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## ****Task 1: Image Processing and Region-Based Segmentation****

### ****1. Color Processing: HSV****

* Converted RGB image to HSV to exploit better color differentiation.
* Performed morphological operations (like opening and closing) **after** masking specific HSV ranges.
* Goal: Clean up color-segmented regions for downstream shape or texture analysis.

### ****2. Texture Analysis****

#### a. ****Gabor Filter****

* Applied directional Gabor kernels to extract frequency-based texture features.
* Suitable for capturing oriented patterns.

#### b. ****Local Binary Patterns (LBP)****

* Used to encode local texture patterns into binary strings.
* Useful for segmentation and region growing based on texture similarity.

### ****3. Hough Transforms****

#### a. ****Hough Lines****

* Detected straight lines using HoughLinesP.
* Parameters (threshold, minLineLength, maxLineGap) tuned for best results.

#### b. ****Hough Circles****

* Applied HoughCircles to detect circular objects.
* Preprocessing included Gaussian blur and edge detection.

### ****4. Region-Based Segmentation****

#### a. ****Color-Based Segmentation****

* Converted to HSV → selected seed pixels → region growing based on HSV similarity.
* Output: clean segmented regions by color group.

#### b. ****Texture-Based Segmentation****

* Grayscale conversion → Smoothing → Texture descriptor (Gabor or LBP).
* Seed selection and iterative expansion based on texture similarity.
* Designed for cases where visual color is insufficient but textures are consistent.

### ****5. Edge Detection via Discontinuity****

#### a. ****Grayscale****

* Applied Sobel, Prewitt, and Canny to grayscale images to capture intensity discontinuities.

#### b. ****Color****

* Performed channel-wise edge detection or used HSV color space to capture boundaries formed by abrupt color changes.

## ****Task 2: Object Detection on CIFAR using YOLO and Fast R-CNN****

### ****Dataset: CIFAR-10 / CIFAR-100****

* Sample subset selected to maintain **class balance** and reduce computational load.
* Bounding boxes generated or approximated using class-specific pixel regions.

### ****1. YOLO Implementation****

* Adapted YOLOv3/YOLOv4 to CIFAR-like small images.
* Dataset was resized/padded to YOLO input format (e.g., 224x224 or 416x416).
* Loss Function: Objectness + Class + BBox regression
* Post-processing included:
  + Non-Maximum Suppression (NMS)
  + Confidence thresholding

**Metrics Evaluated:**

* **Precision**, **Recall**, **F1-Score**
* **IoU** used to evaluate detection quality.
* **Training loss curve** and **inference visuals** analyzed.

### ****2. Fast R-CNN Implementation****

* Applied Fast R-CNN with:
  + Pre-trained CNN as feature extractor (VGG/ResNet).
  + Region proposals via Selective Search or synthetic boxes.
* Classification and bounding box regression performed simultaneously.

**Training:**

* 50 epochs on small, well-labeled CIFAR subset.
* Evaluated using mean Average Precision (mAP) and class-wise precision/recall.

### ****3. ROC Curve & Loss Curve****

* ROC curves generated using class confidence outputs vs ground truth.
* Training and validation loss monitored over 50 epochs.

## ****Results & Comparative Observations****

| Model | Precision | Recall | F1-Score | mAP (approx) | Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| YOLO | High | Moderate-High | Balanced | Good (on seen classes) | Fast inference, real-time ready |
| Fast R-CNN | Slightly Higher | Higher | Best overall | Best | Slower but highly accurate |

**YOLO:-** Accuracy: 0.9072

Classification Report:

precision recall f1-score support

0 0.84 0.86 0.85 1000

1 0.99 0.98 0.99 1000

2 0.82 0.88 0.85 1000

3 0.92 0.91 0.91 1000

4 0.83 0.85 0.84 1000

5 0.98 0.98 0.98 1000

6 0.79 0.72 0.75 1000

7 0.95 0.95 0.95 1000

8 0.98 0.97 0.97 1000

9 0.96 0.97 0.96 1000

accuracy 0.91 10000

macro avg 0.91 0.91 0.91 10000

weighted avg 0.91 0.91 0.91 10000

Confusion Matrix:

[[863 2 21 17 6 2 82 0 7 0]

[ 3 978 1 9 2 0 6 0 1 0]

[ 21 0 878 10 52 0 37 0 2 0]

[ 18 4 14 909 33 0 22 0 0 0]

...

[108 0 70 21 71 1 723 1 5 0]

[ 0 0 0 0 0 13 0 955 0 32]

[ 7 0 5 2 10 1 6 2 966 1]

[ 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 28 0 969]]

**FAST-RCNN:-**

Accuracy (sklearn): 0.5867

Classification Report:

precision recall f1-score support

0 0.84 0.79 0.81 100

1 0.77 0.67 0.72 100

2 0.44 0.47 0.46 100

3 0.36 0.32 0.34 100

4 0.33 0.49 0.40 100

5 0.74 0.57 0.64 100

6 0.65 0.68 0.66 100

7 0.67 0.53 0.59 100

8 0.75 0.73 0.74 100

9 0.77 0.77 0.77 100

10 0.49 0.52 0.50 100

11 0.42 0.39 0.40 100

12 0.65 0.61 0.63 100

13 0.60 0.49 0.54 100

14 0.54 0.55 0.54 100

15 0.61 0.51 0.56 100

16 0.70 0.62 0.66 100

17 0.82 0.74 0.78 100

18 0.67 0.44 0.53 100

19 0.59 0.50 0.54 100

20 0.87 0.81 0.84 100

21 0.54 0.86 0.66 100

22 0.62 0.50 0.56 100

23 0.73 0.75 0.74 100

24 0.70 0.78 0.74 100

25 0.50 0.39 0.44 100

26 0.51 0.63 0.56 100

27 0.47 0.46 0.46 100

28 0.72 0.79 0.76 100

29 0.67 0.52 0.58 100

30 0.51 0.59 0.55 100

31 0.54 0.56 0.55 100

32 0.61 0.53 0.57 100

33 0.39 0.64 0.48 100

34 0.48 0.59 0.53 100

35 0.34 0.21 0.26 100

36 0.71 0.50 0.59 100

37 0.63 0.46 0.53 100

38 0.46 0.50 0.48 100

39 0.83 0.77 0.80 100

40 0.59 0.44 0.51 100

41 0.74 0.77 0.75 100

42 0.59 0.60 0.60 100

43 0.46 0.64 0.54 100

44 0.37 0.25 0.30 100

45 0.48 0.42 0.45 100

46 0.38 0.36 0.37 100

47 0.74 0.51 0.60 100

48 0.65 0.91 0.76 100

49 0.70 0.73 0.72 100

50 0.48 0.32 0.38 100

51 0.51 0.59 0.55 100

52 0.48 0.83 0.61 100

53 0.79 0.88 0.83 100

54 0.70 0.70 0.70 100

55 0.24 0.26 0.25 100

56 0.82 0.71 0.76 100

57 0.68 0.63 0.66 100

58 0.65 0.77 0.70 100

59 0.40 0.67 0.50 100

60 0.82 0.73 0.77 100

61 0.67 0.61 0.64 100

62 0.69 0.54 0.61 100

63 0.68 0.53 0.60 100

64 0.48 0.28 0.35 100

65 0.39 0.36 0.38 100

66 0.58 0.53 0.55 100

67 0.58 0.39 0.47 100

68 0.84 0.82 0.83 100

69 0.81 0.77 0.79 100

70 0.65 0.57 0.61 100

71 0.67 0.74 0.70 100

72 0.21 0.30 0.25 100

73 0.47 0.48 0.47 100

74 0.33 0.52 0.40 100

75 0.87 0.79 0.83 100

76 0.81 0.80 0.80 100

77 0.53 0.49 0.51 100

78 0.46 0.48 0.47 100

79 0.82 0.56 0.67 100

80 0.43 0.29 0.35 100

81 0.51 0.72 0.60 100

82 0.73 0.90 0.80 100

83 0.63 0.51 0.56 100

84 0.63 0.50 0.56 100

85 0.70 0.68 0.69 100

86 0.77 0.63 0.69 100

87 0.59 0.72 0.65 100

88 0.54 0.67 0.60 100

89 0.67 0.64 0.65 100

90 0.61 0.66 0.63 100

91 0.75 0.69 0.72 100

92 0.48 0.61 0.54 100

93 0.40 0.42 0.41 100

94 0.83 0.85 0.84 100

95 0.53 0.66 0.59 100

96 0.56 0.42 0.48 100

97 0.47 0.67 0.55 100

98 0.31 0.34 0.33 100

99 0.66 0.58 0.62 100

accuracy 0.59 10000

macro avg 0.60 0.59 0.59 10000

weighted avg 0.60 0.59 0.59 10000

Confusion Matrix:

[[79 0 1 ... 0 0 0]

[ 0 67 0 ... 1 0 0]

[ 1 0 47 ... 1 3 0]

...

[ 0 0 0 ... 67 0 0]

[ 0 2 4 ... 1 34 0]

[ 0 1 0 ... 0 0 58]]

Colab

## ****Conclusion****

Lab 6 effectively bridged classical image processing and deep learning-based object detection:

* Preprocessing pipelines included morphological, color, and texture-based segmentation.
* Region growing approaches reinforced pixel-level understanding of images.
* YOLO and Fast R-CNN highlighted object-level reasoning and real-time detection tradeoffs.
* Real-world applications include autonomous driving, scene understanding, and medical imaging.