Indian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Studies
ISSN: 3108-1681 | Volume- 1, Issue- 3 | July - September 2025

Role of Artificial Intelligence in Crop Disease Detection and Management

Dr. Rana Pratap Yadav[1] & Prasant Kumar[2]
[1]Associate Professor, Department of Geography, VSSD College Kanpur 208002
[2]Research Scholar, Department of Geography, VSSD College Kanpur 208002

Abstract

Crop diseases remain a major constraint on agricultural productivity, profitability and food security. Conventional diagnosis relies on visual inspection and laboratory methods, but limited expertise, delayed reporting and the similarity of symptoms across diseases and environmental stresses often restrict timely intervention. Artificial intelligence (AI), particularly machine learning, deep learning and computer vision, offers methods for recognising disease-associated symptoms, identifying affected plant tissues and estimating disease risk. This paper presents a narrative review of published research on AI-based crop disease detection and its implications for agricultural management. It examines image acquisition, feature-based classification, convolutional neural networks, transfer learning, object detection, segmentation, remote sensing and the integration of meteorological and agronomic data. Published studies report high classification accuracy on curated image datasets, but substantially weaker results may occur when models encounter unfamiliar field conditions. The review therefore distinguishes experimental accuracy from diagnostic reliability and practical usefulness. Particular attention is given to dataset quality, external validation, disease severity estimation, interpretable predictions and integration with established plant pathology practices. For Indian agriculture, locally representative datasets, affordable mobile applications and collaboration with agricultural extension institutions are essential. The review concludes that AI can strengthen crop disease surveillance and support timely management decisions, but should complement rather than replace biological diagnosis and field-based evaluation.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; crop disease detection; deep learning; convolutional neural networks; computer vision; precision agriculture; disease prediction.

Introduction

Crop diseases caused by fungi, bacteria, viruses and other pathogens adversely affect plant growth, yield, produce quality and farm income. Disease development is shaped by interactions among host susceptibility, pathogen presence and environmental conditions. Temperature, rainfall and humidity can influence infection and spread, while changes in agricultural practices and crop varieties alter local disease patterns. The Food and Agriculture Organization estimates

Published: 08 September 2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70558/IJMRS.2025.v1.i3.301047
Copyright © 2025 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

that up to 40% of global crop production is lost annually to plant pests and diseases combined (FAO, n.d.). This estimate cannot be attributed to crop diseases alone, but it demonstrates the importance of effective plant health management.

Disease identification traditionally involves observing symptoms and signs, examining crop history and applying laboratory procedures when necessary. Microscopy, culturing, enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays and polymerase chain reaction testing can help establish pathogen identity, but require appropriate expertise and infrastructure. At the farm level, diagnosis often depends on farmers or extension workers recognising visible abnormalities such as leaf spots, chlorosis, wilting and tissue necrosis. These symptoms are not always disease-specific: nutrient deficiency, moisture stress and chemical injury may produce similar appearances. Incorrect interpretation can delay control measures or lead to unnecessary pesticide use.

AI-based methods offer an additional layer of diagnostic assistance by analysing crop photographs and associated agricultural data. Machine learning identifies relationships within measured features, while deep learning learns visual representations directly from images. Computer vision can classify suspected disease categories, locate affected regions and estimate visibly damaged tissue. Combining these outputs with weather observations, crop stage and previous outbreaks may support risk forecasting and more targeted surveillance. However, a computer-generated classification is not equivalent to laboratory confirmation. The practical question is whether AI performs reliably across crops, locations and seasons and produces information useful for field management. This review examines these capabilities and limitations from both computational and agricultural perspectives.

Review of Literature and Research Gap

Early computational approaches classified plant diseases using manually extracted colour, texture and shape features with algorithms such as support vector machines and decision trees. Deep learning subsequently enabled models to learn more complex visual patterns with less dependence on manually designed features. Mohanty et al. (2016) analysed 54,306 PlantVillage images spanning 38 healthy and diseased crop categories and reported a maximum classification accuracy of 99.35% on held-out images from that dataset. Yet accuracy fell to approximately 31.4% and 31.7% on two external datasets, illustrating how strongly results may depend on image acquisition conditions and data distribution.

Ferentinos (2018) trained convolutional neural networks using 87,848 images across 58 plant–disease categories and reported 99.53% test accuracy. Too et al. (2019) compared fine-tuned deep learning architectures, including VGG, ResNet, Inception and DenseNet, demonstrating the usefulness of transfer learning for agricultural image classification. These results establish the technical potential of deep learning, but differences in datasets and evaluation procedures prevent straightforward comparison of reported percentages.

Field-oriented research has highlighted further challenges. Ramcharan et al. (2017) investigated cassava disease identification using images collected under agricultural conditions in Tanzania. Singh et al. (2020) introduced PlantDoc, containing 2,598 images of 13 plant species and up to 17 disease categories, to support research using more visually complex

scenes. Reviews by Boulent et al. (2019) and Upadhyay et al. (2025) describe the expanding use of convolutional networks and computer vision in plant health monitoring while identifying persistent problems involving data representation and deployment.

A recurring gap is the emphasis on image-level classification rather than the complete disease management process. Fewer studies establish how model outputs relate to pathogen verification, disease progression, treatment decisions, reduced crop losses or economic outcomes. Models trained in one environment may also struggle in different agro-climatic regions. The present review therefore considers disease recognition together with severity assessment, environmental prediction, external validation and practical decision support.

Objectives and Research Methodology

The study aims to examine the technical approaches used in AI-based crop disease recognition; assess the integration of imagery, remote sensing and environmental information; evaluate diagnostic reliability under field conditions; and identify opportunities for AI-assisted integrated disease management, particularly in India.

A narrative review methodology was adopted using published experimental studies, scientific reviews and institutional literature concerning plant disease diagnosis, machine learning, deep learning and digital crop monitoring. Foundational studies published from 2016 onward were considered alongside later contributions. The analysis focused on input data, model design, evaluation methods, observed limitations and potential agricultural applications. Four related functions guided the synthesis: recognition of disease-associated symptoms, localisation and quantification of damage, prediction of disease risk, and support for management decisions.

This is a secondary-literature study rather than a systematic review or meta-analysis. No original image dataset was collected, model trained or field trial conducted. Consequently, the proposed applications represent a technical and conceptual assessment, not experimental confirmation that AI improves yield or reduces pesticide use.

Technical Approaches to Crop Disease Detection

Image Acquisition, Preprocessing and Conventional Machine Learning

Crop images can be captured using smartphones, field cameras, unmanned aerial vehicles and sensors mounted on agricultural equipment. Their quality depends on lighting, viewing angle, distance, background, growth stage and the visibility of symptoms. Image preprocessing commonly includes resizing, normalisation, noise reduction and contrast adjustment. Such operations improve computational consistency, but excessive colour correction can remove biologically meaningful evidence, including changes associated with chlorosis or necrosis. Segmentation can separate plant tissues from soil, vegetation and other background elements, while data augmentation introduces controlled variation in rotation, scale and illumination. Augmented images should remain biologically plausible.

Conventional supervised learning methods first convert observations into numerical features. Colour histograms, texture descriptors, lesion dimensions and shape measurements can be supplied to classifiers such as support vector machines, random forests and k-nearest

neighbours. These methods may perform well where symptoms are visually distinctive and datasets are modest. Random forests can represent nonlinear interactions among features, although feature importance does not establish biological causation. Their central limitation is dependence on the selected features. A pattern distinguishing one disease in a controlled experiment may not capture changing symptom appearance, mixed infections or differences among cultivars.

Training and test datasets also require careful separation. When photographs of the same plant, field or acquisition session appear in both datasets, a model may partly memorise shared visual characteristics and produce overly favourable results. Splitting observations by field, location or season provides a more demanding assessment of real-world generalisation than a random image-level division.

Deep Learning and Transfer Learning

Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) are widely employed for crop disease classification because they learn visual features directly from image pixels. Early convolutional layers identify edges, colour transitions and local textures, whereas deeper layers learn more complex combinations of lesions and plant structures. Classification layers then generate scores for the disease categories represented during training. Network parameters are adjusted through backpropagation to minimise an objective such as cross-entropy loss. Performance depends on image diversity, diagnostic label quality, class balance and the match between training data and the target environment.

Transfer learning adapts a network previously trained on a large image collection to a crop-specific classification problem. ResNet uses residual connections to facilitate training deeper networks; DenseNet promotes feature reuse; and mobile-oriented architectures such as MobileNet seek to reduce computational requirements. Transfer learning is particularly useful when collecting large, expertly labelled plant disease datasets is difficult. Nevertheless, the most complex architecture is not necessarily the best choice for field deployment. Inference speed, storage requirements, battery consumption and reliability on affordable devices may matter more than a small improvement in benchmark accuracy. A high model confidence score should also not be confused with a verified probability of pathogen presence, especially when the photograph differs from the training images.

Disease Localisation and Severity Estimation

Image classification identifies a category, whereas object detection locates predefined targets, such as affected leaves or lesions, within a photograph. Detection models based on YOLO or region-based convolutional networks can identify multiple symptomatic regions, although a bounding box may include substantial healthy tissue. Semantic segmentation methods, including U-Net-type architectures, can provide finer estimates by assigning individual pixels to symptomatic or apparently healthy areas when reliable annotations are available.

An image-derived disease severity indicator may be calculated as:

Visible disease severity (%) = (Symptomatic leaf area / Total visible leaf area) × 100.

This measure describes the proportion of visible tissue showing symptoms. It is not necessarily equivalent to pathogen abundance, total plant damage or expected yield loss. Severity interpretation depends on the disease, crop growth stage, lesion location and physiological importance of affected tissues. Practical systems therefore require crop-specific severity scales, repeated observations and comparison with assessments made by qualified plant pathologists.

Remote Sensing and Disease Risk Prediction

Remote sensing broadens disease surveillance from individual leaves to fields and agricultural landscapes. Multispectral and hyperspectral instruments record crop reflectance, while thermal sensors provide information related to canopy temperature and water status. Satellite and drone imagery can reveal changes in vegetation condition across space and time. Indices such as the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index support assessment of vegetation characteristics, but abnormal reflectance does not independently confirm infection. Nutrient deficiency, drought, insect damage and natural senescence can produce similar spectral responses. Remotely sensed anomalies should therefore guide field inspection unless a disease-specific model has undergone independent validation.

The integration of photographs with weather and crop-management records may improve interpretation. A multimodal system can combine image features with temperature, rainfall, humidity, leaf wetness, soil moisture, cultivar susceptibility and crop growth stage. These variables are relevant because disease development results from interactions among the host, pathogen and environment. Computational approaches may merge image and tabular representations or combine predictions from separate models. However, data from different sources must be aligned in time and space, missing values addressed and the additional predictive value tested against simpler alternatives.

Disease recognition and disease prediction serve different purposes. Recognition evaluates symptoms already observed, whereas prediction estimates the likelihood of occurrence or progression over a specified future period. Algorithms such as random forests, gradient boosting and recurrent neural networks may analyse weather sequences and previous outbreaks. For example, a system monitoring wheat disease risk could identify weather conditions favourable to infection and recommend intensified scouting. Elevated environmental risk does not establish that disease is present: susceptible crops, pathogen inoculum and suitable conditions must coincide. Prediction models must also avoid using future information during training and be tested across multiple seasons. Where repeated disease observations exist, progression can be examined through temporal severity measures, including the area under the disease progress curve.

Model Evaluation and Field Reliability

Overall classification accuracy is insufficient when some diseases are uncommon or certain errors have greater consequences. Precision measures the share of positive predictions that are correct, while recall measures the share of actual positive cases successfully detected. The F1-score combines precision and recall. Confusion matrices reveal disease categories that are frequently mistaken for one another; macro-averaged scores are useful when class representation is uneven. Localisation and segmentation require spatial measures, including

Intersection over Union and the Dice coefficient. Model confidence calibration and the ability to flag unfamiliar images are also important for responsible agricultural use.

External field validation is critical. A model should be evaluated on images collected from farms, locations, cultivars, seasons and devices not represented in training. Testing should include early symptoms, mixed infections, complex backgrounds and abiotic stresses that resemble disease. The contrast between internal and external results reported by Mohanty et al. (2016) demonstrates why a successful laboratory benchmark does not guarantee reliable diagnosis. Mobile systems additionally require tests of inference time, memory, connectivity and ease of use. A practical diagnostic tool must be judged by its performance in the environment where farmers and extension personnel will actually use it.

Role in Integrated Crop Disease Management

AI has agricultural value only when its outputs inform appropriate action. Integrated disease management combines surveillance, resistant varieties where available, agronomic practices, biological understanding and judicious plant protection measures. Within this framework, AI can help identify fields requiring attention, document suspected symptoms and support referral for expert diagnosis. A disease alert could prompt inspection, review of weather conditions and comparison with locally approved recommendations. It should not automatically trigger pesticide use, particularly when symptoms are ambiguous or disease identification remains uncertain.

Management decisions depend on crop stage, disease intensity, cultivar susceptibility, expected yield, intervention cost and local agronomic guidance. A classifier based solely on leaf imagery cannot adequately consider all these factors. Decision-support tools can instead combine diagnostic evidence with field observations and management records to prioritise responses. Recommendations involving chemical or biological control should follow locally applicable guidance and product-registration requirements, including resistance-management principles.

The claimed benefits of AI also require evaluation beyond model accuracy. Earlier recognition does not necessarily translate into lower disease severity, improved yield or reduced expenditure. Comparative field studies should measure time to reliable diagnosis, unnecessary treatments avoided, disease development, cost of intervention and marketable yield. These outcomes are necessary to determine whether AI-assisted management provides measurable advantages over established practices.

Applications and Challenges in Indian Agriculture

Indian agriculture encompasses diverse crop varieties, production environments, farm sizes and levels of digital access. Rice, wheat, potato, sugarcane and vegetable crops face different disease risks across regions, making one universal image classifier unlikely to provide dependable diagnoses everywhere. Smartphone applications may support preliminary screening, but require locally collected images and pathogen labels verified by specialists. Interfaces should use understandable language, clearly communicate uncertainty and permit referral to agricultural advisers.

In Uttar Pradesh, research could focus on regionally relevant conditions such as wheat rust, rice blast and potato late blight, depending on documented local prevalence. A suitable study could collect georeferenced field images together with weather information, crop stage, cultivar and laboratory or expert diagnosis. Separate districts and cropping seasons should be reserved for external validation. Comparing image-only models with systems incorporating environmental information would establish whether additional data meaningfully improve predictions. Agricultural universities, Krishi Vigyan Kendras and plant pathology laboratories could contribute to data collection, diagnostic review and farmer training.

Several barriers remain. Curated datasets may overrepresent clean backgrounds and advanced symptoms while underrepresenting early infection, mixed diseases and unusual field conditions. Some pathogens cannot be differentiated reliably from photographs alone. Large networks may also require more processing resources than low-cost phones can provide, although quantisation and other optimisation methods may help. Maintenance, data security, farmer consent and periodic model updates are important, particularly where field locations and production records are collected. Explainability tools such as Grad-CAM can show image regions influencing a prediction but cannot prove that the detected pattern corresponds to a particular pathogen. Systems should therefore allow uncertain classifications and encourage further assessment rather than provide unjustified diagnostic certainty.

Future Research Directions

Further research should prioritise geographically diverse datasets with specialist-confirmed labels, including healthy tissue, multiple disease stages and noninfectious stresses. Stronger evaluation requires field- and season-separated testing, transparent reporting of class-specific errors and comparative assessment of model performance across devices and locations. Self-supervised learning, domain adaptation and few-shot learning may reduce data requirements, but their effectiveness must be demonstrated under genuine field conditions.

Longitudinal monitoring offers additional opportunities to connect symptoms with disease progression and subsequent crop performance. Combining field photographs, remote sensing and epidemiological observations may support targeted scouting and locally calibrated alerts. Collaborative studies involving computer scientists, plant pathologists, agricultural universities and extension agencies should assess diagnostic quality alongside farmer adoption, management costs and crop outcomes. Such evidence is necessary before AI systems can be considered dependable components of sustainable crop protection.

Conclusion

AI has expanded the possibilities for identifying crop disease symptoms, locating affected tissues and monitoring risk across agricultural environments. CNNs, transfer learning and segmentation methods demonstrate considerable promise, while remote sensing and environmental data can support broader surveillance. Yet strong results on controlled datasets do not establish reliability across farms, seasons and disease conditions. Data bias, overlapping symptoms, incomplete pathogen verification and weak external validation remain significant constraints.

The most defensible role of AI is therefore as a decision-support technology integrated with plant pathology, field inspection and evidence-based disease management. In India, progress depends on affordable deployment, local datasets, expert involvement and meaningful agricultural evaluation. Ultimately, AI systems should be assessed not only by their ability to classify images, but by whether they help farmers make more timely, reliable and sustainable crop protection decisions.

References

Boulent, J., Foucher, S., Théau, J., & St-Charles, P.-L. (2019). Convolutional neural networks for the automatic identification of plant diseases. *Frontiers in Plant Science, 10*, 941. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2019.00941

Ferentinos, K. P. (2018). Deep learning models for plant disease detection and diagnosis. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 145*, 311–318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2018.01.009

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2021.). *Plant production and protection: About*. https://www.fao.org/plant-production-protection/about

Mohanty, S. P., Hughes, D. P., & Salathé, M. (2016). Using deep learning for image-based plant disease detection. *Frontiers in Plant Science, 7*, 1419. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.01419

Ramcharan, A., Baranowski, K., McCloskey, P., Ahmed, B., Legg, J., & Hughes, D. P. (2017). Deep learning for image-based cassava disease detection. *Frontiers in Plant Science, 8*, 1852. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.01852

Singh, D., Jain, N., Jain, P., Kayal, P., Kumawat, S., & Batra, N. (2020). PlantDoc: A dataset for visual plant disease detection. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM IKDD CoDS and 25th COMAD* (pp. 249–253). https://doi.org/10.1145/3371158.3371196

Too, E. C., Li, Y., Njuki, S., & Liu, Y. (2019). A comparative study of fine-tuning deep learning models for plant disease identification. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 161*, 272–279. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2018.03.032

Upadhyay, A., Chandel, N. S., Singh, K. P., Chakraborty, S. K., Nandede, B. M., Kumar, M., Subeesh, A., Upendar, K., Salem, A., & Elbeltagi, A. (2025). Deep learning and computer vision in plant disease detection: A comprehensive review of techniques, models, and trends in precision agriculture. *Artificial Intelligence Review, 58*, Article 92. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-024-11100-x