0.
- Sorooshian, S., K.-L. Hsu, X. Gao, H. V. Gupta, B. Imam, D. Braithwaite, S. Sorooshian, K.-L. Hsu, X. Gao, H. V. Gupta, B. Imam, and D. Braithwaite (2000), Evaluation of PERSIANN System Satellite-Based Estimates of Tropical Rainfall, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 81(9), 2035–2046, doi:10.1175/1520-

0477(2000)081<2035:EOPSS>2.3.CO;2.

- Spencer, M., J. Eickholt, and J. Jianlin Cheng (2015), A Deep Learning Network Approach to ab initio Protein Secondary Structure Prediction., *IEEE/ACM Trans. Comput. Biol. Bioinforma.*, 12(1), 103–12, doi:10.1109/TCBB.2014.2343960.
- Srivastava, N., G. Hinton, A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and R. Salakhutdinov (2014), Dropout: A Simple Way to Prevent Neural Networks from Overfitting, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 15, 1929–1958.
- Strobelt, H., S. Gehrmann, B. Huber, H. Pfister, and A. M. Rush (2016), Visual Analysis of Hidden State Dynamics in Recurrent Neural Networks, in *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, p. 99.
- Subramanian, G., B. Ramsundar, V. Pande, and R. A. Denny (2016), Computational Modeling of β -Secretase 1 (BACE-1) Inhibitors Using Ligand Based Approaches, *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, 56(10), 1936–1949, doi:10.1021/acs.jcim.6b00290.
- Sun, C., A. Shrivastava, S. Singh, and A. Gupta (2017), Revisiting Unreasonable Effectiveness of Data in Deep Learning Era, in *ICCV 2017*.
- Szegedy, C., Wei Liu, Yangqing Jia, P. Sermanet, S. Reed, D. Anguelov, D. Erhan, V. Vanhoucke, and A. Rabinovich (2015), Going deeper with convolutions, in *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 1–9, IEEE.
- Tao, Y., X. Gao, K. Hsu, S. Sorooshian, A. Ihler, Y. Tao, X. Gao, K. Hsu, S. Sorooshian, and A. Ihler (2016), A Deep Neural Network Modeling Framework to Reduce Bias in Satellite Precipitation Products, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, doi:JHM-D-15-0075.1.
- Tapiador, F. J., C. Kidd, V. Levizzani, F. S. Marzano, F. J. Tapiador, C. Kidd, V. Levizzani, and F. S. Marzano (2004), A Neural Networks–Based Fusion Technique to Estimate Half-Hourly Rainfall Estimates at 0.1° Resolution from Satellite Passive Microwave and Infrared Data, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, doi:10.1175/1520-0450(2004)043<0576:ANNFTT>2.0.CO;2.
- Trottenberg, U., C. W. Oosterlee, and A. Schuller (2000), *Multigrid*, Academic press.
- Tsai, W.-P., S.-P. Huang, S.-T. Cheng, K.-T. Shao, and F.-J. Chang (2017), A data-mining framework for exploring the multi-relation between fish species and water quality through self-organizing map, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 579, 474–483, doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2016.11.071.
- Tuccillo, D., M. Huertas-Company, E. Decenci re, and S. Velasco-Forero (2016), Deep learning for studies of galaxy morphology, *Proc. Int. Astron. Union*, 12(S325), 191–

196, doi:10.1017/S1743921317000552.

- Vandal, T., E. Kodra, S. Ganguly, A. Michaelis, R. Nemani, and A. R. Ganguly (2017), DeepSD: Generating High Resolution Climate Change Projections through Single Image Super-Resolution, in *23rd ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*.
- Vincent, P., H. Larochelle, Y. Bengio, and P.-A. Manzagol (2008), Extracting and composing robust features with denoising autoencoders, in *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning - ICML '08*, pp. 1096–1103, ACM Press, New York, New York, USA.
- Voosen, P. (2017), The AI detectives, *Science* (80-.), 357(6346).
- Wagener, T., M. Sivapalan, P. a. Troch, B. L. McGlynn, C. J. Harman, H. V. Gupta, P. Kumar, P. S. C. Rao, N. B. Basu, and J. S. Wilson (2010), The future of hydrology: An evolving science for a changing world, *Water Resour. Res.*, 46(5), 1–10, doi:10.1029/2009WR008906.
- Wagner, S. A. (2016), SAR ATR by a combination of convolutional neural network and support vector machines, *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, 52(6), 2861–2872, doi:10.1109/TAES.2016.160061.
- Wan, L., M. Zeiler, S. Zhang, Y. LeCun, and R. Fergus (2013), Regularization of neural networks using dropconnect, *Proc. 30th Int. Conf. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn. - Vol. 28*, III-1058.
- Wang, L., K. A. Scott, L. Xu, and D. A. Clausi (2016), Sea Ice Concentration Estimation During Melt From Dual-Pol SAR Scenes Using Deep Convolutional Neural Networks: A Case Study, *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, 54(8), 4524–4533, doi:10.1109/TGRS.2016.2543660.
- Wang, W.-C., K.-W. Chau, C.-T. Cheng, and L. Qiu (2009), A comparison of performance of several artificial intelligence methods for forecasting monthly discharge time series, *J. Hydrol.*, 374(3–4), 294–306, doi:10.1016/J.JHYDROL.2009.06.019.
- Werbos, P. J. (1990), Backpropagation through time: what it does and how to do it, *Proc. IEEE*, 78(10), 1550–1560, doi:10.1109/5.58337.
- White, A. B., P. Kumar, and D. Tchong (2005), A data mining approach for understanding topographic control on climate-induced inter-annual vegetation variability over the United States, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 98(1), 1–20, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2005.05.017.

- Wood, E. F. (1998), Scale analyses for land-surface hydrology, in *Scale dependence and scale invariance in hydrology*, edited by G. Sposito, pp. 1–29, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- Wu, Y., M. Schuster, Z. Chen, Q. V. Le, M. Norouzi, W. Macherey, M. Krikun, Y. Cao, Q. Gao, K. Macherey, J. Klingner, A. Shah, M. Johnson, X. Liu, Ł. Kaiser, S. Gouws, Y. Kato, T. Kudo, H. Kazawa, K. Stevens, G. Kurian, N. Patil, W. Wang, C. Young, J. Smith, J. Riesa, A. Rudnick, O. Vinyals, G. Corrado, M. Hughes, and J. Dean (2016), Google’s Neural Machine Translation System: Bridging the Gap between Human and Machine Translation, *arxiv Prepr.* Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.08144> (Accessed 31 July 2017)
- Wu, Z., B. Ramsundar, E. N. Feinberg, J. Gomes, C. Geniesse, A. S. Pappu, K. Leswing, and V. Pande (2017), MoleculeNet: A Benchmark for Molecular Machine Learning, *arXiv:1703.00564*.
- Xu, T., and A. J. Valocchi (2015), Data-driven methods to improve baseflow prediction of a regional groundwater model, *Comput. Geosci.*, 85, 124–136, doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2015.05.016.
- Yao, Y., L. Rosasco, and A. Caponnetto (2007), On Early Stopping in Gradient Descent Learning, *Constr. Approx.*, 26(2), 289–315, doi:10.1007/s00365-006-0663-2.
- Yaseen, Z. M., A. El-shafie, O. Jaafar, H. A. Afan, and K. N. Sayl (2015), Artificial intelligence based models for stream-flow forecasting: 2000–2015, *J. Hydrol.*, 530, 829–844, doi:10.1016/J.JHYDROL.2015.10.038.
- Yosinski, J., J. Clune, A. Nguyen, T. Fuchs, and H. Lipson (2015), Understanding Neural Networks Through Deep Visualization, in *Deep Learning Workshop, 31 st International Conference on Machine Learning, Lille, France*.
- You, J., X. Li, M. Low, D. Lobell, and S. Ermon (2017), Deep Gaussian Process for Crop Yield Prediction Based on Remote Sensing Data, in *Proceedings of the Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-17)*.
- Zaremba, W., I. Sutskever, and O. Vinyals (2015), Recurrent Neural Network Regularization, in *ICLR 2015*.
- Zeiler, M. D., and R. Fergus (2014), Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks, in *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 818–833, Springer, Cham.
- Zeiler, M. D., G. W. Taylor, and R. Fergus (2011), Adaptive deconvolutional networks for mid and high level feature learning, in *2011 International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 2018–2025, IEEE.

- Zhang, C., S. Bengio, M. Hardt, B. Recht, and O. Vinyals (2016a), Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization, in *ICLR 2017*.
- Zhang, D., G. Lindholm, and H. Ratnaweera (2018), Use long short-term memory to enhance Internet of Things for combined sewer overflow monitoring, *J. Hydrol.*, 556, 409–418, doi:10.1016/J.JHYDROL.2017.11.018.
- Zhang, L., L. Zhang, and B. Du (2016b), Deep Learning for Remote Sensing Data: A Technical Tutorial on the State of the Art, *IEEE Geosci. Remote Sens. Mag.*, 4(2), 22–40, doi:10.1109/MGRS.2016.2540798.
- Zhang, P., M. Gong, L. Su, J. Liu, and Z. Li (2016c), Change detection based on deep feature representation and mapping transformation for multi-spatial-resolution remote sensing images, *ISPRS J. Photogramm. Remote Sens.*, 116, 24–41, doi:10.1016/J.ISPRSJPRS.2016.02.013.
- Zhang, P., L. Zhang, H. Leung, and J. Wang (2017), A Deep-Learning Based Precipitation Forecasting Approach Using Multiple Environmental Factors, in *2017 IEEE International Congress on Big Data (BigData Congress)*, pp. 193–200, IEEE.
- Zhang, Q., J. Xu, L. Xu, and H. Guo (2016d), Deep Convolutional Neural Networks for Forest Fire Detection, in *Proceedings of the 2016 International Forum on Management, Education and Information Technology Application*, Atlantis Press, Paris, France.
- Zhou, Z.-H., and Y. Jiang (2004), NeC4.5: neural ensemble based C4.5, *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 16(6), 770–773, doi:10.1109/TKDE.2004.11.
- Zhu, X. X., D. Tuia, L. Mou, G.-S. Xia, L. Zhang, F. Xu, and F. Fraundorfer (2017), Deep learning in remote sensing: a review, *IEEE Geosci. Remote Sens. Mag.*
- Ziletti, A., D. Kumar, M. Scheffler, and L. M. Ghiringhelli (2017), The face of crystals: insightful classification using deep learning, *arXiv:1709.02298*.