

Received 12 June 2025, accepted 21 July 2025, date of publication 5 August 2025, date of current version 11 September 2025.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/ACCESS.2025.3595943



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Enhanced Sign Language Translation Between American Sign Language and Indian Sign Language Using LLMs

MALAY KUMAR^{ID1}, S. SARVAJIT VISAGAN^{ID1}, TANISH MAHAJAN^{ID1}, ANISHA NATARAJAN^{ID2}, (Member, IEEE), AND P. S. SREEJA^{ID1}

¹School of Computer Science and Engineering, Vellore Institute of Technology, Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600127, India

²School of Electronics Engineering, Vellore Institute of Technology, Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600127, India

Corresponding author: Anisha Natarajan (anisha.natarajan@vit.ac.in)

ABSTRACT This research introduces a foundational framework aimed at bridging the communication gap between American Sign Language (ASL) and Indian Sign Language (ISL) by translating alphabet-level gestures. The proposed system employs a hybrid deep learning model for ASL gesture recognition, integrating a random forest classifier (RFC) and a convolutional neural network (CNN) to enhance accuracy. Recognised gestures are converted into text, which is refined using a prompt-configured large language model (LLM) for contextual and grammatical accuracy. The corrected text is then synthesised into ISL gestures using RIFE-Net, a real-time intermediate flow estimation network, to generate smooth and natural gesture videos. The framework addresses key challenges such as gesture variability and linguistic differences between ASL and ISL. The hybrid model achieves a gesture recognition accuracy of 93.0%, measuring how accurately the system identifies ASL signs. Following recognition, the raw text output is refined using the Large Language Model (LLM), resulting in a text correction accuracy of 94.2%, which reflects improvements in grammatical correctness and contextual relevance. These metrics collectively demonstrate the system's effectiveness in alphabet-level recognition and gesture synthesis, laying the groundwork for more advanced sentence-level translation. Initial experimental results demonstrate real-time processing capabilities, averaging one gesture per second, with video outputs at 60 FPS. This system not only facilitates seamless communication between ASL and ISL users but also lays the groundwork for scalability to other sign language pairs. The results highlight the potential to improve accessibility and inclusion of the global hard of hearing community, paving the way for future research in multi-modal sign language translation systems.

INDEX TERMS American sign language (ASL), Indian sign language (ISL), sign language translation, large language models (LLM), random forest classifier, convolutional neural network, natural language processing (NLP), RIFE-Net, gesture recognition, real-time translation.

I. INTRODUCTION

The communication gap between American Sign Language (ASL) and Indian Sign Language (ISL) poses a significant challenge to intercultural interaction and accessibility within the hard of hearing community [1], [2], [3]. Sign language is an essential tool of communication for hard of hearing individuals. However, the lack of interoperability between ASL and ISL hinders effective communication

The associate editor coordinating the review of this manuscript and approving it for publication was Ikramullah Lali.

across linguistic and cultural boundaries. Addressing this challenge requires innovative strategies that take advantage of modern machine translation technologies and deep learning frameworks [4], [5].

The central goal of this research is to develop a holistic framework for machine translation that efficiently translates ASL gestures into ISL gestures, thus facilitating seamless communication between ASL and ISL users. It is important to note that the current scope is limited to static alphabet-level gestures. The system does not yet support recognition of full ASL sentences or dynamic gestures. However, this serves

as a stepping stone toward more complex sign language translation tasks. Our proposed approach combines advanced image recognition techniques with cutting-edge language processing algorithms powered by Large Language Models (LLMs) [7], [14], [36].

Rather than relying on only traditional convolutional neural network (CNN) based recognition techniques, which often struggle with nuanced gesture interpretation, our framework employs LLM-driven methods to decode recognized ASL gestures into meaningful textual representations as an intermediate step, which ensures accurate and context-sensitive translation into ISL gestures [6], [8], [9], [10]. This approach allows us to preserve linguistic nuances, such as sign syntax, and cultural expressions unique to ISL. Integrating LLM improves accuracy, adaptability, and cultural sensitivity, bridging the communication gap between ASL and ISL. By providing a seamless translation experience, this framework has the potential to significantly improve accessibility and intercultural interaction for the hard of hearing community [39].

A. LEVERAGING DEEP LEARNING FOR GESTURE RECOGNITION AND TRANSLATION

Sign language communication involves complex expressions that carry a certain range of linguistic and cultural nuances in communication. Conventional sign language understanding and translation techniques rely primarily on fixed datasets and pre-built models. Such approaches struggle to adapt to the dynamic nature of sign languages. In this paper, these constraints were overcome by using Random Forest Classifiers for effective gesture recognition, followed by Large Language Models to assist in context-aware translation. The proposed framework, therefore, would represent a breakthrough in integrating real-time processing capabilities and cultural contextualization.

The significance of this work lies in its introduction of an intermediate text-based representation that serves as the connecting link between recognition and the synthesis of gestures. This linguistic intermediate allows for not only a more literal translation, but also allows the tailoring of the translation method in such a way as to keep the intent and cultural nuances of the original expression. This model would become especially important for the reduction of linguistic differences between ASL and ISL, such as differing grammatical structures, word orders, and contextual expressions. Further, generating ISL gestures from translated text with the assistance of RIFE-Net produces a smooth and natural gesture presentation. Such a robust ability of RIFE-Net to effectively handle high variability within gesture sequences leads it to accurately reproduce ISL gestures even while making forward-looking predictions of potentially complex or subtle translations. With advanced recognition, translation, and synthesis modules integrated, the framework places it at the forefront of a cutting-edge tool in the domain of sign language translation.

B. TOWARDS A MULTI-DIALECTAL FUTURE

Though designed specifically for ASL and ISL, the underpinning principles and methodologies may be adapted to support more languages, other than the aforementioned targeted sign language dialects. By adapting the system to use a variety of datasets, it follows that it is viable to address the diversity in sign languages globally, thereby paving the way for universal sign language interoperability. Moreover, this adaptability brings out the scale of using LLMs for translation purposes as it opens up broader applications in assistive technologies. This research promises to formulate an integrated approach combining gesture recognition, natural language processing, and synthesis of gestures to bridge the communication gap, hence present in sign language communities. This is an advance in both technical aspects and towards furthering the scope of inclusivity and exchange across the world's hard of hearing community.

The contributions of this work are:

- Proposes a hybrid model comprising an RFC and a CNN for enhanced sign language recognition accuracy.
- Integration of a prompt-engineered Large Language Model (LLM) to refine recognised ASL gestures into grammatically and contextually accurate text, addressing ambiguities and ensuring semantic clarity.
- A text-to-ISL gesture mapping module, followed by the use of RIFE-Net (Real-Time Intermediate Flow Estimation Network) to synthesise smooth and natural sign videos, preserving ISL-specific syntax and motion continuity.
- Complete end-to-end description of the proposed sign language translation pipeline.

The paper is structured as follows: Section II provides a review of existing research in the area of sign language translation. Section III lays down a detailed description of the proposed sign language translation system and its implementation. Discussion of the results obtained is provided in Section IV. The manuscript is concluded in Section V and future directions are presented in Section VI.

II. LITERATURE SURVEY

Recognition and translation of sign languages have attracted a lot of focus in the recent past because of their pivotal role in improving communication between hard of hearing and mute people. Presenting an overview of the literature in this field, this literature review identifies methodologies, techniques, and challenges in sign language recognition and translation systems.

Rao et al. proposed a system for translating spoken language into sign language, emphasising the importance of linguistic processing in the translation pipeline. Their approach utilised the Natural Language Toolkit (NLTK) for tasks such as tokenisation and part-of-speech tagging to enhance the accuracy of sign language generation [1]. A popular review by Al-Qureshi et al. focused on profiling the sign language recognition model through deep learning

approaches, including challenges and recent milestones [2]. Salian et al. also presented a system for sign language recognition to set the background for subsequent work in this domain [3].

Mubashira and James proposed a Transformer Network for video-to-text translation, demonstrating how transformers are effective in sign language recognition [4]. Halder and Tayade, in a recent study that designed a real-time vernacular sign language recognition system using MediaPipe and machine learning, propose the possibility of real-time applications in this field [5]. Also, in Korean sign language recognition, Shin et al. proposed a Transformer-based deep neural network. They demonstrated how deep learning can be applied to sign language recognition regardless of the type of sign language [6].

Saleem et al. provided an outstanding full-duplex sign language communication system based on machine learning, capable of translating multiple sign languages. The problem of sign language communication technology for the hard of hearing community has received continued attention [7]. Wang et al. proposed an enhanced 3D-ResNet-based sign language recognition algorithm that focuses on improving hand feature extraction using a dual-branch architecture. By integrating an improved EfficientDet network with Bi-FPN and attention modules for precise hand detection, and refining 3D-ResNet18 to separately process global, left-hand, and right-hand features, their method significantly boosts recognition accuracy. Experimental results on the CSL dataset show a Top-1 accuracy of 91.12%, outperforming several recent approaches [8].

Sahoo et al. provided a detailed account of recent approaches to recognising sign languages and major issues [9]. Koller et al. demonstrated that the combination of convolutional neural networks (CNN) with temporal sequence models such as hidden Markov models (HMM) can significantly improve the recognition of continuous sign language gestures, highlighting the benefits of hybrid deep learning approaches in gesture recognition systems [10].

Shenoy et al. have proposed real-time ISL recognition using grid-based feature extraction and machine learning to address the requirements of the Indian hard of hearing and mute community [11]. Sharma and Singh investigated natural language processing methods in the general mapping of speech to Indian Sign Language (ISL) with insights toward a hybrid way of translating sign language [12].

In addition, while Badhe and Kulkarni developed an Indian sign language translator based on gesture recognition algorithms, they noted that feature extraction and motion detection remain decisive factors in designing sign language recognition systems [13].

Furthermore, Jia Gong was motivated by the remarkable translation performance of LLMs and proposed a method to incorporate standard LLMs to address complex Sign Language Translation Tasks [14]. Zhi Gang Chen thought that exploring the gloss-free method is much more crucial because it will greatly decrease the annotation time and promote the

dependence on more accurate and universal sign language translation systems [15].

Although many recent studies have evaluated sign language translation systems using benchmark datasets such as RWTH-PHOENIX-Weather 2014T [37], WSL, or MS-ASL [44], [45], our framework focuses on static letter-level translation and employs custom datasets for both ASL and ISL. These datasets were specifically constructed to address letter-level gesture recognition and ISL gesture synthesis. However, we acknowledge the importance of incorporating standard datasets for improved comparability and plan to integrate them in future iterations of the system.

III. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

This research presents a novel methodology to bridge the communication gap between American Sign Language (ASL) and Indian Sign Language (ISL) through an automated translation system enhanced using large language models (LLMs). The proposed approach comprises three interconnected phases: *Sign Language Recognition*, *Recognised Text Correction*, and *Video Synthesis*. Each phase addresses specific challenges in cross-sign-language translation while maintaining semantic accuracy and natural gesture flow. Currently, semantic accuracy refers to character-level output. The system does not yet handle semantic word disambiguation or sentence construction from dynamic ASL inputs.

The architecture of the proposed system is depicted in Figure 1. The modules of the proposed system are outlined here s

- 1) **Sign Language Recognition Module:** The recognition phase employs a hybrid ensemble model that leverages both Random Forest Classifier (RFC) and Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) to recognise American Sign Language (ASL) gestures from video input.

Pre-processing: A live camera feed captures hand gestures, and two parallel inputs are generated:

- **RFC Input:** Landmark coordinates of 21 points are extracted using the MediaPipe framework.
- **CNN Input:** Silhouette images are generated from hand regions using Otsu-thresholding.

Random Forest Classifier (RFC):

- **Input:** 21 normalized landmark coordinates (x_i, y_i, z_i) per frame.
- **Output:** Predicted ASL alphabet class.
- **Training:** Hyperparameters are optimised via the Grid Search Algorithm.
- **Decision Function:** Final prediction is based on the majority vote across decision trees in the forest. For each class c , the prediction is:

$$\hat{y} = \arg \max_c \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}(h_t(x) = c)$$

where T is the number of trees, h_t is the t -th decision tree, and \mathbb{I} is the indicator function.

Convolutional Neural Network (CNN):




FIGURE 1. Architecture of proposed sign language translation system.

- **Input:** 32×32 pixel silhouette images.
- **Output:** Predicted ASL alphabet class.
- **Training:** Data augmentation includes horizontal flipping, brightness adjustment, and Gaussian noise.
- **Feature Isolation:** The silhouette image helps in isolating key hand features by reducing background noise and lighting variance using Otsu-thresholding:

$$\text{Threshold} = \arg \max_{\theta} \left[\omega_1(\theta) \mu_1^2(\theta) + \omega_2(\theta) \mu_2^2(\theta) \right]$$

where ω_1, ω_2 are class probabilities and μ_1, μ_2 are class means for the background and foreground, respectively.

Ensemble Integration:

The outputs from the RFC and CNN models are combined using weighted voting.

- **Weights:** RFC (0.7), CNN (0.3) based on validation accuracy.

- **Final Output:** Recognized ASL text sequence (e.g., "HELOLO WRLD").

Following the sign language recognition process utilising the proposed hybrid model, the resulting output 'HELOLO WRLD' exhibits certain inconsistencies and inaccuracies. Therefore, a subsequent post-processing phase is employed to refine and correct the recognised text.

- 2) **Recognised Text Correction Module:** The recognised ASL text often contains errors due to the reasons mentioned below:

- **Visual similarity between certain ASL letters** (e.g., 'M' vs. 'N', 'A' vs. 'S'), which often leads to confusion in Silhouette-based classification.
- **Partial occlusion or imperfect hand visibility**, causing landmark misidentification in MediaPipe and thus affecting the RFC's predictions.
- **Variation in lighting conditions, hand size, and orientation**, which sometimes distort the Silhouette generation or 3D landmark accuracy.
- **Frame-level noise or jitter** introduced by rapid gesture transitions or blurred frames during live capture, which may confuse both RFC and CNN classifiers.

After ensemble-based gesture recognition, the output is a raw sequence of ASL characters, and consequently, the output sequence may contain spelling-like errors such as character substitutions, incorrect spellings, missing characters, or unnatural word order, necessitating a robust language model correction phase to restore syntactical and contextual accuracy. These errors can hinder both readability and the effectiveness of gesture synthesis. To correct these recognition-induced errors and ensure grammatical fluency, we employ a Large Language Model (LLM)—specifically, Gemini-1.5 Flash—configured using prompt engineering and few-shot learning to simulate correction behaviour—as a post-processing step. *LLM Correction:*

- **Model:** Gemini-1.5 Flash.
- **Input:** Raw recognized text (e.g., "HELOLO WRLD").
- **Output:** Corrected English text (e.g., "HELLO WORLD").
- **Dataset:** 500 examples of text errors including substitutions, omissions, and reordering.
- **Operation:** Based on a Transformer architecture, the model processes input text as a sequence of tokens and learns the probability distribution over word or character sequences. When processed on our dataset for recognition errors, the model learns to identify likely corrections by leveraging:

Contextual embeddings: The model understands the position and relationship of words or characters within a sentence. For instance, it can

infer that "YUO" is likely a typo for "YOU" based on its position and surrounding words.

Syntactic pattern learning: It models natural grammatical structures and corrects irregularities, such as transforming "GO TO YOU" into "YOU GO".

Noise tolerance: By training on noisy input-output pairs (e.g., "FINEE" → "FINE"), the model becomes robust to real-world spelling and ordering mistakes.

During inference, the model applies these learned patterns to generate the most probable corrected sentence. Unlike traditional rule-based auto-correction systems, the language model adapts to flexible language usage and can correct both shallow spelling errors and deeper syntactic distortions.

- 3) *Video Synthesis Module:* This phase generates Indian Sign Language (ISL) gesture videos from corrected text.

Text-to-ISL Mapping:

- **Input:** Corrected English text.
- **Process:** Each character is mapped to its corresponding ISL image.
- **Special Tokens:** "SPACE" and "BLANK" tokens map to specific pause gestures.
- **Output:** Sequence of ISL gesture frames.

Frame Enhancement:

- **Frame Duplication:** Each gesture frame is duplicated to generate a 24 FPS sequence.
- **RIFE-Net Interpolation:**
 - **FlowNet:** Estimates optical flow between frames.
 - **ContextNet:** Extracts contextual features.
 - **FusionNet:** Synthesizes intermediate frames.
- **Output:** Smooth 60 FPS video.

A detailed explanation of each module mentioned in the previous section for the proposed ASL-to-ISL translation system is provided, covering the dataset preparation process, underlying mathematical models, and the intermediate outputs generated at each stage of the pipeline. The overall system architecture and sequential flow of components are illustrated in Figure 2.

A. SIGN LANGUAGE RECOGNITION

The initial phase employs a hybrid ensemble approach that combines the complementary strengths of a Random Forest Classifier and a Convolutional Neural Network. This RFC+CNN model architecture allows for robust feature extraction and classification of sign language and provides better prediction accuracy [35], [37].

1) RANDOM FOREST CLASSIFIER MODEL

The Random Forest Classifier component focuses on the skeletal approach, which sets a baseline for sign language




FIGURE 2. Pipeline architecture of the proposed ASL-to-ISL translation system.

recognition. It uses the hand-tracking capabilities of the MediaPipe framework for feature extraction [38].

TABLE 1. Dataset distribution and acquisition parameters.

Parameter	Specification	Justification
Image Resolution	32x32 pixels	Optimal balance between detail preservation and computational efficiency
Lighting Conditions	Ambient, Direct, Shadow	Ensures robustness across various lighting scenarios
Background Variation	Background clutter, objects	Improves model generalization
Camera Angles	0°, ±15°, ±30°	Accounts for natural variation in hand positioning
Crop Focus	Hand region	Eliminates irrelevant background information

**FIGURE 3.** American Sign Language dataset sample.

Dataset Preparation: For the above model (RFC), we prepare an image dataset with a sample size of 2800 images (28 distinct classes * 100 images). A subset of the images in the ASL dataset is shown in Figure 3. Specifications of the dataset are shown in Table 1, and it includes the following:

- 26 alphabetic characters (100 images per character).
- Additional classes for ‘DELETE’ and ‘SPACE’ operations.
- A total of 28 distinct classes.

Feature extraction: Employing the MediaPipe framework, we extract 21 prominent landmark points (L) placed on the hand, which serve as the features for training the model [19].

$$L = \{(x_i, y_i, z_i) \mid i \in [1, 21]\} \quad (1)$$

where:

- x_i is the horizontal coordinate (typically normalised between 0 and 1).
- y_i is the vertical coordinate (also normalised between 0 and 1).
- z_i is the depth coordinate, representing the distance of the point from the camera, usually normalised [20].

The coordinates obtained are then processed for normalisation using StandardScaler.

$$x_{\text{normalized}} = \frac{x - \mu_x}{\sigma_x} \quad (2)$$

where μ_x and σ_x represent the mean and standard deviation of the feature distribution, respectively [21].

TABLE 2. RFC hyperparameter configuration.

Parameter	Search Space	Best Value	Impact
n_estimators	[100, 200, 300]	200	Balances complexity and accuracy
max_depth	[None, 10, 20, 30]	20	Controls overfitting
min_samples_split	[2, 5, 10]	5	Ensures robust node splitting
min_samples_leaf	[1, 2, 4]	2	Prediction stability
bootstrap	[True, False]	True	Enables varied tree construction

**FIGURE 4.** Sample Silhouette Image.

Model Architecture and Training: We use the Random Forest Classifier model, whose parameters are optimised through the Grid Search Algorithm. The model parameters were optimised using the Grid Search algorithm, which performs an exhaustive search over a predefined set of hyperparameter values using cross-validation to identify the best-performing combination. The hyperparameters of the Random Forest Classifier are shown in Table 2.

The decision function for the model to predict the class can be expressed as:

$$\hat{y} = \text{mode } \hat{y}_t(x) \quad t = 1^T \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{y}_t(x)$ represents the prediction of the t -th tree, and T is the total number of trees.

2) CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORK MODEL

In the Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) component, silhouette images are utilised to provide complementary visual feature analysis to the landmark-based approach of the Random Forest Classifier (RFC). A silhouette image [22], [23], [24] presents a darkened representation of a subject against a lighter background, typically emphasising the subject’s contour or profile, as illustrated in Figure 4.

The use of silhouette images allows the system to concentrate on the intrinsic structure of hand poses by effectively eliminating background clutter, lighting variations, and other environmental factors. This method isolates the essential features of hand position and configuration, thereby offering a more precise and unambiguous representation for model training [25], [26], [27].

Dataset Preparation: For the CNN model, we generate silhouette images of the American Sign Language (ASL)




FIGURE 5. Silhouette Image American Sign Language dataset.




FIGURE 6. Different Approaches for Generating Silhouette Images
(a) Hist-Thresholding (b) Skin-Colour Segmentation (c) Otsu-thresholding.

with a sample size of 16200 images (27 distinct classes * 600 images). Figure 5 illustrates a sample set from the silhouette image dataset, showing the ASL alphabet for letters A and B. The key features of this dataset are listed below:

- 26 alphabetic characters (600 images per character)
- Additional class for “BLANK” image, which serves as ground truth.
- Image augmentation includes methods such as horizontal flipping (which mirrors images along the vertical axis), brightness variation (where pixel intensities are adjusted by a factor α within the range of [0.8], [1.2]), and the addition of Gaussian noise (which involves perturbing pixel values with noise sampled from a Gaussian distribution with a mean of 0 and a variance of σ^2 [16], [17]).

Silhouette image generation: In the experimental phase, we evaluated three distinct approaches to generate silhouette images: Histogram-based thresholding Figure 6 (a), Skin colour segmentation Figure 6 (b), and Otsu-thresholding Figure 6 (c) [18]. As evident in Figure 6, Otsu-thresholding proved most effective, and the threshold for this technique is given in Equation (4).

$$\text{threshold} = \text{argmax}_t \sigma_B^2(t) \quad (4)$$

where $\sigma_B^2(t)$ is the between-class variance:

$$\sigma_B^2(t) = \omega_0(t)\omega_1(t)[\mu_0(t) - \mu_1(t)]^2 \quad (5)$$

Here, the variables in the equations are defined as:

- t : The threshold value.
- $\sigma_B^2(t)$: The between-class variance at threshold t .

TABLE 3. CNN layer configuration and specifications.

Layer	Configuration	Output Shape	Parameters
Conv2D	16 filters, (2,2) kernel	(31,31,16)	80
MaxPool2D	(2,2) pool, (2,2) stride	(15,15,16)	0
Conv2D	32 filters, (3,3) kernel	(13,13,32)	4,640
MaxPool2D	(3,3) pool, (3,3) stride	(4,4,32)	0
Conv2D	64 filters, (5,5) kernel	(4,4,64)	51,264
MaxPool2D	(5,5) pool, (5,5) stride	(1,1,64)	0
Dense	128 units	(128)	8,320
Dropout	0.2 rate	(128)	0
Dense	num_classes	(num_classes)	varies

- $\omega_0(t)$ and $\omega_1(t)$: The class probabilities for the background and foreground, respectively, at threshold t .
- $\mu_0(t)$ and $\mu_1(t)$: The mean intensity values for the background and foreground classes at threshold t .

Otsu-thresholding Method: Let the image histogram have L intensity levels (e.g., 0–255). For a given threshold t , the image is divided into two classes:

- **Class 0 (background):** All pixels with intensity $\leq t$
- **Class 1 (foreground):** All pixels with intensity $> t$

The class probabilities are calculated as:

$$\omega_0(t) = \sum_{i=0}^t p(i) \quad (6)$$

$$\omega_1(t) = \sum_{i=t+1}^{L-1} p(i) \quad (7)$$

where $p(i)$ is the normalized histogram of intensity level i (i.e., the probability of intensity level i in the image).

These probabilities are used in the computation of the between-class variance $\sigma_B^2(t)$ in the Otsu-thresholding method to find the threshold that best separates the foreground and background.

CNN Architecture: The architectural details of the CNN-based model are shown in Table 3. Training specifications of the CNN model are enumerated below:

- Loss function: Categorical Cross-entropy

$$L = - \sum_{i=1}^C y_i \log(\hat{y}_i) \quad (8)$$

- Optimizer: Adam with learning rate 1×10^{-3}
- Batch size: 32
- Epochs: 100 with early stopping

Ensemble Integration: The CNN and RFC models operate in parallel, not sequentially. Both models receive the same gesture frame but process different types of input representations:

$$P(y|x) = w_{RFC} P_{RFC}(y|x) + w_{CNN} P_{CNN}(y|x) \quad (9)$$

where:

- w_{RFC} and w_{CNN} are the optimised weights for the RFC and CNN models, respectively, determined by validation performance.

TABLE 4. Data characteristics.

Error Type	Percentage	Example Input	Corrected Output
Character Substitution	35%	"hllo"	"hello"
Missing Characters	25%	"wrld"	"world"
Extra Characters	20%	"helploo"	"hello"
Word Order	20%	"you thank"	"thank you"

- $P_{RFC}(y|x)$ and $P_{CNN}(y|x)$ are the class probability distributions for the RFC and CNN models, respectively, given the input x .

RFC: Receives a set of 21 (per hand) 3-dimensional landmark coordinates (x, y, z axes) of the hand extracted using MediaPipe, which capture the skeletal structure of the hand.

CNN: Receives a silhouette image of the hand pose generated from the same frame using Otsu-thresholding, which captures spatial visual features.

Each model independently outputs a predicted ASL class (alphabet letter). These predictions are then fused using a weighted voting mechanism, where the final class is determined by combining the probability outputs of both models $w_{RFC} = 0.7$ and $w_{CNN} = 0.3$, based on validation accuracy results we obtained. This ensures that the strengths of both models are leveraged, and no model is used as input to the other.

This ensemble is crucial because the RFC performs better on structured hand landmarks, while the CNN excels in handling spatial cues in complex visual environments. The fusion ensures a more robust and accurate recognition pipeline.

B. RECOGNIZED TEXT CORRECTION

In this phase, we implement text correction on the recognised text obtained from the sign language recognition phase. We use a prompt-configured large language model to auto-correct the recognised text. To tune the pre-trained LLM, we prepare a dataset containing 500 examples. The dataset distribution is shown in Table 4. The dataset is structured as a collection of text pairs, with each entry containing:

- Input Text: A set of characters or words that may contain typos, scrambled letters, incomplete words, or some non-standard character sequences.
- Output Text: A corrected and meaningful interpretation of the input text. This output contains three variations of grammatically correct phrases, which could be a sentence, a noun phrase, or a meaningful fragment.

Given that our use case is limited to text correction within a predefined context and the number of tokens is not greater than 10, we prioritised the utilisation of lightweight models to ensure efficiency. Our text correction system targets common input errors, including typographical mistakes, minor spelling errors, and character substitutions that frequently occur in user-generated content. For this evaluation, we selected five candidate models based on their

availability, computational efficiency, and suitability for text correction tasks: Gemini-1.5 Flash, GPT-3.5, LLaMA 2 (7B), Claude 3.5, and Perplexity AI. These cloud-deployed models were evaluated to determine the optimal balance between accuracy and computational constraints in our resource-limited environment.

Prompt Design and Few-Shot Training Simulation: All models were evaluated using a custom dataset of 500 noisy-clean text pairs via few-shot prompting to simulate correction capabilities. The simulated correction setup used a consistent few-shot prompt: "You are a text correction system trained to fix common input errors. Given an input string, return the most probable corrected output." While this dataset size is relatively modest, it was designed to represent the most frequent error patterns encountered in our specific use case domain. We acknowledge that larger training datasets could potentially improve performance, but our focus was on achieving acceptable accuracy within computational constraints.

Evaluation Methodology: The models were benchmarked against a separate test set of 100 sample corrections, ensuring no overlap with the training data. For each inference, we measured the total processing time while excluding network latency (approximately 200ms across all models) to focus purely on model performance. We also excluded failed results from our analysis, which included cases where API timeout errors occurred or where the output quality was unacceptable. Output quality was assessed using Levenshtein distance, with a threshold of 2 character differences between the model output and expected correction. This threshold was chosen to allow for minor variations in correction style while maintaining strict quality standards. Results exceeding this threshold were considered failed corrections and excluded from the accuracy calculations.

Results and Analysis: The comprehensive evaluation results are presented in Table 5. The evaluation criteria included accuracy on the test set, average inference time per correction, memory usage during inference, availability of fine-tuning capabilities, support for custom optimisation, and licensing terms.

Model Selection Rationale: Following this evaluation, Gemini-1.5 Flash was selected as the optimal model despite not achieving the highest accuracy (94.2% vs GPT-3.5's 96.8%). This decision was driven by several factors critical to our deployment constraints:

Inference Speed: At 150ms per correction, Gemini-1.5 Flash significantly outperformed other models, enabling real-time text correction capabilities.

Memory Efficiency: With only 2.0GB memory requirements, it was the most resource-efficient option, crucial for our constrained computational environment.

Cost-Performance Balance: The 2.6 percentage point accuracy trade-off compared to GPT-3.5 was deemed acceptable given the 3x improvement in inference speed and 50% reduction in memory usage.

Reliability: Lower timeout rates and more consistent API responses compared to other cloud-deployed options.

TABLE 5. LLM comparison and selection criteria.

Criteria	Gemini-1.5				
	Flash (Selected)	GPT-3.5	LLaMA2 7B	Claude 3.5	Perplexity AI
Accuracy	94.2%	96.8%	95.5%	94.6%	92.7%
Inference Time	150ms	450ms	250ms	500ms	500ms
Memory Usage	2.0GB	4.0GB	3.0GB	8.0GB	8.0GB
Fine-tuning	*Limited	Not Available	Full Control	Limited	Limited
Custom Opt	Limited	No	Yes	Limited	Limited
License	Proprietary	Proprietary	Open Source	Proprietary	Proprietary

Note: Gemini-1.5 Flash and other proprietary models do not support user-level fine-tuning. In this work, “fine-tuning” refers to *simulated tuning via prompt engineering and few-shot learning*.

The selected model meets our primary objectives of providing fast, reliable text correction within computational constraints while maintaining acceptable accuracy levels for the target use case [28], [29], [30].

C. VIDEO SYNTHESIS

The final phase in the ASL–ISL translation pipeline focuses on transforming the corrected text into a natural and smooth video sequence of Indian Sign Language (ISL) gestures.

1) TEXT-TO-ISL MAPPING

The input to this phase is the grammatically corrected English text generated by the LLM (e.g., “HELLO WORLD”).

Each character in the corrected text is mapped to a corresponding static ISL hand gesture image, sourced from our custom ISL dataset containing the 26 alphabet letters (indexed 0–25). These images were captured against a black background, which helps create a high level of contrast and enhances the visibility of hand signs. To ensure uniformity, all images from the ISL dataset will be resized to 128×128 pixels before being used in the output generation process [31], [32], [33].

2) ISL GESTURE GENERATION AND VIDEO SYNTHESIS

After refining the recognised ASL text through LLM-based correction, the system proceeds to generate an ISL gesture video that visually spells out the target word or phrase. This video is synthesised using a three-stage pipeline described below:

1) Frame Retrieval from ISL Bank: Each character in the refined text is mapped to a corresponding static ISL hand gesture image sourced from a pre-built ISL frame bank. This bank includes clear, front-facing images representing each alphabet letter (A–Z), either captured using a native signer or verified from publicly available sources under consistent lighting and pose conditions.

2) Frame Sequence Planning: To simulate natural transitions between gestures, the system forms a sequence

of consecutive letter pairs (e.g., H→E, E→L, etc.). For duplicate letters (such as “P” in “APPLE”), the same frame is held for a longer duration rather than interpolated, maintaining timing consistency. The sequence is designed to preserve spelling accuracy while enabling smooth transitions between dissimilar poses.

3) Temporal Interpolation with RIFE-Net: To animate smooth hand movements between static gesture frames, the Real-Time Intermediate Flow Estimation (RIFE-Net) model is employed. For each adjacent letter pair, RIFE-Net generates intermediate frames by estimating motion flow between the two static images. These interpolated frames are concatenated into the final video, which spells the refined word with continuous, fluid ISL gestures.

The final output is an animated video representing a sequence of ISL alphabet gestures that correspond to the refined textual output. While this approach enables intelligible gesture sequences for basic phrases, it does not produce native ISL glosses or word-level signs. Addressing this limitation remains a key objective for future iterations.

3) FRAME DUPLICATION AND TEMPORAL SMOOTHING

To create a more continuous flow, each gesture frame is duplicated 24 times, producing an intermediate video sequence at 24 FPS. This frame duplication results in a visually smoother output, but it still lacks the natural hand motion transitions required for realistic ISL rendering.

$$F_{out} = \{F_i \mid F_i = F_{\lfloor i/24 \rfloor}, i \in [0, 24n - 1]\} \quad (10)$$

- F_{out} : The output sequence of frames after duplication.
- F_i : The i -th frame in the sequence.
- $F_{\lfloor i/24 \rfloor}$: The frame sampled every 24th frame (duplicates each frame for 24 steps).
- n : The total number of intervals or blocks in the sequence.

RIFE-Net Based Frame Interpolation: To further enhance fluidity, we use RIFE-Net (Real-Time Intermediate Flow Estimation Network) to synthesise intermediate transition frames between consecutive gesture images. This converts the 24 FPS sequence into a high-quality 60 FPS video [14], [15], [34].

RIFE-Net consists of three sub-networks:

- **FlowNet:** Estimates optical flow vectors $F_{t \rightarrow 0}$ and $F_{t \rightarrow 1}$ between the current gesture image I_0 and the next gesture image I_1 , at a given interpolation time step t .

$$F_{t \rightarrow 0}, F_{t \rightarrow 1} = \text{FlowNet}(I_0, I_1, t) \quad (11)$$

- **ContextNet:** Extracts semantic and structural context features C_0 and C_1 from I_0 and I_1 , helping the model retain spatial consistency.

$$C_0, C_1 = \text{ContextNet}(I_0, I_1) \quad (12)$$

- **FusionNet:** Uses the flow and context information to synthesise a new, realistic frame I_t , which represents a smooth transition between I_0 and I_1 .




FIGURE 7. Accuracy and Loss Evaluation of the CNN Model.

The full interpolation process is mathematically defined as:

$$I_t = \text{FusionNet}(I_0, I_1, \mathbf{F}_{t \rightarrow 0}, \mathbf{F}_{t \rightarrow 1}, C_0, C_1) \quad (13)$$

- I_0, I_1 : The first and second input frames.
- $\mathbf{F}_{t \rightarrow 0}, \mathbf{F}_{t \rightarrow 1}$: The optical flow maps from I_0 to I_t and from I_1 to I_t , respectively.
- C_0, C_1 : The context features extracted from I_0 and I_1 .
- I_t : The generated intermediate frame at time t .
- t : The interpolation time step between I_0 and I_1 .

This approach enables us to retain frame clarity while increasing temporal resolution, ensuring the final ISL gesture video not only matches the corrected text but also delivers natural hand movements at 60 FPS, making it more accessible and readable for ISL users.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section provides the experimental results of various phases of development, which are performed and investigated to build a complete framework. The functionalities of the proposed framework are tested in different stages of the development cycle. In addition to that, we have demonstrated the user interface screens of the final application. As indicated in Figure 1, for the initial sign language recognition phase, we implemented a novel hybrid approach comprising predictions from RFC and CNN models. The results obtained on training the RFC Model and the CNN Model are laid out in subsections IV-A and IV-B, respectively.

A. CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORKS MODEL

The training evaluation graphs for the CNN model are shown in Figure 7. The model was trained for 15 epochs, and an accuracy of 82.4% was obtained. Figure 8 presents the confusion matrix obtained on testing the trained model on the test sample set of 180 records for each class. The matrix reveals that the model faces challenges distinguishing between visually similar signs in American Sign Language, particularly among the letters 'a', 'e', 'i', 'j', 'm', 'n', 's', 'u' and 'v'.

B. RANDOM FOREST CLASSIFIER MODEL

Figure 9 displays the confusion matrix with an accuracy of 90.4% obtained by evaluating the trained model on a test data set that contains 30 records for each class. The matrix demonstrates the effectiveness of the model in capturing




FIGURE 8. Confusion matrix Convolutional Neural Network Model.





FIGURE 9. Confusion Matrix Random Forest Classifier Model.

hand poses using key landmarks, enabling it to differentiate between similar hand signs in American Sign Language accurately. This highlights the capability of the model to recognise subtle variations in hand gestures, contributing to its overall performance in sign language recognition.

C. HYBRID MODEL: ENSEMBLE INTEGRATION

To enhance the accuracy of American Sign Language (ASL) gesture recognition, a hybrid ensemble model was employed, integrating a RFC and a CNN. The weighted ensemble approach resulted in an improved accuracy of 93%, demonstrating the effectiveness of combining both traditional machine learning and deep learning methodologies.

The ensemble model assigns a weight of 0.7 to the RFC and 0.3 to the CNN, based on empirical evaluations of the model validation accuracy. The RFC efficiently captures structured numerical features extracted from gestures, while CNN excels in identifying intricate spatial patterns from image frames, so in the hybrid approach, as CNN struggles to capture features of signs that are almost similar in ASL, RFC outperforms CNN here as it relies on hand-landmarks to extract features that distinguish these signs. The fusion of these models leverages their strengths, ensuring robust classification performance. Figure 10 provides a visualisation

**FIGURE 10.** Confusion Matrix Hybrid Model.**TABLE 6.** Sample of tested inputs from validation set.

Input	Output
CENCICLOEDIA	['ENCYCLOPEDIA IS A BOOK', 'ENCYCLOPEDIA OF A BANK', 'A BOOK IS ENCYCLOPEDIA']
IE A BOOL	['EAT APPLE STAY HEALTHY', 'APPLE STAY THERE', 'APPLE IS HEALTHY']
ABLE STY ELTY	['TOY BOOK', 'BOOK OF TOYS', 'TOYS ARE BOOK']
TOY BOK	['MOVIE GOOD', 'GOOD MOVIE', 'MOVIE IS GOOD']
MOVIE GOO	['MOVIE GOOD', 'GOOD MOVIE', 'MOVIE IS GOOD']

of the classification efficiency across 26 gesture classes against 100 samples for each class.

D. LARGE LANGUAGE MODEL



For the text correction phase, the Gemini-1.5 Flash model (configured via prompt engineering) was also validated against a sample set of 100 records. The model shows appropriate auto-correction with a promising accuracy of 94.2% on the validation set. The test results are indicated in Table 6.

E. VIDEO OUTPUTS

In the video synthesis phase, American sign language is converted to Indian sign language, and the successful conversion process is indicated in Figure 11 (a) and Figure 11 (b) shows the frames of the video output in Indian sign language representing “THE BALL IS ON THE TABLE”. Various phases in the user interface during real-time image acquisition, recognition, auto-correction, and translation are depicted in Figure 12. The results manifest the capability of the proposed model to accurately and reliably perform the sign language translation.

F. COMPARISON WITH RELATED WORKS

Our proposed system introduces key advancements in sign language translation by leveraging a hybrid CNN + Random Forest Classifier (RFC) for improved recognition accuracy.

**FIGURE 11.** Results of video synthesis phase (a) Video Output (1FPS) (b) Frame interpolation using RIFE-Net.**FIGURE 12.** Various phases of real-time ASL to ISL translation displayed on the user interface (a) Webcam capture, (b) Recognised ASL, (c) Suggested text after autocorrection using LLM, (d) Converted ISL, (e) Saved video.

Unlike traditional models, we integrate a Large Language Model (LLM) to enhance text correction, ensuring grammatically and contextually accurate translations between ASL and ISL. Additionally, our system employs RIFE-Net for frame interpolation, enabling smoother and more natural 60FPS video synthesis. These innovations collectively improve translation accuracy, fluency, and video realism, setting our approach apart from existing frameworks. A detailed comparison is presented in Table 7.

G. DATASET LIMITATIONS AND GENERALIZABILITY

While our custom-built ASL and ISL datasets allowed for controlled experimentation at the alphabet level, we acknowledge their limitations in scope and size. Unlike large-scale public datasets such as WLASL, RWTH-PHOENIX, and MS-ASL, which include thousands of dynamic sign samples and diverse signs, our datasets were designed for static alphabet gesture recognition and synthesis. As a result, direct

TABLE 7. Comparison of sign language translation frameworks.

Author(s)	Model Used	Dataset Used	Accuracy	Auto correct Mechanism	Video Synthesis
Proposed System:	Hybrid Model (CNN + RFC)	ASL Dataset (16200 images) + ISL Dataset (2800 images)	93% (Hybrid Model), 94.2% (LLM-corrected text translation)	Large Language Model (Gemini-1.5 Flash) for text correction	Uses RIFE-Net for frame interpolation and 60FPS video generation
Natarajan et al. [37]	Hybrid CNN-BiLSTM Model	Weather forecast (RWTH-PHOENIX-Weather 2014T (German)), ISL-CSLTR (Indian), How2Sign (American)	Above 95% classification accuracy	Uses attention-based Neural Machine Translation (NMT) model with GRU	Uses Dynamic-GAN model with intermediary frame generation and video completion
Abdullah Baihan et al. [40]	CNNSa-LSTM (CNN + Self-Attention + LSTM)	Not specified in detail	98.7% accuracy	Hybrid Optimizer using Hippopotamus Optimization Algorithm and Pathfinder Algorithm	Not specified
Poornima et al. [42]	SVM with feature fusion techniques	Two standard datasets with alpha numerals (A-Z & 1-9)	100% with feature fusion	Contour matching approach for hand region segmentation	Not specified
Lakshmi Narayana et al. [41]	K-Nearest Neighbours (KNN) and Support Vector Machine (SVM)	Dataset of 30 ISL signs	~92%	User-generated signing samples for adaptation to individual signing styles	Not specified
Dashti et al. [39]	Deep Learning-Based Framework	Persian text dataset	Not specified	Phonetic analysis for spelling correction	Not applicable

benchmarking against these datasets was not performed in this work.

Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, high-quality ISL datasets are limited in availability, particularly for full sentence-level gesture synthesis. Our custom ISL dataset was created to simulate this behaviour using frame interpolation. In future work, we aim to extend the system to handle dynamic gestures and sentence-level translation by leveraging these benchmark datasets, improving generalizability and robustness.

H. SCOPE LIMITATION: ALPHABET-LEVEL TRANSLATION ONLY

The proposed system is designed for alphabet-level gesture recognition and synthesis. It does not support full-sentence recognition or dynamic ASL/ISL video translation. For example, the input “HELLO WORLD” is recognised and processed as a sequence of individual ASL characters and output as corresponding ISL alphabet gestures. While this limits practical use in real-time conversational contexts, it lays a foundational framework for integrating dynamic gesture recognition and language modelling in future work.

I. ERROR ANALYSIS AND MODEL SHORTCOMINGS

To better understand the limitations of our pipeline, we conducted a detailed error analysis across the RFC, CNN, and LLM-based correction stages.

1) GESTURE MISCLASSIFICATION PATTERNS

Analysis of confusion matrices revealed common misclassifications among visually similar ASL gestures. Notable examples include:

- **M vs N:** Both involve folded fingers with minor thumb placement differences.
- **U vs V:** Often confused when the finger spacing is minimal or lighting is poor.
- **I vs J:** Especially problematic since the letter ‘J’ requires motion, which static images fail to capture.

These misclassifications are attributed to limited dataset diversity and the static nature of gesture capture.

2) LLM CORRECTION IMPACT

A sample set of 100 noisy recognised texts (with 1–3 character errors) was passed to the prompt-engineered Gemini-1.5 Flash model. Key observations:

- In **81%** of cases, the LLM correctly recovered the intended word (e.g., “HELO” → “HELLO”).
- In **12%**, the LLM partially corrected the input but still introduced grammatical issues.
- In **7%**, the LLM hallucinated or changed the original intent (e.g., “THANX” → “THANKSGIVING”).

3) SYNTHESIS QUALITY VARIANCE

The RIFE-Net-based ISL frame interpolation generally produced smooth animations for short words (e.g., “HI”, “YES”), but became inconsistent for longer ones, especially if several letters had similar hand shapes. For instance, “MUMMY” appeared visually repetitive due to minimal gesture contrast between ‘M’ and ‘U’.

4) REAL-TIME TRADEOFFS

In the proposed hybrid model, RFC achieved higher accuracy than CNN, and at a lower memory cost. For deployment

scenarios, this tradeoff must be weighed against the accuracy of sign language recognition.

Overall, these insights guide future model improvements, including introducing more gesture variation, dynamic gesture modelling, and model distillation.

V. CONCLUSION

This research presents a novel framework for alphabet-level ASL to ISL translation, integrating advanced deep learning models, transfer learning, and large language models to bridge gaps in sign language communication. The system addresses linguistic and grammatical differences between ASL and ISL while ensuring context retention and culturally sensitive translation, facilitating interaction among diverse sign language users.

A key innovation is the ensemble model that fuses custom Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and a Random Forest Classifier for robust ASL gesture recognition. This hybrid approach enhances recognition accuracy and captures the nuanced variability of gestures. High-end language models such as Gemini 1.5 Flash, GPT-3.5, and LLaMA 2 (7B) are utilised in a prompt-configured setup to translate gestures into grammatically accurate text, preserving context and intent. Additionally, RIFE-Net enables real-time reconstruction of ISL gestures, resolving issues of gesture variability and temporal recovery.

While focused on alphabet-level translation, the framework addresses core challenges in gesture recognition and synthesis, and promotes inclusivity, enabling users with hearing or speech impairments to express themselves more effectively. This system offers significant potential for advancing accessible technologies and can serve as a foundation for future improvements, including incorporating other sign language dialects and multimodal features such as facial expressions and body language. Moreover, the system's adaptability, through user feedback and self-learning capabilities, can enhance precision and flexibility over time, contributing to the unification of global sign language use.

Absence of Human Evaluation: Due to time and resource constraints, this work does not include evaluation by native ASL or ISL users or sign language experts. While quantitative performance metrics (e.g., accuracy, inference time) provide useful insights, qualitative feedback from end-users remains essential to assess practical usability, gesture clarity, and linguistic naturalness. Incorporating human evaluation will be a key focus in future extensions of this system.

VI. FUTURE SCOPE

This research lays a strong foundation for real-time translation from American Sign Language into Indian Sign Language using state-of-the-art deep learning techniques and Large Language Models. As it handles static gestures and focuses on differences between ASL and ISL, the scope for this framework is huge, and the following are some areas that should be looked into and developed further.

Although the present system draws primarily from ISL, its sister signs differ significantly across regions and cultures, which has always led to a particular local sign including different grammatical structures and expressions. It may become worthwhile to include additional local versions in this work, such as BSL (British Sign Language), FSL (French Sign Language), or ArSL (Arabic Sign Language). However, the vocabulary, regional dialects, and non-standard formats vary with different sign languages. In this scenario, the translation system can be implemented by training on diverse datasets that come with multi-regional sign languages. Fine-tuning LLMs based on a multilingual corpus enables them to effectively handle the nuances of cross-linguistic communication, thus making the framework adaptable to a global scale. Furthermore, to establish a common evaluation framework, future versions of the system will be validated on publicly available sign language datasets such as WLASL, CSLTR, and MS-ASL. This would enable rigorous benchmarking and facilitate direct comparison with existing systems. Cross-domain generalisation using pretraining on large-scale sign datasets will also be explored.

In addition to quantitative evaluation, future work will also focus on conducting structured user studies with native ASL and ISL signers. Qualitative feedback from end-users and sign language experts will be instrumental in assessing gesture clarity, naturalness of ISL synthesis, and overall usability of the system in real-world settings. Such feedback will guide refinements to gesture generation, timing, and interface design.

Current theory relies on the static nature of translation, and most sign languages require dynamic gestures, which involve motion and transition over time. On the contrary, recognition of dynamic gestures necessitates advanced qualitative as well as quantitative time analysis and the ability to distinguish nuances of movement. Dynamic gestures can be dealt with by processing systems like video analysis and processing that can be built using deep models like the Transformer. Even further, sequences of learning models may be utilised, such as Long Short-Term Memory or 3D convolutional networks, to get better insights into gesture transition.

Emotions are important in effective communication. Sign languages include facial expressions, body language, and tone of gestures in passing emotions, which the system does not fulfil to its potential. Emotional context will be identified only by multimodal analysis, starting with facial expression and gesture intensity, and posture. Future directions include multimodal input streams where gesture data are combined with facial emotion recognition systems based on convolutional or hybrid neural networks. Further training of the model on datasets annotated with emotional cues could enhance the system's capability of more holistically capturing the speaker's intent.

Real-time translation is decidedly computationally intensive, especially with LLMs and high-fidelity gesture synthesis. This remains a critical area of improvement as speed and efficiency do not have to interfere with accuracy.

Idioms and context-specific meanings, which are valuable to sign languages, cannot be translated easily. There are some limitations in the usage of idioms in this system, as it is meant to preserve contextual integrity. However, capturing idiomatic context requires a deep understanding of cultural nuances and linguistic patterns. LLMs with datasets that are rich in idiomatic phrases and also with reinforcement learning, where feedback from the user can help fill in this gap. Adaptive learning algorithms that are user-centric will make translations over time more sensitive to the context.

The future system may even comprise an interactive feedback loop where users can modify or even validate the translations. This feedback loop of continuous learning would improve precision and responsiveness with time. A reinforcement learning module, based on user feedback using the improvement of the prediction model, helps in effective gesture recognition and translation processes.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. S. Rao, T. V. Rohit, B. Manasa, and P. V. Lingamaiah, "Multiple languages to sign language using NLTK," *Int. J. Sci. Res. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 12–17, Mar. 2023, doi: [10.32628/ijsrst2310189](https://doi.org/10.32628/ijsrst2310189).
- [2] M. Al-Qurishi, T. Khalid, and R. Souissi, "Deep learning for sign language recognition: Current techniques, benchmarks, and open issues," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 126917–126951, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9530569>
- [3] S. Salian, I. Dokare, D. Serai, A. Suresh, and P. Ganorkar, "Proposed system for sign language recognition," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Comput. Power, Energy Inf. Communucation (ICCPEIC)*, Mar. 2017, pp. 058–062, doi: [10.1109/ICCPEIC.2017.8290339](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCPEIC.2017.8290339).
- [4] N. Mubashira and A. James, "Transformer network for video to text translation," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Power, Instrum., Control Comput. (PICC)*, Dec. 2020, pp. 1–6, doi: [10.1109/PICC51425.2020.9362374](https://doi.org/10.1109/PICC51425.2020.9362374).
- [5] A. Halder and A. Tayade, "Real-time vernacular sign language recognition using MediaPipe and machine learning," *Int. J. Res. Project Res.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 9–17, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ijrpr.com>
- [6] J. Shin, A. S. Musa Miah, M. A. M. Hasan, K. Hirooka, K. Suzuki, H.-S. Lee, and S.-W. Jang, "Korean sign language recognition using transformer-based deep neural network," *Appl. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 5, p. 3029, Feb. 2023, doi: [10.3390/app13053029](https://doi.org/10.3390/app13053029).
- [7] M. I. Saleem, A. Siddiqui, S. Noor, M.-A. Luque-Nieto, and E. Nava-Baro, "A machine learning based full duplex system supporting multiple sign languages for the deaf and mute," *Appl. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 5, p. 3114, Feb. 2023, doi: [10.3390/app13053114](https://doi.org/10.3390/app13053114).
- [8] S. Wang, K. Wang, T. Yang, Y. Li, and D. Fan, "Improved 3D-ResNet sign language recognition algorithm with enhanced hand features," *Sci. Rep.*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 17812, Oct. 2022, doi: [10.1038/s41598-022-21636-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-21636-z).
- [9] A. Sahoo, G. Mishra, and K. Ravulakollu, "Sign language recognition: State of the art," *ARPENJ Eng. Appl. Sci.*, vol. 9, pp. 116–134, May 2014.
- [10] O. Koller, S. Zargaran, H. Ney, and R. Bowden, "Deep sign: Hybrid CNN-HMM for continuous sign language recognition," in *Proc. Brit. Mach. Vis. Conf.*, 2016, pp. 1–12, doi: [10.5244/c.30.136](https://doi.org/10.5244/c.30.136).
- [11] K. Shenoy, T. Dastane, V. Rao, and D. Vyawaharkar, "Real-time Indian sign language (ISL) recognition," in *Proc. 9th Int. Conf. Comput., Commun. Netw. Technol. (ICCCNT)*, Bengaluru, India, Jul. 2018, pp. 1–9, doi: [10.1109/ICCCNT.2018.8493808](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCNT.2018.8493808).
- [12] P. Sharma, D. Tulsian, C. Verma, P. Sharma, and N. Nancy, "Translating speech to Indian sign language using natural language processing," *Future Internet*, vol. 14, no. 9, p. 253, Aug. 2022, doi: [10.3390/fi14090253](https://doi.org/10.3390/fi14090253).
- [13] P. C. Badhe and V. Kulkarni, "Indian sign language translator using gesture recognition algorithm," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Comput. Graph., Vis. Inf. Secur. (CGVIS)*, Bhubaneswar, India, Nov. 2015, pp. 195–200, doi: [10.1109/CGVIS.2015.7449921](https://doi.org/10.1109/CGVIS.2015.7449921).
- [14] J. Gong, L. G. Foo, Y. He, H. Rahmani, and J. Liu, "LLMs are good sign language translators," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit. (CVPR)*, Jun. 2024, pp. 18362–18372, doi: [10.1109/CVPR52733.2024.01738](https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR52733.2024.01738).
- [15] Z. Chen, B. Zhou, J. Li, J. Wan, Z. Lei, N. Jiang, Q. Lu, and G. Zhao, "Factorized learning assisted with large language model for gloss-free sign language translation," in *Proc. Joint Int. Conf. Computational Linguistics, Language Resources Evaluation (LREC-COLING)*, Torino, Italia: ELRA and ICCL, 2024, pp. 7071–7081.
- [16] M. K. Das, S. K. Deb, S. Islam, and A. S. M. Rubaiyat, "Real-time gesture recognition for American sign language using convolutional neural network," *Int. J. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 200, no. 8, pp. 6–10, Jul. 2019, doi: [10.5120/ijca2019919038](https://doi.org/10.5120/ijca2019919038).
- [17] A. Gupta and R. Kumar, "Sign language recognition using hand gesture recognition techniques: A review," *Int. J. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 195, no. 9, pp. 18–23, Sep. 2018.
- [18] S. Jain and R. Patel, "Deep learning-based sign language recognition: A review," *J. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 138–150, 2021.
- [19] A. Kumar and B. Sahoo, "Sign language recognition system using hand gestures: A survey," *Int. J. Comput. Sci. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 5609–5613, 2014.
- [20] S. Mishra, P. K. Panda, S. Mishra, and L. Mishra, "A comprehensive review on sign language recognition techniques and challenges," *J. Ambient Intell. Humaniz. Comput.*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 2495–2506, Jun. 2020.
- [21] K. Patel and P. Verma, "Sign language recognition using deep learning techniques: A review," *Int. J. Comput. Sci. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 52–58, 2021.
- [22] N. Sharma and S. Chaudhary, "A survey on deep learning techniques for sign language recognition," *Int. J. Adv. Res. Comput. Sci. Softw. Eng.*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 452–459, 2020.
- [23] S. Singh and R. Chellappan, "A comprehensive review on sign language recognition: Datasets, techniques, and challenges," *Pattern Recognit. Lett.*, vol. 143, pp. 88–100, Dec. 2020.
- [24] V. Singh and A. Sharma, "A review on sign language recognition techniques," *J. Comput. Sci. Appl.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 22–30, 2021.
- [25] H. Verma and R. Verma, "Sign language recognition: A review," *Int. J. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 218, no. 15, pp. 11–15, Feb. 2020.
- [26] Y. Aggarwal, S. Gehlot, A. K. Singh, A. Jain, and A. Mohan, "A survey on sign language recognition techniques: Challenges and future directions," *J. Ambient Intell. Humanised Comput.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 2181–2195, 2021.
- [27] R. Bansal and S. Bansal, "A review on sign language recognition techniques," *Int. J. Adv. Res. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 123–128, Feb. 2020.
- [28] T. Chauhan and A. Kumar, "Sign language recognition: A review," *Int. J. Comput. Sci. Inf. Secur.*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 1–8, May 2018.
- [29] V. Chaudhary and S. Chaudhary, "A review on sign language recognition techniques and approaches," *Int. J. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 212, no. 13, pp. 40–45, May 2020.
- [30] P. Goyal and S. Goyal, "A comprehensive review on sign language recognition techniques," *Int. J. Adv. Res. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 123–128, Feb. 2020.
- [31] S. Kumar, S. Sharma, and V. Sharma, "Sign language recognition: A review," *Int. J. Comput. Sci. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 9, no. 9, pp. 50–57, Sep. 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://ijcsmc.com/docs/papers/September2020/V9I9202008.pdf>
- [32] N. E.-D. M. Salem, A. Al-Atabi, and M. Sarhan, "A review of sign language translation systems," *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 721–758, 2022.
- [33] B. Ko, K.-J. Oh, J.-H. Lee, S.-H. Choi, C.-K. J. Hong, and I.-S. Lee, "Sign language translation with multimodal neural machine translation," in *Proc. Conf. Empirical Methods Natural Language Processing, 9th Int. Joint Conf. Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, Hong Kong, China, 2019, pp. 5802–5813, doi: [10.18653/v1/D19-1604](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1604).
- [34] H. Wang, W. Zhou, Q. Fan, Z. Lu, and H. Li, "Towards sign language translation: A review," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern., Syst.*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 72–84, Jan. 2022.
- [35] X. Bao, W. Tang, J. Cheng, Z. Chen, and Z. Wang, "Relevant intrinsic feature enhancement network for few-shot semantic segmentation," *Comput. Mater. Continua*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 1779–1798, 2025, doi: [10.32604/cmc.2025.051493](https://doi.org/10.32604/cmc.2025.051493).
- [36] W. X. Zhao, K. Zhou, J. Li, T. Tang, X. Wang, Y. Hou, Y. Min, B. Zhang, J. Zhang, Z. Dong, Y. Chen, J. Li, Y. Du, C. Liu, C.-R. Wang, Y. Qiu, Z. Liu, and J.-R. Wen, "A survey of large language models," *Nat. Sci. Rev.*, vol. 11, no. 12, 2024, Art. no. nwae403, doi: [10.1093/nsr/nwae403](https://doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwae403).
- [37] L. Hertz. (2024). *Comparison of LLMs: Evaluating Large Language Models*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.leewayhertz.com/comparison-of-langs/evaluating-large-language-models>

- [38] B. Natarajan, E. Rajalakshmi, R. Elakkia, K. Kotecha, A. Abraham, L. A. Gabralla, and V. Subramaniyam, "Development of an end-to-end deep learning framework for sign language recognition, translation, and video generation," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 104358–104374, 2022, doi: [10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3210543](https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3210543). [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9905589>
- [39] S. Rajesh, A. Krishnan, and S. Natarajan, "Sign2Sign: A novel approach towards real-time ASL to ISL translation," in *Proc. Emerg. Trends Technol. Intell. Syst.*, 2022, pp. 39–51, doi: [10.1007/978-981-19-4182-5_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-4182-5_4).
- [40] S. M. S. Dashti, A. Khatibi Bardsiri, and M. Jafari Shahbazzadeh, "PERCORE: A deep learning-based framework for Persian spelling correction with phonetic analysis," *Int. J. Comput. Intell. Syst.*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 114, May 2024, doi: [10.1007/s44196-024-00459-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s44196-024-00459-y).
- [41] A. Baihan, A. I. Alutaibi, M. Alshehri, and S. K. Sharma, "Sign language recognition using modified deep learning network and hybrid optimization: A hybrid optimizer (HO) based optimized CNNSa-LSTM approach," *Sci. Rep.*, vol. 14, no. 1, Oct. 2024.
- [42] M. L. Narayana, M. Tanvi, S. Chandini, S. Alekhya, M. Rishitha, and K. B. S. S. L. V. Prasad, "Web-based sign language translator using machine learning," *Tanzania J. Eng. Technol.*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 61–64, 2024, doi: [10.52339/tjet.v19i4.1039](https://doi.org/10.52339/tjet.v19i4.1039).
- [43] B. V. Poornima, S. Srinath, S. Rashmi, and R. Rakshitha, "Performance evaluation of feature fusion approaches for Indian sign language recognition system," *Indian J. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 16, no. 41, pp. 3691–3703, Nov. 2023, doi: [10.17485/ijst/v16i41.1767](https://doi.org/10.17485/ijst/v16i41.1767).
- [44] H. R. V. Joze and O. Koller, "MS-ASL: A large-scale data set and benchmark for understanding American sign language," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit. Workshops (CVPRW)*, Jun. 2018, pp. 2270–2279.
- [45] D. Li, C. R. Opazo, X. Yu, and H. Li, "Word-level deep sign language recognition from video: A new large-scale dataset and methods comparison," in *Proc. IEEE Winter Conf. Appl. Comput. Vis. (WACV)*, Mar. 2020, pp. 1448–1458.



MALAY KUMAR is currently pursuing the B.Tech. degree in computer science and engineering with Vellore Institute of Technology, Chennai, India. He has worked on various research and development projects spanning robotics, artificial intelligence, and web development. His key areas of interests include robot perception, natural language processing, embedded systems, and AI-driven automation. He has actively contributed to robotics competitions, such as Robocon and NXP

AIM India, gaining hands-on experience in ROS, OpenCV, and embedded programming. He has also worked on AI-powered solutions, including sign language translation, fuzzy URL identification, and automated assessment grading.



S. SARVAJIT VISAGAN is currently pursuing the B.Tech. degree in computer science and engineering with Vellore Institute of Technology, Chennai, India. Throughout his academic journey, he has developed a strong passion for design development, embedded systems, and the potential of AI and ML. He has held roles with the Web Development Department of the Microsoft Innovations Club and the Google Developer Student Club. He has interned as a Software and Network Analyst with ISRO, where he integrated a GUI for seamless tracking and data retrieval of LEO satellites. He is also a member of the Regional Mathematical Olympiad Division, Bengaluru. He is currently working on a deep learning project that integrates NLP techniques and LLMs for sign language translation as part of his academic research. His research interest includes the role of embedded systems in machine learning.



TANISH MAHAJAN is currently pursuing the bachelor's degree in computer science with Vellore Institute of Technology, Chennai, India. He possesses knowledge of artificial intelligence, machine learning, and software development, specializing in the applications of natural language processing and computer vision. He has experience with several projects, such as sign language translation using LLMs, license plate recognition, and resume screening using AI. He has also developed industry experience from various internships in AI, full-stack web development, and UI/UX design. He was a Team Lead in UI/UX projects and possesses a good background in building AI-driven applications. He have also contributed to research in various AI-driven applications. His research interests include deep learning, human-computer interaction, and accessibility using AI.



ANISHA NATARAJAN (Member, IEEE) received the B.Tech. and M.Tech. degrees from the Department of Electronics and Communication Engineering, Rajagiri School of Engineering and Technology, Kochi, India, in 2009 and 2013, respectively, and the Ph.D. degree in electronics and communication engineering from Indian Institute of Information Technology, Design and Manufacturing, Kanchipuram, India, in 2023. She is currently an Assistant Professor with the School of Electronics Engineering, Vellore Institute of Technology, Chennai Campus, India. Her areas of interests include device-free human sensing, machine learning, energy management systems, and FPGA-based system design.



P. S. SREEJA received the M.C.A. degree from Bharathidasan University, the M.Phil. degree (Hons.) in computer applications from the University of Madras, and the Ph.D. degree from the College of Engineering, Anna University, Chennai. She is an Assistant Professor with the School of Computer Science and Engineering, Vellore Institute of Technology, Chennai Campus, India. She received the UGC-BSR Fellowship for her research with the University Grants Commission, India. She has several international journal and conference publications to her credit and over 345 citations. Her research interests include artificial intelligence, text mining, natural language processing, and cognitive poetics.