North Asian International Research Journal of Sciences, Engineering & I.T.

IRJIF. I.F. : 3.821

ISSN: 2454-7514 Vol. 12, Issue-7, July-2026

Index Copernicus Value: 52.88 Indian Citation Index Thomson Reuters ID: S-8304-2016

NAIRJC UGC-Aligned | HEI-Approved Peer Reviewed Refereed Journal (Under New UGC Guidelines)

DOI: doiglobal.org/10.2026/NAIRJCSEIT.004

AUTOMATED DETECTION AND CLASSIFICATION OF PLANT LEAF DISEASES Using Digital Image Processing and Machine Learning

***Dr. Nagamani H S (MS, Mphil, Ph.D)**

**Associate Professor, Department of Computer Science, Smt VHD Central Institute of Home Science, (MCU) Seshadri Road, Bengaluru 560001, Karnataka, India,*

Email: nagamani.hs@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Plant diseases are a major cause of reduced agricultural productivity and frequently appear as visible changes in leaf colour, texture, shape and surface structure. Manual diagnosis depends on expertise and may be slow when large agricultural areas require monitoring. This paper presents a computer-aided framework for automated plant leaf disease detection using digital image processing and machine learning. The proposed pipeline consists of image acquisition, preprocessing, leaf segmentation, diseased-region identification, feature extraction, classification and performance evaluation. Colour statistics, Gray-Level Co-occurrence Matrix (GLCM) texture measures and morphological descriptors are considered as handcrafted features, while convolutional neural networks and transfer learning provide an alternative end-to-end approach. The paper discusses Support Vector Machine, Random Forest, K-Nearest Neighbour and CNN-based classification, together with accuracy, precision, recall and F1-score. Particular attention is given to dataset quality, field-condition variability, class imbalance and the risk of reporting inflated results from controlled images. The study concludes that a hybrid, carefully validated image-processing system can provide an efficient foundation for low-cost plant disease screening, particularly when combined with mobile and edge-computing technologies.

Keywords: *Digital Image Processing, Plant Disease Detection, Image Segmentation, Machine Learning, Computer Vision, GLCM, CNN, Transfer Learning.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Digital image processing is a core area of computer science concerned with the acquisition, enhancement, transformation, segmentation and computational interpretation of images. Its applications extend across medical imaging, remote sensing, biometrics, industrial inspection, intelligent transportation, agriculture and artificial intelligence.

Agriculture is particularly suitable for image-based analysis because many plant diseases generate visible symptoms. These may include yellowing, necrotic lesions, fungal patches, colour variation, deformation and irregular texture. A computer vision system can analyse these visual signals and assist in distinguishing healthy from diseased tissue.

Traditional diagnosis through visual inspection remains valuable, but it can be affected by subjectivity, limited access to experts and the difficulty of repeatedly examining large crop areas. Smartphone cameras and inexpensive computing devices have made automated image analysis increasingly practical. The research challenge is not merely to classify clean laboratory images, but to construct methods that remain reliable under changes in illumination, background, camera quality, disease severity and leaf orientation.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To examine the role of digital image processing in automated plant disease detection.
2. To design a systematic image-processing pipeline for leaf-image analysis.
3. To study preprocessing, segmentation and morphological processing techniques.
4. To extract colour, texture and shape features associated with diseased regions.
5. To compare conventional machine-learning classifiers with deep-learning approaches.
6. To define appropriate performance metrics for disease classification.
7. To identify practical limitations affecting field deployment.
8. To propose directions for mobile, edge and explainable disease-detection systems.

3. RESEARCH PROBLEM AND QUESTIONS

The central research problem is: How can digital image processing and machine-learning techniques automatically identify and classify visible plant diseases from leaf images while remaining robust to real-world imaging conditions?

- Which preprocessing methods best reduce noise and illumination variation?
- How can the leaf and diseased regions be segmented from complex backgrounds?
- Which colour, texture and morphological features provide useful discriminatory information?
- How do SVM, Random Forest and KNN compare with CNN and transfer-learning models?
- How should model performance be evaluated when disease classes are imbalanced?

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The proposed study follows an experimental methodology. Images are collected from a public plant-health dataset and, where possible, supplemented with field photographs. The dataset should contain healthy leaves and multiple disease categories. Images are cleaned, labelled and divided into training, validation and independent testing subsets. A 70:15:15 split may be used as a starting point, although stratified cross-validation is preferable when individual classes contain relatively few samples.

The experimental pipeline is: Image Acquisition → Preprocessing → Leaf Segmentation → Diseased Region Detection → Feature Extraction → Classification → Evaluation. Conventional feature-based classifiers and deep-learning models should be evaluated on the same held-out test set to ensure a fair comparison.

5. IMAGE ACQUISITION AND DATASET PREPARATION

Image acquisition strongly influences the reliability of every subsequent stage. Public datasets provide standardised images that are useful for reproducible experiments, while field images provide a more realistic test of generalisation. A robust dataset should contain variation in illumination, camera angle, leaf orientation, symptom severity and background.

Data leakage must be avoided. Near-duplicate images or multiple photographs of the same physical leaf should not be distributed across training and testing sets because this can produce unrealistically high accuracy. Class labels should be verified and class distributions documented.

6. IMAGE PREPROCESSING

Raw images may contain sensor noise, shadows, irrelevant background and differences in scale. Preprocessing attempts to standardise the input while preserving diagnostically important information.

6.1 Resizing

Images can be resized to a common spatial resolution. CNN architectures often use inputs such as 224 × 224 pixels, although the optimal size depends on the model and lesion scale. Excessive down-sampling can remove small disease spots.

6.2 Noise Reduction

Median filtering can suppress impulse noise while preserving edges, whereas Gaussian filtering reduces high-frequency variation. The filter strength should remain moderate because aggressive smoothing can destroy lesion boundaries and texture.

6.3 Colour-Space Transformation

RGB is intuitive but strongly couples colour with illumination. HSV separates hue and saturation from brightness, while CIELAB separates lightness from approximately opponent colour dimensions. These representations can make disease-related chromatic changes easier to isolate.

6.4 Contrast Enhancement

Histogram equalisation and Contrast Limited Adaptive Histogram Equalization (CLAHE) can improve local contrast. CLAHE is useful when illumination varies across an image, but enhancement parameters should be controlled to avoid amplifying noise.

7. LEAF AND DISEASE SEGMENTATION

Segmentation partitions an image into meaningful regions. The first objective is normally to separate the leaf from the background; the second is to identify potentially diseased tissue within the leaf.

7.1 Thresholding and Otsu Method

Thresholding classifies pixels according to intensity or colour. Otsu's method automatically selects a threshold that maximises between-class variance and can be effective when foreground and background form distinguishable distributions.

7.2 K-Means Clustering

K-means groups pixels according to feature similarity. For image segmentation, pixel vectors may contain colour-space coordinates. The objective is to minimise within-cluster squared distance: : $J = \Sigma_j \Sigma_{x_i \in C_j} ||x_i - \mu_j||^2$, where μ_j is the centroid of cluster C_j.

7.3 Morphological Processing

Binary masks frequently contain isolated noise and small holes. Erosion removes small foreground structures, dilation expands foreground regions, opening removes isolated noise, and closing fills small gaps. These operations can improve lesion masks before feature extraction.

8. FEATURE EXTRACTION

Feature extraction converts visual characteristics into compact numerical descriptors. Handcrafted features remain useful because they are computationally inexpensive and relatively interpretable.

8.1 Colour Features

Mean and standard deviation of RGB, HSV or LAB channels, colour histograms and colour moments can represent changes in pigmentation. Disease-related chlorosis, browning and fungal growth often produce measurable shifts in these statistics.

8.2 Texture Features Using GLCM

The Gray-Level Co-occurrence Matrix describes how often pairs of grey levels occur at a specified spatial relationship. Common descriptors include contrast, energy, homogeneity and correlation. These measures can capture roughness, spotting and local texture changes that are not represented by colour alone.

8.3 Shape and Morphological Features

Area, perimeter, circularity, eccentricity, lesion-to-leaf area ratio and boundary irregularity can describe the geometry of visible symptoms. Combining colour, texture and morphology often provides a richer representation than any single feature family.

9. MACHINE-LEARNING CLASSIFICATION

9.1 Support Vector Machine

Support Vector Machine constructs a separating hyperplane with maximum margin between classes. Kernel functions allow nonlinear separation and can be effective when the feature vector is high-dimensional but the dataset is moderate in size.

9.2 Random Forest

Random Forest combines many decision trees trained on sampled observations and features. It handles nonlinear interactions, is comparatively resistant to overfitting and can provide feature-importance estimates.

9.3 K-Nearest Neighbour

KNN assigns a sample according to nearby labelled feature vectors. It is simple and useful as a baseline, but prediction becomes expensive with large datasets and performance can deteriorate when irrelevant or differently scaled features are included.

10. CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORKS

Convolutional Neural Networks learn hierarchical visual representations directly from pixel data. Early layers commonly learn edges and simple textures, while deeper layers learn increasingly complex patterns. A basic architecture may follow: Input → Convolution → Activation → Pooling → Convolution → Pooling → Fully Connected Layer → Softmax.

CNNs reduce dependence on manually engineered features but require careful regularisation, sufficient training diversity and rigorous testing. Data augmentation such as rotation, translation, scale variation and mild colour transformations can improve generalisation when used appropriately.

11. TRANSFER LEARNING AND MOBILE DEPLOYMENT

Transfer learning adapts a model pretrained on a large image dataset to a specialised plant-disease task. Architectures such as ResNet, DenseNet, EfficientNet and MobileNet can be fine-tuned by replacing or retraining their final classification layers. This approach can reduce training time and improve performance when the available agricultural dataset is limited.

MobileNet and related efficient architectures are attractive for smartphone and edge deployment because they reduce computational and memory requirements. Quantisation and model pruning may further reduce inference cost, but accuracy and latency should both be measured.

12. PROPOSED SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE

1. Capture or upload a plant leaf image.
2. Resize and normalise the image.
3. Reduce noise and correct contrast where necessary.
4. Segment the leaf from the background.
5. Detect candidate diseased regions.
6. Extract colour, GLCM texture and morphological features for conventional models.
7. Apply the trained classifier or a fine-tuned CNN.
8. Return healthy/diseased status and probable disease class.
9. Display confidence and, where available, highlight the suspected region.

13. ALGORITHM

1. Input: RGB leaf image I.
2. Resize I to the model's required dimensions.
3. Apply noise reduction and optional contrast correction.
4. Convert I to HSV or LAB for segmentation.
5. Generate leaf mask M and remove background.
6. Apply clustering/thresholding to locate candidate lesions.
7. Clean mask using morphological opening/closing.
8. Extract colour, GLCM and shape feature vector F.
9. Predict class using trained SVM/Random Forest, or pass processed image to CNN.
10. Output predicted class, confidence score and lesion mask.

14. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A confusion matrix records True Positives (TP), True Negatives (TN), False Positives (FP) and False Negatives (FN). Standard metrics are:

$$\textbf{Accuracy} = (\textbf{TP} + \textbf{TN}) / (\textbf{TP} + \textbf{TN} + \textbf{FP} + \textbf{FN})$$

$$\textbf{Precision} = \textbf{TP} / (\textbf{TP} + \textbf{FP})$$

$$\textbf{Recall} = \textbf{TP} / (\textbf{TP} + \textbf{FN})$$

$$\textbf{F1-score} = 2 \times (\textbf{Precision} \times \textbf{Recall}) / (\textbf{Precision} + \textbf{Recall})$$

For multi-class disease recognition, macro-averaged and class-wise precision, recall and F1-score should be reported. Accuracy alone can be misleading when some disease classes are much larger than others.

15. EXPERIMENTAL COMPARISON FRAMEWORK

Model	**Input / Features**	**Main Strength**	**Important Limitation**
KNN	Handcrafted features	Simple baseline	Sensitive to scaling and dataset size
SVM	Colour + GLCM + shape	Strong on moderate feature sets	Kernel/parameter selection required
Random Forest	Combined features	Nonlinear and interpretable	May need many trees
Custom CNN	Raw/processed images	Learns visual features automatically	Needs data and computation
MobileNet Transfer Learning	Images + pretrained features	Efficient for mobile deployment	Domain shift can reduce field accuracy

The table defines an experimental comparison rather than fabricated results. Numerical accuracy should be inserted only after executing the models on a documented test set.

16. EXPECTED FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A conventional SVM or Random Forest model is expected to provide a strong baseline when segmentation and handcrafted features are reliable. Deep models are expected to learn more complex representations and may outperform handcrafted methods when sufficient diverse training data are available. However, a model trained only on clean, single-leaf images may fail when tested on cluttered field photographs.

The most meaningful result is therefore not necessarily the highest laboratory accuracy. A scientifically stronger system is one that maintains acceptable sensitivity across disease classes, remains robust to imaging variation and reports limitations transparently.

17. ADVANTAGES OF THE PROPOSED APPROACH

- Rapid preliminary screening
- Objective and repeatable image analysis
- Potential smartphone implementation
- Scalable crop monitoring
- Early visual symptom identification
- Integration with agricultural advisory platforms
- Possibility of offline edge inference

18. LIMITATIONS

Several limitations must be acknowledged. Different diseases may have visually similar symptoms, while nutrient deficiencies and environmental stress can imitate infection. Very early symptoms may be too small to detect from ordinary photographs. Lighting, shadows and background clutter can alter segmentation. Dataset labels may contain errors, and performance on curated datasets may overestimate real-world accuracy. Image-based prediction should therefore be treated as decision support rather than definitive biological diagnosis.

19. FUTURE SCOPE

Future work can integrate disease recognition with object detection, semantic segmentation, hyperspectral imaging, drone monitoring, Internet of Things sensors and geographic information systems. Explainable AI can highlight image regions responsible for a prediction. Federated learning may allow distributed model improvement without centralising all farm images. Lightweight models can enable real-time offline inference on smartphones and edge devices.

20. CONCLUSION

Digital image processing and machine learning provide a practical framework for automated analysis of visible plant disease symptoms. Preprocessing, segmentation, GLCM texture analysis, colour statistics and morphological descriptors offer an interpretable conventional pipeline, while CNNs and transfer learning provide powerful alternatives that learn features directly from images.

For credible computer-science research, model evaluation must extend beyond a single accuracy value. Independent testing, class-wise metrics, prevention of data leakage and evaluation on realistic field images are essential. A carefully validated hybrid system can form the basis of low-cost agricultural screening tools and illustrates the wider value of image processing in intelligent decision-support systems.

REFERENCES

1. Gonzalez, R. C., & Woods, R. E. Digital Image Processing. Pearson.
2. Szeliski, R. Computer Vision: Algorithms and Applications. Springer.
3. Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., & Courville, A. Deep Learning. MIT Press.
4. Bishop, C. M. Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning. Springer.
5. Mohanty, S. P., Hughes, D. P., & Salathé, M. (2016). Using Deep Learning for Image-Based Plant Disease Detection. Frontiers in Plant Science, 7, 1419.
6. Hughes, D. P., & Salathé, M. (2015). An Open Access Repository of Images on Plant Health to Enable the Development of Mobile Disease Diagnostics.
7. Haralick, R. M., Shanmugam, K., & Dinstein, I. (1973). Textural Features for Image Classification. IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics.
8. Cortes, C., & Vapnik, V. (1995). Support-Vector Networks. Machine Learning, 20, 273–297.
9. Breiman, L. (2001). Random Forests. Machine Learning, 45, 5–32.
10. Howard, A. G., et al. (2017). MobileNets: Efficient Convolutional Neural Networks for Mobile Vision Applications.