



Deploying Machine Learning components coupled to Earth System Models with OASIS3-MCT (v6) and Eophis (v1.1)

Alexis Barge¹, Julien Le Sommer¹, Andrea Storto², and Sophie Valcke³

¹Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, INRAE, IRD, Grenoble INP, IGE, Grenoble, France

³CECI UMR 5318, CERFACS, CNRS, IRD, Toulouse, France

²National Research Council of Italy (CNR), Institute of Marine Sciences (ISMAR), Roma, Italy

Correspondence: Alexis Barge (alexis.barge@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr) and Julien Le Sommer (julien.lesommer@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr)

Abstract.

The integration of machine learning (ML) components into Earth System Models (ESMs) holds significant potential for improving climate simulations, but it is often constrained by challenges related to interoperability, reproducibility, and computational efficiency. This paper presents a novel coupler-based approach that combines the OASIS3-MCT coupling library with Eophis, a high-performance Python library, to seamlessly deploy ML components in ESMs. By leveraging OASIS3-MCT's robust communication infrastructure, Eophis abstracts the technical complexities of coupling, enabling users to integrate Python-based ML models or analytical parameterizations into geophysical simulations with minimal overhead. Eophis provides a modular interface for defining data exchanges, synchronizing time steps, and managing parallel communications, including advanced features such as halo construction for Convolutional Neural Networks and hybrid CPU/GPU execution. We evaluate this framework by coupling the NEMO4 ocean model with both ML-based and analytical parameterizations, demonstrating scalability, asynchronous execution, and flexible resource allocation. Benchmarking results show that this approach allows to deploy Python components in NEMO without affecting time-to-solution while offering a user-friendly, reproducible, and collaborative workflow. By lowering the barrier to hybrid modeling, this work facilitates the integration of ML components into ESM workflows. The combination of OASIS3-MCT and Eophis offers a practical solution for bridging the gap between ML and climate modeling, supporting innovation in Earth system science while maintaining reproducibility and ease of use.

1 Introduction

Application of machine learning (ML) to scientific computing has grown rapidly, giving rise to a new interdisciplinary field commonly referred to as Scientific Machine Learning (SciML) (Baker et al., 2019; Karniadakis et al., 2021; Keith et al., 2025). This field encompasses a wide range of applications, including the design of numerical solvers, subgrid parameterizations, algorithms for inverse problems, surrogate models, emulators, data assimilation and uncertainty quantification. These advances are reshaping how scientists approach modelling and simulation in many areas of computational science. Application of SciML



to computational geosciences has also grown rapidly, in particular in the context of Earth System modelling. Given their computational cost and structural complexity, Earth System Models (ESMs), which aim to simulate the time evolution of climate variables in response to diverse forcings, indeed stand to benefit significantly from ML techniques.

The concept of hybrid Earth System Models, combining data-driven and physics-based components, has been proposed for improving long-term projections of Earth's physical climate (Reichstein et al., 2019; Irrgang et al., 2021; Zanna et al., 2025). While their physics-based components implement known physical laws, their data-driven components are trained, based on observational or simulated data (Watt-Meyer et al., 2024), with the aim of improving the skill and reducing the cost of the resulting ESM. The formulation of subgrid parameterizations and bias correction schemes has been tackled with such approaches, which have now been tested with most components of ESMs, including the atmosphere, ocean, land surface, and cryosphere (Beucler, 2025). While open questions remain concerning the hybrid models' ability to generalize outside the range of their training data, the modular nature of ML components offers a compelling path toward making ESMs more adaptable and extensible. In practice, however, integrating trainable components into current generation ESMs remains a complex task. A primary difficulty lies in bridging the gap between the ML and climate modelling communities, which typically operate in different software environments and follow different development paradigms. This has raised important concerns related to computational efficiency, ease of deployment, code maintainability, and scientific reproducibility. Over the years, several integration strategies have been proposed. These range from implementing neural networks directly in Fortran, to interfacing with ML libraries via Python/C bindings, to using C++ wrappers or high-level APIs that abstract away the underlying complexity. Each approach carries trade-offs in terms of performance, portability, and ease of use. In this work, we propose a new approach to address these challenges by leveraging an already well-integrated component in many current-generation ESMs: their coupler. We introduce a new high-performance library that simplifies the deployment of ML components in ESMs which use the OASIS3-MCT coupling library (Craig et al., 2017). Our library is designed to be modular, efficient, and compatible with existing ESM infrastructure. We demonstrate its capabilities through a series of performance benchmarks and functional comparisons against alternative integration strategies. Although the test cases in this study are based on the NEMO ocean model, the approach is easily applicable to any global¹ or regional² OASIS3-MCT-equipped numerical ESM component. Our results highlight not only the computational advantages of the proposed approach, but also its potential to streamline the adoption of ML components in operational ESM workflows.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sect. 2, we present the existing solutions to implement ML components in ESMs and our arguments for using couplers as interface. Then, we propose and present a Python library named Eophis that aims to overcome limitations and difficulties in setting up coupling between ESMs and ML components in Sect. 3. The computational performance of Eophis is evaluated in a series of test cases presented in Sect. 4. Finally, we discuss and summarize our results in Sect. 5 and 6.

¹IPSL-CM, CNRM-CM, EC-EARTH, MPI-ESM, ACCESS-OM2

²COSMO-CLM, ICON-CLM, GCOAST-AHOI, RegCM



55 2 Technological landscape of hybrid models

2.1 Existing solutions for online inference in hybrid models

In this paper, we examine software solutions that enable *online inference* of pre-trained machine learning (ML) components within physics-based simulation environments. Achieving this integration in practice requires dynamically updating the simulator's state during run time based on the predictions of the ML component, thus coupling data-driven inference with the evolving physical system. This task is distinct from *online learning*, which entails optimizing the parameters of a ML component using a training objective that incorporates the physics-based simulator itself (Frezat et al., 2022). The latter typically necessitates the use of differentiable solvers (Shen et al., 2023; Gelbrecht et al., 2023) and falls outside the scope of the present work. A primary challenge for online inference of ML components in ESMs is bridging the heterogeneity of programming languages and hardware optimization. ML libraries and their communities predominantly use high-level, Python-native APIs, while ESMs are typically written in low-level languages like Fortran, which are optimized for high performance. Beyond the language difference, ESMs are often composed of CPU-optimized codes, whereas many ML libraries are developed for and run most efficiently on GPUs. Therefore, interfaces are essential to enable communication and data exchange between these disparate entities, allowing for a seamless integration of hybrid models.

Over the past years, several practical solutions have been tested for online inference of ML components in Fortran codes. Existing solutions can be classified into five main categories.

The first category leverages advanced features of recent Fortran versions to develop Fortran-written ML libraries. These approaches implement in Fortran some of the standard ML abstractions for constructing, training and calling neural networks (NN). This is proposed for instance by neural-fortran (Curcic, 2019), module_neural_net (ESCOMP, 2025), and Fiats (formerly inference-engine) (BerkeleyLab, 2025). A subcategory of approaches proposes to convert NN built and trained with Python native ML libraries into Fortran code. Fortran-Keras-Bridge (Ott et al., 2020) and FNN (Farchi et al., 2022) projects propose a collection of tools to convert Keras NN in such a way, as well as Fortran modules to load and use them. The main benefit of the above solutions is to ease the integration of ML projects in existing Fortran codes, but they require users to be experienced Fortran programmers. One other caveat is that these solutions may not systematically integrate the latest advances available in prominent ML libraries, in particular in terms of NN architectures.

Another category of solutions seeks to enable the direct invocation of ML library functions — implemented in languages other than Fortran — from within a Fortran environment. These approaches build upon the C/C++ APIs of widely used ML libraries, which provide the foundation for developing Fortran wrappers that expose their functionality within Fortran applications. PyTorch NN can be wrapped for inference by TorchClim (Fuchs et al., 2024), which provides additional layers to ease wrapping in the Community Earth System Model (CESM) framework. FTorch (Atkinson et al., 2025), TorchFort (Romero et al., 2024) and pytorch-fortran (Alexeev, 2023) are also Fortran wrappers for PyTorch NN that include training features. TensorFlow NN can be wrapped for inference by Fortran-TF-lib (Atkinson et al., 2023) and Infero (Bonannim and Quintino, 2024). Infero wrapper also includes TensorRT and ONNX-Runtime, the latter providing interoperability with most common ML libraries.



A third category of solutions consists in calling Python scripts from Fortran code, using C and Python bindings. These solutions eliminate the need to manipulate neural networks directly from Fortran and instead allow ML practitioners to operate within Python, the native environment for most ML development. CFFI (C Foreign Function Interface) is a library that allows Python functions to be exposed as C functions, which can then be called from Fortran through the standard Fortran-C bindings. More directly, Forpy (Rabel, 2020) and call_py_fort (Brenowitz, 2023) are two Fortran modules that enable the wrapping of Python objects and functions. With these approaches, Fortran variables are converted to Python representations and passed as arguments to functions imported from Python scripts; the returned results are then converted back to Fortran. Illustrative applications of this strategy can be found in the studies by Zhang et al. (2023a) and Arnold et al. (2024). Although these approaches offer considerable flexibility in designing bridges between Fortran codes and Python scripts, the types of Fortran variables that must be transferred to Python are typically similar across applications—most often arrays representing physical fields discretized on a fixed grid. Consequently, manually converting each variable for every new use case introduces unnecessary redundancy and can become a limiting factor in practice.

A fourth category of solutions for hybrid modelling relies on higher-level abstractions, such as couplers. Couplers are software components designed to exchange fields between different codes through Message Passing Interface (MPI) routines, often defined on different discretization grids, and therefore typically include interpolation capabilities. They are widely used in Earth System Models to integrate distinct model components—for example, facilitating the exchange of variables between ocean and atmosphere models at the sea surface. Couplers generally enforce strict rules and protocols regarding the formatting of fields to be exchanged. Developing Python APIs for couplers through Fortran/Python bindings can therefore reduce the redundancy found in previously discussed tools by leveraging the standardized interface already provided by the coupler and used in the component codes to communicate with the rest of the coupler system. In this setup, a Fortran model and a Python script – each implementing a coupling interface – are executed concurrently and exchange data throughout the simulation. Coupling solutions for online inference of ML components may be custom-designed (Zhang et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2022; Zhong et al., 2023) or built upon existing libraries, such as PhyDLL (Serhani, 2023) or SmartSim (Partee et al., 2021). Couplers commonly employed in Earth System Models can also be readily adapted for this purpose, especially if they are already equipped with Python bindings. Studies by Balogh et al. (2024) and Arnold et al. (2024) respectively used the OASIS3-MCT (Craig et al., 2017) and YAC (Hanke and Redler, 2019) coupling libraries to hybridize atmospheric models with Python scripts containing ML components.

A final category of hybrid modelling solutions involves constructing Python wrappers around existing Fortran models and integrating them into production workflows implemented in Python or other high-level languages. McGibbon et al. (2021) introduced such a wrapper for the NOAA FV3GFS atmospheric model, providing an interface that allows Python to advance the Fortran main loop and to retrieve or modify variables used within the Fortran code. With this approach, updating the model state using the output of a pre-trained ML component becomes straightforward, since both the ML component and the Fortran-based simulator are accessible from within the same Python environment. Wrappers for legacy models, however, are inherently model-specific and must be carefully engineered to align with the structure and requirements of the particular geophysical model under consideration. Interestingly, from the user's perspective, the effort required to integrate ML components into



physical models using this approach is, in practice, very similar to that involved in hybrid modelling with geoscientific models implemented directly in high-level languages. Several examples of hybrid models based on scalable ocean or atmosphere models implemented in Python (Häfner et al., 2021) or Julia (Silvestri et al., 2025; Klöwer et al., 2024) have indeed been implemented over recent years (Kochkov et al., 2024; Meunier et al., 2025).

2.2 The OASIS3-MCT coupling library and the Eophis library

We aim to investigate hybrid modelling strategies that are both intuitive for ML practitioners – facilitating rapid prototyping – and efficient for large-scale production applications. For this reason, we concentrate on a coupler-based approach (corresponding to the fourth category described above), as it allows heterogeneous model components to operate within distinct programming environments while requiring only minimal bindings. Our development is based on the OASIS3-MCT coupling library (Craig et al., 2017), specifically OASIS3-MCT v6 (Valcke et al., 2025). OASIS3-MCT is a middleware framework widely used in the climate modelling community. It provides Fortran, C, and Python APIs and has been integrated into several European Earth System Models. Although OASIS3-MCT and coupling libraries providing similar API diversity, such as YAC, have already been employed for hybrid modelling, the practical steps required to develop such applications are not entirely straightforward. The heterogeneous APIs are in principle sufficient to couple a Fortran-based code with a Python-based script, but their design does not fully address the specific requirements of ESM-ML coupling for inference. In practice, these coupling libraries assume that all coupled components share a set of features typically implemented in ESMs: (i) a time-stepping procedure, implying time-synchronized exchanges, (ii) an internal MPI communication layer enabling optimal parallel decomposition, and (iii) autonomy in generating both the physical fields to be exchanged and the discretization grids on which they are defined. By contrast, the NN embedded in the Python script merely ingests geophysical fields produced by an existing ESM and returns inferred results. As such, the Python script can be viewed as a standalone function, unable to generate physical data or discretization grids on its own. This design renders both a time-stepping procedure and an MPI-based parallelization strategy unnecessary on the Python side, since the NN passively awaits input fields without considerations of temporal synchronization or domain decomposition. Conversely, this by-design waiting behavior establishes a coupling pattern driven entirely by the ESM, thereby avoiding potential deadlock situations that may arise in conventional ESM-ESM couplings with concurrent calls of the coupling library. While OASIS3-MCT provides mechanisms to detect such deadlocks, or circumvent them if they can be anticipated, these are not required in the present context where data exchanges can be described as back-and-forth communications initiated by the Fortran model. Furthermore, the absence of grid generation on the Python side makes the interpolation capabilities of the coupling library superfluous, as the ML component is required to receive fields directly on the native Fortran discretization. Thus, the intended use of OASIS3-MCT in this context involves both simplified and extended operations relative to its typical applications, rendering standard steps for OASIS3-MCT instrumentation insufficiently tailored for these hybrid modelling applications. Finally, even once OASIS3-MCT is properly configured on the Fortran side and the Python component equipped with the necessary features, additional work is needed to implement and configure the OASIS3-MCT interface within the Python script and to prepare the corresponding OASIS3-MCT namelist. Setting up such a coupling demands a solid understanding of OASIS3-MCT and its associated configuration materials, and users without prior expertise




Figure 1. Coupling through OASIS3-MCT with Eophis principle diagram. The geoscientific model and Eophis are executed independently. Both can exchange data through the coupling library. Eophis flexibly automates the configuration of the OASIS3-MCT Python API, and runs a generic Python environment compatible with the OASIS3-MCT usage in which any functions can be imported.

might encounter recurrent errors, especially in this unusual usage. Moreover, some of these steps must be repeated and adapted for each new coupling scenario, making the process labor-intensive.

160 We propose a Python library named Eophis, which acts as a generic coupled OASIS3-MCT Python component equipped with the functionalities required by the coupling library, and in which any function from an external Python script can be imported and called with the exchanged data. Technically, the Eophis script is here the Python entity coupled with the ESM³. This library also aims to generalize the configuration of OASIS3-MCT on the Python side through a simplified interface, and to provide tools to assist in setting up the global coupling environment, including the coupler namelist and ancillary files.

165 Thus, it allows the user to flexibly define the data exchanges to perform. Figure 1 illustrates how Eophis operates as a Python component coupled with the ESM, bridging the Python script used for hybrid modelling with the Python coupling interface. It should be noted that each entity and the OASIS3-MCT communications may be all executed on CPUs. However, as discussed in Arnold et al. (2024), MPI-based communications of the coupling library makes it possible to run the ESM and Python components as separate jobs. In this context, inserting GPU offloading instructions within the coupled Python script enables

170 hybrid CPU/GPU modelling without modifications of the ESM.

3 Abstracting the deployment of ML models with Eophis

3.1 Scope and components of Eophis library

Eophis enables the coupling of Python scripts as standalone functions, abstracting away technical coupling challenges such as exchange execution, time synchronization, namelist configuration, and parallel communication. In this context, Python scripts

175 are easily shareable and interchangeable. From the user's perspective indeed, coupling a geophysical model with a Python script containing a ML component can be described succinctly as follows: *"I want the model to send these fields, on this grid, to the Python function, receive the returned results, and repeat this process at a specified frequency."* Eophis is designed to

³By extension, the external Python script containing the functions imported in the Eophis script for hybrid modelling is also designated as the coupled Python script.




Figure 2. Eophis pipeline principle diagram. The workflow inside the dashed line rectangle is handled in Eophis. Tunnel is an OASIS3-MCT wrapper used to define exchanges that can be performed through coupling. Eophis emulates time stepping to synchronize exchanges as the geoscientific model is advancing in time. It finally configures routers to connect received fields towards inputs of the Python functions, as well as returned outputs towards fields to send back.

encapsulate all the technical steps required on the Python side through APIs that directly reflect this user-level description. Three main components structure this workflow: specifying the fields to be exchanged, defining how the sent and received fields map to the inputs and outputs of the Python-based ML component, and synchronizing the exchanges from the Python side as the Fortran simulation progresses in time. This workflow is illustrated in Fig. 2. We describe in detail what these entities do in practice and how they give form to the generic OASIS3-MCT Python component introduced in the previous section.

The definition of exchanges is intuitively reducible to the names of fields to receive and to send back (convention is taken from the Python point of view). However, it is worth keeping in mind that each component is, in practice, parallelized and executed on its own dedicated pool of processes. Thus, the sent and received fields are scattered among these processes, and OASIS3-MCT needs to know the local grid sizes expressed with global indexes to perform optimized partition-to-partition communications (see Fig. 3). If global sizes are different, OASIS3-MCT can also perform interpolation from one grid to another. However, the Eophis framework considers that identical grids are used on both sides, as any interpolation at the Python level can be performed efficiently through dedicated libraries. Describing the local partition for each component is still required in this configuration to set up communications. This is automatically done for the Python side by Eophis from the global 2D longitude and latitude sizes.

For some operations, such as differential calculus or in Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN), it is necessary to know the neighboring cells of the local grid being processed. When local grids are located at the edges of the global grid, boundary conditions must be specified. These are required, in general, even in single-process simulations, as, for instance, in global model domains requiring periodic conditions. As illustrated in Fig. 4, grid cells can be divided into two parts: cells strictly contained in the local grid (*real cells* in light gray) and extra cells outside the local grid containing neighboring values (*halos* in dark gray). In classic OASIS3-MCT coupling, communications only involve real cells, as coupled geoscientific models have their own internal communication system to construct halos. With some intermediate reconstruction operations performed by Eophis, Python processes can obtain local fields with extra halo cells directly from OASIS3-MCT communications. Boundary conditions can also be specified to define values of halo cells that cross the global grid edges. This spares the need to create




Figure 3. Multiple processes coupling principle diagram (without interpolation). Two exclusive pools of processes are allocated, respectively, with three processes for the geoscientific Fortran model and two for the Python script. Coupled fields are scattered among processes on each side. OASIS3-MCT handles the communications between the pools and the redistribution to exchange the field from the processes of one model to those of the other.

an internal communication system in the Python script, which has the twofold advantage of combining halo construction with field exchanges. Halos are automatically ignored when sending back a field.

In its standard use, OASIS3-MCT needs to know the temporal advancement of both coupled components. In the context of coupling a Python script containing only functions, the time required by OASIS3-MCT is lacking on the Python side.

205 To preserve synchronization, Eophis mirrors the temporal advancement of the coupled geoscientific code and automatically orchestrates all Python data receptions and sendings at the appropriate coupling times.

Finally, Eophis routes the received fields to the desired Python script inputs, and forwards the returned fields to the correct OASIS3-MCT API for sending back. Since coupling a different Python script implies different function signatures, this pipeline must be adapted from one use case to another by modifying the mapping between exchanged data and the inputs and outputs of the imported Python functions.

210 Thus, the Eophis interface allows flexible modification of the router configuration. Extra useful tools are also available with the Eophis library to automatically write the OASIS3-MCT namelist *namcouple* in accordance with defined exchanges and to read or write Fortran namelists. The latter helps to automate the Eophis execution, mirroring temporal and grid parameters, or transferring Eophis information into a Fortran accessible object, for instance.

3.2 Eophis interface

215 We give here minimal examples of how Eophis can be used in practice. As mentioned in the previous section, the Eophis API reduces all coupling operations to what the user wants to exchange and link. Let us suppose that we wish an ESM to send two fields, named U, V , every hour to a Python script that returns a single forcing term named *force*. We know that the




Figure 4. Halos reconstruction principle diagram. In regular coupling, each cell (in light gray) is communicated once between processes, as in Fig. 3. Eophis can configure OASIS3-MCT parallel features to communicate grid cells several times. The local grid from one Python process can receive a copy of cells (in dark gray) addressed to another Python process. They correspond to the neighboring cells of the local grid. Halo cells are present on the Python side to let the Python scripts work with array-like objects without the need for internal communications. These are ignored when sending back the coupling information from Python to Fortran processes. The number of halos and how to fill them at the boundaries are user parameters.

fields are discretized on the 20 levels of a periodic grid of size (100,150). Additionally, the Python script is a CNN whose receptive field is a 5×5 square, meaning that 2 halos are required at the edges of the local grid. We write the Eophis script from these information to couple the CNN with the ESM through OASIS3-MCT. First, the exchanges should be summarized in the abstraction class `Tunnel`, whose definition is shown in Fig. 5. We define a grid (`grids` line) from the global number of longitude and latitude points. The number of wished halos and boundary conditions is also specified. The `exchs` line is a list of parameters describing how the fields should be exchanged. It can be read as: every 3600 seconds, receive the fields `U`, `V` and send back the field `force` on the 20 first levels of grid `geo_grid`. It is also possible to define several exchanges in the same `Tunnel`, with only incoming or outgoing fields, or different frequency or grid, for instance. The functions `write_coupling_namelist()` and `open_tunnels()` generate OASIS3-MCT namelist `namcouple` and configure the OASIS3-MCT Python API, respectively, from the `Tunnel`'s attributes. The corresponding `namcouple` for this example is available in Appendix A.

The next step is to set up the Python time synchronization and connections between the received fields and the fields to send back. Here, `force` is the result of the Python script with `U`, `V` passed as arguments. The Eophis interface for these components is shown in Fig. 6. First, the function `compute_force()` is imported, as it is the Python operation external to Eophis. The `all_in_all_out()` decorator defines time orchestration of exchanges. It takes a `Tunnel` to work with, the number



```
import eophis

# Define exchanges to perform
tunnel_config = list()
tunnel_config.append( { 'label' : 'T0_ESM', \
                        'grids' : { 'geo_grid' : {'npts' : (100,150), 'halos' : 2, 'bnd' : ('cyclic','cyclic')} }, \
                        'exchs' : [{ 'freq' : 3600, 'grd' : 'geo_grid', 'lvl' : 20, 'in' : ['U','V'], 'out' : ['force'] }] }

                        )

ESM, = eophis.register_tunnels( tunnel_config )

# Write OASIS namelist
ESM_Nite = 1000
eophis.write_coupling_namelist( simulation_time=3600*ESM_Nite )

# Start OASIS configuration
eophis.open_tunnels()
```

Figure 5. User-written Eophis code to define a Tunnel object. The latter gathers information on the global grid on which coupled fields are discretized, as well as exchanges to perform. The Tunnel is registered in Eophis' memory to prepare the OASIS3-MCT namelist and configuration.

```
from models import compute_force

# Define Router and Time Synchronization
@eophis.all_in_all_out(geo_model=ESM, step=3600, niter=ESM_Nite)
def loop_core(**inputs):
    outputs = {}
    outputs['force'] = compute_force(inputs['U'],inputs['V'])
    return outputs

# Start exchanges orchestration
eophis.starter(loop_core)
```

Figure 6. User-written Eophis code to define time synchronization of exchanges and the connections between exchanged fields.

of temporal iterations, and the time step value. The definition of connections between received and sent back fields is done within the `loop_core()` function. All the Tunnel received fields (i.e., those identified as `in` in Tunnel) are present in the `inputs` dictionary. The user defines here towards which imported functions they should be sent, and how to fill `outputs` content, whose keys correspond to the fields to send back (identified as `out` in Tunnel). It should be noted here that all these components describe pipelines only. The choice of the values contained in the arrays to pass through OASIS3-MCT and the specific operations to perform should be done by the Python and geophysical models.

From now on, OASIS3-MCT needs to be configured in the ESM in accordance with the coupling context defined through Eophis. Although this part strongly depends on how OASIS3-MCT has been implemented in the geoscientific model, useful information can be found in the Eophis logs to help in this part of the configuration (see Appendix A). More advanced examples and tutorials can be found in the Eophis sources as well, as referenced in the "Code and data availability" statement.



4 Computational performance of hybrid modelling with Eophis

4.1 Benchmark cases

245 We evaluate the performance for hybrid modelling with OASIS3-MCT and Eophis with the ocean general circulation model NEMO version 4.2.1, coupled with different Python scripts. Given that NEMO and the Python scripts are executed independently, a first benefit of using couplers is the flexibility in setting the number of processes for each component. We highlight this feature by setting up two test cases of a $1/4^\circ$ global ocean NEMO configuration with 75 depth levels (eORCA025.L75).

In the first test case, NEMO is coupled with a Python script containing the ML-based Mixed Layer Eddies closure proposed
 250 by Bodner et al. (2025). The latter leverages data-driven methods to take into account of the complex relationships between mixed layer vertical buoyancy fluxes and the large-scale physics observed in recent studies (Bodner et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023b). The approach relies on a CNN trained to infer vertical buoyancy fluxes $\overline{w'b'}$ from the large-scale buoyancy gradient, Coriolis parameter, mixed layer depth, air-sea fluxes, horizontal divergence, vertical vorticity, and strain. All fields are 2D, vertically averaged over the mixed layer depth to remain consistent with the original Fox-Kemper et al. (2011) formulation.
 255 Building on this, the returned vertical buoyancy flux is used to compute the velocity streamfunction Ψ representing the unresolved eddy effects by inverting $\overline{w'b'} = \Psi \times \nabla_H \bar{b}^z$, where the last term is the horizontal buoyancy gradient. The streamfunction is finally applied over depth using the vertical structure function proposed by Fox-Kemper et al. (2011) to update the NEMO velocity transport. All operations on 3D fields are performed by NEMO, and only the 2D fields required for inference are exchanged. This case is hereafter referred to as 2D.

260 In the second test case, NEMO is coupled with a Python script containing the deterministic density correction $\rho_c = \frac{\partial^2 \hat{\rho}(T, S)}{\partial T^2}$
 $c |\delta \circ \nabla \bar{T}|^2$ proposed by Stanley et al. (2020) to correct for small-scale fluctuations of temperature and salinity. Here, c is a constant, $\delta = (\delta_x, \delta_y)$ is the grid-scale length vector, $\circ$ is the Hadamard product, and $\hat{\rho}(T, S)$ is the density calculated by the equation of state from temperature and salinity. The script leverages the Python API of the Gibbs Sea Water oceanographic toolbox TEOS-10 (McDougall and Barker, 2011) to compute the second derivative of the equation of state. The density cor-
 265 rection is then returned to update the NEMO density field. All 75 grid levels of the temperature, salinity, and density correction are exchanged here. The case is hereafter referred to as 3D.

A first set of 2D and 3D cases are executed on CPUs (i.e. both for NEMO and the Python script). The number of CPUs allocated to NEMO is kept fixed, while the number of CPUs for the Python scripts varies. Additionally, the 2D cases are doubled. In the second version, the inference computation is offloaded to GPUs (1 for 40 CPUs allocated to the Python script).
 270 Each test case is first executed with a synchronous implementation, that is, NEMO sends the inputs, and then waits for the Python script results, as would be for any in-built NEMO function. Cases in this configuration are denoted hereafter with the -S suffix (2D-S for instance). Taking advantage of the parallel-execution capabilities offered by the couplers, we reproduced each test case by changing the coupling implementation from synchronous to asynchronous. In the latter, NEMO sends the inputs as soon as possible in the time loop, and continues computation as far as possible, i.e., until it needs the fields processed by the
 275 Python script. The cases in this configuration are denoted hereafter with the -A suffix.




Figure 7. (a): NEMO simulation speed in Simulated Year Per Day for eORCA025.L75 as function of the number of processes allocated to the 2D case Python script executed on CPUs and on GPUs, and for different coupling implementation, asynchronous (-A) and synchronous (-S). Number of processes allocated to NEMO is fixed and equal to 999. (b): Same with the 3D case Python script executed on CPUs.

4.2 Scalability

We first discuss the performance for the test cases executed with the synchronous implementation. The results for asynchronous cases are treated in the next section. Figure 7 shows the number of Simulated Year Per Day (SYPD) for the simulations for (a) the 2D case with the Python script executed on CPUs and on GPUs, and (b) the 3D case on CPUs only (continuous curves for synchronous implementation). The number of processes allocated to the Python script is increased by successive doublings and follows integer powers of two. The performance for the eORCA025.L75 configuration without coupling is also shown as a reference speed to be reached. Unsurprisingly, it is seen that the addition of the coupling context causes the simulation speed to fall for all cases. Fortunately, this loss can be easily balanced by allocating more processes to the Python script. For the 2D case executed on CPUs (curves with squares), allocating additional resources of roughly 30% of those assigned to NEMO (a bit more than 256 extra Python processes over 999 NEMO processes) brings the simulation speed close to the reference performance, although it remains clearly lower. Beyond this point, increasing allocation up to an order of magnitude similar to NEMO yields little improvement, indicating a plateau in performance gains. The time cost incurred by using the CPUs for neural networks can be overcome by running the inference on GPUs (curves with triangles). The order of magnitude of the resource overhead to match the reference in this case can be located around 3% of those allocated to NEMO (32/999). For the 3D case, achieving performance close to the reference requires a resource overhead of over 100% (more than 1024 additional Python processes, exceeding the number of NEMO processes), although the reference performance here again is still not fully reached.




Figure 8. (a) Averaged percentage of time repartition of a NEMO iteration between OASIS3-MCT routines, execution of the 2D case Python script and NEMO routines with the synchronous (-S) implementation for eORCA075.L75 as function of the number of processes allocated to the 2D case Python script. (b) Same with the 3D case Python script executed on CPUs.

Figure 8 provides more insight into the origin of the overhead. It shows the average percentage of time spent per NEMO iteration by different steps in the synchronous implementation. Despite the 3D case involving more OASIS3-MCT operations due to the size of the grid, the percentage of time spent on OASIS3-MCT routines remains comparable across all test cases. It obviously decreases as the number of processes allocated to Python increases, but not significantly. However, changing the number of Python processes has a clear impact on the time spent on Python operations. As can be expected, a notable difference in the computation time between the Python scripts of the 2D and 3D cases can be observed for a given number of processes. The Python scripts for the 2D and 3D cases being different in terms of computational needs, the separation of the resource allocation appears here as an adapted tool for exploring different Python hybridization given a specific geophysical configuration.

4.3 Asynchronous coupling

Synchronous implementation is obviously suboptimal since reducing NEMO waiting time implies allocating more and more resources to the Python script to make its execution faster. We now compare the SYPD between synchronous and asynchronous implementations in Fig. 7. We can observe that the global resource overhead is lower compared to the corresponding synchronous cases. It decreases to less than 1% of the resources allocated to NEMO for the 2D case executed on GPUs (8 additional Python processes over 999 NEMO processes). More notable is the resource overhead for the 2D case on CPUs that falls around 6% (64/999). Similarly, the computational cost in the 3D case is reduced to an order of magnitude of 25% (256/999).



Every asynchronous test case exhibits a plateau immediately after a discontinuity. It corresponds to the moment from which
 310 NEMO no longer waits for the Python scripts. Allocating more resources to the Python script after this point is useless.

4.4 Comparison with other solutions

For completeness of the evaluation, we compared the performance of OASIS3-MCT and Eophis with other hybrid modelling
 methods. The benchmarking is based on the case of Storto et al. (2024) (S24 hereafter) in which a neural network is used to
 correct the air-sea heat fluxes in the NEMO 1° global ocean circulation configuration (ORCA1). Here, version 4.0.7 of the
 315 NEMO model is used, according to S24. In the S24 study, the ML component is an in-house Fortran-written library whose
 weights have been saved in NetCDF format. In a first step, we duplicated the neural network and the weights with the Keras
 library in TensorFlow-readable format. Then, we performed three realizations of the simulation described in the paper with
 different implementations of the ML model. The first is the exact reproduction of the original study (ORCA1-F), while the
 second implements the Infero (Bonannim and Quintino, 2024) Fortran API, version 2.0, in NEMO to load the TensorFlow
 320 version of the neural network and use it for inference (ORCA1-I). In the third case, instructions for loading and using the
 TensorFlow version of the neural network for inference are encapsulated in a Python function. The latter takes the inputs
 required by the ML component as arguments. The Python script containing this function is coupled to NEMO through OASIS3-
 MCT with help of Eophis (ORCA1-E). For ORCA1-E, the inference is computed with CPUs, and the coupling implementation
 is synchronous, similarly to the sequential implementation of the neural network for ORCA1-F and ORCA1-I. A last test case
 325 in which the ML component is not used is also performed as a reference, hereafter denoted as ORCA1.

A first comparison of the SYPD between ORCA1, ORCA1-F, and ORCA1-I against the number of processes allocated to
 NEMO is shown in Fig. 9a. As expected, ORCA1 runs the fastest since the neural network is not activated. ORCA1-I and
 ORCA1-F show a slight decrease in speed compared to ORCA1, with ORCA1-F being slower than ORCA1-I. However,
 overall performance and scalability remain comparable across configurations. To compare the performance between these
 330 cases and ORCA1-E, we fixed the number of processes assigned to NEMO to three different values (40, 80 and 160). Then,
 we vary the number of processes allocated to the Python script. The resulting curve is compared with the ORCA1, ORCA1-F,
 and ORCA1-I SYPD values corresponding to the fixed number of NEMO processes, as shown in Fig. 9b. We can observe that
 the performance of the Eophis implementation (ORCA1-E) for a low number of Python processes is comparable to that of
 Infero. As also illustrated previously, increasing the number of Python processes makes the inference computation faster. For
 335 all the chosen number of NEMO processes, it is possible, for ORCA1-E, to recover the simulation speed of the reference case
 (i.e. NEMO without ML model) at a high number of Python processes. It should be noted that the size of the inputs in the
 S24 configuration is quite light. An interesting supplementary study to this benchmark would be to evaluate how the different
 implementation methods scale with the input size or the number of computational operations required by the inference.




Figure 9. (a) Simulation speed in Simulated Year Per Day as function of the number of processes allocated to NEMO for different implementation of the Storto et al. (2024) ML model: NEMO without ML model (ORCA1), with Fortran (ORCA1-F), and Infero (ORCA1-I). (b) Simulation speed in Simulated Year Per Day for ORCA1-E as a function of the number of processes allocated to the Python script for different number of processes allocated to NEMO. Results are compared for different implementation of the Storto et al. (2024) ML model: NEMO without ML model (ORCA1), with Fortran (ORCA1-F) and Infero (ORCA1-I). Lines for those cases are here for readability as their values are fixed and independent of the number of Python processes.

5 Discussion

340 5.1 Limitations

In our effort to use and evaluate OASIS3-MCT with Eophis, we remained limited to applications of hybrid modelling that involve inference only. Although it is possible in practice to couple a geophysical model that would only send inputs to a Python script to train a neural network, we do not think that it would be the most adapted tool for this kind of application. The important data stream required for training could be a limiting factor, given the architecture of OASIS3-MCT. Alternative coupling

345 libraries with more advanced data-handling capabilities may therefore provide a more suitable basis for online training. Recent developments in projects such as Melissa (Schouler et al., 2023) or XIOS point in this direction. However, evaluating the performance of OASIS3-MCT for training neural networks with relatively light architectures, or those that do not require inputs at every time step, or only partial re-training, would be of interest.

Practical deployment aspects must also be considered. Despite all the aforementioned advantages of using coupling libraries

350 for hybrid modelling, the additional software layer required to deploy a coupled configuration can be harsh, depending on the user's expertise in coupling tools. A typical situation where this approach might become suboptimal is for an ML parameterization implemented in an operational geophysical model. Here, since the use of the ML components is expected to be regular, a



permanent implementation using Fortran ML library APIs may be easier to run and maintain than relying on coupling libraries. Nevertheless, similar to the study by Zhang et al. (2023a), this kind of uncoupled implementation might require additional MPI communications within the Fortran code itself. Indeed, depending on the architecture of the neural network, users may need to reconstruct halos or redistribute fields in a more optimized grid decomposition, which can be a challenge in terms of development effort. Hence, thanks to the interchangeability of Python scripts, coupler-based methods appear advantageous for prototyping and quick testing new parameterizations before addressing the question of permanent integration.

5.2 Future perspectives

We emphasize here that Eophis is a utility software that does not perform the coupling itself but leverages the Python API of OASIS3-MCT. This backend could be extended to support other coupling libraries offering such an API, without requiring changes to the Eophis abstraction layer. At the time of writing, and to our knowledge, most coupling libraries used in ESMs do not yet provide Python support, except YAC (Hanke and Redler, 2019) and XIOS, or are still under development, making OASIS3-MCT central to this work. In any case, most of these libraries rely on design assumptions similar to those of OASIS3-MCT, namely symmetric ESM features between coupled components. While Eophis is a proposal for facilitating the use of current ESMs coupling tools for hybrid modelling, we hope this work to serve as feedback for the next generation of couplers, which should explicitly account for the asymmetry for coupling ESMs with ML components or any Python routines.

5.3 Sharing experiments

Being a new promising field, hybrid modelling naturally raised many concerns, both in terms of scientific relevance and practical application. In this conclusion, we wish to address the latter. While intense efforts have been made to investigate ways of calling ML from Fortran, several practical aspects remain underexplored. As mentioned earlier, integrating ML components into ESMs requires additional complex software layers. This raises the question of how to account for such obstacles in the broader goal of making hybrid modelling experiments easily reproducible. Ensuring that the weights and biases of ML models are preserved and accessible is also crucial in this regard. Therefore, we need to explore new ways to evolve and strengthen best practices for reproducible hybrid modelling. Moreover, the wide variety and complexity of existing solutions for deploying ML components in physics-based models currently make the establishment of standard procedures for sharing code and experiments highly challenging. As a step toward addressing this issue, we present the solution we have adopted to share the ocean hybrid modelling experiments we performed with help of Eophis in the Appendix B. All test cases conducted in this study are stored following this solution and are openly available (see "Code and data availability" section). We do not claim to provide a definitive solution for the sharing of reproducible hybrid experiments. Rather, this work should be regarded as a proposed contribution, which may help inform and inspire future practices.



6 Summary

In this paper, we have explored how coupling libraries present in Earth System Models can be used for implementing code components written in Python, as for instance pre-trained Machine Learning (ML) components. This approach allows two codes to be executed simultaneously and independently; the former is a geophysical model, while the latter is a Python script that contains instructions to use the ML component for inference. Both are exchanging data through the coupling interface as the simulation progresses. Many benefits of this method have been identified. Since ESMs are written in Fortran and ML components in Python, the first possibility is to split up the simulation into two heterogeneous programming environments. The Fortran-Python bindings development work is limited here to the coupler interface. Thus, the operations required to compute and pass the geophysical fields to the ML component are performed in the ESMs, where the numerical tools are the most adapted; operations related to the manipulation of the ML component inputs and outputs are then isolated within the coupled Python script. Similarly, the appropriate integration of the fields returned by the ML component in the simulation is done within the geophysical model, according to the solver algorithms. Our experience demonstrated that this feature eases the collaboration between climate modelers and computer scientists, with each community being able to work in their preferred environment. Separation into two independent codes also unlocks parallel work. In this context, computing resources can be distributed flexibly and asymmetrically between components, allowing both to work with a differently optimized decomposition. Moreover, the reconstruction of the global geophysical fields is operated through the MPI routines of the coupling library, which is essential for performance. Finally, the low intrusiveness of this method makes the Python scripts containing the pre-trained components easily shareable between different physics-based models, may they include an implementation of the coupling library. In this work, the OASIS3-MCT coupling library has been chosen to couple Python ML components with ESMs because it already possesses Fortran and Python APIs, in addition to being widely present in the climate modelling codes.

However, we also highlighted that although coupler-based frameworks enable hybrid Fortran-Python coupling, their design targets ESM-ESM interactions and is therefore not well suited to ESM-ML applications. ML components indeed act as passive functions driven by the ESM and lack several features commonly implemented in geophysical models and expected by coupling libraries, leading to additional unnecessary complexity in the ML Python scripts.

To address this, we introduced Eophis, a generic OASIS3-MCT coupled Python component that provides the required features to bridge any function imported from an external Python script with an ESM coupling interface, including useful functionalities such as exchange execution, time synchronization, reading and writing of namelists, parallel communication, and guidance for configuring the coupling layer on the ESM side. The Eophis interface eases configuration of the coupling API on the Python side by abstracting the definition of the exchanges to perform between the ESM and the Python script. It also allows the user to define, if necessary, the mapping between the received data and the data to send back. This design enables the Python coupling environment to be easily adapted to the requirements of the imported Python functions, keeping them coupling-independent and readily interchangeable.



415 Evaluation of the performance of hybrid ESM-ML modelling with OASIS3-MCT and EopHis has been conducted by cou-
 pling 2D and 3D Python ML and analytical scripts with the ocean general circulation model NEMO, chosen arbitrarily among
 the OASIS3-MCT-equipped ESMs compatible with this framework. We showed that the separation between NEMO and the
 Python script was particularly suitable to couple a given geophysical configuration with different Python scripts having dif-
 ferent computational needs. The flexibility in resource allocation has also been distinguished in the possibility of performing
 420 hybrid CPU/GPU modelling. The asynchronous coupling, i.e., the possibility of making both codes work in parallel, enabled
 an important reduction of the geophysical model waiting time for Python operations, making the extra cost associated with
 the Python script negligible. Compared to a sequential coupling of the Python script, the resource overhead to reach a given
 simulation speed under asynchronous conditions has been divided from four to eight for the test cases considered in this study.
 Finally, we compared the performance of OASIS3-MCT with different hybrid modelling methods. The results were better – or
 425 similar in the worst case – compared to methods based on Fortran wrappers of ML libraries, primarily because of flexible and
 asymmetric resource allocation, though at the expense of additional resource costs.

Code and data availability. EopHis_v1.1 is distributed under the MIT license at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17736834> (Barge and Le Som-
 mer, 2025). OASIS3-MCT v6 can be found publicly at <https://zenodo.org/records/18020824> (Valcke et al., 2025) under the LGPL license.

The Infero library (Bonannim and Quintino, 2024), version 2.0, is available at <https://github.com/ecmwf/infero/archive/refs/tags/0.2.0.zip>
 430 under the Apache-2.0 license.

The NEMO model is available through the official website <https://www.nemo-ocean.eu>. Versions 4.0.7 and 4.2.1, used in this study
 can be downloaded at http://forge.ipsl.jussieu.fr/nemo/changeset/15814/NEMO/releases/r4.0/r4.0-HEAD?old_path=%2F&format=zip and
<https://forge.nemo-ocean.eu/nemo/nemo/-/archive/4.2.1/nemo-4.2.1.zip> under the CeCILL license, respectively.

In-house modifications to the NEMO model, run-control files, namelists, build options, post-processing files, coupling configuration,
 435 neural-network code and weights for eORCA025.L75 test case coupled with (Bodner et al., 2025) and Gibbs Sea Water oceanographic
 toolbox (McDougall and Barker, 2011) can be found at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18244386> (Barge et al., 2026a) and <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18244389> (Barge and Le Sommer, 2026), respectively. Same material for ORCA1 test case coupled with Storto et al. (2024)
 is shared at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18244414> (Barge et al., 2026b). The code contained in the latter archive is the same used for the
 uncoupled configurations ORCA1, ORCA1-F and ORCA1-I (with switches in namelists), and includes the library for online inference in
 440 Fortran.

An Apptainer (<https://apptainer.org/>) container image providing pre-installed common software environment to run the coupled test cases,
 including OASIS3-MCT and EopHis, can be downloaded at <https://github.com/morays-community/morays-doc/releases/>. Instructions to use
 the container image and deploy the coupled cases from the mentioned archives are provided in this documentation: <https://morays-doc.readthedocs.io/en/latest/index.html>.

445 Atmospheric fields from ECMWF to force the ocean in the experiments presented in Sect. 4.4 have been taken from the Climate Data
 Store (CDS <https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu>) archive (ERA5) and the operational archive (operational forecasts, see www.ecmwf.int)).

Atmospheric field to force the ocean in the experiments presented in Sect. 4 have been taken from Geoscience Data Exchange (GDEx
<https://gdex.ucar.edu/>) archive (JRA-55).



Appendix A: Additional details about files generated by Eophis

Figure A1a shows an example of the Eophis log for writing the OASIS3-MCT namelist *namcouple*, according to the example given in Sect. 3.2. The latter is filled with information about Eophis version, dependencies, and Python implementation. We can also note the *Coupling Initialization* part. When Eophis starts, it automatically looks for the OASIS3-MCT coupling namelist to read its content. If *namcouple* exists, it is read and copied as *namcouple_ref*. If *namcouple* does not exist but *namcouple_ref* does, the reference namelist is copied, then read. If both files exist, *namcouple* is read. Finally, if none of the files exists, Eophis creates an empty *namcouple*. This behavior allows for the scenario where the user wishes to couple a Python script with a first ESM that is also coupled with another ESM. Since only one coupling namelist is required by OASIS3-MCT to perform all the exchanges, the user may bring its own *namcouple* with pre-written information about the coupling between the ESMs, and use Eophis to complete it with the Python coupling information. For a user who does not know about *namcouple* or does not wish to write it, the default case makes its creation straightforward.

We now emphasize the content of the OASIS3-MCT namelist generated by Eophis in Fig. A1b. Regular OASIS3-MCT users may notice that the two first terms for a given *namcouple* section do not match names defined in the Tunnel. Those are indeed aliases that OASIS3-MCT uses to perform the communications. OASIS3-MCT manipulates *U* under the name *E_OUT_0* on the ESM side, and under *M_IN_0* on the Python side. Those aliases have been set by default during Tunnel registration. In Eophis, it does not matter to know these aliases, since all OASIS3-MCT actions are wrapped. On the contrary, it might matter in the geoscientific code to configure the coupling. To help setting up the coupling from the ESM side, the mapping between Tunnel fields names and OASIS3-MCT aliases can be found in the Eophis log (see Fig. A1a). Another solution is to make the geoscientific model read the *eophis_nml* file generated by Eophis. This file contains the aforementioned mappings in Fortran namelist format. It is intended to help adapt the call of the OASIS3-MCT API in the Fortran side, according to Tunnel definition. This approach requires the development, at least once, of a Fortran module responsible for carrying out this procedure, according to how the OASIS3-MCT API has been implemented in the ESM. Such a module has been used with NEMO for the test cases conducted in this study. It can be found and served as template within our sharing platform presented in Appendix B.

Appendix B: Proposal for sharing reproducible hybrid experiments

As a possible solution to share ocean hybrid modelling experiments performed with Eophis, we use a GitHub organization named *Morays-Community* (Morays – <https://github.com/morays-community>). Each experiment and its material are stored in individual repositories following a standard template. The latter allows a unique generalized procedure to deploy an experiment from its repository. Being open to contribution, Morays documentation also provides instructions to create a hybrid experiment with OASIS3-MCT and Eophis from scratch, as well as tutorials to store the experiment according to the templates. The minimal required software environment is described in detail with documentation for an installation from sources or from a container image.



(a)

```
=====
|  CNRS - IGE - MEOM Team  |
|  -----                |
|  EOPHIS 1.0.2 (2025)    |
|  -----                |
=====
Main packages used:
Python implementation: CPython
Python version       : 3.10.15
IPython version      : 8.28.0

mpi4py : 3.1.5
f90nml : 1.4.4
numpy  : 2.0.1
netcdf4: not installed

-----
Coupling Initialization
-----
Checking up OASIS namelists...
  namcouple not found, looking for reference file namcouple_ref
  namcouple_ref not found either, creating it from scratch
Reading namcouple

===== EOPHIS TUTO : Pre-Production =====
Aim: write coupling namelist

----- Tunnel TO_ESM registered -----
namcouple variable names
  Earth side:
    - U -> E_OUT_0
    - V -> E_OUT_1
    - force -> E_IN_0
  Models side:
    - U -> M_IN_0
    - V -> M_IN_1
    - force -> M_OUT_0

Grid geo_grid registered
  Global size: (100, 150)
  Boundary conditions: ('cyclic', 'cyclic')
-----

Writing namcouple with registered tunnels

Closing tunnels

EOPHIS run finished
```

(b)

```
##### MODIFIED BY EOPHIS #####
$NFIELD$
3
$END
#####
$RUNTIME
3636000
$END
#####
$NLOGPRT
1 0
$END
#####
$STRINGS
# ===== Tunnel TO_ESM =====
# Earth -- U --> Models
E_OUT_0 M_IN_0 1 3600 0 rst.nc EXPORTED
100 150 100 150 geo_grid geo_grid LAG=0
R 0 R 0
# Earth -- V --> Models
E_OUT_1 M_IN_1 1 3600 0 rst.nc EXPORTED
100 150 100 150 geo_grid geo_grid LAG=0
R 0 R 0
# Earth <-- force -- Models
M_OUT_0 E_IN_0 1 3600 0 rst.nc EXPORTED
100 150 100 150 geo_grid geo_grid LAG=0
R 0 R 0
#
$END
```

Figure A1. (a): Eophis log for writing *namcouple*. (b): Content of the OASIS3-MCT namelist *namcouple* generated by Eophis.



Let us now describe the template repository. First, the structure of the README file is designed to organize software requirements thematically. It begins by specifying the version of the ocean model to be used. Next, instructions to install the Python script sources must be clearly described, as well as Eophis version. The template also includes two sections for post-processing and production tools. In general, any additional libraries required to run the experiment should be listed in the README. The focus is on specifying their versions and the commands needed to install them, along with their dependencies. The rest of the repository is divided in five directories. The first is dedicated to the ocean model resources, such as custom source code or compilation files. The second is dedicated to the Python components, including the Eophis script, the Python script to couple and the model sources. If the Python script is a ML component, the weights and biases are also stored here. Then comes the directory containing instructions for running the experiment, such as namelists, lightweight input files and submission scripts. The final two directories contain post-processing scripts and representative results from the experiment. The post-processing scripts serve as templates, illustrating the types of representative results that can be extracted from the experiment; these are stored in the results directory. Although the figures can reflect the quality of the simulation, their primary purpose is to provide quick feedback to users aiming to reproduce the experiment.

Author contributions. AB developed the Eophis library, performed the experiments and provided the figures. AB and JLS defined and evaluated the 2D and 3D use cases, and wrote the original draft. AS provided the ORCA1-F, ORCA1-I test cases and S24 neural network for the comparison benchmark. SV is main developer of OASIS3-MCT library. AB, JLS, AS and SV reviewed and edited the final paper.

Competing interests. At least one of the (co-)authors is a member of the editorial board of Geoscientific Model Development.

Acknowledgements. This study received support from the ANR - France 2030 program under grant number ANR-22-POCE-0003 (PPR-OCEAN MEDIATION project) and grant number ANR-22-EXTR-0006 (TRACCS-PC5-COMPACT project) as part of the PEPR TRACCS program. JLS also acknowledges support from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation program under grant agreement no. 101137682 (AI4PEX project). Access to the computing resources was granted by IDRIS under the allocation A0190116930 made by GENCI.



References

- Alexeev, D.: pytorch-fortran: PyTorch bindings for Fortran, <https://github.com/alexeedm/pytorch-fortran>, 2023.
- 505 Arnold, C., Sharma, S., Weigel, T., and Greenberg, D. S.: Efficient and stable coupling of the SuperdropNet deep-learning-based cloud microphysics (v0.1.0) with the ICON climate and weather model (v2.6.5), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 17, 4017–4029, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-17-4017-2024>, 2024.
- Atkinson, J., Clifford, S., Orchard, D., and Edsall, C.: fortran-TF-lib, <https://github.com/Cambridge-ICCS/fortran-tf-lib>, 2023.
- Atkinson, J., Elafrou, A., Kasoar, E., Wallwork, J. G., Meltzer, T., Clifford, S., Orchard, D., and Edsall, C.: FTorch: a library for coupling
 510 PyTorch models to Fortran, *Journal of Open Source article*, 10, 7602, <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.07602>, 2025.
- Baker, N., Alexander, F., Bremer, T., Hagberg, A., Kevrekidis, Y., Najm, H., Parashar, M., Patra, A., Sethian, J., Wild, S., Willcox, K., and Lee, S.: Workshop Report on Basic Research Needs for Scientific Machine Learning: Core Technologies for Artificial Intelligence, <https://doi.org/10.2172/1478744>, 2019.
- Balogh, B., Saint-Martin, D., and Geoffroy, O.: Online Test of a Neural Network Deep Convection Parameterization in ARP-GEM1, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.21920>, 2024.
- 515 Barge, A. and Le Sommer, J.: EopHis, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17736834>, 2025.
- Barge, A. and Le Sommer, J.: morays-community/NEMO-eORCA025_Subgrid_Density, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18244389>, 2026.
- Barge, A., Contreras, M., Bodner, A., Balwada, D., and Le Sommer, J.: morays-community/NEMO-eORCA025_MLE, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18244386>, 2026a.
- 520 Barge, A., Storto, A., and Le Sommer, J.: morays-community/NEMO-ORCA1_AirSeaHeat, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18744705>, 2026b.
- BerkeleyLab: Functional inference and training for surrogates, <https://github.com/BerkeleyLab/fiats>, 2025.
- Beucler, T.: Towards Hybrid Earth System Modeling: A Living Review, <https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.16967529>, <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.16967529>, 2025.
- 525 Bodner, A., Balwada, D., and Zanna, L.: A Data-Driven Approach for Parameterizing Submesoscale Vertical Buoyancy Fluxes in the Ocean Mixed Layer, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.06972>, 2025.
- Bodner, A. S., Fox-Kemper, B., Johnson, L., Roedel, L. P. V., McWilliams, J. C., Sullivan, P. P., Hall, P. S., and Dong, J.: Modifying the Mixed Layer Eddy Parameterization to Include Frontogenesis Arrest by Boundary Layer Turbulence, *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 53, 323 – 339, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-21-0297.1>, 2023.
- 530 Bonannim, A. and Quintino, T.: infero, <https://github.com/ecmwf/infero>, 2024.
- Brenowitz, N. D.: call_py_fort, https://github.com/nbren12/call_py_fort, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7779572>, 2023.
- Craig, A., Valcke, S., and Coquart, L.: Development and performance of a new version of the OASIS coupler, OASIS3-MCT_3.0, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10, 3297–3308, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-3297-2017>, 2017.
- Curcic, M.: A parallel Fortran framework for neural networks and deep learning, *ACM SIGPLAN Fortran Forum*, 38, 4–21,
 535 <https://doi.org/10.1145/3323057.3323059>, 2019.
- ESCOMP: module_neural_net (PUMAS Fortran neural network module), <https://github.com/ESCOMP/PUMAS>, 2025.
- Farchi, A., Chrust, M., Bocquet, M., Laloyaux, P., and Bonavita, M.: The Fortran Neural Network (FNN) library, <https://github.com/cereadaml/fnn>, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7245291>, 2022.



- 540 Fox-Kemper, B., Danabasoglu, G., Ferrari, R., Griffies, S., Hallberg, R., Holland, M., Maltrud, M., Peacock, S., and Samuels, B.: Param-
eterization of mixed layer eddies. III: Implementation and impact in global ocean climate simulations, *Ocean Modelling*, 39, 61–78,
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2010.09.002>, 2011.
- Frezat, H., Le Sommer, J., Fablet, R., Balarac, G., and Lguensat, R.: A Posteriori Learning for Quasi-Geostrophic Turbulence Parametrization,
Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems, 14, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022ms003124>, 2022.
- Fuchs, D., Sherwood, S. C., Prasad, A., Trapeznikov, K., and Gimlett, J.: TorchClim v1.0: a deep-learning plugin for climate model physics,
545 *Geoscientific Model Development*, 17, 5459–5475, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-17-5459-2024>, 2024.
- Gelbrecht, M., White, A., Bathiany, S., and Boers, N.: Differentiable programming for Earth system modeling, *Geoscientific Model Devel-*
opment, 16, 3123–3135, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-16-3123-2023>, 2023.
- Häfner, D., Nuterman, R., and Jochum, M.: Fast, Cheap, and Turbulent—Global Ocean Modeling With GPU Acceleration in Python, *Journal*
of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems, 13, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021ms002717>, 2021.
- 550 Hanke, M. and Redler, R.: New features with YAC 1.5.0, *Deutscher Wetterdienst*, 3, https://doi.org/10.5676/DWD_pub/nwv/icon_003, 2019.
- Irrgang, C., Boers, N., Sonnewald, M., Barnes, E. A., Kadow, C., Staneva, J., and Saynisch-Wagner, J.: Towards neural Earth
system modelling by integrating artificial intelligence in Earth system science, *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 3, 667–674,
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-021-00374-3>, 2021.
- Karniadakis, G. E., Kevrekidis, I. G., Lu, L., Perdikaris, P., Wang, S., and Yang, L.: Physics-informed machine learning, *Nature Reviews*
555 *Physics*, 3, 422–440, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42254-021-00314-5>, 2021.
- Keith, B., O’Leary-Roseberry, T., Sanderse, B., Scheichl, R., and van Bloemen Waanders, B.: Scientific Machine Learning: A Symbiosis,
Foundations of Data Science, 7, i–x, <https://doi.org/10.3934/fods.2024051>, 2025.
- Klöwer, M., Gelbrecht, M., Hotta, D., Willmert, J., Silvestri, S., Wagner, G. L., White, A., Hatfield, S., Kimpson, T., Constantinou, N. C., and
Hill, C.: SpeedyWeather.jl: Reinventing atmospheric general circulation models towards interactivity and extensibility, *Journal of Open*
560 *Source Software*, 9, 6323, <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.06323>, 2024.
- Kochkov, D., Yuval, J., Langmore, I., Norgaard, P., Smith, J., Mooers, G., Klöwer, M., Lottes, J., Rasp, S., Düben, P., Hatfield, S., Battaglia,
P., Sanchez-Gonzalez, A., Willson, M., Brenner, M. P., and Hoyer, S.: Neural general circulation models for weather and climate, *Nature*,
632, 1060–1066, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07744-y>, 2024.
- McDougall, T. J. and Barker, P. M.: Getting started with TEOS-10 and the Gibbs-Seawater (GSW) Oceanographic Toolbox, 28pp., *sCOR/I-*
565 *APSO WG127*, ISBN 978-0-646-55621-5, 2011.
- McGibbon, J., Brenowitz, N. D., Cheeseman, M., Clark, S. K., Dahm, J. P. S., Davis, E. C., Elbert, O. D., George, R. C., Harris, L. M., Henn,
B., Kwa, A., Perkins, W. A., Watt-Meyer, O., Wicky, T. F., Bretherton, C. S., and Fuhrer, O.: fv3gfs-wrapper: a Python wrapper of the
FV3GFS atmospheric model, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 14, 4401–4409, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-4401-2021>, 2021.
- Meunier, E., Ouala, S., Frezat, H., Sommer, J. L., and Fablet, R.: Towards fully differentiable neural ocean model with Veros,
570 <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2511.17427>, 2025.
- Ott, J., Pritchard, M., Best, N., Linstead, E., Curcic, M., and Baldi, P.: A Fortran-Keras Deep Learning Bridge for Scientific Computing,
<https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.10652>, 2020.
- Partee, S., Ellis, M., Rigazzi, A., Bachman, S., Marques, G., Shao, A., and Benjamin, R.: Using Machine Learning at Scale in HPC Simula-
tions with SmartSim: An Application to Ocean Climate Modeling, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4682270>, 2021.
- 575 Rabel, E.: Forpy: a library for fortran-Python interoperability, <https://github.com/ylikx/forpy>, 2020.



- Reichstein, M., Camps-Valls, G., Stevens, B., Jung, M., Denzler, J., Carvalhais, N., and Prabhat: Deep learning and process understanding for data-driven Earth system science, *Nature*, 566, 195–204, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0912-1>, 2019.
- Romero, J., Thorsten, K., Meltzer, T., and Loppi, N.: An Online Deep Learning Interface for HPC programs on NVIDIA GPUs, <https://github.com/NVIDIA/TorchFort>, 2024.
- 580 Schouler, M., Caulk, R. A., Meyer, L., Terraz, T., Conrads, C., Friedemann, S., Agarwal, A., Baldonado, J. M., Pogodziński, B., Sekula, A., Ribes, A., and Raffin, B.: Melissa: coordinating large-scale ensemble runs for deep learning and sensitivity analyses, *Journal of Open Source Software*, 8, 5291, <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.05291>, 2023.
- Serhani, A.: PhyDLL, <https://gitlab.com/cerfacs/phydll>, 2023.
- Shen, C., Appling, A. P., Gentine, P., Bandai, T., Gupta, H., Tartakovsky, A., Baity-Jesi, M., Fenicia, F., Kifer, D., Li, L., Liu, X., Ren, W.,
585 Zheng, Y., Harman, C. J., Clark, M., Farthing, M., Feng, D., Kumar, P., Aboelyazeed, D., Rahmani, F., Song, Y., Beck, H. E., Bindas, T., Dwivedi, D., Fang, K., Höge, M., Rackauckas, C., Mohanty, B., Roy, T., Xu, C., and Lawson, K.: Differentiable modelling to unify machine learning and physical models for geosciences, *Nature Reviews Earth and Environment*, 4, 552–567, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-023-00450-9>, 2023.
- Silvestri, S., Wagner, G. L., Constantinou, N. C., Hill, C. N., Campin, J., Souza, A. N., Bishnu, S., Churavy, V., Marshall, J., and Ferrari, R.:
590 A GPU-Based Ocean Dynamical Core for Routine Mesoscale-Resolving Climate Simulations, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 17, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024ms004465>, 2025.
- Stanley, Z., Grooms, I., Kleiber, S., Bachman, S., Castruccio, F., and Adcroft, A.: Parameterizing the impact of unresolved temperature variability on the large-scale density field: Part 1. Theory, *JAMES*, 12, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020MS002185>, 2020.
- Storto, A., Frolov, S., Slivinski, L., and Yang, C.: Correction of Air-Sea Heat Fluxes in the NEMO Ocean General Circulation Model Using
595 Neural Networks, *Geoscientific Model Development Discussions*, 2024, 1–27, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2024-185>, 2024.
- Valcke, S., Piacentini, A., Craig, A., and Jonville, G.: OASIS3-MCT_6.0, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18020824>, 2025.
- Wang, X., Han, Y., Xue, W., Yang, G., and Zhang, G. J.: Stable climate simulations using a realistic general circulation model with neural network parameterizations for atmospheric moist physics and radiation processes, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 15, 3923–3940, [https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-3923-](https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-3923-2022)
600 2022, 2022.
- Watt-Meyer, O., Brenowitz, N. D., Clark, S. K., Henn, B., Kwa, A., McGibbon, J., Perkins, W. A., Harris, L., and Bretherton, C. S.: Neural Network Parameterization of Subgrid-Scale Physics From a Realistic Geography Global Storm-Resolving Simulation, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 16, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023ms003668>, 2024.
- Zanna, L., Gregory, W., Perezhogin, P., Sane, A., Zhang, C., Adcroft, A., Bushuk, M., Fernandez-Granda, C., Reichl, B., Balwada, D., Busecke, J., Chapman, W., Connolly, A., Du, D., Everard, K., Falasca, F., Falga, R., Kamm, D., Meunier, E., Liu, Q., Nasser, A., Pudig, M., Shao, A., Simpson, J. L., Vogt, L., and Wu, J.: A Framework for Hybrid Physics-AI Coupled Ocean Models, <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2510.22676>, 2025.
- Zhang, C., Perezhogin, P., Gultekin, C., Adcroft, A., Fernandez-Granda, C., and Zanna, L.: Implementation and Evaluation of a Machine Learned Mesoscale Eddy Parameterization Into a Numerical Ocean Circulation Model, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*,
610 15, e2023MS003697, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023MS003697>, 2023a.
- Zhang, J., Zhang, Z., and Qiu, B.: Parameterizing Submesoscale Vertical Buoyancy Flux by Simultaneously Considering Baroclinic Instability and Strain-Induced Frontogenesis, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 50, e2022GL102292, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL102292>, 2023b.



615 Zhang, T., Morcrette, C., Zhang, M., Lin, W., Xie, S., Liu, Y., Van Weverberg, K., and Rodrigues, J.: A Fortran–Python interface for integrating machine learning parameterization into earth system models, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 18, 1917–1928, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-18-1917-2025>, 2025.

Zhong, X., Ma, Z., Yao, Y., Xu, L., Wu, Y., and Wang, Z.: WRF–ML v1.0: a bridge between WRF v4.3 and machine learning parameterizations and its application to atmospheric radiative transfer, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 16, 199–209, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-16-199-2023>, 2023.