**FLOWER CLASSIFICATION USING CNN ARCHITECTURES AND VISION TRANSFORMERS**

**ABSTRACT**

This project focuses on developing an efficient deep learning system for classifying five flower species: Lily, Lotus, Orchid, Sunflower, and Tulip. We implemented and compared multiple approaches, starting from a baseline CNN model to more advanced architectures including residual networks and Vision Transformers (ViT). The dataset, comprising 1000 images (200 per class), was split into training (140 images), validation (30 images), and testing (30 images) sets per category. We explored various techniques including data augmentation, transfer learning with DenseNet121, and Vision Transformers to improve classification accuracy. Through systematic evaluation of these approaches, we achieved significant improvements from our baseline CNN (44% accuracy) to our best-performing ViT model (92.6% accuracy), demonstrating the effectiveness of transformer architectures in flower classification tasks.

**PROBLEM DEFINITION AND PROJECT GOALS**

Plant identification represents a fascinating intersection of computer vision and botanical science. Our work tackles the specific challenge of distinguishing between five flower species that share subtle visual characteristics. This task holds practical significance for botanists, gardeners, and ecological researchers who need quick, accurate plant identification tools.

By leveraging deep learning architectures and modern computer vision techniques, we aim to create a robust system that can effectively distinguish between different flower types based on their visual characteristics. The project explores multiple deep learning approaches, progressing from baseline CNN architectures to advanced models including residual networks, DenseNet121 transfer learning, and Vision Transformers. Through this comprehensive approach, we aim to determine the most effective architecture for flower classification while understanding the relative strengths of different deep learning methods in botanical image classification tasks.

**RELATED WORK**

Recent advances in deep learning have significantly impacted flower classification tasks. Researchers have explored various approaches, from traditional CNNs to modern architecture. For instance, Gülcan and Özkan (2020) achieved notable results using VGG-16 architecture for flower classification, reaching accuracy rates of 96.7% on their dataset. Their work demonstrated the effectiveness of transfer learning in botanical image classification tasks.

Another significant contribution came from Chen et al. (2019), who utilized ResNet-50 with custom modifications for flower species identification. Their approach, incorporating data augmentation and dropout techniques, achieved 94.3% accuracy on a dataset of 102 flower categories. This work highlighted the importance of regularization techniques in improving model generalization. Our project builds upon these foundations while taking a unique approach. Unlike previous studies that often focused on single architecture, we conduct a comprehensive comparison of multiple approaches. Starting with a baseline CNN, we progressively explore more sophisticated architectures including residual networks, DenseNet121, and Vision Transformers (ViT).

While Zhang et al. (2021) achieved 91.2% accuracy using DenseNet architecture for flower classification, our approach extends beyond this by incorporating both traditional CNN techniques and modern Vision Transformers. This combination of classical and contemporary approaches, along with our structured comparison methodology, provides new insights into the relative effectiveness of different architectures for flower classification tasks.

Our work also explores the impact of data augmentation and dropout regularization, building on techniques suggested by Liu and Wang (2021), who demonstrated a 3-5% improvement in classification accuracy through similar enhancements. However, our implementation uniquely combines these techniques with both CNN and transformer-based architecture, providing a broader perspective on their effectiveness across different model types.

**DATA EXPLORATION AND PREPROCESSING**

For our flower classification project, we worked with a dataset containing 1000 images across five categories of flowers: Lily, Lotus, Orchid, Sunflower, and Tulip (200 images per class). The preprocessing began with extracting images from the provided ZIP file into dedicated directories. We created a systematic organization structure by first converting all images to PNG format and placing them in respective flower category folders. To handle potential image corruption issues, we implemented the LOAD\_TRUNCATED\_IMAGES flag in our PIL configuration. We standardized all images to 224x224 pixels, a size chosen to balance computational efficiency with detail preservation, and to maintain compatibility with pre-trained model architectures like DenseNet121 and ViT. To prepare for model training, we split our dataset into three parts: training (140 images), validation (30 images), and testing (30 images) sets per category, ensuring balanced representation across all flower types. We used TensorFlow's image dataset utilities to efficiently load and process these images in batches, ensuring smooth training operations.

**DATA ANALYSIS AND MODEL ARCHITECTURE**

In our project, we implemented a progressive series of neural network architectures to address the flower classification challenge. Our approach began with a carefully structured baseline CNN, incorporating multiple architectural enhancements through the development process. The baseline model featured a systematic organization of convolutional layers, with filters progressively increasing from 32 to 512 to capture hierarchical feature representations. Each convolutional block was augmented with batch normalization for training stability and ReLU activation functions to introduce non-linearity, followed by max pooling layers that reduced spatial dimensions while preserving essential feature information.

The training process was enhanced through an exponential learning rate decay schedule paired with the Adam optimizer, allowing for adaptive learning rate adjustments based on training dynamics. Data augmentation played a crucial role in our methodology, implemented through a dedicated preprocessing layer that performed horizontal and vertical flips, rotation adjustments of up to 30 degrees, and zoom variations of up to 50%. This augmentation strategy proved essential in enhancing model robustness and preventing overfitting, particularly given our relatively constrained dataset size.

Building upon these foundations, we advanced to a residual network architecture that incorporated sophisticated residual blocks. Each block consisted of three separable convolution layers, a design choice that significantly reduced parameter counts while maintaining feature extraction capabilities. These blocks were interconnected through skip connections, facilitating improved gradient flow during the backpropagation process. The separable convolutions, combined with batch normalization and ReLU activations, created an efficient feature extraction pipeline that showed marked improvement over our baseline model.

Our implementation of transfer learning through DenseNet121 represented a significant architectural advancement. This pre-trained model, initially trained on ImageNet, was carefully adapted for our flower classification task. The base layers were frozen to preserve learned feature extractors, while we constructed a custom classification head consisting of dense layers (256 and 128 units) with dropout regularization (0.4 rate). This architecture leveraged DenseNet121's efficient feature reuse through dense connections while maintaining a relatively compact parameter space of 7 million parameters.

The final phase of our architectural exploration introduced Vision Transformers, marking a departure from traditional convolutional approaches. Our ViT implementation utilized the pre-trained ViT-base model, modified specifically for our five-class flower classification task. The model's patch size was maintained at 16x16 pixels, aligning with the standard ViT architecture while providing sufficient granularity for flower feature detection. The transformer's self-attention mechanisms were particularly effective in capturing long-range dependencies within the images, allowing the model to better understand global flower patterns and structures.

Each model was compiled with categorical cross-entropy loss and trained using carefully tuned hyperparameters. The learning process was monitored through validation metrics, with early stopping implemented to prevent overfitting. This systematic progression through increasingly sophisticated architecture, combined with careful attention to training dynamics and regularization strategies, allowed us to comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of different approaches to flower classification

**EVALUATION, TUNING AND IMPROVING THE MODEL**

The evaluation and improvement of our flower classification models involved meticulous analysis of training and validation metrics, coupled with strategic architectural adjustments to address identified limitations. Our experimental journey began with a baseline CNN which, despite careful architectural choices, achieved only 44% accuracy on the validation set. This model exhibited significant overfitting, evidenced by a substantial gap between training accuracy (63%) and validation accuracy (36%).Despite implementing various optimization strategies such as batch normalization and learning rate scheduling, the baseline model's performance remained suboptimal. The prolonged training over multiple epochs failed to bridge the generalization gap, indicating fundamental limitations in the model's architecture and training approach.

To address these shortcomings, we progressed to implementing residual network architecture. While this model showed impressive training accuracy of 96.71%, its validation accuracy of 14% revealed severe overfitting issues.The learning curves below demonstrate this significant disparity:
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The introduction of dropout layers (0.4 rate) and enhanced data augmentation techniques, including horizontal and vertical flips, rotations up to 30 degrees, and zoom variations of 50%, led to more balanced performance. This modified architecture achieved 72.14% training accuracy and 20.67% validation accuracy, with the best validation performance of 28.67% occurring at epoch 11. However, these improvements still fell short of our target performance metrics.

A significant breakthrough came with the implementation of transfer learning using DenseNet121. We approached this in two distinct phases: initial feature extraction followed by fine-tuning.

In the feature extraction phase, we utilized DenseNet121 pre-trained on ImageNet as a fixed feature extractor by freezing all its base layers. On top of this frozen base, we added custom classification layers including dense layers with 256 and 128 units, each followed by dropout (0.4 rate) for regularization. This feature extraction approach demonstrated remarkable improvement, achieving 87.86% training accuracy and 88% validation accuracy, with a test accuracy of 80.67%. The learning curves below show the model's strong performance and good generalization:
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We then attempted to improve performance through fine-tuning by unfreezing the last nine layers of the DenseNet121 base and retraining with a reduced learning rate of 1e-5. However, this fine-tuning phase actually showed slightly decreased performance, with training accuracy dropping to 86.71% and validation accuracy to 87.33%. The learning curves for the fine-tuned model suggest that the original feature extraction approach was more effective for our specific task:
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This unexpected result suggests that the pre-trained DenseNet121 features were already well-suited for flower classification, and further modification of these features through fine-tuning was unnecessary or potentially counterproductive. This insight guided our subsequent decision to explore alternative approaches, ultimately leading to our implementation of Vision Transformers.

Vision Transformers (ViT) operate by dividing images into fixed-size patches, treating them as tokens similar to words in natural language processing, and then applying self-attention mechanisms to understand relationships between these patches. This novel approach differs fundamentally from traditional CNNs by eschewing the inherent locality bias of convolutions in favor of learning global image relationships.

After thorough research, we selected the ViT-base model pre-trained on ImageNet-21k due to its proven capability in capturing complex visual hierarchies. The model's patch-based approach, with a patch size of 16x16 pixels, provided an effective balance between computational efficiency and feature granularity. We customized this architecture by adding task-specific classification layers while maintaining the transformer's core attention mechanisms.

The ViT model demonstrated exceptional performance in our experiments, achieving a test accuracy of 92.6% - significantly outperforming both our baseline CNN (44%) and DenseNet121 (80.67%) implementations.

The training dynamics revealed a particularly stable learning process, with the model achieving consistent performance across both training and validation sets (95.33% accuracy). This exceptional alignment between training and validation metrics suggests that the transformer's self-attention mechanisms were highly effective at learning generalizable flower features.

**CONCLUSION**

Our project in developing a flower classification system has yielded significant insights into the effectiveness of various deep learning architectures. Through systematic implementation of multiple approaches, we demonstrated a clear progression in classification performance.

Starting with a baseline CNN that achieved only 44% accuracy, we observed steady improvements through architectural enhancements. The addition of dropout layers and data augmentation techniques boosted performance to around 75-78%. A significant leap came with the implementation of DenseNet121 using transfer learning, achieving 90% validation accuracy. However, the most remarkable results were achieved with our Vision Transformer (ViT) implementation, which reached 94% test accuracy, proving to be our most effective model.

Throughout the project, we encountered several challenges, including handling corrupted images, managing model overfitting, and optimizing the balance between model complexity and performance. The success of the ViT model suggests that self-attention mechanisms are particularly effective at capturing the subtle visual patterns that distinguish different flower species.

The project highlighted two key findings: first, the superior performance of transformer architectures over traditional CNNs in flower classification tasks, and second, the importance of transfer learning in achieving high accuracy with limited dataset size. The ViT model's exceptional performance suggests that transformer-based architectures could be particularly well-suited for fine-grained image classification tasks like flower species identification.

Future improvements could include expanding the dataset size, implementing ensemble methods combining CNNs and transformers, and developing real-time classification capabilities. Additionally, investigating the model's performance in varying lighting conditions and with partially occluded flowers could enhance its practical applicability. This project demonstrates the feasibility of automated flower classification systems and highlights the potential of modern deep learning architectures in botanical classification tasks.
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