A. Details of the Network Structure

The goal of underwater image restoration is to conquer the problems such as low contrast, color distortion and blur. To this end, we propose an Asymmetric Illumination-aware Multi-scale Network (AIM-Net) to restore underwater images, as illustrated in Fig. 1. AIM-Net contains two important branches, namely illumination-aware restoration branch and gradient branch. The restoration branch adopts a multi-scale structure containing three parallel streams to extract precise spatial information and abundant contextual information in different scales. In addition, illumination prior is incorporated into the restoration branch to enhance the perception capability of color and light source. The simple gradient branch aims to recover high quality gradient map. The recovered gradient features are merged into the restoration branch to provide edge and structure prior.

The entire pipeline is as follows. The degraded image \( x \) passes through a convolution layer to extract preliminary features. After that, the preliminary features are fed into the illumination-aware restoration branch to extract and integrate precise spatial information and contextual information. The illumination map \( x_L \) is converted to illumination feature \( x'_L \) after a convolution layer. Then \( x'_L \) participates in the restoration branch via illumination guidance block (IGB) [8]. On the other side, \( x \) is fed into the gradient branch to restore fine gradient information. The gradient branch incorporates intermediate representations from the restoration branch because the intermediate representations carry rich structure information and are helpful for gradient map recovery. Later, attention feature fusion (AFF) block [3] fuses the fine features obtained by the two branches. Finally, the restored clear image \( x_{out} \) and restored gradient map \( g_{out} \) are both obtained after a convolution layer.

**Illumination-aware Restoration Branch** The task of the restoration branch is to reconstruct overall structure and color information of a degraded image. To complete the task, we introduce a parallel multi-scale structure incorporating illumination prior. The multi-scale structure can effectively integrate local details from different resolutions to maintain edge features and suppress halo artifacts [18]. Therefore, we adopt the structure of Multiscale Residual Block (MRB) [23] as the backbone. MRB contains three parallel streams of different scales. Each stream utilizes residual contextual block (RCB) to distill useful spatial information and selective kernel feature fusion (SKFF) block to integrate contextual information. Based on the structure of MRB, we add several fundamental modules to further enhance feature extraction capability, including: multi-dilated-convolution block (MDB), IGB, non-local spatial attention (NLSA) block. Meanwhile, we replace the SKFF block with AFF block to better aggregate contextual information. These modules are described in detail as follows.

**MDB** works at the front of each stream to exact spatial features. It expands the receptive field via combing four dilated convolutions. Dilation rates are set as 1, 2, 3 and 4, consistent with [2]. RCB [23] distills useful contextual features by modeling and transforming the inter-channel dependencies via attention mechanism.

In the highest resolution stream, we introduce IGB between MDB and RCB to incorporate illumination prior. As is noted in [22], the illumination map reflects underwater light field information including ambient light and scene-dependent degradation that are essential for underwater image formation. As a result, we introduce the illumination map to help the
network perceive color and light source information. The illumination map is estimated in accordance with [22]. IGB consists of a spatial feature transformation layer [20] and a deformable convolution [25]. In this way, our network can adapt to different color and light degradation types of underwater images.

To better integrate features from different scales, we replace SKFF module with AFF module. SKFF captures channel-wise dependencies via global-scale channel attention, whereas AFF squeezes local and global information into channel attention because local information is helpful to highlight local small targets [3]. The AFF module follows the RCB to aggregate local and global contextual features. Furthermore, we add NLSA module [14] in the middle of the two lower resolution streams. NLSA models long-range feature correlations and enjoys robustness from sparse representation. Compared with the standard non-local attention [19], it reduces computation expenses significantly.

With the help of the above well-designed modules, the network is able to extract fine feature representations. These feature representations are important for texture and color reconstruction.

**Gradient Branch** Image gradient map contains rich edge information and can guide the network to focus on local regions with sharp edges. As a result, we adopt the gradient map to enhance the edges of a restored image. Similar to [13], the image gradient prior is introduced to promote the restoration of underwater images from two aspects: 1) a gradient branch to restore a high-quality gradient map and provide structural information for the restoration branch; 2) a supplementary gradient loss to constrain the second-order relationship of adjacent pixels, guiding the underwater image restoration to focus more on the geometry. The gradient branch first estimates a coarse gradient map of $x$ via gradient operation $G(\cdot)$ [13], and then enhances the gradient map. Thanks to the intermediate representations from the restoration branch, the gradient branch can recover a fine gradient map with a very simple structure only including three convolution layers and two RCBs. Gradient loss is detailed in Eq. (2). Under these two types of guidance, the structure features can be better preserved, and the restoration results with sharper edges, higher perceptual quality and less geometric-inconsistent textures can be obtained.

In a word, AIM-net takes a degraded underwater image $x$ and its corresponding illumination map $x_L$ as input and outputs a restored clear image $x_{out}$ and a restored gradient map $g_{out}$:

$$x_{out}, g_{out} = f_\theta(x, x_L),$$

where $f_\theta$ represents the AIM-net parameterized by $\theta$. AIM-Net has 1.675M parameters, and its inference speed is 33.3 FPS on the images with a resolution of 256×256.

**B. Details of Validation Set and Loss Functions**

The detailed perceptual loss and gradient penalty are as follows:

\[
L_{\text{per}} = \sum_{j=1}^{K'} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |\varphi'_j(x_{\text{out}_i}) - \varphi'_j(y^i_l)|
\]

\[
L_{\text{grad}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} |g_{\text{out}_i} - G(y^i_l)|,
\]

where \( L_{\text{per}} \) denotes perpetual loss based on pretrained VGG-16 [17] network and \( L_{\text{grad}} \) denotes gradient loss. \( \varphi'_j \) refer to ReLU1-2, ReLU2-2, and ReLU3-3 layers of the VGG-16 model. \( y^i_l \) denotes clear ground truth. \( G(\cdot) \) stands for the operation to extract a gradient map [13]. \( L_{\text{grad}} \) constrains the restored gradient map of AIM-Net to approach the ground truth’s gradient map.

C. Influence of Optimizer and NR-IQA Metrics during Training

Table 1 shows the total training epochs required by Adam and AdamP to reach a similar accuracy. It can be observed that the training time required by Adam is longer than that by AdamP. Thus we choose AdamP as training optimizer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optim</th>
<th>PSNR</th>
<th>SSIM</th>
<th>Epochs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdamP</td>
<td>24.59</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To compare the efficiency of NR-IQA metrics, we additionally show the performance of adopting all seven NR-IQA metrics in Table 2. It is easy to check that using MUSIQ can achieve the best performance. Moreover, Fig. 2 presents some examples of pseudo labels (images in the reliable bank) selected by seven NR-IQA methods in the training process. It can be observed that MUSIQ can help select more visually pleasing pseudo labels (rightmost) over other metrics.

![Figure 2. Examples of pseudo labels selected by NR-IQA metrics during training.](image)

D. Inherent Advantage of Semi-UIR

In order to verify the inherent advantage of our proposed semi-supervised restoration framework Semi-UIR, we replace the AIM-Net with 5-layer Unet used by FUnIE-GAN [6], and compare the performance using and not using Semi-UIR. Training details and datasets are unchanged. The quantitative results are shown in Table 3. It’s obvious that our semi-supervised framework Semi-UIR is beneficial to improve the generalizability of general model like Unet on real-world underwater benchmarks. It also demonstrates that Semi-UIR is extensible.

E. Additional Experimental Results on Non-reference Benchmark

In Fig. 3-5, we present more results of our Semi-UIR on non-reference benchmarks Seathru [1], RUIE [12], UIEB [11] and EUVP [6], and compare with the state-of-the-art methods including GDCP [16], MMLE [24], WaterNet [11], Ucolor [9], FUnIE-GAN [6], PRWNet [5] and CWR [4]. Our proposed Semi-UIR outperforms other algorithms in restoring underwater images with rich details and natural color.
Table 2. Evaluation the influence of adopting different NR-IQA metrics on testS \[10\] and testR \[11\] in terms of PSNR and SSIM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>NIQE</th>
<th>NIMA</th>
<th>UCIQE</th>
<th>BRISQUE</th>
<th>UIQM</th>
<th>PAQ2PIQ</th>
<th>MUSIQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
<td>41.05%</td>
<td>48.16%</td>
<td>48.69%</td>
<td>76.87%</td>
<td>82.11%</td>
<td>91.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>testS</td>
<td>22.83/0.811</td>
<td>23.01/0.813</td>
<td>22.90/0.813</td>
<td>23.15/0.820</td>
<td>23.24/0.820</td>
<td>23.08/0.818</td>
<td>23.40/0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>testR</td>
<td>22.98/0.887</td>
<td>23.88/0.888</td>
<td>23.64/0.890</td>
<td>24.00/0.900</td>
<td>23.80/0.897</td>
<td>24.28/0.893</td>
<td>24.59/0.901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Evaluations on non-reference benchmarks UIEB \[11\], EUVP \[6\], RUIE \[12\] and Seathru \[1\] in terms of UIQM \[15\], UCIQE \[21\] and MUSIQ \[7\]. Unet-base refers to training Unet without semi-supervised learning and unlabeled data. Unet-semi denotes training Unet with our proposed Semi-UlIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>UIQM (higher, better)</th>
<th>UCIQE (higher, better)</th>
<th>MUSIQ (higher, better)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UIEB</td>
<td>EUVP</td>
<td>RUIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unet-base</td>
<td>4.215</td>
<td>4.442</td>
<td>4.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unet-semi</td>
<td>4.329</td>
<td>4.512</td>
<td>4.763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Visual comparisons on non-reference benchmark Seathru \[1\].

Figure 4. Visual comparisons on non-reference benchmark RUIE \[12\].
Figure 5. Visual comparisons on non-reference benchmark UIEB [11].
Figure 6. Visual comparisons on non-reference benchmark EUVP [6].
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