

Artificial Intelligence-Assisted Crop Disease Recognition Using Digital Image Processing Techniques

Dr. Emma Visser

Assistant Professor, Utrecht Institute of Computer Vision Technology, Netherlands

Abstract

Crop diseases can reduce agricultural productivity and quality when symptoms are not identified at an appropriate stage. Visual inspection remains important in plant-health assessment, but large cultivation areas and similarities among symptoms can make consistent recognition difficult. Digital image processing provides computational tools for enhancing leaf images, separating symptomatic regions, and extracting color, texture, and shape characteristics. Artificial intelligence can extend this process by learning complex image patterns and assigning disease categories automatically. This hypothetical methodological study examines an artificial intelligence-assisted crop disease recognition framework integrating digital image preprocessing, lesion segmentation, handcrafted visual descriptors, and convolutional image classification. A fictional dataset containing 1,200 crop-leaf images is divided into hypothetical training, validation, and testing subsets. Three conceptual configurations are compared: a conventional color-texture support vector machine, a convolutional neural network, and an integrated AI-assisted image-processing and convolutional model.

The illustrative analysis evaluates overall classification performance through accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 score. A second analytical comparison examines recognition across healthy leaves, leaf spot, blight, rust, and mildew categories. Under the assigned hypothetical values, the integrated architecture records the strongest overall performance, although recognition varies across symptom categories. These numerical results are illustrative rather than experimentally obtained. The study concludes that combining digital image processing with artificial intelligence offers a useful methodological framework for crop-disease recognition. However, reliable deployment requires representative field images, robust segmentation, control of illumination and background variability, independent testing, and careful examination of visually similar symptoms. Empirical experimentation is required before practical diagnostic accuracy can be established.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Crop Disease Recognition, Digital Image Processing, Plant Disease Detection, Convolutional Neural Network, Leaf Image Classification, Computer Vision, Agricultural Informatics, Image Segmentation, Precision Agriculture.

1. Introduction

Crop diseases represent an important challenge for agricultural production because infection can affect plant development, yield quality, and marketable output. Many diseases produce visible symptoms on

leaves, stems, or fruits, including spots, discoloration, lesions, mildew-like patterns, and tissue deterioration. Visual inspection by experienced personnel can be useful, but manual assessment becomes difficult across large cultivation areas. Computational image analysis offers a complementary approach by converting visible symptoms into measurable color, texture, shape, and spatial characteristics suitable for automated classification.

Digital image processing has been applied to plant-disease analysis through procedures such as color transformation, thresholding, segmentation, texture analysis, and morphological processing. Pydipati et al. demonstrated that color and texture characteristics could support recognition of diseased citrus leaves. Camargo and Smith subsequently investigated digital-image algorithms for identifying visible plant-disease symptoms. These studies established that symptomatic regions can often be distinguished computationally when appropriate image representations and classification features are selected.

Artificial intelligence extends conventional image processing by allowing classification models to learn relationships between image characteristics and disease labels. Machine-learning systems can use handcrafted features such as color histograms and texture descriptors, whereas deep learning models can learn hierarchical representations directly from image data. The development of convolutional neural networks has been particularly relevant to visual recognition because these models can capture spatial patterns that are difficult to define manually. Their usefulness nevertheless depends strongly on dataset quality and training conditions.

Plant-disease images collected under laboratory conditions may contain uniform backgrounds, controlled lighting, and clearly visible leaves. Field images are typically more complicated because shadows, soil, overlapping foliage, variable illumination, and different camera positions can affect visual appearance. Barbedo reviewed digital-image approaches for disease detection and highlighted several practical constraints associated with symptom variability and image acquisition. Consequently, high classification performance on carefully prepared images does not automatically demonstrate equivalent reliability under agricultural field conditions.

The present hypothetical study develops an AI-assisted crop-disease recognition framework combining image preprocessing with convolutional classification. The methodology includes color normalization, leaf-region isolation, lesion enhancement, data augmentation, and predictive learning. Three conceptual configurations are compared through illustrative classification metrics, followed by disease-specific evaluation. No real crop images were collected or analyzed for this paper. The purpose is to establish a transparent methodological structure that could guide subsequent empirical experimentation using verified agricultural image datasets.

2. Objectives of the Study

The principal objective of this study is to examine the methodological potential of artificial intelligence-assisted image analysis for recognizing visible crop diseases. The investigation focuses on image preprocessing, disease-feature representation, machine-learning classification, category-specific recognition, and methodological challenges affecting agricultural computer-vision systems.

2.1 Examination of Digital Image Processing Techniques

The first objective is to examine image-processing procedures that can improve the representation of visible crop-disease symptoms. The proposed workflow considers image resizing, color normalization, background separation, leaf segmentation, lesion enhancement, and texture extraction. These procedures

are intended to reduce irrelevant image variation while preserving symptom information required by the classifier. The objective emphasizes that appropriate preprocessing can influence recognition because disease patterns may occupy only a limited portion of the complete leaf image.

The study also examines the relationship between preprocessing and artificial intelligence. Excessive image manipulation can remove diagnostically useful variation, while insufficient preprocessing may allow models to learn backgrounds or lighting conditions rather than disease symptoms. Consequently, the image-processing stage should support disease recognition without introducing artificial patterns. The proposed framework retains both processed lesion information and original visual context so that future experiments can determine whether segmentation provides measurable improvement relative to direct image classification.

2.2 Evaluation of AI-Based Disease Recognition

The second objective is to establish a transparent framework for comparing alternative crop-disease recognition approaches. A color-texture SVM represents conventional image processing and machine learning, while a convolutional neural network represents end-to-end image learning. The integrated configuration combines preprocessed disease-region information with convolutional features. Accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 score are used to demonstrate how classification performance can be compared under a common hypothetical test set.

The objective further examines category-specific performance because aggregate accuracy can conceal weaknesses affecting individual diseases. Healthy leaves, leaf spot, blight, rust, and mildew are considered separately within the illustrative analysis. Recognition difficulty may vary because different diseases can share visual characteristics such as yellowing or irregular lesions. Reporting class-level precision and recall therefore provides a more informative representation of model behavior than presenting only a single overall accuracy score.

2.3 Identification of Agricultural Imaging Challenges

The third objective is to identify methodological problems that may limit automated disease recognition. Relevant challenges include illumination variation, complex backgrounds, overlapping leaves, symptom similarity, disease severity, mixed infections, and differences among crop varieties. These factors can alter image appearance substantially even when the underlying disease remains the same. Recognizing such variation is essential because a model trained on narrowly controlled images may fail when confronted with previously unseen field conditions.

The study additionally considers requirements for responsible diagnostic interpretation. Automated image recognition should be viewed as decision support rather than definitive plant-pathology confirmation when symptoms can arise from nutrient deficiency, environmental stress, or multiple diseases. Reliable agricultural systems should report uncertainty and support expert review where consequences are significant. This objective therefore connects computational classification with practical plant-health assessment and emphasizes the need for field validation before deployment.

3. Review of Literature

3.1 Digital Image Processing for Plant Disease Detection

Pydipati et al. examined citrus-disease identification using color-texture features and discriminant analysis. Their study demonstrated that hue, saturation, intensity, and texture characteristics could

provide useful information for separating healthy and diseased leaves. Camargo and Smith later developed image-processing algorithms for detecting visible disease symptoms and explored pattern classification for identifying causal disease categories. These contributions established important foundations for computational plant-health assessment based on standard color images.

Barbedo reviewed digital image-processing techniques for detecting, quantifying, and classifying plant diseases and discussed challenges involving segmentation and visual symptom diversity. Arivazhagan et al. developed an approach using color transformation, segmentation, and texture features to distinguish diseased plant leaves. Barbedo subsequently proposed an automatic method for detecting and measuring visible symptoms. Together, these studies demonstrate the importance of symptom segmentation and quantitative image description in conventional plant-disease recognition systems.

3.2 Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence in Crop Imaging

Camargo and Smith used support vector classification to distinguish plant-disease patterns from extracted visual features, illustrating the transition from purely rule-based image processing toward machine-learning classification. Sankaran et al. reviewed advanced plant-disease detection approaches and identified machine vision as an important component of automated health monitoring. Machine-learning methods can combine multiple image descriptors simultaneously, but performance depends on whether the selected features remain stable under changes in lighting, crop variety, and symptom severity.

Deep convolutional learning subsequently reduced dependence on manually engineered visual descriptors. Krizhevsky et al. demonstrated the effectiveness of deep convolutional networks for large-scale image classification, while LeCun et al. described broader advances in deep learning. Mohanty et al. later applied deep learning to image-based plant-disease detection using the PlantVillage resource. Such research demonstrated the potential of end-to-end visual learning, while also reinforcing the importance of dataset composition and independent generalization assessment.

3.3 Image Datasets and Practical Recognition Constraints

Hughes and Salathé introduced an open-access plant-health image repository that supported development of computational disease-recognition methods. Mohanty et al. subsequently used PlantVillage images to investigate deep learning across multiple crops and disease categories. Large labeled repositories provide valuable opportunities for model development because they enable standardized comparison. However, dataset images often differ from operational field photographs in background complexity, illumination, leaf orientation, and symptom presentation.

Barbedo's research emphasized that practical plant-disease image analysis is influenced by image acquisition and symptom characteristics. Sladojevic et al. further examined deep neural classification of plant diseases from leaf images. These studies illustrate that automated recognition has progressed from handcrafted visual features toward learned representations. Nevertheless, field deployment requires models to remain reliable when image conditions differ from those represented during training, making external validation an essential component of agricultural computer-vision research.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Design and AI-Assisted Recognition Framework

The present study adopts a hypothetical methodological research design centered on multiclass crop-leaf classification. The proposed pipeline begins with image normalization and leaf segmentation, followed by lesion enhancement and feature preparation. A machine-learning classifier or convolutional network then assigns each image to a predefined disease category. The integrated architecture conceptually combines processed lesion representations with learned convolutional image features. None of the configurations has been implemented for the numerical analysis reported in this manuscript.

Three conceptual recognition approaches are compared. The first extracts color and texture features followed by support vector machine classification. The second uses a convolutional neural network on normalized RGB images. The third uses an AI-assisted hybrid architecture receiving both normalized full-leaf images and processed lesion-region information. All systems conceptually use identical data partitions so that differences in illustrative performance are not created by different evaluation samples or class distributions.

4.2 Hypothetical Crop Image Dataset and Preprocessing

The fictional image dataset contains 1,200 leaf photographs assigned to five categories: healthy, leaf spot, blight, rust, and mildew. Eight hundred forty images are allocated to training, one hundred eighty to validation, and one hundred eighty to independent testing. The dataset is assumed to contain multiple crop species and moderate variations in illumination, orientation, symptom coverage, and background. These images do not correspond to PlantVillage or any other real agricultural image collection.

Image preprocessing conceptually includes resizing to a consistent resolution, normalization of pixel values, color-space conversion for lesion analysis, and segmentation of leaf regions from the background. Training images may also undergo rotation, horizontal reflection, limited scaling, and brightness variation as data augmentation. Augmentation is restricted to the training set to avoid artificially increasing the effective test sample. Image transformations are designed to preserve disease characteristics rather than create unrealistic symptoms.

4.3 Evaluation Procedure and Classification Metrics

The three hypothetical recognition systems are evaluated using the same conceptual test set. Overall accuracy measures the proportion of correctly classified leaf images. Macro precision and macro recall give each disease category equal contribution regardless of frequency, while the macro F1 score summarizes their balance. This approach is appropriate for demonstrating multiclass evaluation because high performance on a frequent category should not completely conceal weak recognition of less common disease classes.

Disease-specific evaluation is also reported for the integrated architecture. Precision indicates the proportion of predicted examples for a disease that are assumed correct, while recall represents the proportion of reference examples successfully identified. F1 combines these measures through their harmonic mean. All numerical values in the analysis are deliberately constructed. A real experiment would additionally require confusion matrices, confidence intervals, repeated training runs, independent field testing, and statistical comparison among recognition systems.

5. Analysis

5.1 Comparative Performance of Disease Recognition Models

The first hypothetical analysis compares conventional feature-based classification, direct convolutional learning, and the integrated AI-assisted architecture. The color-texture SVM is assigned overall accuracy of 82.8%, whereas the conventional CNN achieves 89.4%. The integrated framework records hypothetical accuracy of 92.8%. Macro precision, recall, and F1 demonstrate a similar illustrative pattern. These values show how an empirical comparison could be presented but do not represent actual trained models or measured agricultural performance.

The illustrative improvement assigned to the integrated framework assumes that processed lesion information complements convolutional visual representation. However, preprocessing can also reduce performance if lesion segmentation is inaccurate or removes relevant context. Consequently, these numerical differences cannot establish the superiority of hybrid processing. A genuine study should perform ablation experiments comparing original images, segmented images, and combined inputs to determine whether the image-processing stage provides reproducible predictive benefit.

Table 1: Hypothetical Crop-Disease Recognition Performance

Recognition Model	Accuracy (%)	Macro Precision (%)	Macro Recall (%)	Macro F1 Score (%)
Color-Texture SVM	82.8	82.1	81.6	81.8
Convolutional Neural Network	89.4	89.1	88.8	88.9
AI-Assisted Hybrid Recognition Model	92.8	92.5	92.1	92.3

Note: All values are illustrative and were not generated by an implemented crop-disease recognition system.

5.2 Disease-Specific Recognition Performance

The second hypothetical analysis evaluates the integrated model across individual image categories. The healthy-leaf category records the strongest illustrative F1 score at 94.5%, while rust produces the lowest value at 90.5%. Blight, leaf spot, and mildew fall between these values. The assigned variation illustrates how visually similar lesions and differences in symptom appearance may influence category-level recognition, even when the overall classifier appears comparatively strong.

Disease-specific results provide additional information because a model with high average accuracy can still perform poorly for a particular condition. For agricultural applications, such variation may be important when one disease requires especially timely identification. The illustrative results do not imply that rust is inherently more difficult than other conditions. Actual class difficulty would depend on crop species, image quality, symptom severity, disease stage, and the composition of the training and evaluation datasets.

Table 2: Hypothetical Disease-Specific Performance of the AI-Assisted Model

Image Category	Precision (%)	Recall (%)	F1 Score (%)
Healthy	94.0	95.0	94.5
Leaf Spot	92.0	91.0	91.5
Blight	93.0	92.0	92.5
Rust	91.0	90.0	90.5
Mildew	92.0	91.0	91.5

Note: Categories and performance values are illustrative and do not correspond to any real diagnostic image experiment.

6. Discussion

6.1 Integration of Image Processing and Artificial Intelligence

The hypothetical findings illustrate a methodological rationale for combining traditional image processing with learned visual representations. Segmentation can emphasize symptomatic regions, whereas convolutional models can learn complex spatial patterns directly from images. Earlier image-processing studies demonstrated the usefulness of color and texture analysis, while later deep-learning research reduced dependence on manually specified descriptors. Combining these approaches may provide complementary information when lesion boundaries can be identified reliably.

The benefit of integration nevertheless depends on the accuracy of the preprocessing stage. Incorrect segmentation may exclude disease symptoms, include irrelevant background regions, or alter color characteristics needed for classification. Deep networks may also learn useful features directly without explicit lesion isolation. Therefore, hybrid designs should be evaluated through controlled ablation experiments. The presence of an additional processing stage should not be considered beneficial unless its contribution can be demonstrated independently under identical training and testing conditions.

6.2 Disease Recognition and Visual Symptom Variability

Plant-disease symptoms can differ substantially according to infection stage, crop cultivar, environmental conditions, and the part of the leaf being examined. Different diseases may also produce similar visual patterns, including discoloration and necrotic lesions. Digital image analysis therefore encounters an inherent ambiguity that cannot always be resolved through appearance alone. Sankaran et al. and Barbedo emphasized the diversity of sensing and imaging challenges involved in automated plant-health assessment.

The hypothetical category-level variation illustrates why model performance should be interpreted disease by disease. A high aggregate accuracy can be influenced strongly by categories containing visually distinctive symptoms. Field applications may also include mixed disease, nutrient deficiency, insect damage, or environmental stress that was absent from the training labels. Future

studies should therefore include challenging negative examples and unknown-condition handling rather than forcing every observed symptom into one predefined disease category.

6.3 Evaluation and Agricultural Applicability

Automated crop-disease recognition requires evaluation under conditions resembling its intended use. Laboratory datasets with isolated leaves and uniform backgrounds are useful for model development but may produce optimistic performance estimates compared with field photography. Mohanty et al. demonstrated the potential of deep learning using a large plant-image resource, while broader plant-disease imaging literature has emphasized the importance of acquisition conditions. External testing is therefore essential before operational performance claims are made.

Agricultural applicability also depends on how predictions are communicated. A recognition system may provide a probability or ranked set of possible disease categories rather than a definitive diagnosis. This can help users identify cases requiring further inspection. Computer-vision tools are most defensible when they complement agronomic expertise and established diagnostic procedures. Future systems should therefore combine predictive accuracy with uncertainty reporting, practical usability, and mechanisms for expert verification when disease symptoms are ambiguous.

7. Challenges

7.1 Image Quality and Environmental Variation

Field images can contain shadows, reflections, uneven illumination, soil backgrounds, overlapping leaves, and differences in camera distance. These variations may influence both lesion segmentation and deep-learning representations. A model trained mainly on uniform images may learn shortcuts associated with image acquisition rather than genuine disease symptoms. Barbedo's work on digital plant-disease analysis illustrates the importance of acquisition conditions and the practical limitations created by complex backgrounds and visual variability.

Environmental variation also changes the appearance of plant tissue itself. Leaf age, moisture, sunlight exposure, and cultivar characteristics can modify color and texture independently of disease. Data collection should therefore include diverse healthy examples and multiple levels of symptom severity. Controlled augmentation can increase variation during training, but synthetic transformations cannot fully substitute for genuine field diversity. External evaluation remains necessary to determine whether a recognition model generalizes beyond its original image collection.

7.2 Similar Symptoms and Disease Classification Ambiguity

Different plant disorders may produce visually overlapping symptoms. Yellowing can arise from disease, nutrient imbalance, water stress, or natural senescence, while necrotic lesions may appear in several unrelated conditions. Image-only models can therefore encounter cases that are not uniquely diagnosable from visible appearance. Treating all classification errors as computational failures may ignore genuine diagnostic ambiguity in the source images.

Another difficulty arises from disease progression. Early symptoms may occupy small regions and show limited visual contrast, whereas advanced infection may substantially alter leaf structure. A model trained mostly on severe disease examples could fail to recognize early-stage symptoms. Reliable datasets should therefore include multiple severity levels and carefully verified labels. Disease-

recognition systems should also provide an uncertain or unknown category when evidence is insufficient rather than always forcing a specific diagnosis.

7.3 Dataset Bias and Model Generalization

Agricultural image datasets may contain unintended correlations between disease categories and background, camera type, crop variety, or acquisition location. A deep model can exploit these patterns because they help classification within the dataset even though they are unrelated to disease biology. Random image splitting may not reveal such bias when visually similar photographs from the same acquisition session appear in both training and testing sets. Dataset construction therefore requires careful separation procedures.

Model generalization should be evaluated using images collected under new conditions. Cross-location, cross-season, or cross-device testing can provide stronger evidence than random partitioning alone. Computationally strong models may still fail when disease appearance changes or when previously unseen crop varieties are introduced. Future agricultural AI studies should therefore report both internal test performance and independent external validation, particularly when the intended application involves field-based disease recognition.

8. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence-assisted digital image analysis provides a useful methodological framework for recognizing visible crop diseases. The present hypothetical study combined image preprocessing, lesion-oriented processing, and convolutional classification within a conceptual recognition architecture. It also demonstrated how conventional feature-based machine learning, direct CNN classification, and integrated approaches can be compared through common evaluation metrics.

The illustrative analysis assigned the highest overall performance to the integrated AI-assisted configuration and demonstrated variation across disease categories. These values are completely hypothetical and cannot establish empirical superiority. Actual claims would require verified image data, implemented models, repeated experiments, independent testing, and careful assessment under uncontrolled field conditions.

The study concludes that reliable crop-disease recognition depends on more than classifier complexity. Image diversity, symptom ambiguity, preprocessing quality, external validation, and uncertainty handling are equally important. Future research should emphasize representative field datasets, early-stage symptoms, mixed conditions, and cross-location evaluation to determine whether AI-assisted image recognition can provide dependable agricultural decision support.

References

1. Barbedo, J. G. A. (2013). Digital image processing techniques for detecting, quantifying and classifying plant diseases. SpringerPlus, 2, Article 660. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-1801-2-660>
2. Barbedo, J. G. A. (2016). A review on the main challenges in automatic plant disease identification based on visible range images. Biosystems Engineering, 144, 52–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2016.01.017>
3. Barbedo, J. G. A. (2018). Factors influencing the use of deep learning for plant disease recognition. Biosystems Engineering, 172, 84–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2018.05.013>

4. Boulent, J., Foucher, S., Théau, J., & St-Charles, P.-L. (2019). Convolutional neural networks for the automatic identification of plant diseases. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 10, Article 941. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2019.00941>
5. Ferentinos, K. P. (2018). Deep learning models for plant disease detection and diagnosis. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 145, 311–318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2018.01.009>
6. Hughes, D. P., & Salathé, M. (2015). An open access repository of images on plant health to enable the development of mobile disease diagnostics. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.08060>
7. Kamilaris, A., & Prenafeta-Boldú, F. X. (2018). Deep learning in agriculture: A survey. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 147, 70–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2018.02.016>
8. Mohanty, S. P., Hughes, D. P., & Salathé, M. (2016). Using deep learning for image-based plant disease detection. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 7, Article 1419. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.01419>
9. Sladojevic, S., Arsenovic, M., Anderla, A., Culibrk, D., & Stefanovic, D. (2016). Deep neural networks based recognition of plant diseases by leaf image classification. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2016, Article 3289801. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/3289801>
10. Too, E. C., Yujian, L., Njuki, S., & Yingchun, L. (2019). A comparative study of fine-tuning deep learning models for plant disease identification. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 161, 272–279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2018.03.032>
11. Yao, J., Tran, S. N., Garg, S., & Sawyer, S. (2024). Deep learning for plant identification and disease classification from leaf images: Multi-prediction approaches. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(6), Article 153. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3639816>
12. Das, P. K., Rupa, S. S., Pumrin, S., Das, U. C., & Hossen, M. K. (2024). Deep learning for plant disease detection and classification: A systematic analysis and review. *Current Applied Science and Technology*, 24(4), Article e0259016. <https://doi.org/10.55003/cast.2024.259016>
13. Pacal, I., Kunduracioglu, I., Alma, M. H., Deveci, M., Kadry, S., Nedoma, J., Slany, V., & Martinek, R. (2024). A systematic review of deep learning techniques for plant diseases. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 57, Article 304. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-024-10944-7>
14. Natarajan, S., Chakrabarti, P., & Margala, M. (2024). Robust diagnosis and meta visualizations of plant diseases through deep neural architecture with explainable AI. *Scientific Reports*, 14, Article 13695. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-64601-8>
15. Shukla, P. K., Duhan, M., Gulia, P., and colleagues. (2024). An analysis to investigate plant disease identification based on machine learning techniques. *Expert Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/exsy.13576>
16. Revolutionizing crop disease detection with computational deep learning: A comprehensive review. (2024). *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 196, Article 302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-024-12454-z>
17. Feature engineering to identify plant diseases using image processing and artificial intelligence: A comprehensive review. (2024). *Smart Agricultural Technology*, 8, Article 100480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atech.2024.100480>
18. Plant leaf disease detection, classification, and diagnosis using computer vision and artificial intelligence: A review. (2024). *IEEE Access*, 12, 37443–37469. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3373001>



19. Advances and challenges in computer vision for image-based plant disease detection: A comprehensive survey of machine and deep learning approaches. (2024). IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering, 22, 2639–2670. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TASE.2024.3382731>
20. Semantic segmentation for plant leaf disease classification and damage detection: A deep learning approach. (2024). Smart Agricultural Technology, 9, Article 100526. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atech.2024.100526>