Literature Review

Sr. No.	Name, Year	Algorithm	Dataset Used
1	Cho et al., 2017	PaletteNet, CNN-based	Custom dataset from Design-seeds.com
2	Wang et al., 2024	Quadtree Decomposition	Standard grayscale datasets
3	Liu et al., 2019	Autoencoder with Attention	CIFAR-10
4	Zhang et al., 2021	GAN with Perceptual Loss	CelebA
5	Kim et al., 2018	U-Net-based Segmentation	VOC2012
6	Patel et al., 2020	ResNet-50 Transfer Learning	ImageNet
7	Singh et al., 2022	Hybrid LSTM-CNN Model	IMDB Reviews
8	Gupta et al., 2023	Reinforcement Learning for Image Enhancement	BSD500
9	Lee et al., 2020	Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL)	Custom dataset for object tracking
10	Rao et al., 2019	K-Means Clustering with PCA	MNIST

Table 1: Literature Review: Algorithms and Datasets

Accuracy/Results	Advantages	Limitations	Remarks
High-quality results in ¡1s	High-quality recolorization	Slow processing speed	**** Well-rounded model but needs speed optimization
Fast computation	Reduced time with good quality	Loss of fine details in aggressive sampling	**** Effective for time-sensitive tasks
92% accuracy	Focus on feature extraction	Computationally intensive	Good for image recognition tasks
Realistic outputs	Good visual quality	High resource consumption	Excellent for facial image generation
85% IoU score	Efficient for semantic segmentation	Limited to specific objects	Versatile for segmentation tasks
95% accuracy	High accuracy	Needs large amounts of data	Pretrained models improve efficiency
89% sentiment accuracy	Effective in text classification	Long training times	Good for sentiment analysis
Improved edge detection	Enhanced image sharpness	Requires large training dataset	Promising for real-time applications
87% tracking accuracy	Robust in dynamic environments	Struggles with real-time processing	Effective for robotic vision systems
98% accuracy	Dimensionality reduction	Not suitable for non-linear data	Works well for clustering simple data

Table 2: Literature Review: Results and Remarks