**F1value vs Weight (for tf-int8)**

**Data Set: 1**

**Image Size: 64**

**Weights: 64, 128, 192, 256 ,320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Image Size =64**

For threshold: 0.5 to 0.55

1) F1value is lowest at weight 192.

2) F1value is highest for weight 320.

3) F1values at weight 128 and 256 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.5.

4)F1values at weight 64 ,128 and 256 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.55.

5)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.6 and 0.65

1) F1value is lowest at weight 192.

2) F1value is highest for weight 320.

3) F1values at weight 128 and 256 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.6.

4)F1values at weight 128,192 and 256 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.65.

5)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.7 and 0.75

1) F1value is lowest at weight 192.

2) F1value is highest t weight 320.

3) F1values at weight 64 and 320 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.75.

4)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.8 and 0.85

1) F1value is lowest at weight 192 for threshold 0.8.

2) F1value is lowest at weight 128 for threshold 0.85.

3) F1value is highest for weight 320 for both thresholds.

4) F1values at weight 128 and 192 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.8.

5) F1values at weight 64 and 320 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.8.

6)F1value at weight 192 surpasses F1 value at weight 128 at threshold 0.85.

7) F1value at weight 320 surpasses F1 value at weight 64 to reach 1, at threshold 0.85.

8) F1values at weight 192 and 256 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.85.

9)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.9 and 0.95

1)F1value becomes 1 for weights 64,256 am 320 at threshold 0.9.

2) F1value becomes 1 for all weights except weight 128 at threshold 0.95.

3)F1value is minimum at weight 128.

4) The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

Conclusion:

As the threshold value increases, the nature of graph is becoming as a straight

Till threshold 0.8,miNImum value of F1value occurs at weight 192 but at 0.85 it gets surpassed and F1value becomes minimum at weight 128.

The F1 value overall remains lowest for weight of 192.

The F1 value overall remains highest for weight of 320.

**Image Size =128**

For threshold: 0.5 to 0.55

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 192.

3) ) F1value is higher than 0.7 for all weights at both thresholds.

4) The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.6 and 0.65

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 192.

3) ) F1value is higher than 0.7 for all weights at both thresholds.

4) The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.7 and 0.75

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 192.

3) ) F1value is higher than 0.75 for all weights at both thresholds.

4) F1values at weight 256 and 320 are comparable to each other at both thresholds.

5) F1value at 64 reaches 0.9 value.

6) The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold 0.8 and 0.85

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 192.

3) ) F1value is higher than 0.8 for all weights at both thresholds.

4) F1values at weights 64, 256 and 320 are comparable to each other at both thresholds.

5)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.9 and 0.95

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 192 for threshold 0.9 equal to 1.

3) F1value is highest for weight 64,192,256 and equal to 1, for threshold 0.95.

4) F1values at weights 64 and 192 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.95.

5) )F1value at weight 320 surpasses F1 value at weight 256 ,and becomes equal to F1 value of weight of 192, at threshold 0.9

6)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

Conclusion:

As the threshold value increases, the nature of graph is becoming as a straight

The F1 value overall remains lowest for weight of 128.

The F1 value overall remains highest for weight of 192.

**Image Size =192**

For threshold: 0.5 to 0.55

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 192.

3) F1values at weights 192 and 320 are comparable to each other at both thresholds.

5)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.6 and 0.65

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 192.

3) ) F1value is higher than 0.6 for all weights at both thresholds.

4) F1values at weights 192 and 320 are comparable to each other at both thresholds.

5)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.7 and 0.75

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 192.

3)F1values at weights 192,256,and 320 are comparable to each other at both thresholds.

4)F1value at weight 256 surpasses F1 value at weight 320 , at threshold 0.75.

5)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.8 and 0.85

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 192 for threshold 0.8.

3) F1value is highest for weight 64 for threshold 0.85.

4) F1values at weights 192,256 and 320 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.8.

5) F1values at weights 64 ,192,256 and 320 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.85.

6)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.9 and 0.95

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 192 for threshold 0.8.

3) F1value is highest for weight 64,192,256 and 320 and equal to 1 for threshold 0.85.

4) F1values at weights 64,192,256 and 320 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.85.

5) F1values at weights 64 ,256 and 320 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.8.

6)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

Conclusion:

As the threshold value increases, the nature of graph is becoming as a straight

Till threshold 0.8,maximum value of F1value occurs at weight 192 but at 0.85 it gets surpassed and F1value becomes maximum at weight 64,although after threshold 0.85 the F1 value is maximum again for weight of 192.

The F1 value overall remains lowest for weight of 128.

The F1 value overall remains highest for weight of 192.

**Image Size =256**

For threshold: 0.5 to 0.55

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 320.

3) The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.6 and 0.65

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 320.

3))F1values at weights 192 and 256, are comparable to each other at both thresholds.

4)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.7 and 0.75

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 192.

3)F1value is higher than 0.6 for all weights at both thresholds.

4)F1values at weights 192 and 320 are comparable to each other at 0.7 threshold.

5)F1values at weights 192 and 256 are comparable to each other at 0.75 threshold.

6)F1value at weight 256 catches upto F1 value at weight 192 , at threshold 0.75.

7)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.8 and 0.85

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 320.

3)F1value is higher than 0.65 for all weights at both thresholds.

4)F1values at weights 192,256 and 320 are comparable to each other at both thresholds.

5)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.9 and 0.95

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weights of 64and 320 equal to 1,for threshold 0.9.

3) F1value is highest for weight 64,192,256 and 320 and equal to 1 for threshold 0.95.

4)F1value at weight 256 catches upto F1 value at weight 192 and weight 320 , at threshold 0.95.

5)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

Conclusion:

As the threshold value increases, the nature of graph is becoming as a straight

The F1 value overall remains lowest for weight of 128.

The F1 value overall remains highest for weight of 320.

**Image Size =320**

For threshold: 0.5 to 0.55

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 320.

3)F1values at weights 192 and 256 are comparable to each other at 0.55 threshold.

5)F1value at weight 192 catches upto F1 value at weight 256 , at threshold 0.55.

7)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.6 and 0.65

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 320.

3)F1value is higher than 0.6 for all weights at both thresholds.

4)F1values at weights 192 and 256 are comparable to each other at 0.6 threshold.

5)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.7 and 0.75

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 320.

3)F1value is higher than 0.6 for all weights at both thresholds.

4)F1values at weights 192 and 256 are comparable to each other at 0.6 threshold.

5)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.8 and 0.85

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 320.

3)F1value is higher than 0.7 for all weights at both thresholds.

4)F1values at weights 192 and 256 are comparable to each other at 0.6 threshold.

5)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.9 and 0.95

1) F1value is lowest at weight 128.

2) F1value is highest for weight 192 equal to 1 ,at threshold 0.9.

3) F1value is highest for weight 192,256 and 320 equal to 1 ,at threshold 0.95.

4)The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

Conclusion:

As the threshold value increases, the nature of graph is becoming as a straight

Till threshold 0.85,maximumvalue of F1value occurs at weight 320 but at 0.9 it gets surpassed and F1value becomes maximum at weight 192

The F1 value overall remains lowest for weight of 128.

The F1 value overall remains highest for weight of 320.

**Overall Conclusion:**

In general, performance of weight of 128 is weakest.

In general, performance of weight of 320 is best.

**Intel TF int8: Precision vs Weight**

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 64**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value is lowest for weight of 192 for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value is highest for weight of 320 for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64, 128 and 256 are nearly same.

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value is lowest for weight of 192 for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value is highest for weight of 320 for both the thresholds.
3. For threshold of 0.65, the precision value of weight of 128 and 192 are nearly same still precision value of 192 is lowest.
4. For threshold of 0.6, the precision value of weight of 128 and 256 are nearly same.
5. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value is lowest for weight of 192 for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value is highest for weight of 320 for both the thresholds.
3. For threshold of 0.7, the precision value of weight of 128 and 192 are nearly same but still precision value of weight of 128 is higher.
4. For threshold of 0.7, the precision value of weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 64 and 128.
5. For threshold of 0.75, the precision value of weight of 128 and 256 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value is highest for weight of 320 for both the thresholds.
2. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 192 is the lowest.
3. For threshold of 0.85, the precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest.
4. When threshold is 0.85, the precision value for weight of 192 surpasses the precision value of weight of 128.
5. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 128 and 192 are nearly same but still precision value of weight of 128 is higher.
6. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 64 and 128.
7. For threshold of 0.85, the precision value of weight of 192 and 256 are nearly same but still precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
8. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 192 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 320 is the best performer.

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 128**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. The precision value for weight of 320 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 64.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 128.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 192.

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. The precision value for weight of 320 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 64.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 128.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 192.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. The precision value for weight of 320 is nearly equal to the precision value of weight of 256, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 128.
5. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 320 is nearly equal to the precision value of weight of 256, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
4. For threshold of 0.85, The precision value for weight of 64,256 and 320 is nearly equal, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
5. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 128 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 192 is the best performer.

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 192**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. The precision value for weight of 192 and 320 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 64

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. The precision value for weight of 192 and 320 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 64.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. For threshold of 0.7, The precision value for weight of 192 and 320 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.
4. For threshold of 0.7, The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
5. For threshold of 0.75, The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 128.
6. For threshold of 0.7, The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 64.
7. For threshold of 0.75, The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 192.
8. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for threshold of 0.8.
3. The precision value of weight of 64 is highest for threshold of 0.85.
4. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 256 and 320 are nearly same.
5. For threshold of 0.85, The precision value for weight of 64, 192, 256 and 320 are nearly same.
6. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 128.
7. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 128 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 192 is the best performer.

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 256**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
4. The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 320.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 64.

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 192.
4. The precision value for weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
5. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 192.
4. For threshold of 0.7, The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. For threshold of 0.75. The precision value for weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 192.
4. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 64 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 320.
6. For threshold of 0.85. The precision value for weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
7. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 128 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 320 is the best performer.

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 320**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 192.
4. For threshold of 0.5, The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 64 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. For threshold of 0.5, The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 320.
6. For threshold of 0.55. The precision value for weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 192.
4. The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 128.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 192.
4. The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 128.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 192.
4. The precision value of weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same.
5. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 128 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 320 is the best performer.

**Jeston TF int8: Precision vs Weight**

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 64**

**Weight: 64, 128, 192,256,320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value is lowest for weight of 192 for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value is highest for weight of 320 for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 128 and 256 are nearly same.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and 192.
5. Precision value of all the weights lie above 0.8.

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value is lowest for weight of 192 for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value is highest for weight of 320 for both the thresholds.
3. For threshold of 0.65, the precision value of weight of 128 and 256 are nearly same.
4. For threshold of 0.6, the precision value of weight of 64, 128 and 256 are nearly same.
5. For threshold of 0.65, The Precision value of weight of 64 surpasses the precision value of weight of 128.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value is lowest for weight of 192 for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value is highest for weight of 320 for both the thresholds.
3. For threshold of 0.75, the precision value of weight of 64 and 320 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 320 is higher
4. For threshold of 0.7, the precision value of weight of 128 and 192 are nearly same but still precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
5. For threshold of 0.7, the precision value of weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 64 and 128.
6. For threshold of 0.75, the precision value of weight of 128 and 256 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
7. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value is highest for weight of 320 for both the thresholds.
2. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 64 and 320 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 320 is higher
3. For threshold of 0.85, the precision value of weight of 320 is highest and is equivalent to 1.
4. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 192 is the lowest.
5. For threshold of 0.85, the precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest.
6. When threshold is 0.85, the precision value for weight of 192 surpasses the precision value of weight of 128.
7. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 128 and 256 are nearly same but still precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
8. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 64 and 128.
9. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.9 and 0.95**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for 0.9 threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 256 and weight of 320 is highest for 0.9 threshold and equl to 1.
3. For threshold 0.95,the precison value of all weights is 1

4. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 192 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 320 is the best performer.
3. As threshold value is increasing, precision values for all the weights are also increasing but the precisions value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 128**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.

2 The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.

3 The precision value for weight of 320 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 64.

4 The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 128.

5 The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 192.

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. For threshold of 0.6, The precision value for weight of 320 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 64.
4. For threshold of 0.65, The precision value of weight of 256 and 320 is nearly equal, still precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
5. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 128.
6. For threshold of 0.6, The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 192.
7. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. For threshold of 0.7, The precision value of weight of 256 and 320 is nearly equal, still precision value of weight of 320 is higher.
4. For threshold of 0.75, The precision value of weight of 320 surpasses the precision value of weight of 256.
5. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 320 is nearly equal to the precision value of weight of 256, still the precision value of weight of 320 is higher.
4. For threshold of 0.85, The precision value for weight of 64 and 320 is nearly equal.
5. For threshold of 0.85, The precision value of weight of 320 surpasses the precision value of weight of 256.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.9 and 0.95**

1.The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both thresholds.

2.The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both thresholds.

3.For threshold 0.9, The precision value of weight of 256 and 192 is nearly equal.

4. For threshold 0.95, The precision value of weight of 64,192 and 320 are nearly equal.

5. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 128 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 192 is the best performer.
3. As threshold value is increasing, precision values for all the weights are also increasing but the precisions value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 192**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. The precision value for weight of 192 and 320 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 64

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. The precision value for weight of 192 and 320 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 64.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. For threshold of 0.7, The precision value for weight of 192 and 320 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 64.
6. The precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.
7. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the thresholds.
3. For threshold of 0.85, The precision value of weight of 64 and 192 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is highest.
4. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 256 and 320 are nearly same, still precision value of weight of 320 is higher.
5. For threshold of 0.85, The precision value for weight of 64, 192, 256 and 320 are nearly same.
6. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
7. The precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.
8. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.9 and 0.95**

1.The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both thresholds.

2.The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for 0.9 threshold and is equal to 1.

3.For threshold 0.9, The precision value of weight of 64,256 and 320 are nearly equal.

4. For threshold 0.95, The precision value of weight of 64,192,256 and 320 are nearly equal and are all equal too 1.

5. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 128 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 192 is the best performer.
3. As threshold value is increasing, precision values for all the weights are also increasing but the precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 256**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
4. The precision value for weight of 192 and 265 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 256.
4. The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. For threshold of 0.65, The precision value for weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 192.
4. For threshold of 0.75, The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 64 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. For threshold of 0.75, The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 320.
6. For threshold of 0.7. The precision value for weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
7. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 192.
4. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 64 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 320.
6. For threshold of 0.85. The precision value for weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
7. The precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.
8. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.9 and 0.95**

1.The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both thresholds.

2.The precision value of weight of 320 is highest for 0.9 threshold and is equal to 1.

3.For threshold 0.9, The precision value of weight of 192 and 320 are nearly equal.

4. For threshold 0.95, The precision value of weight of 192,256 and 320 are nearly equal and are all equal too 1.

5. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 128 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 320 is the best performer.
3. As threshold value is increasing, precision values for all the weights are also increasing but the precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 320**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. For threshold of 0.5, The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 192.
4. For threshold of 0.55, The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. For threshold of 0.55, The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 256.
6. For threshold of 0.55, The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 64.
7. For threshold of 0.5. The precision value for weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 256.
4. The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 64.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 256.
4. The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 64.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 256.
4. For threshold of 0.85, The precision value of weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.
5. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and 320.
6. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and 64.
7. The precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.
8. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.9 and 0.95**

1.The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both thresholds.

2.The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for 0.9 threshold and is equal to 1.

3.For threshold 0.9, The precision value of weight of 256 and 320 are nearly equal.

4. For threshold 0.95, The precision value of weight of 192,256 and 320 are nearly equal and are all equal too 1.

5. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 128 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 320 is the best performer.
3. As threshold value is increasing, precision values for all the weights are also increasing but the precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.

**Final conclusion:**

1. In general, overall performance of weight of 128 is weakest.
2. In general,overall+ performance of weight of 320 is best.
3. For image size 64 the overall worst performance is at weight of 192.
4. For image size 128 and 192 the overall best performance is at weight of 192 .

**Jetson\_tf\_int8\_F\_vs\_W\_dataset1.**

**Data Set: 1**

**Image Size: 64**

**Weights: 64, 128, 192, 256 ,320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Image Size =64**

For threshold: 0.5 to 0.55

1. F1value is lowest at weight 192.
2. F1value is highest for weight 320.
3. F1values at weight 128 and 256 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.5.
4. F1values at weight 128 and 256 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.55.
5. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.6 and 0.65

1. F1value is lowest at weight 192.
2. F1value is highest for weight 320.
3. F1values at weight 128 and 256 are comparable to each other at both thresholds.
4. F1values at weight 64 increases as weight increases.
5. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.7 and 0.75

1. F1value is lowest at weight 192.
2. F1value is highest at weight 320.
3. F1values at weight 64 and 320 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.75.
4. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.8 and 0.85

1. F1value is lowest at weight 192 for threshold 0.8.
2. F1value is lowest at weight 128 for threshold 0.85.
3. F1value is highest for weight 320 for both thresholds.
4. F1values at weight 128 and 192 are in competition to each other at threshold 0.8.
5. F1values at weight 64 and 320 are in competition to each other at threshold 0.8.
6. F1value at weight 192 surpasses F1 value at weight 128 at threshold 0.85.
7. F1value at weight 320 surpasses F1 value at weight 64 to reach 1, at threshold 0.85.
8. F1values at weight 192 and 256 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.85.
9. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.9 and 0.95

1. F1value becomes 1 for weights 256 am 320 at threshold 0.9.
2. F1value becomes 1 for all weights at threshold 0.95.
3. F1value is minimum at weight 128 at 0.9 threshold
4. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

Conclusion:

* As the threshold value increases, the nature of graph is becoming as a straight
* Till threshold 0.8,minimum value of F1value occurs at weight 192 but at 0.85 it gets surpassed and F1value becomes minimum at weight 128.
* The F1 value overall remains lowest for weight of 192.
* The F1 value overall remains highest for weight of 320.

**Image Size =128**

For threshold: 0.5 to 0.55

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 192.
3. F1value is higher than 0.7 for all weights at both thresholds.
4. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.
5. F value at weight 64 and 128 are in close competition.

For threshold: 0.6 and 0.65

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 192.
3. F1value is higher than 0.7 for all weights at both thresholds.
4. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.
5. F value at weight 256 and 320 are in close competition.

For threshold: 0.7 and 0.75

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 192.
3. F1value is higher than 0.75 for all weights at both thresholds.
4. F1values at weight 256 and 320 are comparable to each other at 0.7 threshold.
5. F1value at 64 reaches 0.9 value.
6. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold 0.8 and 0.85

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 192.
3. F1value is higher than 0.8 for all weights at both thresholds.
4. F1values at weights 64, 256 and 320 are comparable to each other at both thresholds.
5. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.9 and 0.95

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 192 for threshold 0.9 equal to 1.
3. F1value is highest for weight 64,192,320 and equal to 1, for threshold 0.95.
4. At 0.9 threshold the weights 192 and 256 are in close competition.
5. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

Conclusion:

* As the threshold value increases, the nature of graph is becoming as a straight
* The F1 value overall remains lowest for weight of 128.
* The F1 value overall remains highest for weight of 192.

**Image Size =192**

For threshold: 0.5 to 0.55

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 192.
3. F1values at weights 192 and 320 are comparable to each other at both thresholds.
4. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.6 and 0.65

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 192.
3. F1value is higher than 0.65 for all weights at both thresholds.
4. F1values at weights 192 and 320 are comparable to each other at both thresholds.
5. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.7 and 0.75

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 192.
3. F1values at weights 192,256,and 320 are comparable to each other at both thresholds.
4. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.8 and 0.85

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 192.
3. F1values at weights 192,256 and 320 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.8.
4. F1values at weights 64 ,192,256 and 320 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.85.
5. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.9 and 0.95

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 192 for threshold 0.9.
3. F1value is highest for weight 64,192,256 and 320 and equal to 1 for threshold 0.95.
4. F1values at weights 64 ,256 and 320 are comparable to each other at threshold 0.9.
5. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

Conclusion:

* As the threshold value increases, the nature of graph is becoming as a straight
* The F1 value overall remains lowest for weight of 128.
* The F1 value overall remains highest for weight of 192.

**Image Size =256**

For threshold: 0.5 to 0.55

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 320.
3. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.
4. weights at 192 and 256 are in close competition.

For threshold: 0.6 and 0.65

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 320.
3. F1values at weights 192 and 256, are comparable to each other at both thresholds.
4. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.7 and 0.75

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 320.
3. F1value is higher than 0.65 for all weights at both thresholds.
4. F1values at weights 192 and 256 are in close competition to each other at 0.7 threshold.
5. F1values at weights 192 and 256 are comparable to each other at 0.75 threshold.
6. F1value at weight 256 F value increases at threshold 0.75.
7. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.8 and 0.85

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 320.
3. F1value is higher than 0.65 for all weights at both thresholds.
4. F1values at weights 192,256 and 320 are comparable to each other at 0.85 threshold.
5. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.
6. The F value at weights 192 and 256 are in close competition.

For threshold: 0.9 and 0.95

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 320 equal to 1,for threshold 0.9.
3. F1value is highest for weights 192,256 and 320 and equal to 1 for threshold 0.95.
4. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

Conclusion:

* As the threshold value increases, the nature of graph is becoming as a straight
* The F1 value overall remains lowest for weight of 128.
* The F1 value overall remains highest for weight of 320.

**Image Size =320**

For threshold: 0.5 to 0.55

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 320.
3. F1values at weights 192 and 256 are in close competition to each other at 0.5 threshold.
4. F1value at weight 192 increases than value at weight 256 , at threshold 0.55.
5. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.6 and 0.65

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 320.
3. F1value is higher than 0.6 for all weights at both thresholds.
4. F1values at weights 192 and 256 are comparable to each other at 0.6 threshold.
5. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.7 and 0.75

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 320.
3. F1value is higher than 0.6 for all weights at both thresholds.
4. F1values at weights 192 and 256 are comparable to each other at both thresholds.
5. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

For threshold: 0.8 and 0.85

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 320.
3. F1value is higher than 0.7 for all weights at both thresholds.
4. F1values at weights 192 and 256 are comparable to each other at 0.8 threshold.
5. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.
6. F1values at weights 192 and 256 are in close competition to each other at 0.85 threshold.

For threshold: 0.9 and 0.95

1. F1value is lowest at weight 128.
2. F1value is highest for weight 192 equal to 1 ,at threshold 0.9.
3. F1value is highest for weight 192,256 and 320 equal to 1 ,at threshold 0.95.
4. The f1 value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

Conclusion:

* As the threshold value increases, the nature of graph is becoming as a straight
* Till threshold 0.85,maximumvalue of F1value occurs at weight 320 but at 0.9 it gets surpassed and F1value becomes maximum at weight 192
* The F1 value overall remains lowest for weight of 128.
* The F1 value overall remains highest for weight of 320.

**Overall Conclusion:**

* In general, performance of weight of 128 is weakest.
* In general, performance of weight of 320 is best.
* The performance at weight is weak at weight 192 in image size 64.
* The performance at weight is best at weight 192 in image size 192 and 128.

**RPI TF int8: Precision vs Weight**

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 64**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value is lowest for weight of 192 for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value is highest for weight of 320 for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 128 and 256 are nearly same.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and 192.
5. Precision value of all the weights lie above 0.8.

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value is lowest for weight of 192 for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value is highest for weight of 320 for both the thresholds.
3. For threshold of 0.65, the precision value of weight of 128 and 256 are nearly same.
4. For threshold of 0.6, the precision value of weight of 64, 128 and 256 are nearly same.
5. For threshold of 0.65, The Precision value of weight of 64 surpasses the precision value of weight of 128.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value is lowest for weight of 192 for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value is highest for weight of 320 for both the thresholds.
3. For threshold of 0.75, the precision value of weight of 64 and 320 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 320 is higher
4. For threshold of 0.7, the precision value of weight of 128 and 192 are nearly same but still precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
5. For threshold of 0.7, the precision value of weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 64 and 128.
6. For threshold of 0.75, the precision value of weight of 128 and 256 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
7. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value is highest for weight of 320 for both the thresholds.
2. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 64 and 320 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 320 is higher
3. For threshold of 0.85, the precision value of weight of 320 is highest and is equivalent to 1.
4. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 192 is the lowest.
5. For threshold of 0.85, the precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest.
6. When threshold is 0.85, the precision value for weight of 192 surpasses the precision value of weight of 128.
7. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 128 and 256 are nearly same but still precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
8. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 64 and 128.
9. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 192 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 320 is the best performer.
3. As threshold value is increasing, precision values for all the weights are also increasing but the precisions value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 128**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. The precision value for weight of 320 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 64.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 128.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 192.

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. For threshold of 0.6, The precision value for weight of 320 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 64.
4. For threshold of 0.65, The precision value of weight of 256 and 320 is nearly equal, still precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
5. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 128.
6. For threshold of 0.6, The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 192.
7. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. For threshold of 0.7, The precision value of weight of 256 and 320 is nearly equal, still precision value of weight of 320 is higher.
4. For threshold of 0.75, The precision value of weight of 320 surpasses the precision value of weight of 256.
5. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 320 is nearly equal to the precision value of weight of 256, still the precision value of weight of 320 is higher.
4. For threshold of 0.85, The precision value for weight of 64 and 320 is nearly equal.
5. For threshold of 0.85, The precision value of weight of 320 surpasses the precision value of weight of 256.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 128 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 192 is the best performer.
3. As threshold value is increasing, precision values for all the weights are also increasing but the precisions value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 192**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. The precision value for weight of 192 and 320 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 64

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. The precision value for weight of 192 and 320 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 64.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the threshold.
3. For threshold of 0.7, The precision value for weight of 192 and 320 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.
4. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 64.
6. The precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.
7. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the threshold.
2. The precision value of weight of 192 is highest for both the thresholds.
3. For threshold of 0.85, The precision value of weight of 64 and 192 are nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is highest.
4. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 256 and 320 are nearly same, still precision value of weight of 320 is higher.
5. For threshold of 0.85, The precision value for weight of 64, 192, 256 and 320 are nearly same.
6. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
7. The precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.
8. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 128 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 192 is the best performer.
3. As threshold value is increasing, precision values for all the weights are also increasing but the precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 256**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and precision value of weight of 128.
4. The precision value for weight of 192 and 265 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 256.
4. The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. For threshold of 0.65, The precision value for weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 192.
4. For threshold of 0.75, The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 64 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. For threshold of 0.75, The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 320.
6. For threshold of 0.7. The precision value for weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
7. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 192.
4. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 64 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. For threshold of 0.8, The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 320.
6. For threshold of 0.85. The precision value for weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.
7. The precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.
8. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 128 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 320 is the best performer.
3. As threshold value is increasing, precision values for all the weights are also increasing but the precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.

**Data-set: 1**

**Image size: 320**

**Weight: 64, 128, 160, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Precision Value: in range from 0.5 to 1**

**For threshold 0.5 and 0.55**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. For threshold of 0.5, The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 192.
4. For threshold of 0.55, The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. For threshold of 0.55, The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 256.
6. For threshold of 0.55, The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 64.
7. For threshold of 0.5. The precision value for weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 256 is higher.

**For threshold 0.6 and 0.65**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 256.
4. The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 64.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.7 and 0.75**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 256.
4. The precision value for weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 320 and precision value of weight of 256.
5. The precision value for weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and precision value of weight of 64.
6. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**For threshold 0.8 and 0.85**

1. The precision value of weight of 128 is the lowest for both the thresholds.
2. The precision value of weight of 320 is the highest for both the thresholds.
3. The precision value for weight of 64 lies between the precision value of weight of 128 and precision value of weight of 256.
4. For threshold of 0.85, The precision value of weight of 192 and 256 is nearly same, still the precision value of weight of 192 is higher.
5. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 192 lies between the precision value of weight of 256 and 320.
6. For threshold of 0.8, the precision value of weight of 256 lies between the precision value of weight of 192 and 64.
7. The precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.
8. The precision value for all the weights increased, this means that the graph is shifting upwards.

**Overall:**

1. Weight of 128 is a weak performer.
2. Weight of 320 is the best performer.
3. As threshold value is increasing, precision values for all the weights are also increasing but the precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.

**Final conclusion:**

1. Weight of 128 is a weak performer.
2. Precision values for all the weights are also increasing but the precision value of weight of 64 is increasing at faster rate as compared to others.
3. For image size 64, 256 and 320, weight of 320 is a good performer.
4. For image size 128 and 192, weight of 192 is a good performer.

#rpi\_tf\_int8\_f\_vs\_w\_d1

**Data Set: 1**

**Weights: 64, 128, 192, 256, 320**

**Threshold: 0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95**

**Image Size : 64**

* For threshold 0.5 and 0.55

1. For both thresholds the lowest F value is at weight 192 & Highest F value is at 320.
2. At both thresholds the F values are nearly equal for 128 and 256 weights.
3. All weights have values are above 0.8 F value.
4. As F value increases, graphs shift towards ideal value.

* For threshold 0.6 and 0.65

1. At both threshold the lowest F value is at weight 192 & Highest F value is at 320.
2. At threshold 0.6 the F values at weight 64 and 128 are in close competition whereas at weight 128 and 256, F value is same.
3. The weights at 128 & 256 are in close competition with each other at 0.65 threshold
4. The F value at 0.65 threshold at weight 64 surpasses it at threshold 0.6

* For threshold 0.7 and 0.75

1. At 0.7 threshold the lowest F value is at weight 192 & Highest F value is at 320.
2. At 0.75 threshold the lowest F value is at 192 & Highest F value at 320 and 64 is nearly equal.
3. The nature of graph remains same.
4. As the F value increases graph shifts upwards approaching 1.

* For threshold 0.8 and 0.85

1. At 0.8 threshold the lowest F value is at weight 192 & Highest F value is nearly same at 64 & 320 weight.
2. At 0.8 thresholds the F values are in competition for 128 and 256 weights.
3. At 0.85 threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 & Highest F value is at weight 320 equal to 1.
4. Weights 128, 192, 256 seems to be collinear at 0.85 threshold.
5. All weights have values are above 0.9 F value.

* For threshold 0.9 and 0.95

1. At threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 & the weights 256 and 320 are equal to ideal F value equal to 1.
2. The graph shifts upward, as F value increases at higher rate.
3. At 0.95 all the values at F approaches to 1.

Overall:

1. Till 0.8 threshold the lowest F value is at weight 192. At Higher threshold it is lowest at weight 128 onwards. The performances are weakest at minimum F values.
2. Till 0.7 the f Value is highest at weight 320. From 0.75 to 0.8 threshold it seems equally highest at weights 320 and 64.
3. At 0.85 threshold its highest F value is at weight 320 equal to 1.
4. At the threshold 0.9 highest F value is tie between 256 and 320
5. Maximum value of F value is 1 which occurs at 0.95 threshold.

**Image Size : 128**

* For threshold 0.5 and 0.55

1. At 0.5 threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 & Highest F value is at 192.
2. At 0.5 threshold the F value at weight 64 and 128 are in competition.
3. At 0.55 threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 and 64 are almost same & Highest F value is at 192.
4. As F value increases the all weight having values shifts towards ideal condition.
5. All weights lie above 0.7 threshold here.

* For threshold 0.6 and 0.65

1. The lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest at weight 192 at both thresholds.
2. The F value at 0.6 threshold of weight 64 gradually increases above 0.7 F value.
3. The F values at weights 256 & 320 becomes nearly equal.
4. At 0.65 the F value surpasses the value at the threshold of 0.6.
5. Here the difference between F values of weight 128 & 192 is comparably more than other weights.
6. As the value increases of all weights, graphs shift upwards.

* For threshold 0.7 and 0.75

1. The lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest at weight 192 at both thresholds.
2. At 0.75 threshold the F value at weight 320 surpasses the weight 256.
3. Basically, overall nature of graph remains same maintaining lowest & highest values at same weights to previous thresholds.
4. As the value increases of all weights, graphs shift upwards.

* For threshold 0.8 and 0.85

1. The lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest at weight 192 at both thresholds.
2. At threshold 0.8 the F values are nearly equal for weight 64 & 256.
3. But at threshold 0.85 the F values are nearly equal for weight 64 & 320.
4. The F values at weight 64 and 320 takes a drift in from their previous F values.
5. Here the difference between F values of weight 128 & 192 is comparably more than other weights.

* For threshold 0.9 and 0.95

1. The lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest at weight 192 & 256 at 0.9 threshold.
2. The lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest value is at weights 64, 192 & 320 equal to 1 at threshold 0.95.
3. All weights have F values above 0.8 F value.
4. As the value increases of all weights, graphs shift upwards.

Overall:

1. At 0.5 threshold Minimum F value is at weight 128. Whereas the minimum F value is nearly equal in 0.55 threshold at weights 128 & 64.
2. After 0.55 threshold or at Higher thresholds the F value is minimum at weight 128.
3. Minimum F values at particular weight result a bad performance of that weight.
4. Till 0.85 threshold the F value at weight 192 is maximum i.e. best performer.
5. At higher thresholds at 0.9 maximum F value is equal for weight 192 and 256. Whereas for weights 64, 192 & 320 it becomes 1 an ideal condition.
6. As the graph move upwards it’s F value approaches to 1 at particular weights.

**Image Size : 192**

* For threshold 0.5 and 0.55

1. For both thresholds the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 192 & 320.
2. There is much difference in F values between weight 128 (lowest one) and 192 &320( highest ones)
3. The nature of graph remains same.
4. Here at both thresholds, the weights 192 and 320 are having same F value.

* For threshold 0.6 and 0.65

1. For both thresholds the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 192 & 320.
2. The F value increases at weight 64 of threshold 0.65 in comparison with 0.6 threshold.
3. Again, there is much difference un F values between weight 128 (lowest one) and 192 &320( highest ones).
4. F value increases the graph shifts upwards.

* For threshold 0.7 and 0.75

1. For 0.7 threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 192 & 320.
2. For threshold 0.75 the lowest F value is at 128 and highest is at weight 192.
3. At 0.7 the weight 256 is in competition with 192 and 320 where as at 0.75 threshold the weight 256 is in competition with 320.
4. The F values at weight 64 and 128 increases slightly.

* For threshold 0.8 and 0.85

1. For both thresholds the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 192.
2. The weights at 64, 256 & 320 are in close competition with each other of F values at threshold 0.8.
3. The weights 64 & 320 are in close competition with each other.
4. The F value at 64 weight increases gradually increase in thresholds.
5. As the value increases all weights suppose to shift upwards.

For threshold 0.9 and 0.95

1. For 0.9 threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 192.
2. At 0.95 threshold the lowest F value is at 128 weight and highest F value becomes 1 for all rest of the weights.
3. The weights 256 & 64 are having nearly equal F values.
4. The value of weight 128 increases at higher rate tending to be above 0.8 F value.

Overall:

1. At all thresholds F value is minimum at weight 128, it’s performance is bad.
2. Till 0.7 threshold the maximum F value is equal at weights 192 and 320. From 0.75 to 0.9 threshold maximum F value is at weight 192.
3. Maximum F values at 0.95 threshold, all weight except at weight 128 all having F values equal to 1.
4. As the weights F value increases graph shifts upward.

**Image Size : 256**

* For threshold 0.5 and 0.55
* For both threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 320.
* The F values of weight 192 and 256 are nearly same.
* Highest value at 320 approaching 1
* All weights lie above 0.5 F value.
* The difference between weights 128(lowest ones) & 256 and 192(highest ones)
* For threshold 0.6 and 0.65

1. For both threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 320
2. The F value at weight 64 of threshold 0.65 surpasses the value at threshold 0.6.
3. The weights 192 and 256 comes in close competition with their F values in 0.65 threshold.
4. The difference between weights 128(lowest ones) & 256 and 192(highest ones)

* For threshold 0.7 and 0.75
* For both threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 320.
* At 0.75 threshold the F values at weights 192, 256 & 320 becomes collinear.
* The F values at weight 64 and 128 increases at higher threshold.
* All weights have F value lies at 0.6 F value or above it.
* For threshold 0.8 and 0.85

1. For both threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 320.
2. The F values of all weights lies above 0.6 F value.
3. The F value at weight 64 of threshold 0.85 surpasses the value at threshold 0.8.
4. At 0.85 weights 192 and 256 are almost equal.
5. As the value of weights increases, graph shifts upwards.

* For threshold 0.9 and 0.95

1. For 0.9 threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 320 equal to 1.
2. At 0.9 threshold the weight 192 and 256 are in competition.
3. At 0.95 the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest at weight 192, 256 & 320 equal to 1.
4. All weights have F value above 0.7 F values.

Overall:

1. For all thresholds the minimum F value is at weight 128. Thus weight 128 acts as bad performer.
2. Till 0.9 threshold the maximum F value is at weight 320, as it performs best.
3. Whereas at higher threshold the F value becomes 1 for weights 192, 256 & 320.

**Image Size : 320**

* For threshold 0.5 and 0.55

1. For both threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 320.
2. At 0.5 threshold the F values is equal for weights 192 and 256.
3. All weights lies above 0.6 F values.
4. The F value at weight 192 at threshold 0.55 surpasses the value at 0.5 threshold.

* For threshold 0.6 and 0.65

1. For both threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 320.
2. The F value at weight 64 and 128 increases slightly as compared to 0.6 threshold.
3. The overall graph nature remains same.

* For threshold 0.7 and 0.75

1. For both threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 320.
2. The F value at 0.75 threshold at weight 64 surpasses the value at threshold 0.7.
3. The F value at 0.75 threshold at weight 128 surpasses the value at threshold 0.7.
4. The weights 256 and 192 are in competition with each other.

* For threshold 0.8 and 0.85

1. For both threshold the lowest F value is at weight 128 and highest F value is equal at weights 320.
2. At threshold 0.8 the weights 192 and 320 are in close competition with each other.
3. At threshold 0.85 the weights 192 and 256 are nearly equal.
4. At 0.85 threshold at weight 64 the F value increases.
5. All weights lies above 0.7 F values.

* For threshold 0.9 and 0.95

1. At 0.9 threshold the lowest F value is at 128 and highest is at weight 192.
2. At 0.95 threshold the lowest F value is at 128 and highest is at weight 192, 256, 320 which is equal to 1.
3. At 0.9 threshold the weights 256 and 320 are having closest F value.
4. F value increases at weight 64 approaches to 1 at 0.95 threshold.

**Overall:**

1. For all thresholds the minimum F value is at weight 128. Thus weight 128 acts as bad performer.
2. Till 0.85 threshold the maximum F value is at weight 320. At 0.9 threshold the maximum F value is at weight 192. Max F value proportional to best performer.
3. At higher I.e. 0.95 threshold the F value is higher at thresholds 192, 256 & 320 which is equal to 1.

Overall Conclusion:

* In general, best performance is at weight 320.
* In general, weak performance is at weight 128.
* For image size 64, weight 320 is best performer & weight 192 is weak performer.
* For image size 128, the best performer is at weight 192.
* Nature of graphs may vary but always the whole graph shifts upwards with the increasing value of the threshold.
* For image size 128 at weight 192 F value increases at higher rate in comparison with 64 weight.