How to Augment for Atmospheric Turbulence Effects on Thermal Adapted Object Detection Models?

A PREPRINT

Engin Uzun Dept. of Image Processing & Computer Vision Tech. ASELSAN Inc., Türkiye Graduate School of Informatics, METU, Türkiye enginuzun@aselsan.com Erdem Akagündüz Department of Modeling and Simulation Graduate School of Informatics, METU, Türkiye akaerdem@metu.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

Atmospheric turbulence poses a significant challenge to the performance of object detection models. Turbulence causes distortions, blurring, and noise in images by bending and scattering light rays due to variations in the refractive index of air. This results in non-rigid geometric distortions and temporal fluctuations in the electromagnetic radiation received by optical systems. This paper explores the effectiveness of turbulence image augmentation techniques in improving the accuracy and robustness of thermal-adapted and deep learning-based object detection models under atmospheric turbulence. Three distinct approximation-based turbulence simulators (geometric, Zernike-based, and P2S) are employed to generate turbulent training and test datasets. The performance of three state-of-the-art deep learning-based object detection models: RTMDet-x, DINO-4scale, and YOLOv8-x, is employed on these turbulent datasets with and without turbulence augmentation during training. The results demonstrate that utilizing turbulence-specific augmentations during model training can significantly improve detection accuracy and robustness against distorted turbulent images. Turbulence augmentation enhances performance even for a non-turbulent test set.

1 Introduction

A major research area in deep learning and computer vision is augmenting datasets artificially. The philosophy behind data augmentation is to make the training distribution more diverse so that the model is more robust to variations in the input and less prone to overfitting. By creating fresh samples from existing ones through different techniques, the model is exposed to a wider range of variations and can learn to recognize features and patterns that are invariant to various transformations. This helps the model generalize better to unseen data and compensate for imbalanced datasets by generating new samples for under-represented classes and features. Some problem definitions attribute these transformations to complex conditions, such as atmospheric turbulence. For a proper introduction to the subject, in the following, we review data augmentation literature before moving on to our problem definition, namely augmenting turbulence effects into thermal-adapted object detection models.

1.1 Data Augmentation Literature

The demand for more labelled data has increased as a result of recent advances in deep learning. Particularly as a result of the explosive growth of vision transformer architectures, attention-based algorithms dominate many vision benchmarks such as image classification [1, 2, 3], object detection [4, 5, 3] and image generation [6, 7]. There is, however, significant consumption of labeled data in these algorithms. To address this requirement, current deep learning research predominantly focus on utilizing self-supervised [8] or semi-supervised learning [9, 10] methods. No matter what supervision strategy is used in these studies, training deep neural networks requires more data than ever before. Augmentation is still one of the most efficient and effective ways to increase the amount of labeled or unlabelled data to regularize problems such as small-scale sets, class imbalance, and domain shift, to name a few.

It is imperative to understand two fundamental dimensions when augmenting data into a learning model: the method used to generate the augmented data and the strategy used to train the model with the augmented data. Mingle et al. [11] propose a novel augmentation taxonomy that incorporates both data generation methods and training strategies. Basically, they categorize augmentation under three titles: model-free, model-based, and optimization-based. The first two cover data augmentation methods, while the third deals with augmentation strategies. Partially inspired by their taxonomy, our augmentation classification is illustrated in Figure 1.

Our approach to augmentation differs from that of [11], in which we first split the process into its two major dimensions, namely data generation methods and augmentation strategies. We divide data generation methods into two categories as model-based and model-free. Model-free data augmentation, as the name suggests, refers to techniques used to increase the diversity of training data without the use of a model¹. Model-free data augmentation can be broadly divided into two subcategories: augmentation using a single sample or a fusion of multiple data samples. Model-free single-sample augmentation refers to the process of diversifying the dataset by applying various types of basic data processing techniques, such as rotation, scaling, flipping [12, 13]. Previous work such as [14] shows that when combining these techniques and combining their outputs with the original sample, further improvement is possible. These techniques are applied randomly, allowing for the creation of a diverse set of augmented samples from a single original source. Despite their simplicity, model-free augmentation techniques are commonly used for various computer vision tasks [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21].

Model-free multiple-sample augmentation methods aim to combine more than one sample to dilate the training dataset distribution. Fusing two samples is the most common way of implementing multiple-sample augmentation techniques. The pioneering "Mix-up" [22] and "Cut-Mix" [23] methods are the inspiration for several subsequent augmentation methods such as [24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. In addition, there are several algorithms with varying strategies to utilize more than two samples for augmentation such as "RICAP" [29] and mosaic augmentation [30].

Model-based data augmentation refers to techniques that utilize a complex mathematical model when generating fresh samples. Under this title, we categorize the utilized models under three headings: generative models, physics-based models, and approximation models. Generative model-based augmentation methods are overwhelmingly composed of techniques that utilize Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), Variational Autoencoders(VAEs), and neural style transfer algorithms. Following the categorization of the original GAN literature, [11] further classifies generative model-based approaches as unconditional, label-conditional, and sample-conditional. Unconditional sample generation creates fresh samples from a given input noise [31, 32] (also called the latent code in the GAN literature), resulting in samples that are similar to the training data distribution. Label-conditional sample generation involves conditioning the generator and discriminator models on a label [33, 34, 35, 36], allowing for augmentation for a supervised learning

¹In spite of the fact that many methods, such as flipping or rotating a signal, can also be considered to include a mathematical model, they are called model-free due to their simplicity.



Figure 1: Methods and strategies for data augmentation.

model. As the final alternative, sample generation conditions can be determined by other existing samples, hence leading to label-preserving [37, 38, 39, 40] or label-changing generation processes [41, 42, 43, 44, 45].

Physics-based data augmentation methods utilize physical laws and principles to create synthetic samples that are consistent with the underlying physics of the system that generates the sample space. For example, in order to augment the atmospheric turbulence effect on an image, physics-based models would rely on the actual fluid mechanics of turbulent flows in the atmosphere. The turbulence effects on 2D images are typically accurately simulated when detailed information regarding the 3D environment is provided, such as the temperature distribution and wind velocity distribution [46, 47]. These models can provide highly detailed and accurate simulations of atmospheric turbulence effects on images, but require significant computational resources to solve the complex equations governing fluid mechanics [48]. In contrast to physics-based data augmentation methods, approximation models are computationally less expensive and often do not require detailed model of the system. Instead, they utilize simplified or empirical models to approximate the generative process. Using the turbulence example, these models often do not require detailed 3D environmental data, so they are less computationally intensive. Some approximation models use statistical data that collected from different atmospheric conditions to model atmospheric effects on samples [49, 50], while others use physically motivated approximations to simplify the calculation of turbulence effects on images. The simplified models aims to produce turbulent images via modelling spatially-temporal geometric distortions in pixel level [51, 52]. However, the distinction between physics-based and approximation models can be difficult to draw in practice, regardless of the generation domain. For example, some physics-based models may use simplified systems models to reduce the computational cost, while some approximation models may still incorporate some physical principles or empirical data.

Contrary to [11], we categorize augmentation strategy as a separate dimension, because these strategies utilize data generation methods listed in the left part of our taxonomy. The most straightforward approach to using augmented data in a training model is to take no action and treat the enhanced samples identically to the original samples. We refer to this default approach as "Vanilla Augmentation" because this is essentially how the majority of augmentation in the deep learning literature is done. Besides the default approach, we identify three significant directions in augmentation strategies: curriculum-based, reinforcement learning-based and adversarial learning-based methods. Unlike vanilla augmentation, these titles aim at optimizing the augmentation policy. For example, curriculum learningbased augmentation strategically refines datasets in alignment with the principles of curriculum learning, ensuring a gradual and targeted enhancement process [53]. Reinforcement learning-based data augmentation strategies aim to optimize the augmentation process based on the learning performance of the model [54]. The philosophy behind it is to dynamically generate augmented samples that are most informative to the model and can improve its learning process. The augmentation process is modeled as a Markov Decision Process (MDP), where the state is the current training dataset, the actions are the augmentation operations, and the reward signal represents the improvement in model performance. The goal of the MDP is to find an optimal policy that generates the most informative augmented samples by balancing exploration and exploitation [55]. Reinforcement learning-based data augmentation can lead to better performance compared to vanilla augmentation. However, it also requires more computational resources and is more complex to implement. On the other hand, adversarial-based data augmentation involves generating augmented samples that are similar to the original samples but can fool the model into making incorrect predictions. New samples are generated by seeking the small transformations of the given sample that yields maximum loss[56]. The philosophy

behind it is to improve the model's robustness by exposing it to samples that are close to the original data but can cause the model to fail. The idea is that by training the model on these adversarial samples, the model will learn to be more robust and resistant to similar adversarial attacks [57, 58, 59]. Adversarial-based data augmentation can be used in conjunction with other data augmentation methods and is particularly useful in applications where the data distribution is complex and non-linear, such as computer vision and speech recognition. However, it can also be computationally expensive and may not always lead to significant improvements in model performance.

1.2 Problem Definition

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the challenges associated with augmenting for atmospheric turbulence effects in thermal adapted object detection models. By exploring this context, we aim to address the inherent complexities associated with achieving accurate and robust detection performance in real-world scenarios.

Optical systems are affected by atmospheric turbulence, which results in noise, non-rigid distortion, and blurry images. Light rays are bent and scattered in different directions because atmospheric turbulence changes the refractive index of the air. What is more, turbulence in the atmosphere causes fluctuations in the air's temperature and density, which results in temporal variations in the electromagnetic radiation received by optics. For detailed explanations about the turbulence effects on optical imaging systems reader may refer to [60].

Various techniques are being studied in the literature to counteract the effects of turbulence on computer vision tasks [61, 62, 63, 64, 65]. Regardless of the problem, the generalization capability and robustness against challenging computer vision tasks such as detection on turbulent images, occluded images, adversarial samples etc. usually require high-quality data. In this paper, we specifically focus on thermal adapted deep object detection models, which are specialized frameworks designed to detect and localize objects using thermal imaging data. By adapting deep learning techniques to thermal imagery, these models offer enhanced detection capabilities in diverse real-world scenarios. While there has been a recent increase in research on object detection using thermal imagery [66, 67, 68, 69, 70], there are a limited number of attempts that study the atmospheric effects on thermal object detection systems [64, 52, 71, 72, 73].

In order to counteract the effects of atmospheric turbulence, mitigation algorithms [74, 75, 76, 77] aim to reduce and/or eliminate the turbulence effects on images. Estimating and correcting turbulence distortion is a computationally intensive task that may not be feasible to perform in real-time due to limited resources. Another approach to overcome this difficulty, which we also explore in this paper, is to train these models with turbulent augmented samples and avoid any additional computational cost on the system.

By using turbulent image augmentation techniques, the accuracy and ability of the baseline model to handle degradation effects caused by turbulence can be improved, such as noted in [52, 78]. Even when the test images exhibit no distortion, augmentation methods that include blurring and geometric distortions may be useful approaches for address the increasing generalization capability of the detection models.

In this paper, we present a comparative discussion on turbulent image augmentation for thermal band images in the context of object detection. Our goal is to identify the optimal augmentation method in terms of accuracy. We generate turbulent images by employing three different atmospheric turbulence simulation methods [52, 48, 51]. The detection models used in our study include state-of-the-art real-time models, namely: RTMDet [79], DINO [4], and YOLOv8 [80].

The organization of the paper is as follows. Section 2 describes the image augmentation algorithms utilized in the paper. In Section 3, we discuss the experimental setup, specifically the datasets and techniques used to generate turbulent images. The benchmarked object detection models are presented in Section 4. Section 5 presents a discussion of the results. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper and offers future directions.

2 Turbulent Image Generation

Simulation of turbulence effects on sensory signals is a major challenge in many fields, including astronomy [81], surveillance [82], and navigation [83]. There are various approaches to simulating these effects [84]. In this paper, we utilize three *approximation models* for generating turbulent images: a geometrical turbulence simulator (Section 2.1), a Zernike-based simulator (Section 2.2), and a phase-to-space simulator (Section 2.3). For the second and third simulators, camera-related parameters are required to produce physically accurate turbulent images. In order to accomplish this, we use the parameters of the FLIR Tao v2 640 x 512 13mm 45°HFoV - LWIR Thermal Imaging Camera, since "FLIR-ADASv2" dataset is collected by using this optical system. The related parameters are listed in Table 2 and Table 3. The detailed explanation about the "FLIR-ADASv2" dataset and the augmented images are presented in Section 3.1.

2.1 Geometrical Turbulence Simulator

Approximation models [52, 78, 51] mimic the effect of atmospheric turbulence by combining blurring and random distortions. Our chosen geometric simulator [52] uses a real-time model, which utilizes a geometrical turbulence approach, employing a Gaussian kernel for blurring and image warping for random distortions. In the original paper [52], the physical approximations of the geometric model are described in detail. The mathematical definition of the approach can be briefly described as Equation 1.

$$F_n(x,y) = D((G_B(x,y) \circledast I_n(x,y)), d_n^u(x,y), d_n^v(x,y))$$
(1)

In Equation 1, $F_n(x, y)$ is the source image, D is the warping function, \circledast is the convolution operation and $G_B(x, y)$ is a Gaussian kernel with variance σ_B^2 , responsible for blurring. Note that warping is applied to both horizontal and vertical directions using the random distortion fields, $d_n^u(x, y)$ and $d_n^v(x, y)$, respectively, which are defined as:

$$d_n^u(x,y) = \gamma * (G_D(x,y) \circledast v_n^u(x,y))$$
⁽²⁾

$$d_n^v(x,y) = \gamma * (G_D(x,y) \circledast v_n^v(x,y))$$
(3)

where γ is the amplitude of the random distortion and $G_D(x, y)$ is the Gaussian kernel with variance σ_D^2 . $v_n^u(x, y)$ and $v_n^v(x, y)$ are random vectors with zero-mean, unit-variance normal distributions. Convolution operation with $G_D(x, y)$ provides spatial correlation of the random distortions over the image. σ_D^2 is used to adjust the strength of the spatial correlation while γ is the amplitude of the distortions in the model. σ_B^2 is used to adjust the amount of blurring. Table 1 denotes the parameter values used for turbulent image generation.

Table 1: Simulation parameters for the utilized geometric simulator [52].

2.2 Zernike-based Turbulence Simulator

=

The second model [48] we used in our experiments, is another novel approximation-based approach. The authors aim at a satisfactory balance between precision and complexity for turbulence simulation. The model utilizes a propagation-free simulation technique to sample spatially correlated Zernike coefficients. Zernike polynomials are a set of orthogonal functions defined over a circular aperture, commonly used to represent aberrations in optical systems [85]. These polynomials are denoted as $Z_m^n(\rho, \theta)$, as can be seen in Equation 4. The Zernike coefficients C_m^n represent the weights of each associated Zernike polynomial in a given wavefront aberration, which can be expressed as:

$$W(\rho,\theta) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-n}^{n} c_n^m Z_n^m(\rho,\theta)$$
(4)

In [48], Zernike coefficients are utilized to simulate atmospheric turbulence effects such as tilt and blur. The terms C_1^1 and C_{-1}^1 correspond to the horizontal and vertical tilts respectively. While these tilts signify geometric distortions across the input image, the high-order coefficients denote the blur effect. Table 2 denotes the simulation parameters used for this technique in our experiments.

Table 2: Simulation parameters of [48].					
Image Dimensions	[640, 640] pixels				
Aperture Diameter	29 mm				
Wavelength	10.5 µm				
Refractive index parameter(C_n^2)	$1e^{-15}$				
Focal length	13 mm				
Propagation Length	2000 m				

2.3 Phase-to-Space Simulator

The third method we utilize for generating turbulent images is called the Phase-to-Space (P2S) Transform [51]. The P2S Transform, which is based on the idea of reformulating spatially varying convolution as a set of invariant convolutions using basis functions, builds upon the second method [48] that we employ. The basis functions are learned by a shallow lightweight neural network. By using the learned basis functions the model can convert per-pixel Zernike coefficients to their associated point spread function (PSF) basis coefficients. This technique enables generating realistic synthetic turbulent images, while upholding theoretically verifiable statistics. Table 3 denotes the simulation parameters used for this technique in our experiments.

Table 3: Simulation parameters of [51].

Image Dimensions	[640_640] nivels
A porture Diameter	20 mm
Aperture Diameter	29 IIIII 10 5
wavelength	$10.5 \mu m$
Fried parameter	0.0145
Focal length	13 mm
Propagation Length	4000 m

3 Experimental Setup

In order to analyze the effectiveness of data augmentation over turbulent images, three state-of-the-art object detection models have been selected. A brief description of the models is provided in Section 3.2. To train the models, we utilize the open-source frameworks MMDetection [86] and MMYOLO [87]. The models were trained on four NVIDIA Quadro RTX 8000 GPUs. While training all of the models, the backbone weights are held frozen. Table 4 illustrates key specifications of three selected models, including batch size, number of epochs, augmentation techniques employed, backbone architecture, and the Average Precision (*AP*) scores on the COCO dataset.

Table 4. The configuration, and functine settings of training processes					
	Batch Size	Epochs	Augmentations Backbone		AP on COCO ¹
			RandomFlip		
			RandomResize	CSPNeXt	
RTMDet-x	2	300	RandomCrop	with	52.8
			Mosaic	P6 architecture	
			MixUp		
			RandomChoiceResize		
DINO-4scale	2	36	RandomFlip	ResNet50	50.1
			RandomCrop		
			Mosaic		
YOLOv8-x	2	500	MixUpRandomFlip	YOLOv8CSPDarknet	52.7
			Albumentations		

Table 4: The configuration, and runtime settings of training processes...

 ^{1}AP scores in this table are taken from MMDetection [86] and MMYOLO [87] framework benchmark documentation, not from the original publications.

3.1 The Dataset

The experiments in this paper are carried out using the publicly available FLIR-ADAS v2 image set [88]. The experiments aim to analyze how well the augmented turbulent samples affect the performance of thermal adapted state-of-the-art object detection models. For this purpose, three different turbulence simulators are utilized to augment images. The turbulence simulators are presented in Section 2. A number of original images and turbulent images generated from these originals are shown in Figure 2. FLIR-ADAS v2 is a medium-scale image set annotated for object detection tasks in both thermal and visible bands. The set includes a total of 26,442 annotated frames from a set of videos and still images with 15 different object classes. A total of 9,711 thermal and 9,233 RGB still images exist. In this study, we use only the 9,711 still thermal images of the set, which are acquired with a Teledyne FLIR Tau 2.

The resolution of the thermal image set is 640×512 pixels. In our experiments, we focus solely on the *car* and *person* classes due to the insufficient number of samples available for domain adaptation in the other classes.

The original FLIR-ADAS v2 thermal still image set is divided as 90%/10% for training and validation respectively. Similar to previous studies that use this dataset [89, 90], we utilize the original 10% validation set as our test set and create a validation set for fine-tuning purposes using the 10% of the training set of the original FLIR-ADAS v2 thermal still image set.

In the following, we construct the turbulent augmentation for the training using the approximation-based simulator [52], as previously mentioned above. We additionally create different versions of this turbulent training set with varying γ levels of 25, 50, 100, and 150. We refer to this alternative set of turbulent training sets as the "turbulent augmentation sets", and utilize these sets as the training sets for the experiments with turbulent image augmentation. For the test sets, we utilize all three turbulence simulators, namely geometric, Zernike-based, and P2S. For the geometric simulator, we fix the γ value to 100 for the test samples. This way, we obtain a total of four different test sets: the original test set and the turbulent sets obtained from the three simulators.



(a) Original Image

(b) Geometric

(c) Zernike-based

(d) P2S Simulator

Figure 2: This figure illustrates original (input) 2a and associated outputs of three turbulence generator algorithms: geometric simulator with $\gamma = 100$ 2b, Zernike-based simulator 2c, and P2S Simulator 2d.

3.2 Object Detection Models

In recent years, there have been remarkable advancements in deep learning-based object detection models, with innovations focusing on enhancing accuracy, efficiency, and versatility. For a survey on the subject, readers may refer to [91, 92]. For our experiments, we selected three state-of-the-art models, DINO [4], RTMDet [79], and YOLOv8 [80]. Each of these models introduces a unique technical solution, contributing to the development of object detection literature.

3.2.1 DINO: DETR with Improved DeNoising Anchor Boxes for End-to-End Object Detection

DINO [4] represents a significant advancement in Detection Transformer (DETR) like models, with a focus on enhancing both performance and efficiency in end-to-end object detection. Central to DINO's innovation is the contrastive denoising training technique, which significantly improves training efficiency by incorporating both positive and negative samples linked to the same ground truth. This approach is further strengthened by the mixed query selection method, which enhances query initialization by merging outputs from the encoder, supplying positional queries, with learnable content queries. Additionally, DINO introduces the look forward twice scheme, a novel strategy that uses refined box information from deeper layers to fine-tune parameters in earlier layers, significantly improving accuracy. The model also integrates a deformable attention mechanism, selected for its computational effectiveness, greatly augmenting the model's attention capabilities and establishing DINO as a powerful tool in object detection.

3.2.2 RTMDet: An Empirical Study of Designing Real-Time Object Detectors

RTMDet [79] is a real-time object detector, designed to outperform the YOLO series and expand its capabilities into areas like instance segmentation and detection of rotated objects. One of the key innovations in RTMDet is the implementation of Large-Kernel Depth-Wise Convolutions within both its backbone and its neck. This feature enables the model to effectively capture global context, which is vital for precise object detection. Another notable advancement is the integration of soft labels in dynamic label assignment, a method that utilizes soft targets to enhance accuracy and diminish noise in label assignment.

3.2.3 YOLOv8

YOLOv8 [80], among the pioneering object detection methods, has witnessed significant advancements with the introduction of YOLOv8, which excels in various tasks such as image classification, object detection, and instance segmentation. A major innovation in YOLOv8 is the introduction of the decoupled head module, which shifts from an anchor-based to an anchor-free framework. This change refines the classification and detection heads, leading to improved performance. Another key feature of YOLOv8 is its innovative approach to loss calculation, specifically the distribution focal loss in regression, customized to better suit the model. Additionally, YOLOv8 utilizes advanced data augmentation techniques, particularly by disabling mosaic augmentation towards the end of its training. This enhancement optimizes the training process and significantly improves the model's accuracy and efficiency across various applications.

4 Results

In this section, we present the results of our experiments. The evaluation metrics are based on the COCO (Common Objects in Context) metrics [93]. The evaluated scores of the metrics are presented as Tables 5, 6, 7, 8. The tables have identical layout. The first column indicates whether turbulent image augmentation was applied during training (w/ for "with" and w/o for "without"). The second column lists the model names. The next six columns represent varying Average Precision (AP) metrics: AP, AP_{50} , AP_{75} , AP_S , AP_M , and AP_L . (AP) values are computed by calculating the area under the precision-recall curve for IoU thresholds ranging from 0.50 to 0.95. Similarly, mean AP values are determined specifically at IoU thresholds of 0.50 and 0.75 by averaging the AP values obtained from the precision-recall curve at these thresholds, respectively. Each row corresponds to a specific experiment, showing the performance metrics of the corresponding model under the given condition. Horizontal lines separate different sections of the table, providing clarity in distinguishing between experiments conducted with different models. Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 respectively present the results obtained using the original (i.e. clean) test dataset, geometric turbulence simulator, Zernike-based turbulence simulator, and P2S turbulence simulator applied to the test dataset.

Table 5: Mean Average Precision results obtained for different experiments using each detection model, with or without turbulent image augmentation while training for varying levels of turbulence gain γ . Only the original test is utilized in these experiments. **Clean Test Set.**

Aug	Model	AP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _S	AP _M	AP _L
w/o	RTMDet-x	56.8	84.3	60.5	45.3	78.3	81.8
w/	RTMDet-x	58.2	85.2	63.1	47.2	79.1	82.3
w/o	DINO-4scale	56.3	85.9	59.9	45.7	75.5	81.1
w/	DINO-4scale	57.8	87.7	61.8	47.5	77.1	81.8
w/o	YOLOv8-x	57.8	85.0	62.4	47.0	78.9	80.0
w/	YOLOv8-x	58.4	85.6	62.9	47.6	79.2	81.5

Table 6: Mean Average Precision results obtained for different experiments using each detection model, trained with and without turbulent augmentation set, and for varying levels of turbulence gain γ . For this experiment, the test set is constructed using the geometric simulator [52].

Aug	Model	AP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _S	AP _M	APL
w/o	RTMDet-x	41.8	69.9	41.9	27.8	67.7	78.2
w/	RTMDet-x	47.1	76.4	47.9	33.3	72.7	81.7
w/o	DINO-4scale	35.9	65.9	34.1	23.0	59.4	75.2
w/	DINO-4scale	44.6	77.2	43.9	32.0	67.7	78.5
w/o	YOLOv8-x	43.1	72.5	42.8	29.5	68.8	77.4
w/	YOLOv8-x	47.8	77.6	48.6	34.6	73.1	79.1

Test set with turbulence $\gamma = 100$

Table 7: Mean Average Precision results obtained for different experiments using each detection model, trained with and without turbulent augmentation set, and for varying levels of turbulence gain γ . For this experiment, the test set is constructed using the Zernike-based simulator [48].

Test set Zernike-method.

Aug	Model	AP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _S	AP _M	APL
w/o	RTMDet-x	36.2	63.5	34.9	20.7	65.9	76.0
w/	RTMDet-x	40.8	67.0	37.2	24.8	67.7	79.9
w/o	DINO-4scale	31.7	60.3	28.7	17.4	57.2	72.0
w/	DINO-4scale	34.9	64.3	32.1	20.3	61.7	75.1
w/o	YOLOv8-x	36.6	64.9	35.1	21.5	66.5	77.3
w/	YOLOv8-x	41.2	68.2	37.5	24.9	68.8	79.7

Table 8: Mean Average Precision results obtained for different experiments using each detection model, trained with and without turbulent augmentation set, and for varying levels of turbulence gain γ . For this experiment, the test set is constructed using the P2S-based simulator[51].

Aug	Model	AP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _S	AP _M	APL
w/o	RTMDet-x	19.7	38.3	17.5	6.4	42.2	67.5
w/	RTMDet-x	24.5	49.1	21.2	9.6	49.8	74.5
w/o	DINO-4scale	17.1	35.9	14.4	5.3	37.0	64.7
w/	DINO-4scale	19.5	42.5	16.6	7.5	39.6	66.9
w/o	YOLOv8-x	23.0	46.7	19.5	7.6	47.7	69.2
w/	YOLOv8-x	24.8	49.9	21.4	9.8	49.9	73.0

Test set with	turbulence	based-on	P2S-method

5 Discussion

The experimental results reported in Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 offer valuable insights into the efficiency of turbulence image augmentation for improving object detection performance under challenging atmospheric turbulence conditions. Below is a list of salient observations based on these results.

Firstly, as illustrated in Table 5, utilizing turbulence image augmentation during the training phase leads to improved detection performance independent from the evaluated models, even when testing on the clean test set. This improvement suggests that augmenting with turbulent samples can help the models generalize better and become more robust to various image degradations caused by atmospheric turbulence.

Furthermore, the results presented in Tables 6, 7, and 8 clearly present the critical importance of turbulence augmentation when the set comprises images degraded by atmospheric turbulence. Across all three turbulence simulators employed, the models trained with turbulence augmentation consistently outperform their non-augmented counterparts. This pattern underlines the necessity of including turbulence specific augmentations to enhance detection accuracy in real-world scenarios affected by atmospheric distortions.

We observe that there is a noticeable performance improvement associated with turbulence augmentation for smaller objects (see AP_S in tables) compared to larger objects(see AP_L in tables). This observation aligns with the expected impact of atmospheric turbulence, which is clearly observable in Fig 2. Atmospheric turbulence tends to have a more significant disruptive effect on the visibility and detection of smaller objects due to their limited spatial area and lower contrast.

While all evaluated models benefit from turbulence augmentation, the degree of improvement varies across different architectures. For instance, the RTMDet-x and YOLOv8-x models seem to indicate more significant performance enhancement compared to DINO-4scale, as evidenced by the larger differences in AP scores between their augmented and non-augmented versions that shown in Tables 6, 7, and 8.

Table 8 illustrates the most drastic simulation results compared to the other two simulators. Performance degradation is more pronounced when P2S-simulated tests are evaluated. This observation and Figure 2 suggest that the P2S simulator may produce more challenging turbulent images. Due to employed harsh parameter setting in this study, given in Table 3.

6 Conclusions

The present study explores the effectiveness of turbulence image augmentation for improving the performance of thermal-adapted object detection models in the presence of atmospheric turbulence. The results demonstrate that utilizing turbulence-specific augmentations during training can significantly improve detection accuracy and robustness against turbulence degradations. By employing three distinct approximation-based turbulence simulators (geometric, Zernike-based, and P2S) and evaluating on corresponding turbulent test sets, this study provides an extensive analysis of the impact of turbulence augmentation across various simulation approaches. The findings indicate that turbulence augmentation is beneficial for all evaluated models, including RTMDet-x, DINO-4scale, and YOLOv8-x. However, the degree of improvement varies across architectures, with some models demonstrated significant improvements than others. This observation suggests that the effectiveness of turbulence augmentation may be influenced by the specific design and characteristics of the object detection model.

Furthermore, the results suggest that turbulence augmentation is particularly effective in improving the detection of smaller objects, which are more affected to the effects of atmospheric turbulence due to their limited spatial area and lower contrast. This finding aligns with the expectations and highlights the importance of addressing the challenges by atmospheric turbulence for detection of small-scale objects.

While the current study focused on thermal-adapted object detection models, the insights gained from this work may be applicable to other computer vision tasks and modalities affected by atmospheric turbulence, such as visible-light object detection, tracking, or segmentation. Future research could explore the generalization of these findings to different domains and applications.

Potential future directions for this line of research could include investigating more advanced turbulence simulation techniques, such as physics-based models or data-driven approaches, to better capture the complexities of real-world atmospheric conditions. Additionally, exploring more sophisticated augmentation strategies, such as curriculum learning or reinforcement learning-based methods, may further improve the effectiveness of turbulence augmentation by optimizing the augmentation process.

Overall, this study provides valuable insights for researchers and engineers working on computer vision systems operating in challenging atmospheric conditions, highlighting the importance of utilizing turbulence-specific augmentations to improve detection accuracy and robustness. The findings contribute to the ongoing efforts in developing robust and reliable computer vision solutions for real-world applications affected by atmospheric turbulence.

References

- Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [2] Yixuan Wei, Han Hu, Zhenda Xie, Zheng Zhang, Yue Cao, Jianmin Bao, Dong Chen, and Baining Guo. Contrastive learning rivals masked image modeling in fine-tuning via feature distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14141*, 2022.
- [3] Wenhui Wang, Hangbo Bao, Li Dong, Johan Bjorck, Zhiliang Peng, Qiang Liu, Kriti Aggarwal, Owais Khan Mohammed, Saksham Singhal, Subhojit Som, et al. Image as a foreign language: Beit pretraining for all vision and vision-language tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.10442*, 2022.
- [4] Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Shilong Liu, Lei Zhang, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, Lionel M Ni, and Heung-Yeung Shum. Dino: Detr with improved denoising anchor boxes for end-to-end object detection. arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03605, 2022.
- [5] Yanghao Li, Hanzi Mao, Ross Girshick, and Kaiming He. Exploring plain vision transformer backbones for object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.16527*, 2022.
- [6] Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, 2022.
- [7] Chitwan Saharia, William Chan, Saurabh Saxena, Lala Li, Jay Whang, Emily Denton, Seyed Kamyar Seyed Ghasemipour, Burcu Karagol Ayan, S Sara Mahdavi, Rapha Gontijo Lopes, et al. Photorealistic text-to-image diffusion models with deep language understanding. arXiv: 2205.11487, 2022.
- [8] Ashish Jaiswal, Ashwin Ramesh Babu, Mohammad Zaki Zadeh, Debapriya Banerjee, and Fillia Makedon. A survey on contrastive self-supervised learning. *Technologies*, 9(1):2, 2020.
- [9] Xiaohua Zhai, Avital Oliver, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. S41: Self-supervised semi-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1476–1485, 2019.
- [10] Xiangli Yang, Zixing Song, Irwin King, and Zenglin Xu. A survey on deep semi-supervised learning. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2103.00550, 2021.
- [11] Mingle Xu, Sook Yoon, Alvaro Fuentes, and Dong Sun Park. A comprehensive survey of image augmentation techniques for deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01491*, 2022.
- [12] Connor Shorten and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. A survey on image data augmentation for deep learning. *Journal of big data*, 6(1):1–48, 2019.
- [13] Jakub Nalepa, Michal Marcinkiewicz, and Michal Kawulok. Data augmentation for brain-tumor segmentation: a review. *Frontiers in computational neuroscience*, 13:83, 2019.
- [14] Dan Hendrycks, Norman Mu, Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Justin Gilmer, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. Augmix: A simple data processing method to improve robustness and uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02781*, 2019.

- [15] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [16] Chien-Yao Wang, Alexey Bochkovskiy, and Hong-Yuan Mark Liao. Scaled-yolov4: Scaling cross stage partial network. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/cvf conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 13029– 13038, 2021.
- [17] Wenchi Ma, Yuanwei Wu, Feng Cen, and Guanghui Wang. Mdfn: Multi-scale deep feature learning network for object detection. *Pattern Recognition*, 100:107149, 2020.
- [18] Chien-Yao Wang, I-Hau Yeh, and Hong-Yuan Mark Liao. You only learn one representation: Unified network for multiple tasks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.04206, 2021.
- [19] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 10012–10022, 2021.
- [20] Hugo Touvron, Matthieu Cord, Matthijs Douze, Francisco Massa, Alexandre Sablayrolles, and Hervé Jégou. Training data-efficient image transformers & distillation through attention. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 10347–10357. PMLR, 2021.
- [21] Barret Zoph, Vijay Vasudevan, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V Le. Learning transferable architectures for scalable image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8697–8710, 2018.
- [22] Hongyi Zhang, Moustapha Cisse, Yann N Dauphin, and David Lopez-Paz. mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.09412*, 2017.
- [23] Sangdoo Yun, Dongyoon Han, Seong Joon Oh, Sanghyuk Chun, Junsuk Choe, and Youngjoon Yoo. Cutmix: Regularization strategy to train strong classifiers with localizable features. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 6023–6032, 2019.
- [24] Devesh Walawalkar, Zhiqiang Shen, Zechun Liu, and Marios Savvides. Attentive cutmix: An enhanced data augmentation approach for deep learning based image classification. arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.13048, 2020.
- [25] Jang-Hyun Kim, Wonho Choo, and Hyun Oh Song. Puzzle mix: Exploiting saliency and local statistics for optimal mixup. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5275–5285. PMLR, 2020.
- [26] Vikas Verma, Alex Lamb, Christopher Beckham, Amir Najafi, Ioannis Mitliagkas, David Lopez-Paz, and Yoshua Bengio. Manifold mixup: Better representations by interpolating hidden states. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6438–6447. PMLR, 2019.
- [27] AFM Uddin, Mst Monira, Wheemyung Shin, TaeChoong Chung, Sung-Ho Bae, et al. Saliencymix: A saliency guided data augmentation strategy for better regularization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.01791, 2020.
- [28] Shaoli Huang, Xinchao Wang, and Dacheng Tao. Snapmix: Semantically proportional mixing for augmenting fine-grained data. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 1628–1636, 2021.
- [29] Ryo Takahashi, Takashi Matsubara, and Kuniaki Uehara. Ricap: Random image cropping and patching data augmentation for deep cnns. In *Asian conference on machine learning*, pages 786–798. PMLR, 2018.
- [30] Alexey Bochkovskiy, Chien-Yao Wang, and Hong-Yuan Mark Liao. Yolov4: Optimal speed and accuracy of object detection. arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10934, 2020.
- [31] Maayan Frid-Adar, Eyal Klang, Michal Amitai, Jacob Goldberger, and Hayit Greenspan. Synthetic data augmentation using gan for improved liver lesion classification. In 2018 IEEE 15th international symposium on biomedical imaging (ISBI 2018), pages 289–293. IEEE, 2018.
- [32] Ali Madani, Mehdi Moradi, Alexandros Karargyris, and Tanveer Syeda-Mahmood. Chest x-ray generation and data augmentation for cardiovascular abnormality classification. In *Medical imaging 2018: Image processing*, volume 10574, pages 415–420. SPIE, 2018.
- [33] Hao Yang and Yun Zhou. Ida-gan: a novel imbalanced data augmentation gan. In 2020 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR), pages 8299–8305. IEEE, 2021.
- [34] Adamu Ali-Gombe and Eyad Elyan. Mfc-gan: class-imbalanced dataset classification using multiple fake class generative adversarial network. *Neurocomputing*, 361:212–221, 2019.
- [35] Giovanni Mariani, Florian Scheidegger, Roxana Istrate, Costas Bekas, and Cristiano Malossi. Bagan: Data augmentation with balancing gan. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.09655*, 2018.

- [36] Georgios Douzas and Fernando Bacao. Effective data generation for imbalanced learning using conditional generative adversarial networks. *Expert Systems with applications*, 91:464–471, 2018.
- [37] Sheng-Wei Huang, Che-Tsung Lin, Shu-Ping Chen, Yen-Yi Wu, Po-Hao Hsu, and Shang-Hong Lai. Auggan: Cross domain adaptation with gan-based data augmentation. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 718–731, 2018.
- [38] Yezi Zhu, Marc Aoun, Marcel Krijn, Joaquin Vanschoren, and High Tech Campus. Data augmentation using conditional generative adversarial networks for leaf counting in arabidopsis plants. In *BMVC*, page 324, 2018.
- [39] Robert Geirhos, Patricia Rubisch, Claudio Michaelis, Matthias Bethge, Felix A Wichmann, and Wieland Brendel. Imagenet-trained cnns are biased towards texture; increasing shape bias improves accuracy and robustness. arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.12231, 2018.
- [40] Rui Li, Wenming Cao, Qianfen Jiao, Si Wu, and Hau-San Wong. Simplified unsupervised image translation for semantic segmentation adaptation. *Pattern Recognition*, 105:107343, 2020.
- [41] Xinyue Zhu, Yifan Liu, Jiahong Li, Tao Wan, and Zengchang Qin. Emotion classification with data augmentation using generative adversarial networks. In *Pacific-Asia conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 349–360. Springer, 2018.
- [42] Ziqiang Zheng, Zhibin Yu, Yang Wu, Haiyong Zheng, Bing Zheng, and Minho Lee. Generative adversarial network with multi-branch discriminator for imbalanced cross-species image-to-image translation. *Neural Networks*, 141:355–371, 2021.
- [43] Eli Schwartz, Leonid Karlinsky, Joseph Shtok, Sivan Harary, Mattias Marder, Abhishek Kumar, Rogerio Feris, Raja Giryes, and Alex Bronstein. Delta-encoder: an effective sample synthesis method for few-shot object recognition. Advances in neural information processing systems, 31, 2018.
- [44] Antreas Antoniou, Amos Storkey, and Harrison Edwards. Data augmentation generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.04340*, 2017.
- [45] Minui Hong, Jinwoo Choi, and Gunhee Kim. Stylemix: Separating content and style for enhanced data augmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14862–14870, 2021.
- [46] Jeremy P Bos and Michael C Roggemann. Technique for simulating anisoplanatic image formation over long horizontal paths. *Optical Engineering*, 51(10):101704–101704, 2012.
- [47] Armin Schwartzman, Marina Alterman, Rotem Zamir, and Yoav Y Schechner. Turbulence-induced 2d correlated image distortion. In 2017 IEEE International Conference on Computational Photography (ICCP), pages 1–13. IEEE, 2017.
- [48] Nicholas Chimitt and Stanley H Chan. Simulating anisoplanatic turbulence by sampling intermodal and spatially correlated zernike coefficients. *Optical Engineering*, 59(8):083101–083101, 2020.
- [49] Barak Fishbain, Leonid P Yaroslavsky, and Ianir A Ideses. Real-time stabilization of long range observation system turbulent video. *Journal of Real-Time Image Processing*, 2:11–22, 2007.
- [50] Xiang Zhu and Peyman Milanfar. Removing atmospheric turbulence via space-invariant deconvolution. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(1):157–170, 2012.
- [51] Zhiyuan Mao, Nicholas Chimitt, and Stanley H Chan. Accelerating atmospheric turbulence simulation via learned phase-to-space transform. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 14759–14768, 2021.
- [52] Engin Uzun, Ahmet Anıl Dursun, and Erdem Akagündüz. Augmentation of atmospheric turbulence effects on thermal adapted object detection models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 241–248, 2022.
- [53] Juhwan Choi and YoungBin Kim. Colorful cutout: Enhancing image data augmentation with curriculum learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.20012, 2024.
- [54] Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Dandelion Mane, Vijay Vasudevan, and Quoc V Le. Autoaugment: Learning augmentation strategies from data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern* recognition, pages 113–123, 2019.
- [55] Juan C Caicedo and Svetlana Lazebnik. Active object localization with deep reinforcement learning. In Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision, pages 2488–2496, 2015.
- [56] Alhussein Fawzi, Horst Samulowitz, Deepak Turaga, and Pascal Frossard. Adaptive data augmentation for image classification. In 2016 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP), pages 3688–3692. Ieee, 2016.

- [57] Alexander J Ratner, Henry Ehrenberg, Zeshan Hussain, Jared Dunnmon, and Christopher Ré. Learning to compose domain-specific transformations for data augmentation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [58] Xinyu Zhang, Qiang Wang, Jian Zhang, and Zhao Zhong. Adversarial autoaugment. arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.11188, 2019.
- [59] Xi Peng, Zhiqiang Tang, Fei Yang, Rogerio S Feris, and Dimitris Metaxas. Jointly optimize data augmentation and network training: Adversarial data augmentation in human pose estimation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2226–2234, 2018.
- [60] Michael C Roggemann, Byron M Welsh, and Bobby R Hunt. Imaging through turbulence. CRC press, 1996.
- [61] Rajeev Yasarla and Vishal M Patel. Learning to restore images degraded by atmospheric turbulence using uncertainty. In 2021 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP), pages 1694–1698. IEEE, 2021.
- [62] Yifei Lou, Sung Ha Kang, Stefano Soatto, and Andrea L Bertozzi. Video stabilization of atmospheric turbulence distortion. *Inverse Probl. Imaging*, 7(3):839–861, 2013.
- [63] Zhiyuan Mao, Ajay Jaiswal, Zhangyang Wang, and Stanley H Chan. Single frame atmospheric turbulence mitigation: A benchmark study and a new physics-inspired transformer model. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 430–446. Springer, 2022.
- [64] Omar Oreifej, Xin Li, and Mubarak Shah. Simultaneous video stabilization and moving object detection in turbulence. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(2):450–462, 2012.
- [65] Eli Chen, Oren Haik, and Yitzhak Yitzhaky. Detecting and tracking moving objects in long-distance imaging through turbulent medium. *Applied optics*, 53(6):1181–1190, 2014.
- [66] Xin Wu, Danfeng Hong, and Jocelyn Chanussot. Uiu-net: U-net in u-net for infrared small object detection. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 32:364–376, 2022.
- [67] Shasha Li, Yongjun Li, Yao Li, Mengjun Li, and Xiaorong Xu. Yolo-firi: Improved yolov5 for infrared image object detection. *IEEE access*, 9:141861–141875, 2021.
- [68] Xuerui Dai, Xue Yuan, and Xueye Wei. Tirnet: Object detection in thermal infrared images for autonomous driving. *Applied Intelligence*, 51:1244–1261, 2021.
- [69] Chenchen Jiang, Huazhong Ren, Xin Ye, Jinshun Zhu, Hui Zeng, Yang Nan, Min Sun, Xiang Ren, and Hongtao Huo. Object detection from uav thermal infrared images and videos using yolo models. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*, 112:102912, 2022.
- [70] Yuhang Chen, Liyuan Li, Xin Liu, and Xiaofeng Su. A multi-task framework for infrared small target detection and segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 60:1–9, 2022.
- [71] Fabian Erlenbusch, Constanze Merkt, Bernardo de Oliveira, Alexander Gatter, Friedhelm Schwenker, Ulrich Klauck, and Michael Teutsch. Thermal infrared single image dehazing and blind image quality assessment. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 459–469, 2023.
- [72] Chengyang Li, Heng Zhou, Yang Liu, Caidong Yang, Yongqiang Xie, Zhongbo Li, and Liping Zhu. Detectionfriendly dehazing: Object detection in real-world hazy scenes. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2023.
- [73] Xinggui Xu, Ping Yang, Hao Xian, and Yong Liu. Robust moving objects detection in long-distance imaging through turbulent medium. *Infrared Physics & Technology*, 100:87–98, 2019.
- [74] Janki M Patel, Dippal Israni, and Chintan Bhatt. The comprehensive art of atmospheric turbulence mitigation methodologies for visible and infrared sequences. In Advances in Information Communication Technology and Computing: Proceedings of AICTC 2021, pages 145–153. Springer, 2022.
- [75] Robert Nieuwenhuizen, Judith Dijk, and Klamer Schutte. Dynamic turbulence mitigation for long-range imaging in the presence of large moving objects. *EURASIP journal on image and video processing*, 2019:1–22, 2019.
- [76] Nithin Gopalakrishnan Nair, Kangfu Mei, and Vishal M Patel. At-ddpm: Restoring faces degraded by atmospheric turbulence using denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 3434–3443, 2023.
- [77] Tushar Jain, Madeline Lubien, and Jerome Gilles. Evaluation of neural network algorithms for atmospheric turbulence mitigation. In *Signal Processing, Sensor/Information Fusion, and Target Recognition XXXI*, volume 12122, pages 223–236. SPIE, 2022.
- [78] Wai Ho Chak, Chun Pong Lau, and Lok Ming Lui. Subsampled turbulence removal network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.04418*, 2018.

- [79] Chengqi Lyu, Wenwei Zhang, Haian Huang, Yue Zhou, Yudong Wang, Yanyi Liu, Shilong Zhang, and Kai Chen. Rtmdet: An empirical study of designing real-time object detectors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.07784*, 2022.
- [80] Glenn Jocher, Ayush Chaurasia, and Jing Qiu. Ultralytics yolov8. 2023.
- [81] Andreas Quirrenbach. The effects of atmospheric turbulence on astronomical observations. A. Extrasolar planets. Saas-Fee Advanced Course, 31(137):137, 2006.
- [82] Yitzhak Yitzhaky, Eli Chen, and Oren Haik. Surveillance in long-distance turbulence-degraded videos. In Electro-Optical Remote Sensing, Photonic Technologies, and Applications VII; and Military Applications in Hyperspectral Imaging and High Spatial Resolution Sensing, volume 8897, pages 26–31. SPIE, 2013.
- [83] Gabriela Stroe and Irina-Carmen Andrei. Analysis regarding the effects of atmospheric turbulence on aircraft dynamics. *INCAS Bulletin*, 8(2):123, 2016.
- [84] Michael C Roggemann and Byron M Welsh. Imaging through turbulence. CRC press, 2018.
- [85] Robert J Noll. Zernike polynomials and atmospheric turbulence. JOsA, 66(3):207–211, 1976.
- [86] Kai Chen, Jiaqi Wang, Jiangmiao Pang, Yuhang Cao, Yu Xiong, Xiaoxiao Li, Shuyang Sun, Wansen Feng, Ziwei Liu, Jiarui Xu, et al. Mmdetection: Open mmlab detection toolbox and benchmark. arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.07155, 2019.
- [87] MMYOLO Contributors. MMYOLO: OpenMMLab YOLO series toolbox and benchmark. https://github.com/open-mmlab/mmyolo, 2022.
- [88] FLIR. Free flir thermal dataset for algorithm training. https://www.flir.com/oem/adas/adas-dataset-form/, 2020.
- [89] Farzeen Munir, Shoaib Azam, and Moongu Jeon. Sstn: Self-supervised domain adaptation thermal object detection for autonomous driving. In 2021 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems (IROS), pages 206–213. IEEE, 2021.
- [90] Muhammad Ali Farooq, Peter Corcoran, Cosmin Rotariu, and Waseem Shariff. Object detection in thermal spectrum for advanced driver-assistance systems (adas). *IEEE Access*, 9:156465–156481, 2021.
- [91] Xiangheng Wang, Hengyi Li, Xuebin Yue, and Lin Meng. A comprehensive survey on object detection yolo. *Proceedings http://ceur-ws. org ISSN*, 1613:0073, 2023.
- [92] Zhengxia Zou, Keyan Chen, Zhenwei Shi, Yuhong Guo, and Jieping Ye. Object detection in 20 years: A survey. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 2023.
- [93] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In Computer Vision–ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6-12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V 13, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014.