
Deep Learning Architectures for Anomaly Detection in Precision Agriculture: A Systematic Review

Dr. Haruto Tanak

Affiliation: Department of Computer Science, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, Japan

Prof. Aiko Nakamura

Affiliation: Graduate School of Engineering, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

Published Date: - 11 September 2024, Page No.: - 56-61

KEYWORDS

Precision Agriculture, Deep Learning, Anomaly Detection, Convolutional Neural Networks, Recurrent Neural Networks, IoT-based Agriculture, Smart Farming, Graph Neural Networks, Crop Monitoring, Predictive Analytics

ABSTRACT

Precision agriculture has emerged as a transformative approach to optimizing crop yield, resource utilization, and environmental sustainability. Among emerging technologies, deep learning-based anomaly detection has gained prominence due to its ability to identify irregularities in complex agricultural datasets, including crop health, soil conditions, and sensor-generated data. This paper presents a systematic review of contemporary deep learning architectures applied to anomaly detection in precision agriculture. The review synthesizes studies spanning convolutional neural networks, recurrent neural networks, graph-based models, and hybrid architectures, emphasizing technical mechanisms, real-world applicability, and performance metrics. Comparative analyses reveal current strengths, limitations, and gaps in model interpretability, scalability, and integration with Internet-of-Things (IoT) frameworks. Findings indicate that while deep learning significantly enhances detection accuracy and decision-making efficiency, challenges remain in data heterogeneity, computational requirements, and domain-specific adaptation. This study consolidates theoretical foundations and empirical evidence, providing a research roadmap for deploying robust, high-performing anomaly detection systems in precision agriculture.

INTRODUCTION

1 Problem Statement

Precision agriculture has emerged as a transformative approach to optimizing crop yield, resource utilization, and environmental sustainability. Among emerging technologies, deep learning-based anomaly detection has gained prominence due to its ability to identify irregularities

in complex agricultural datasets, including crop health, soil conditions, and sensor-generated data. This paper presents a systematic review of contemporary deep learning architectures applied to anomaly detection in precision agriculture. The review synthesizes studies spanning convolutional neural networks, recurrent neural networks, graph-based models, and hybrid architectures, emphasizing

technical mechanisms, real-world applicability, and performance metrics. Comparative analyses reveal current strengths, limitations, and gaps in model interpretability, scalability, and integration with Internet-of-Things (IoT) frameworks. Findings indicate that while deep learning significantly enhances detection accuracy and decision-making efficiency, challenges remain in data heterogeneity, computational requirements, and domain-specific adaptation. This study consolidates theoretical foundations and empirical evidence, providing a research roadmap for deploying robust, high-performing anomaly detection systems in precision agriculture.

RESULTS

4.1 Model Performance and Detection Accuracy

Analysis of deep learning architectures demonstrates substantial improvements in anomaly detection performance over traditional machine learning methods (Altalak et al., 2022; Darwin et al., 2021). CNN-based models achieve high spatial feature extraction efficiency, with precision rates exceeding 90% in image-based disease detection tasks (Kamilaris & Prenafeta-Boldú, 2018a; Moazzam et al., 2019). RNNs and LSTM architectures effectively detect temporal anomalies, such as delayed crop growth or nutrient deficiency trends, with minimal false positives (Kumar et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2021). Hybrid CNN-RNN frameworks further enhance detection robustness, capturing both spatial irregularities and temporal deviations in crop development.

Graph-based approaches, particularly GCNs, show superior performance in detecting network-propagated anomalies. For example, in multi-sensor deployments, residual-enhanced GCNs effectively detect abnormal sensor readings while maintaining low computational overhead (Khan et al., 2024). Comparisons indicate that hybrid and graph-based methods outperform standalone CNN or RNN architectures in datasets with complex interdependencies.

4.2 Integration with IoT and Remote Sensing

IoT integration provides real-time anomaly monitoring capabilities (Ayaz et al., 2019; Jasim & Fourati, 2023). UAV-based systems combined with deep learning models allow rapid identification of stressed regions in large agricultural fields. Multispectral and hyperspectral imaging, coupled with CNNs or autoencoder-based anomaly detectors, enhance early identification of plant stressors (Nguyen et al., 2022; Singh et al., 2020). These approaches minimize intervention delays and enable proactive resource allocation.

4.3 Comparative Analysis Across Studies

Table 1 summarizes model types, datasets, and observed performance outcomes.

Study	Architecture	Dataset	Key Findings
Kamilaris & Prenafeta-Boldú, 2018a	CNN	Crop images	>90% accuracy in disease detection
Darwin et al., 2021	CNN-RNN hybrid	UAV & sensor data	High temporal-spatial anomaly detection
Khan et al., 2024	GCN	Sensor networks	Low-latency detection, propagative anomaly modeling
Altalak et al., 2022	Various DL models	Multi-source agriculture data	Improved anomaly recognition in smart farming systems
Nguyen et al., 2022	CNN	Satellite imagery	Precise yield anomaly mapping
Singh et al., 2020	CNN + hyperspectral	Crop stress datasets	Early detection of biotic/abiotic stress

The synthesis of results across studies indicates that deep learning architectures, especially those incorporating hybrid or graph-based designs, significantly outperform classical machine learning techniques in accuracy, scalability, and multi-modal data integration.

4.4 Limitations Observed

Despite performance gains, several limitations persist:

1. **Data Dependency:** High accuracy models often require large labeled datasets, which are costly and labor-intensive to generate (Altalak et al., 2022).
2. **Computational Demand:** Training deep networks on high-resolution imagery or multi-sensor time-series data requires significant computational resources (Moazzam et al., 2019; Khan et al., 2024).
3. **Domain Generalization:** Many models are crop-specific or region-specific, limiting applicability to diverse agro-ecosystems (Darwin et al., 2021; Magomadov, 2019).
4. **Interpretability:** Black-box nature of deep learning complicates anomaly attribution, reducing actionable insights for field managers (Chalapathy & Chawla, 2019; Ruff et al., 2021).

DISCUSSION

5.1 Theoretical Implications

Deep learning transforms precision agriculture by enabling automated anomaly detection and predictive modeling. CNNs provide a hierarchical understanding of spatial patterns, RNNs capture temporal dependencies, and GCNs allow relational data interpretation (Altalak et al., 2022; Khan et al., 2024). Theoretically, integrating these architectures supports a unified framework for multi-modal data, enhancing the decision-making process. The convergence of IoT, UAVs, and satellite imaging with deep learning represents a paradigm shift toward fully autonomous, data-driven agricultural monitoring systems.

5.2 Practical Implications

In practice, deploying these models can reduce crop loss, optimize resource utilization, and support sustainable agriculture. Hybrid architectures facilitate early detection of anomalies, enabling

timely interventions such as targeted irrigation, pest control, or fertilization adjustments (Ayaz et al., 2019; Jasim & Fourati, 2023). Residual-enhanced graph models provide actionable insights at both field and plot levels, predicting anomaly propagation and enhancing operational planning (Khan et al., 2024).

5.3 Trade-offs and Limitations

Model complexity introduces trade-offs between performance and feasibility. High-accuracy CNN-RNN-GCN hybrid models demand substantial computational resources and technical expertise, which may limit adoption in small-scale farms (Altalak et al., 2022). Moreover, the lack of standardized benchmark datasets in agriculture impedes cross-comparison of model effectiveness (Moazzam et al., 2019; Darwin et al., 2021). Models trained in controlled environments often underperform in real-world heterogeneous conditions, highlighting the necessity for robust domain adaptation strategies.

5.4 Comparison with Literature

This review confirms findings in prior surveys (Kamilaris & Prenafeta-Boldú, 2018b; Chandra et al., 2020) while emphasizing advancements in GCNs and hybrid models. IoT-enabled anomaly detection complements conventional CNN-based frameworks, demonstrating improved latency and coverage. However, persistent challenges in model interpretability, dataset diversity, and scalability remain consistent across studies, underscoring the need for integrated research efforts.

CONCLUSION

This systematic review demonstrates that deep learning architectures provide powerful tools for anomaly detection in precision agriculture, offering superior accuracy and adaptability compared to classical methods. CNNs, RNNs, GCNs, and hybrid models enable comprehensive spatial, temporal, and relational analysis of multi-modal datasets, facilitating early detection of crop and

environmental anomalies. Integrating these models with IoT and UAV technologies enhances real-time monitoring and predictive intervention capabilities.

Key contributions of this study include:

1. Consolidation of deep learning techniques for anomaly detection in precision agriculture.
2. Critical evaluation of performance, limitations, and real-world applicability.
3. Identification of gaps in data availability, interpretability, and model generalization.

Future research should focus on developing standardized datasets, lightweight architectures for real-time deployment, and explainable AI frameworks to enhance interpretability. Additionally, domain adaptation and transfer learning strategies could broaden applicability across diverse crops and geographic regions. The findings provide a robust foundation for advancing smart, sustainable, and high-precision agricultural monitoring systems.

REFERENCES

1. M. Altalak, M. A. Uddin, A. Alajmi, and A. Rizg, "Smart agriculture applications using deep learning technologies: A survey," *Appl. Sci.*, vol. 12, no. 12, p. 5919, Jun. 2022.
2. M. Ayaz, M. Ammad-Uddin, Z. Sharif, A. Mansour, and E. M. Aggoune, "Internet-of-Things (IoT)-based smart agriculture: Toward making the fields talk," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 129551–129583, 2019.
3. L. Basora, X. Olive, and T. Dubot, "Recent advances in anomaly detection methods applied to aviation," *Aerospace*, vol. 6, no. 11, p. 117, Oct. 2019.
4. A. L. Chandra, S. V. Desai, W. Guo, and V. N. Balasubramanian, "Computer vision with deep learning for plant phenotyping in agriculture: A survey," 2020, arXiv:2006.11391.
5. A. Darwin, P. Dharmaraj, S. Prince, D. E. Popescu, and D. J. Hemanth, "Recognition of Bloom/yield in crop images using deep learning models for smart agriculture: A review," *Agronomy*, vol. 11, no. 4, p. 646, Mar. 2021.
6. R. Chalapathy and S. Chawla, "Deep learning for anomaly detection: A survey," 2019, arXiv:1901.03407.
7. K. Dokic, L. Blaskovic, and D. Mandusic, "From machine learning to deep learning in agriculture—The quantitative review of trends," *IOP Conf. Ser., Earth Environ. Sci.*, vol. 614, no. 1, Dec. 2020, Art. no. 012138.
8. N. A. Farooqui, M. Haleem, W. Khan, and M. Ishrat, "Precision agriculture and predictive analytics: Enhancing agricultural efficiency and yield," in *Intelligent Techniques for Predictive Data Analytics*. Hoboken, NJ, USA : Wiley, 2024, pp. 171–188.
9. A. Kamilaris and F. X. Prenafeta-Boldú, "A review of the use of convolutional neural networks in agriculture," *J. Agricult. Sci.*, vol. 156, no. 3, pp. 312–322, Apr. 2018.
10. Kamilaris and F. X. Prenafeta-Boldú, "Deep learning in agriculture: A survey," *Comput. Electron. Agricult.*, vol. 147, pp. 70–90, Apr. 2018.
11. N. Jasim and L. C. Fourati, "Agriculture 4.0 from IoT, artificial intelligence, drone, & blockchain perspectives," in *Proc. 15th Int. Conf. Develop. eSyst. Eng. (DeSE)*, Jan. 2023, pp. 262–267.
12. W. Khan, A. Mohd, M. Suaib, M. Ishrat, A. A. Shaikh, and S. M. Faisal, "Residual-enhanced graph convolutional networks with hypersphere mapping for anomaly detection in attributed networks," *Data Sci. Manage.*, Sep. 2024.
13. Y. Kumar, R. Singh, M. R. Moudgil, and Kamini, "A systematic review of different categories of plant disease detection using deep

- learning-based approaches,” *Arch. Comput. Methods Eng.*, vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 4757–4779, Nov. 2023.
14. Q. Liu, Q. Yan, J. Tian, and K. Yuan, “Key technologies and applications in intelligent agriculture,” *J. Phys., Conf. Ser.*, vol. 1757, no. 1, Jan. 2021, Art. no. 012059.
 15. S. I. Moazzam, U. S. Khan, M. I. Tiwana, J. Iqbal, W. S. Qureshi, and S. I. Shah, “A review of application of deep learning for weeds and crops classification in agriculture,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Robot. Autom. Ind. (ICRAI)*, Oct. 2019, pp. 1–6.
 16. V. S. Magomadov, “Deep learning and its role in smart agriculture,” *J. Phys., Conf. Ser.*, vol. 1399, no. 4, Dec. 2019, Art. no. 044109.
 17. L. H. Nguyen, S. Robinson, and P. Galpern, “Medium-resolution multispectral satellite imagery in precision agriculture: Mapping precision canola (*Brassica napus* L.) yield using Sentinel-2 time series,” *Precis. Agricult.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 1051–1071, Jun. 2022.
 18. M. O. Ojo and A. Zahid, “Deep learning in controlled environment agriculture: A review of recent advancements, challenges and prospects,” *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 20, p. 7965, Oct. 2022.
 19. Ren, D.-K. Kim, and D. Jeong, “A survey of deep learning in agriculture: Techniques and their applications,” *J. Inf. Process. Syst.*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 1015–1033, Oct. 2020.
 20. L. Ruff, J. R. Kauffmann, R. A. Vandermeulen, G. Montavon, W. Samek, M. Kloft, T. G. Dietterich, and K.-R. Müller, “A unifying review of deep and shallow anomaly detection,” *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 109, no. 5, pp. 756–795, May 2021.
 21. L. Santos, F. N. Santos, P. M. Oliveira, and P. Shinde, “Deep learning applications in agriculture: A short review,” in *Proc. Iberian Robot. Conf. Cham, Switzerland : Springer*, Nov. 2019, pp. 139–151.
 22. P. Singh, P. C. Pandey, G. P. Petropoulos, A. Pavlides, P. K. Srivastava, N. Koutsias, K. A. K. Deng, and Y. Bao, “Hyperspectral remote sensing in precision agriculture: Present status, challenges, and future trends,” in *Hyperspectral Remote Sensing*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands : Elsevier, 2020, pp. 121–146.
 23. S. Toomula and S. Pelluri, “An extensive survey of deep learning-based crop yield prediction models for precision agriculture,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Cogn. Intell. Comput. Cham, Switzerland : Springer*, Jan. 2022, pp. 1–12.
 24. P. Tokekar, J. V. Hook, D. Mulla, and V. Isler, “Sensor planning for a symbiotic UAV and UGV system for precision agriculture,” *IEEE Trans. Robot.*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 1498–1511, Dec. 2016.
 25. J. A. Taylor, “Precision agriculture,” in *Encyclopedia of Soils in the Environment*, 2nd ed., M. J. Goss, and M. Oliver, Eds., Oxford, U.K. : Academic, 2023, pp. 710–725.
 26. J. James P. Suarez, and P. C. Naval Jr., “A survey on deep learning techniques for video anomaly detection,” 2020, arXiv:2009.14146.
 27. Q. Zhang, Y. Liu, C. Gong, Y. Chen, and H. Yu, “Applications of deep learning for dense scenes analysis in agriculture: A review,” *Sensors*, vol. 20, no. 5, p. 1520, Mar. 2020.
 28. J. Yang, X. Guo, Y. Li, F. Marinello, S. Ercisli, and Z. Zhang, “A survey of few-shot learning in smart agriculture: Developments, applications, and challenges,” *Plant Methods*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1–12, Dec. 2022.
 29. Z. Ünal, “Smart farming becomes even smarter with deep learning—A bibliographical analysis,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 105587–105609, 2020.
 30. S. I. Moazzam, U. S. Khan, M. I. Tiwana, J. Iqbal, W. S. Qureshi, and S. I. Shah, “A review of application of deep learning for weeds and

crops classification in agriculture,” in Proc. Int. pp. 1–6.
Conf. Robot. Autom. Ind. (ICRAI), Oct. 2019,