

Efficient Auto-Labeling of Large-Scale Poultry Datasets (ALPD) Using Semi-Supervised Models, Active Learning, and Prompt-then-Detect Approach

Ramesh Bahadur Bist^a, Lilong Chai^b, Shawna Weimer^c, Hannah Atungulu^{a,d}, Chantel Pennicott^c, Xiao Yang^b, Sachin Subedi^b, Chaitanya Pallerla^c, Yang Tian^a, Dongyi Wang^{a,e*}

^a *Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA, 72701*

^b *Department of Poultry Science, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA, 30602*

^c *Department of Poultry Science, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA, 72701*

^d *Haas Hall Academy, Springdale, AR, USA, 72764*

^e *Department of Food Science, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA, 72704*

* *Corresponding: dongyiw@uark.edu*

ABSTRACT

The rapid growth of artificial intelligence (AI) in poultry farming has highlighted the challenge of efficiently labeling large, diverse datasets. Manual annotation is time-consuming and costly, making it impractical for modern systems that continuously generate data. This study addresses this challenge by exploring semi-supervised auto-labeling methods, integrating active learning and the prompt-then-detect paradigm to develop an efficient, label-scarce framework for auto-labeling of large poultry datasets (ALPD) annotation aimed at advancing AI-driven behavior and health monitoring. For this study, video data were collected from broilers and laying hens housed at the University of Arkansas and the University of Georgia. The collected videos were then converted into images, filtered, pre-processed, augmented, and labeled. Various machine learning models, including zero-shot models like Grounding DINO, YOLO-World, and CLIP, and supervised models like YOLO and Faster-RCNN, were utilized for broilers, hens, and behavior detection. The results showed that YOLOv8s-World and YOLOv9s performed better when compared performance metrics for broiler and hen detection under supervised learning, while among the semi-supervised model, YOLOv8s-ALPD achieved the highest precision (96.1%) and recall (99.0%) with an RMSE of 1.9. The hybrid YOLO-World model, incorporating the optimal YOLOv8s backbone, demonstrated the highest overall performance. It achieved a precision of 99.2%, recall of 99.4%, and an F1 score of 98.7% for breed detection, alongside a precision of 88.4%, recall of 83.1%, and an F1 score of 84.5% for individual behavior detection. Additionally,

semi-supervised models showed significant improvements in behavior detection, achieving up to 31% improvement in precision and 16% in the F1-score. The semi-supervised models with minimal active learning reduced annotation time by over 80% compared to full manual labeling. Moreover, integrating zero-shot models with the best models enhanced detection and behavior identification. In conclusion, integrating semi-supervised auto-labeling and zero-shot models significantly improves detection accuracy. It reduces manual annotation efforts, offering a promising solution to optimize AI-driven systems in poultry farming, advancing precision livestock management, and promoting more sustainable practices.

Keywords: Poultry, behaviors, auto-label, zero-shot detection, machine learning.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the livestock and poultry sectors have faced significant challenges due to rising labor costs and persistent labor shortages, particularly during peak seasons. In 2024, labor expenses, including both cash and noncash employee compensation, are projected to increase by \$3.0 billion (6.1%), reaching \$52.0 billion compared to 2023 (USDA, 2024). Additionally, livestock and poultry purchases are expected to rise by \$4.4 billion (10.2%), totaling \$47.4 billion. These trends are expected to persist, emphasizing the urgent need for advanced technologies like artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) to enhance automation, decision-making, and efficiency in agricultural systems (Shaikh et al., 2022). These AI-driven systems rely heavily on high-quality labeled datasets, which are the foundation for training robust models. Available models are often limited to basic detection, segmentation, classifications, and auto-labeling like "chicken" or "birds." However, it cannot distinguish between breeds, their behaviors, or physical conditions. Poultry data varies significantly in breed, behavior, appearance, and rearing conditions. This diversity makes accurate and timely annotation crucial for quality control, behavior and welfare analysis, health monitoring, and process optimization.

Deep learning has significantly advanced automatic object detection, yet the need for large, high-quality, labeled datasets often constrains its practical application. Current approaches, particularly those based on supervised training, rely heavily on these datasets, posing a major challenge for widespread implementation. Supervised methods are inherently data-intensive and depend heavily on the availability of large, high-quality labeled datasets (Cao, 2024). Even with expert annotations, label noise or errors due to annotator variation are inevitable. Fully supervised labeling is effective but demands extensive manual annotation of large datasets, making it both time-consuming and expensive (Sapkota et al., 2024). This approach is often impractical in the poultry sector, where data is continuously generated in vast quantities, and tasks such as detecting subtle quality variations in poultry products require expert knowledge, adding to the complexity. Previous research on supervised learning models for object detection, which rely on paired images and labels, often faces limitations based on the volume and quality of annotated data (Wang et al., 2022). While large and diverse datasets enhance a model's pattern recognition and generalization

to new images (Alzubaidi et al., 2023), creating such datasets is labor-intensive, potentially hindering the adoption of deep learning methods. To overcome this, semi-supervised learning, unsupervised domain adaptation, and noisy label learning have emerged as key methods to handle imperfect datasets. However, each type of model has its own limitations such as inefficiencies in filtering noisy labels and inadequate handling of limited data (Chen et al., 2022). Semi-supervised deep learning and transformer architecture were developed for an automatic labeling method that generates bounding box annotations for images with multiple objects leveraging both labeled and unlabeled data (**Fig. 1**), thereby reducing the need for extensive manual labeling (Wang et al., 2022). These semi-supervised methods can guide the labeling process, improving accuracy with active learning while reducing the annotation burden (Adsule et al., 2024). Active learning complements the process by identifying the most informative samples from human intervention, ensuring that labeling efforts focus on data points that maximize the model's learning potential (Qazi et al., 2024). This hybrid approach of machine labeling augmented by human corrections addresses the limitations of manual annotation, saving time and resources. It also ensures data quality and reliability. By improving the efficiency of data labeling, these techniques enhance the performance of AI-driven systems for behavior monitoring and health assessment in poultry.




Fig. 1. Example of the semi-supervised learning model.

On the other hand, unsupervised learning models are required to solve labeling problems, which operate without labeled data. These models can automatically label all the images as they are trained in a large dataset but lack training in the specific domain, such as classifying all poultry species and their behaviors. In addition, it often struggles to achieve the accuracy required for critical applications due to the inherent noise and variability in agricultural data (Usama et al., 2019). Automatically generated labels are often considered "noisy" due to their lower annotation quality than manual labeling (Culman et al., 2023). To address this issue, a study pre-trained an object detection model using these noisy labels and fine-tuned the model with a limited amount of manually labeled data (Ahn et al., 2023; Culman et al., 2023). Recent advancements have

demonstrated that combining noisy labels with a limited amount of manually labeled data can significantly enhance detection precision, with gains of up to 37.0% compared to models trained solely on limited labeled data (Culman et al., 2023). Precision gains were also observed on unseen images, ranging from 17.6% to 38.5%, depending on the camera setup. These findings underscore the effectiveness of automatic labeling in scenarios with insufficient training data, where manual labeling is constrained by resources or time.

Current research in auto-labeling within agriculture has primarily explored methods like self-training and active learning, with promising results in domains such as image classification and segmentation (Li et al., 2023). Despite the progress, the application of these methods in the poultry industry remains underexplored, presenting a significant opportunity for innovation. Self-training, for instance, uses confidence thresholds to include only high-confidence pseudo-labeled samples in the retraining process, which minimizes errors and enhances model reliability (Wang et al., 2021). This research also adopts an active-learning approach, augmented by human intervention to relabel incorrect or ambiguous images, thereby combining the strengths of automated and manual annotation. Moreover, this study integrates a zero-shot, text-based detection framework with the trained model to further improve accuracy and facilitate targeted image retrieval. This novel combination allows producers to locate specific behaviors or conditions through simple text inputs, providing an intuitive and efficient solution for monitoring and managing poultry datasets. These advancements highlight the potential of semi-supervised learning methods to address the challenges of data annotation in agriculture, paving the way for more scalable and precise AI applications.

This study explored label-efficient learning methods within deep learning and their poultry applications, highlighting their significance in overcoming data annotation challenges in poultry farming. The objectives of this study were to (a) test and compare different zero-shot, supervised, and semi-supervised auto-labeling models, (b) develop and evaluate a semi-supervised auto-labeling method tailored to the unique challenges of the poultry industry, particularly in the context of large, diverse datasets, (c) investigate the effectiveness of combining best model with zero-shot detector to improve detection and auto-labeling of broilers, layers, and their behavioral datasets, and (d) text-based detection and auto labeling model implementation. By achieving these objectives, this research aims to significantly advance the development of robust training datasets, enabling producers to effortlessly detect and monitor various normal and abnormal behaviors in poultry through intuitive text-based inputs. This study not only addresses the pressing challenges of data annotation in agriculture but also contributes to advancing AI-driven solutions, fostering greater efficiency, scalability, and precision in the poultry industry.

2. Materials and methods

The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) reviewed and approved this study involving broilers under protocol #23009 at the University of Arkansas. Additionally, a related laying hen study was approved by the IACUC under protocol AUP# A2020 08-014-A2 at the University of Georgia.

2.1. Housing and management

2.1.1. Broilers

The study was conducted in broiler houses designed with specific configurations and management practices. Each house comprised 12 pens measuring 3.66m (12ft) x 2.44m (8ft), with individual programmable environmentally controlled research chambers utilized to maintain precise environmental conditions; average daily temperatures and relative humidity levels were monitored within these chambers and placed as per Cobb 500 broiler management guidelines. The experimental design included raising Cobb 500 male broilers, with a stocking density of 1.92ft² per bird, and each pen housing 50 broilers aged from day 0 to 42. This study was conducted from February 1, 2023, to March 15, 2023. No treatments were applied during the study period, and the broilers received only commercial starter, grower, and finisher diets without additional enzymes or medications. For monitoring, cameras were strategically installed at a height of 2m (6.5ft), with angles perpendicular to the ground, ensuring comprehensive coverage of feeding stations and water sources within each pen. The camera setup utilized a LOREX 4K 32ch 8TB Wired NVR System (Model # N883A38B, Lorex Corporation, Markham, ON, Canada) with dual 8TB internal hard drives for recording, capturing footage at a frame rate of 30 Frame Per Second (FPS) and a resolution of 1920 x 1080.

2.1.2. Laying hens

The experiment was conducted in four identical research houses, each housing 200 Hy-Line W-36 hens. Birds were raised from day 1 to day 630 (90 weeks) in rooms measuring 7.3 m × 6.1 m × 3 m, equipped with perches, litter flooring, feeders, drinkers, lights, and nest boxes. Pine shavings were used as bedding, and a Chore-Tronics Model 8 controller (Chore-Time Equipment, Milford, IN) controlled environmental conditions such as temperature, humidity, light, and ventilation. Behavior was recorded using six night-vision network cameras (PRO-1080MSB, Swann Communications USA Inc., Santa Fe Springs, LA) mounted 3 meters above the litter floor and two cameras 0.5 meters above the ground, capturing footage 24 hours videos a day. Videos were stored in .avi format at a resolution of 1920 × 1080 pixels and 15 frames per second, using a digital video recorder (DVR-4580, Swann Communications USA Inc., Santa Fe Springs, LA) for data storage, covering the period from 25 to 50 weeks of age. The previously published paper explained the details of housing and management (Bist et al., 2023c; Yang et al., 2023a).

2.2. Image labeling and data pre-processing

The images collected from broiler and laying hen experimental rooms were first preprocessed and filtered to ensure they met the requirements for training a machine learning model. The dataset was then divided into training (60%), validation (20%), and testing (20%) subsets. To enhance model performance and generalization, various augmentation techniques, including geometric transformations (such as rotations, flipping, and scaling), were applied following the previous paper (Bist et al., 2024). These augmentations simulate real-world variations, improve model

robustness, prevent overfitting, and enhance performance on unseen data. The final dataset distributions after augmentation are summarized in **Tables 1**, **Table 2**, and **Table 3**. These tables present the labeled training and validation datasets along with the unlabeled test datasets. Besides unlabeled test datasets, this study also has other unlabeled image categories, often referred to as pseudo-label images, which were later assigned pseudo-labels using the best-performing model from training. **Table 1** was used to evaluate model performance and compare confidence scores. Additionally, **Table 2** highlights the varying quantities of images used to determine the minimum required for optimal results. Similarly, the Supervised I-640 dataset was used for model comparisons on behavioral data.

Table 1. Datasets distribution for broilers and laying hens used in this experiment to compare different models’ performance.

Subsets	Broilers					Laying hens				
	Train	Val	Test	Pseudo-label Images	Total	Train	Val	Test	Pseudo-label Images	Total
Images	120	40	40	1500	1700	120	40	40	1500	1700
Instances	5437	1830	1853	70,251	79,371	3981	1356	1634	48,428	55,399

Table 2. Different number of datasets used to compare model auto-labeling performance.

Images	Subsets	Broilers				Laying hens			
		Train	Val	Test	Total	Train	Val	Test	Total
I50	Images	15	5	5	25	15	5	5	25
	Instances	701	232	231	1,164	643	342	265	1,250
I100	Images	30	10	10	50	30	10	10	50
	Instances	1422	399	461	2,282	1193	605	439	2,237
I200	Images	60	20	20	100	60	20	20	100
	Instances	2824	864	927	4,615	2293	1022	813	4,128
I400	Images	120	40	40	200	120	40	40	200
	Instances	5437	1803	1853	9,120	3981	1356	1634	6,971

Where I50, I100, I200, and I400 are the image quantity 50, 100, 200, and 400, respectively.

Table 3: Distribution of hen behavior datasets used in this study.

Supervised I-200 Model	Supervised I-640 Model	Pseudo-label images (semi-
------------------------	------------------------	----------------------------

Behaviors	Train			Val			Test			supervised model)				
	Images	Instances	Images	Instances	Images	Instances	Images	Instances	Images	Instances	Images	Instances		
Feeding		361		131		120		1285		472		443		7,494
Foraging		801		266		223		3035		1003		973		13,795
Drinking	120	403	40	124	40	83	384	1489	128	504	128	428	2,500	10,293
Dustbathing		66		30		30		196		47		62		728
Preening		121		42		20		443		116		160		2,995
Perching		454		181		224		1852		573		951		15,062
Wing-Flipping		28		12		7		63		22		23		75
Mortality		11		3		4		27		7		8		25
Pecking		24		9		5		98		55		37		389
Mislaying		35		8		12		62		32		19		154
Piling		16		5		11		36		18		13		49
Total	120	2320	40	811	40	739	384	8,586	128	2,849	128	3,117	2,500	51,059

Where the Supervised I-200 and I-640 models are run on 200 and 640 images with labeled train and val images; pseudo-labels were generated from pseudo-label images using the “best.pt” model from Supervised I-200 to make a semi-supervised model.

For this study, we also focused on the behavioral data of laying hens due to the wide range of complex behaviors they exhibit. However, previous research has focused on detecting a limited number of behaviors, such as piling (Bist et al., 2023a), mislaying (Bist et al., 2023c), mortality (Bist et al., 2023b), perching (Paneru et al., 2024a), and dustbathing (Paneru et al., 2024b), but none have addressed the detection of all these behaviors simultaneously. In this study, we identified and categorized 11 distinct behaviors, as outlined in **Table 3**. These behaviors are predominantly observed in cage-free housing systems, providing a rich dataset for analysis. This study aims to improve behavior detection by leveraging a continuously growing pool of pseudo-labeled images, thereby refining model training and enhancing robustness. The ethogram of hen behaviors is mentioned in **Table 4** (Appleby, 2004, 1984; Appleby et al., 1988, 2004; Yang et al., 2023b).

Table 4. Ethogram of Common Behaviors Based on Posture and Body Orientation

Behaviors	Posture and body orientation
-----------	------------------------------

Foraging	Scratching the ground with feet and pecking at surfaces, indicating curiosity or exploratory behavior.
Drinking	Drinking water by tilting head upward, possibly indicating relief or relaxation.
Feeding	Pecking at food with the beak, occasionally lifting head to swallow, may reflect excitement or heightened activity levels.
Perching	Standing or sitting on a perch, gripping it with feet, indicating rest or sleep.
Preening	Standing or sitting with feathers fluffed, using the beak to clean and align feathers, occasionally stretching wings or shaking feathers.
Pecking	Repetitive pecking at the feathers of other birds, leading to the removal and sometimes ingestion of those feathers. This behavior can result in feather loss, skin damage, and increased stress within the flock.
Dustbathing	Lying on the ground, digging with legs, flapping wings to spread dust or dirt on the body, and rolling or wriggling in the dust, indicating relaxation or enjoyment.
Piling	Birds clustering tightly together, often in a corner or confined space, indicating stress, fear, or overcrowding.
Mortality	Lack of movement, unnatural body position, rigidity, isolation from the flock, and absence of breathing motion.
Mislaying	Tense posture, crouching, neck and tail stretching, circling or pecking before laying, with signs of stress like panting. FELB is often seen in tight groups, near corners, walls, or over eggs laid on floor.
Wing-Flipping	Flapping or rapidly moving wings, often as a sign of excitement, communication, or maintaining balance.

This study utilized diverse training, validation, and testing image datasets, as summarized in **Table 1-3**. Beyond conventional model training and validation, it also incorporated a text-prompt-based model to enable targeted breed (hen, broiler) and behavior monitoring within image and video datasets. This innovative approach allows producers to query specific behaviors by entering relevant prompts. For example, when investigating mislaying behavior, producers can input the term “mislaying”, the system will automatically detect and highlight instances of this behavior, along with its frequency and location. This functionality provides a comprehensive visualization, helping producers identify potential environmental or management factors contributing to such behaviors. By leveraging these insights, producers can implement targeted interventions to reduce abnormal behaviors, ultimately enhancing the welfare and productivity of laying hens in cage-free systems. This study demonstrates the potential of integrating advanced behavioral analysis with machine learning models to facilitate data-driven decision-making in poultry management.

For labeling, we utilized tools including MakeSense.ai and CVAT to annotate the training, validation, and initially unlabeled datasets. Trained specialists in manual labeling were hired and cross-checked their labeled datasets by the author before training the models with the help of given tools. The labeled datasets were then exported in YOLO text and Pascal VOC formats to ensure

compatibility with different machine learning frameworks. These labeled datasets were subsequently used to train various machine-learning models. The performance of the trained models was evaluated using validation and test datasets to determine their effectiveness. The best-performing model was then employed to automatically label the remaining unlabeled images, generating pseudo-labeled data.

The following experimental setup in **Table 5** was used for model training and evaluation, designed to ensure optimal performance and efficient training. This setup included high-performance hardware, software, and training configuration. The system utilized an NVIDIA A100 GPU with CUDA acceleration, Python-based tools, and key machine-learning libraries to facilitate the training and evaluation of the models provided by the Arkansas High-Performance Computing Center located at the University of Arkansas.

Table 5. Experimental setup utilized for model evaluation.

Configuration	Parameters
Operating system	Linux-Based System
Accelerated environment	NVIDIA CUDA
GPU	A100, 64 Cores, 40 GB VRAM
VRAM	40 GB
Computer CPU	Intel® Core™ Ultra 7 155H 3.80GHz
Computer RAM	32 GB
Software tool	Jupyter Notebook
Python	Python 3.11.5
Libraries	Tensorflow-2.18.0, Torch 2.5.1+cu124, Torch-vision 0.20.1+cu124, CUDA version 12.4, NumPy 2.1.3
Training setup	Batch size of 16, learning rate of 0.001, 300 epochs

2.3. Model description

In this study, we utilized various machine learning models for auto-labeling to efficiently generate labeled data for model training. The models employed for this purpose span different categories, including zero-shot, supervised, and semi-supervised models, each with distinct methodologies and capabilities.

2.3.1. Zero-shot models for auto-labeling

2.3.1.1. Grounding DINO (GDINO)

Grounding DINO is a state-of-the-art zero-shot object detection model developed by IDEA-Research (Liu et al., 2025), designed to detect arbitrary objects or behaviors based on human input, such as category names or referring expressions. Built on the DINO model, a transformer-based architecture known for its success in image classification and object detection, Grounding DINO incorporates a grounding module. This addition enables the model to establish a relationship between language and visual content by learning to associate words in text descriptions with specific regions in images. As a result, Grounding DINO can detect objects in unseen images without prior knowledge of those objects, offering high versatility for a range of real-world applications, including agriculture.

Key components of Grounding DINO include the image and text backbones, which extract features from input images and corresponding text descriptions, respectively (Liu et al., 2025). The feature enhancer fuses these modalities, allowing for cross-modality information exchange, while the language-guided query selection initializes queries using language inputs. Finally, the cross-modality decoder predicts bounding boxes based on the fused features and queries, enabling the model to localize and identify objects accurately. The model's ability to generalize to new objects without requiring additional training data makes it an efficient and adaptive solution for zero-shot detection. In this configuration, we fine-tune the initial GDINO model on a small, labeled dataset to improve its precision and recall for poultry behavior detection. Fine-tuning enhances the model's ability to predict more accurate labels when applied to unlabeled images. Non-maximum suppression is applied to remove duplicate detections. This technique calculates the overlap between detected objects using the Intersection over Union (IoU) metric. If the overlap exceeds a specified threshold, the detections are considered redundant. These duplicates are eliminated starting with the detection with the lowest confidence score. The threshold value ranges from 0 to 1, with smaller values making non-maximum suppression more selective in removing overlapping detections.

2.3.1.2. YOLO-World

YOLO-World is an advanced extension of the YOLO framework, designed by AI Lab to address the limitations of traditional object detection models that rely on predefined categories (Cheng et al., 2024). By incorporating vision-language modeling and pre-training on large-scale datasets, YOLO-World enables open-vocabulary detection, allowing it to identify a diverse range of objects in a zero-shot manner without requiring task-specific annotations. The model features a Reparameterizable Vision-Language Path Aggregation Network (RepVL-PAN), which facilitates effective interaction between visual and linguistic information and utilizes a region-text contrastive loss to enhance alignment between image and text data. YOLO-World has demonstrated superior performance on challenging benchmarks, such as the LVIS dataset, achieving 35.4 Average Precision (AP) with 52.0 Frames Per Second (FPS) on a V100 GPU, surpassing several state-of-the-art methods in both accuracy and speed. Its ability to generalize to unseen categories is further proven through its fine-tuned performance on downstream tasks like object detection and open-vocabulary instance segmentation. The integration of transfer learning and pre-trained weights allows YOLO-World to analyze visual data for tasks without relying on annotated data, and its architecture, which supports user-defined vocabulary prompts, makes it adaptable to various detection tasks. This versatility ensures rapid and accurate results across diverse applications, including poultry behavior analysis in agriculture.

2.3.1.3. CLIP

CLIP (Contrastive Language-Image Pre-Training) is an advanced neural network developed by OpenAI, designed to bridge the gap between visual and textual information (OpenAI, 2024). Trained on a diverse dataset of image-text pairs, CLIP predicts a given image's most relevant textual description through natural language instructions, demonstrating zero-shot learning capabilities similar to models like GPT-2 and GPT-3. Remarkably, CLIP achieves comparable performance to ResNet50 on the ImageNet "zero-shot" benchmark without relying on the 1.28 million labeled examples from the original dataset (OpenAI, 2024). This achievement highlights its ability to address critical challenges in computer vision, such as dependency on large, labeled datasets and generalization to novel tasks. By aligning visual and textual modalities, CLIP has

proven highly versatile for applications requiring a deep understanding of image-text relationships, including image captioning, visual question answering, and object detection.

This study employed CLIP to align image regions with textual descriptions using cosine similarity between image and text embeddings (Wolff et al., 2023). For a batch of N image-text pairs, the model calculates similarity scores for all possible combinations, identifying correct pairings by maximizing the similarity between matched embeddings and minimizing it for mismatched pairs. Through joint training of image and text encoders, CLIP creates a shared embedding space that facilitates accurate mapping of textual labels to image regions. This capability is particularly valuable in dynamic and diverse agricultural environments, where it enhances tasks, such as behavior detection, annotation, and interpretation. By leveraging CLIP's matrix-based representation, the study effectively improved the understanding and integration of visual and textual data, advancing applications in precision agriculture and beyond (Wolff et al., 2023).

2.3.2. Supervised models for auto-labeling

2.3.2.1. YOLO models

For this research, we utilized multiple versions of the YOLO (You Only Look Once) detector series by Ultralytics, including YOLOv8s, YOLOv9s, YOLOv10s, YOLO11s, YOLOv8s-Worldv2, and RT-DETR (Ultralytics, 2024). These models were selected for their efficiency and performance in object detection tasks focusing on their suitability for auto-labeling and detection in poultry-related applications. YOLOv8s and other small variants were chosen for their speed and lower resource consumption than larger models, making them ideal for real-time processing and handling large datasets with reduced computational overhead. While larger models provide higher accuracy, the smaller YOLO models balance speed and performance, enabling rapid detection and labeling without requiring extensive hardware resources. YOLOv8s-Worldv2, a more advanced version, was specifically leveraged for its open-vocabulary detection capabilities, allowing greater flexibility in identifying a wide range of objects without predefined labels. This combination of models provides a versatile, scalable solution for efficient and accurate auto-labeling in the context of poultry behavior detection. Once trained, they are deployed to auto-label additional unlabeled images, creating pseudo-labeled data that can be used for further training iterations.

2.3.2.2. Faster-RCNN

Faster-RCNN, a region-based convolutional neural network (CNN), was utilized for object detection in this study and analyzed using open-source GitHub repository (Ren et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2017). The model generates candidate regions within an image and subsequently classifies them into predefined categories. Initially, Faster-RCNN undergoes supervised training on a labeled dataset, allowing it to learn to detect various objects or behaviors. Once trained, the model can be applied to unlabeled images for auto-labeling tasks, particularly for identifying and classifying poultry behaviors. The ResNet backbone was employed for the feature extraction and image classification tasks due to its deep residual network architecture. ResNet's use of skip connections aids in effectively training deeper models, which is especially beneficial for accurately recognizing complex behaviors in poultry. After the model is trained on labeled datasets, it can generate pseudo-labels for various poultry behaviors, enabling efficient and scalable auto-labeling in real-world applications. In this research, Faster-RCNN with a ResNet backbone was selected for its robustness in object detection tasks and its ability to generate high-quality pseudo-labels for

behavior recognition in poultry. This approach detects various behaviors without requiring extensive manual annotation, making it an effective tool for large-scale data labeling tasks.

2.3.3. Semi-supervised models for auto-labeling

2.3.3.1. YOLO-ALPD

The YOLO models, including YOLOv8s, YOLOv9s, YOLOv10s, YOLOv11s, YOLOv8s-Worldv2 and RT-DETR, were initially trained on small, labeled datasets to develop highly accurate baseline models. These trained models were then employed to ALPD that were previously unlabeled. The ALPD approach integrates supervised learning with semi-supervised techniques to enhance model performance in data-scarce scenarios. Specifically, the models were first fine-tuned on the small labeled datasets to optimize detection accuracy. Subsequently, these models were applied to unlabeled datasets to generate pseudo-labels, which were iteratively incorporated back into the training process. During each iteration, the model's predictions on the unlabeled data were refined, creating a feedback loop that progressively improved its detection and labeling capabilities. This iterative auto-labeling strategy enabled the semi-supervised models to efficiently label large datasets while enhancing their performance, making them suitable for scalable and accurate detection tasks in poultry datasets.

2.3.3.2. Faster-RCNN-ALPD

The Faster-RCNN with ResNet backbone models were adapted to employ the ALPD technique within a semi-supervised learning framework. Initially, these models underwent supervised training on small labeled datasets to establish a reliable baseline for detection tasks. Following this, the models were utilized to generate pseudo-labels for unlabeled poultry behavior datasets. These pseudo-labels were iteratively refined and incorporated back into the training process, creating a feedback loop that progressively enhanced model accuracy and generalization. In the case of Faster-RCNN, the model leveraged its region-based detection framework, while ResNet utilized its robust feature extraction capabilities to identify and label poultry datasets effectively. The ALPD approach facilitated large-scale data augmentation and reduced the dependency on extensive manual annotation, allowing the models to adapt to diverse datasets and improve their performance across successive iterations. This semi-supervised learning paradigm ensured continuous improvement, making these models highly effective for large-scale poultry dataset analysis.

2.3.4. Final model architecture

The models employed for auto-labeling played a pivotal role in generating large-scale labeled datasets essential for training and enhancing machine learning models designed for poultry breed and behavior detection. This study utilized a combination of zero-shot learning, supervised learning, and semi-supervised learning with active learning techniques to develop a robust detection system with improved accuracy, while significantly reducing the reliance on manual labeling. Active learning helps the model selectively query the most informative data points for labeling to improve performance efficiently (Adsule et al., 2024). The approach facilitated scalable solutions for monitoring poultry breeds and behaviors, addressing key challenges in poultry management. To further enhance prediction capabilities, the best-performing model (best.pt) was integrated with zero-shot learning frameworks, incorporating text-based prompts to improve prediction accuracy and adaptability. This integration allowed the system to manage novel

scenarios effectively and produce more detailed and comprehensive outputs, as illustrated in Fig. 2.




Fig. 2. Flowchart of the ALPD semi-supervised model integrated with a text-prompt auto-labeling and detection framework. Note: The initial phase employs a semi-supervised learning structure, which is subsequently combined with a fusion of semi-supervised learning and a zero-shot text-based detection and auto-labeling approach. ALPD: Auto-Labeling Large Poultry Datasets; AI: Artificial Intelligence.

This study introduces a deep-learning framework called ALPD model, designed to address the challenges of semi-supervised learning, unsupervised domain adaptation, and noisy label learning in agricultural image detection. ALPD leverages models trained on limited annotated data (SSL) (50 labeled images for each breed and 200 labeled images for behaviors) or annotated source domain data to generate noisy labels for unlabeled datasets. A cross-model co-optimization approach is employed, where two networks are trained in parallel while exchanging information to filter and correct noisy labels through a cascaded process. This iterative refinement progressively improves label quality, offering a flexible and efficient solution for deep neural network models. ALPD model is particularly suited for large-scale, annotation-efficient tasks like automatic labeling in poultry datasets, addressing critical bottlenecks in data preparation for agricultural applications. To enhance annotation efficiency, the framework incorporates active learning, empowering labelers to focus on uncertain or critical data points that maximize model improvement.

2.3.5. *Active learning framework*

This study employs four active learning frameworks to enhance model performance while minimizing manual labeling efforts: confidence thresholding, uncertain sample selection and labeling, query by committee, and model retraining with performance evaluation. These frameworks work together to iteratively improve the detection model by prioritizing uncertain and high-impact samples for labeling and retraining.

2.3.5.1. Confidence thresholding

The Active Learning with Confidence Thresholding (ALCT) methodology aims to iteratively refine object detection performance. Initially, the model is trained on a small, labeled dataset to learn basic object representations. Once trained, the model makes predictions on the unlabeled data and assigns confidence scores to each detected object, reflecting the certainty of the predictions. A predefined confidence threshold is applied to these predictions, with any instances falling below the threshold flagged as uncertain (Wang et al., 2021). These uncertain samples are prioritized for relabeling again and send back to unlabeled images, ensuring the model focuses on the data points most likely to improve its performance. The new image samples are integrated into the training dataset, and the model is retrained. Over successive iterations, this process continually enhances the model's ability to make accurate predictions, improving its robustness and scalability for agricultural monitoring tasks.

2.3.5.2. Selection of uncertain samples and labeling

In this framework, the model ranks the unlabeled samples based on their confidence scores. Lower confidence scores indicate higher uncertainty, and these samples are extracted for further labeling (Wang et al., 2021). A user-defined confidence threshold, typically set below 50%, determines which samples are considered uncertain. These uncertain samples are then manually or semi-automatically labeled. In the semi-automated approach, the model generates initial labels, which

are later verified and corrected by human annotators. This reduces the time required for manual annotation while ensuring high-quality labeling. Once labeled, the samples are added to the training dataset, enhancing its diversity and quality and improving the model's performance in subsequent iterations.

2.3.5.3. Query by committee

The query-by-committee approach identifies instances where the model's predictions conflict or exhibit significant uncertainty. In these cases, multiple models are used to generate different predictions, and the discrepancies between them guide human annotators to focus on clarifying these uncertainties. Resolving these conflicts enriches the dataset with critical, high-impact information, allowing the model to learn more effectively from ambiguous or complex examples.

2.3.5.4. Model retraining and performance evaluation

Following the incorporation of newly labeled samples, the model undergoes retraining to integrate the expanded dataset. This phase is essential for allowing the model to learn from the newly labeled data, enhancing its detection capabilities. During this process, the model adapts to the additional information, which helps refine its performance on previously unseen examples. Retraining involves fine-tuning the model on the updated dataset, optimizing the loss function, adjusting learning rates, and applying data augmentation techniques to improve generalization. After retraining, a separate validation dataset evaluates the model's performance. Key metrics, such as mean Average Precision (mAP), precision, recall, and F1-score, are used to assess the model's accuracy and its ability to generalize to unseen data. These evaluation results guide the iterative learning process, ensuring that each cycle leads to measurable improvements in model performance and efficiency.

2.4. *Model evaluation metrics*

A range of commonly used evaluation metrics were employed to evaluate the models' performance for auto-labeling and pseudo-labeled data output (Cheng et al., 2024; Ultralytics, 2024). These metrics help assess the quality of the model's predictions, including its ability to detect behaviors and the accuracy of its auto-labeled outputs. The following metrics were applied:

2.4.1. Precision

Precision measures the proportion of correctly predicted positive instances out of all instances predicted as positive. It is crucial when false positives have a high cost.

$$Precision = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \quad (i)$$

Where, TP = True Positives and FP = False Positives

High precision ensures that the model accurately detects target behaviors, such as breeds or behaviors, without many false detections.

2.4.2. Recall

Recall, also known as sensitivity, measures the proportion of actual positive instances that were correctly identified by the model. It is especially useful when false negatives are costly.

$$Recall = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad (ii)$$

Where, FN = False Negatives

A high recall ensures that most of the true behaviors, such as breeds or behaviors, are identified, even if it results in some false positives.

2.4.3. Mean Average Precision

The mean average precision is a commonly used metric in object detection, evaluating the model's precision at a standard overlap threshold.

$$mAP = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N AP_i \quad (iii)$$

Where, AP_i = Average Precision for class i and N = Total number of classes

A higher mAP indicates better overall performance in detecting breeds or behaviors with an acceptable level of localization.

2.4.4. F1-Score

The F1-score is the harmonic means of precision and recall, providing a single metric that balances both the ability to correctly identify positive instances and the ability to detect as many positives as possible.

$$F1 = 2 \times \frac{Precision \times Recall}{Precision + Recall} \quad (iv)$$

The F1-score is particularly useful when there is an imbalance between classes (e.g., rare behaviors like mislaying). It provides a balanced measure of a model's performance, ensuring that both false positives and false negatives are accounted for in the evaluation.

2.4.5. Intersection over Union (IoU)

IoU measures the overlap between the predicted bounding box and the ground truth bounding box. It is widely used to assess the localization accuracy in object detection tasks.

$$IoU = \frac{\text{Area of overlap}}{\text{Area of union}} \quad (v)$$

A higher IoU indicates that the predicted bounding box closely matches the true position of the object (e.g., detected behavior). IoU is essential for understanding how well the model is localizing specific behaviors, such as mislaying or pecking.

2.4.6. Mean Absolute Error (MAE)

MAE measures the average absolute difference between the true and predicted values, providing a straightforward indication of prediction accuracy.

$$MAE = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \hat{y}_i| \quad (vi)$$

where y_i is the true value and \hat{y}_i is the predicted value. N refers to the total number of samples or data points in the evaluated dataset.

MAE measures the average magnitude of errors without considering their direction. Lower MAE values indicating better model performance.

2.4.7. Mean Squared Error (MSE)

MSE calculates the average squared difference between the true and predicted values, heavily penalizing larger errors.

$$MSE = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2 \quad (vii)$$

MSE penalizes larger errors more heavily, making it sensitive to outliers. A lower MSE value signifies a model that makes fewer and smaller errors in its predictions.

2.4.8. Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)

RMSE is the square root of the MSE, offering a measure of prediction error in the same units as the data. Smaller RMSE values indicate better predictive accuracy.

$$RMSE = \sqrt{MSE} \quad (viii)$$

2.4.9. False Negative Rate (FNR)

FNR represents the proportion of actual positive instances that were incorrectly classified as negative, indicating the model's failure to detect positives.

$$FNR = \frac{FN}{FN+TP} \quad (ix)$$

where FN is the number of false negatives.

FNR quantifies the proportion of actual positives incorrectly identified as negatives.

3. Results and discussions

3.1. Data distribution

Fig. 3 and **Fig. 4** present the distribution of instance labels across different datasets used for model training. However, while the images allocated for broilers and hens maintain the same quantity, the instances within each image vary. **Fig. 3a** shows the distribution of labels across the training datasets for broilers and hens, demonstrating a balanced representation of the various categories, ensuring the model encounters diverse instances during training. **Fig. 3b** displays the distribution of labels in the pseudo-label training datasets, where the model generates additional labels based on its predictions. While this expands the dataset, slight imbalances in certain categories can be observed due to the challenges in automatically labeling some instances. Similarly, **Fig. 4a** illustrates the label distribution in the training datasets for individual behaviors, maintaining a comprehensive representation of behaviors, although some categories may be slightly overrepresented or underrepresented. **Fig. 4b** shows the distribution of pseudo-label datasets for individual behaviors, indicating the model's ability to generate plausible labels for less frequent behaviors, though minor inaccuracies and noise in the predictions are present. Overall, these distributions highlight the strengths of our approach in combining real and pseudo-labeled instances to create a robust training dataset.




Fig. 3. Distribution of instances labels across a) Training datasets for broilers and hens, and b) Pseudo-label Datasets.




Fig. 4. Distribution of instances labels across a) Training datasets for individual behaviors and b) Pseudo-label datasets.

3.2. Supervised and semi-supervised model comparison

The performance metrics of supervised and semi-supervised models for broiler and hen detection reveal notable distinctions in their accuracy, precision, recall, and mAP scores across different models (**Table 6** and **Fig. 5**). Among the supervised models, YOLOv8s demonstrated higher performance for broiler detection with a precision of 97.3%, recall of 98.7%, and mAP_{0.50} of 99.3%. This was closely followed by YOLOv9s, which achieved similarly high mAP_{0.50} of 99.3% for broilers but with slightly better precision and recall values of 98.1% and 98.6%, respectively. Similarly, YOLOv9s for hen detection achieved the best performance with a recall of 91.0% and mAP_{0.50} of 96.3%, outperforming YOLOv8s with a recall of 88.1% and mAP_{0.50} of 96.1%. The YOLOv8s-World model, with an overall mAP_{0.50} of 97.5%, also performed well across both species, demonstrating the model's adaptability to various conditions. However, it was outperformed by YOLOv9s in terms of precision and recall for broilers. The RT-DETR-l model, which represents a different architecture, displayed impressive performance for broiler detection (precision of 98.7%, recall of 98.2%) and hens' detection with recall at 93.4% and mAP_{0.50} of 97.1%. In comparison, Faster-RCNN Restnet50 showed significantly lower performance across all categories, with an overall recall of just 66.8% and mAP_{0.50} of 94.0%. These results highlight the superior capabilities of the YOLO family and RT-DETR-based models in real-time object detection tasks for poultry, outperforming Faster-RCNN in terms of both precision and recall.




Fig. 5. Performance comparison of various models for broiler and hen detection with a) precision, b) recall, c) mAP_{0.50}, d) mAP_{0.50-0.95}, and e) F1-score. mAP is mean average precision; YOLO stands for You Only Look Once; ALPD stands for Auto-labeling of large poultry datasets; RT-DETR stands for Real-Time DETector Transformer.

Table 6. Validation performance metrics of supervised and semi-supervised models for broiler and hen detection across various models.

Categories	Models	Class	Precision	Recall	mAP _{0.50}	mAP _{0.50-0.95}	F1-score
		Broiler	97.3	98.7	99.3	72.2	98.0
	YOLOv8s	Hen	94.3	88.1	96.1	68.5	91.1
		Overall	95.8	93.4	97.7	70.4	94.6
	YOLOv8s-World	Broiler	96.6	98.3	99.2	72.5	97.4
		Hen	95.4	89.4	95.9	67.9	92.3

Supervised	YOLOv9s	Overall	96.0	93.9	97.5	70.2	94.9
		Broiler	98.1	98.6	99.3	72.9	98.3
		Hen	94.9	91.0	96.3	69.0	92.9
	YOLOv10s	Overall	96.5	94.8	97.8	71.0	95.6
		Broiler	94.3	97.6	98.8	71.3	95.9
		Hen	92.8	88.8	95.2	67.1	90.8
	YOLOv11s	Overall	93.6	93.2	97.0	69.2	93.4
		Broiler	94.2	98.6	99.0	72.5	96.3
		Hen	94.1	88.4	95.9	67.9	91.2
	RT-DETR-l	Overall	94.1	93.5	97.5	70.2	93.8
		Broiler	98.7	98.2	99.1	72.1	98.4
		Hen	95.0	93.4	97.1	66.7	94.2
	Faster-RCNN	Overall	96.7	95.8	98.1	69.4	96.2
		Broiler	63.9	70.7	98.2	63.9	67.1
		Hen	55.5	62.8	89.8	55.5	58.9
	Restnet50	Overall	59.7	66.8	94.0	59.7	63.1
YOLOv8s-ALPD		Broiler	97.2	96.9	98.8	70.2	97.0
		Hen	95.5	86.3	93.7	64.9	90.7
	Overall	96.4	91.6	96.3	67.5	93.9	
YOLOv8s-World-ALPD	Broiler	97.8	97.1	98.5	71.8	97.4	
	Hen	93.5	91.2	95.2	67.5	92.3	
	Overall	95.7	94.2	96.8	69.6	94.9	
YOLOv9s-ALPD	Broiler	96.7	97.5	98.5	73.1	97.1	
	Hen	95.1	87.3	92.9	68.0	91.0	
	Overall	95.9	92.4	95.7	70.6	94.1	
YOLOv10s-ALPD	Broiler	95.6	97.2	98.7	70.9	96.4	
	Hen	93.0	85.5	93.4	64.1	89.1	
	Overall	94.3	91.3	96.0	67.5	92.8	
YOLOv11s-ALPD	Broiler	97.2	97.3	98.4	72.4	97.2	
	Hen	92.4	89.7	93.6	66.5	91.0	
	Overall	94.8	93.5	96.0	69.5	94.1	
RT-DETR-l	Broiler	95.3	96.6	94.8	72.3	95.9	
	Hen	93.8	87.8	92.2	67.2	90.7	
	Overall	94.6	92.2	93.5	69.8	93.4	

Where mAP is mean average precision; YOLO stands for You Only Look Once, ALPD stands for Auto-labeling of large poultry datasets, RT-DETR stands for Real-Time DEtector Transformer; Supervised models are trained on 400 images of each broiler and hen; Semi-supervised models are trained on 50 images of each broiler and hen.

The semi-supervised models, particularly those incorporating ALPD, also showed promising results. YOLOv8s-ALPD achieved an overall mAP_{0.50} of 96.3%, with broiler precision and recall at 97.2% and 96.9%, respectively. YOLOv9s-ALPD further improved upon this with an overall mAP_{0.50} of 95.7%, maintaining competitive performance for broiler detection while outperforming YOLOv8s-ALPD for hen detection with a recall of 87.3% and mAP_{0.50} of 92.9%. These findings are consistent with recent studies, where integrating semi-supervised learning

approaches has enhanced model robustness, particularly in cases with limited labeled data (Kim et al., 2022; Shen et al., 2024). The ALPD variants, such as YOLO-World-ALPD, also maintained high detection capabilities, with broiler performance like their supervised counterparts. Notably, semi-supervised models exhibited a trade-off in performance, with slight reductions in overall precision but gains in flexibility when data availability is limited. This aligns with previous research by Zhang et al. (2022) and Liu et al. (2022), who observed that while supervised models tend to perform better in accuracy, semi-supervised learning offers the advantage of improving model performance in real-world applications with minimal labeled data.

The training dataset outputs depicted in **Fig. 6** reveal notable distinctions in loss performance across models (box_loss, cls_loss, and dfl_loss). Box loss measures bounding box accuracy, cls loss evaluates classification correctness, and dfl loss refines box localization precision (Paneru et al., 2024b). YOLOv8s variants, particularly YOLOv8s-World-ALPD, exhibit lower training losses than other models, signifying efficient optimization and effective handling of training data. Studies have shown that reducing training or validation losses are correlated with higher detection accuracy in deep-learning models (Li et al., 2024; Munir et al., 2023). RT-DETR achieves exceptionally low training losses, particularly in box_loss, reflecting its strong performance during training and potential for robust predictions. In contrast, Faster R-CNN consistently achieves the lowest training box_loss and cls_loss among all models; however, its performance does not translate effectively to validation datasets, indicating a possible overfitting issue. This happens when the model learns the training data too well, including noise and outliers, which reduces its ability to generalize to new, unseen data (Jabbar and Khan, 2015). In addition, the Faster R-CNN model found struggling with small or unusually shaped objects, heavily occluded items, and cluttered scenes (Boesch, 2024). Models like YOLOv10s and YOLOv11s display higher training losses, suggesting suboptimal convergence or limitations in architecture refinement during training. Including ALPD markedly improves training efficiency across YOLO models, reducing losses and indicating enhanced label quality and dataset scalability. These results underline the superior training performance of YOLOv8s variants and RT-DETR, while highlighting the limitations of Faster R-CNN despite its low training losses. This suggests the need for more effective regularization or validation strategies to prevent overfitting in its application.




Fig. 6. Performance comparison of different models for broiler and hen detection across a) Train box loss, b) Validation box loss, c) Train class loss, d) Validation class loss, e) Train dfl loss, and f) Validation dfl loss. YOLO is You Only Look Once; ALPD is Auto-labeling of large poultry datasets; RT-DETR is Real-Time DEtector TRansformer; Val is validation; cls is class; dfl is distribution focal loss.

Although models often exhibit high accuracy on training and validation datasets, their performance on test datasets can sometimes be less consistent, demonstrating a gap between training success and real-world applicability (Xu and Goodacre, 2018). This highlights the necessity of evaluating predicted outcomes on test data, as it provides insight into the model's ability to generalize beyond the data it was trained on. Such evaluations are critical for detecting issues like overfitting and ensuring the model's robustness in diverse, unseen scenarios (Jabbar and Khan, 2015). Consequently, thorough testing and performance assessment on test data are essential for validating a model's true predictive power and reliability. Therefore, the predicted performance of various models for detecting broilers and hens was evaluated across three training paradigms: zero-shot, supervised, and semi-supervised learning (**Table 7**). Zero-shot models like GDINO and YOLOWorld showed limited success distinguishing between broilers and hens. While GDINO achieved moderate performance for broilers (MAE of 0.9 and F1 score of 79.0%), but it struggled to detect hens accurately, with a false-negative rate (FNR) of 100.0% and undefined precision and recall. During our analysis, we observed the presence of outliers and noise in the detected instances, which were mitigated using a normal distribution filter constrained within Mean \pm 2 Standard Deviations. Additionally, overlapping bounding boxes, which can lead to ambiguity in object localization, were corrected by adjusting the non-maximum suppression value. This optimization ensured that the final detections were distinct and representative of true object boundaries. This approach effectively filtered out erroneous detections and enhanced the clarity of the resulting images, ensuring higher-quality inputs for downstream tasks. These results highlight Grounding DINO's strong detection capabilities, particularly when combined with statistical filtering techniques, and suggest its potential for broad applications in tasks requiring reliable and adaptive detection mechanisms. Similarly, YOLOWorld and GDINO exhibited high FNRs for hens, highlighting their limitations in multi-class detection. Notably, CLIP performed overall better with a precision of 76.5%, recall of 64.1%, and an F1 score of 69.7%. However, the zero-shot models lacked sufficient generalizability for differentiating between broilers and hens, primarily due to fine-tuning and lack of training on similar labeled datasets.

Table 7. Predicted performance metrics of zero-shot, supervised, and semi-supervised models for broiler and hen detection across various models.

Categories	Models	Class	MAE	MSE	RMSE	Precision (%)	Recall (%)	F1 Score (%)	FNR (%)
Zero-shot*	GDINO	Broiler	0.9	213.0	14.6	94.7	68.0	79.0	32.0
		Hen	1.2	368.0	19.2	0.0	0.0	Undefined	100.0
		Overall	1.1	290.5	16.9	47.4	34.0	79.0	66.0
	YOLOWorld	Broiler	22.8	700.0	26.5	50.1	50.2	50.2	49.8
		Hen	17.0	742.0	27.2	0.0	0.0	Undefined	100.0
		Overall	19.9	721.0	26.9	25.1	25.1	50.2	74.9
	CLIP	Broiler	1.1	163.0	12.8	36.5	24.9	29.7	75.1
		Hen	1.0	281.0	16.7	100.0	96.7	98.0	3.3
		Overall	1.1	222.0	14.8	68.3	60.8	63.9	39.2
	YOLOv8s	Broiler	0.4	0.8	0.9	98.9	99.5	99.2	0.5
		Hen	0.9	3.2	1.8	95.2	99.9	97.5	0.1

Supervised	YOLOv8s-World	Overall	0.7	2.0	1.4	97.1	99.7	98.4	0.3	
		Broiler	0.3	0.4	0.6	99.2	99.5	99.4	0.5	
		Hen	0.6	1.9	1.4	97.1	99.2	98.1	0.8	
	YOLOv9s	Overall	0.5	1.2	1.0	98.2	99.4	98.8	0.6	
		Broiler	0.4	0.6	0.8	99.1	99.4	99.2	0.6	
		Hen	0.5	1.6	1.3	97.3	99.9	98.6	0.1	
	YOLOv10s	Overall	0.5	1.1	1.1	98.2	99.7	98.9	0.3	
		Broiler	0.9	2.7	1.7	96.8	99.5	98.1	0.5	
		Hen	1.1	3.7	1.9	95.4	98.5	96.9	1.5	
	YOLOv11s	Overall	1.0	3.2	1.8	96.1	99.0	97.5	1.0	
		Broiler	0.4	0.9	1.0	98.6	99.6	99.1	0.4	
		Hen	1.0	6.1	2.5	94.7	99.7	97.2	0.3	
	RT-DETR-l	Overall	0.7	3.5	1.8	96.7	99.7	98.2	0.3	
		Broiler	0.5	1.9	1.4	96.4	98.3	99.1	1.7	
		Hen	1.0	2.9	1.7	95.2	98.1	97.4	1.9	
	Faster-RCNN	Overall	0.6	2.4	1.6	95.8	98.2	98.3	1.8	
		Broiler	1.1	4.7	2.2	90.0	96.5	93.1	3.5	
		Hen	2.4	7.5	2.7	87.8	93.8	90.7	6.2	
	Semi-supervised	YOLOv8s-ALPD	Overall	1.8	6.1	2.5	88.9	95.2	91.9	4.8
			Broiler	1.0	3.4	1.8	96.7	99.2	97.9	0.8
Hen			1.0	3.6	1.9	95.6	98.9	97.2	1.1	
YOLO-World-ALPD		Overall	1.0	3.5	1.9	96.2	99.1	97.6	0.9	
		Broiler	0.9	2.8	1.7	96.5	99.7	98.1	0.3	
		Hen	1.8	11.7	3.4	90.8	99.9	95.1	0.1	
YOLOv9s-ALPD		Overall	1.4	7.3	2.6	93.7	99.8	96.6	0.2	
		Broiler	0.8	2.6	1.6	97.1	99.6	98.3	0.4	
		Hen	1.3	6.8	2.6	93.4	99.3	96.3	0.7	
YOLOv10s-ALPD		Overall	1.1	4.7	2.1	95.3	99.5	97.3	0.5	
		Broiler	1.0	3.5	1.9	96.3	99.3	97.8	0.7	
		Hen	1.2	4.4	2.1	93.9	99.3	96.5	0.7	
YOLOv11s-ALPD		Overall	1.1	4.0	2.0	95.1	99.3	97.2	0.7	
		Broiler	0.9	3.5	1.9	96.4	99.7	98.0	0.3	
		Hen	2.1	14.3	3.8	89.1	99.8	94.2	0.2	
			Overall	1.5	8.9	2.9	92.8	99.8	96.1	0.2

*Model performance is higher when just detecting one class, either as “broiler, chicken, or bird,” but when it comes to detecting between two classes, “broiler” and “hen,” neither of the models can detect hen; instead, it is mislabeled as “broiler” or “chicken.” Supervised models are trained on 400 images of each broiler and hen; Semi-supervised models are trained on 50 images of each broiler and hen; YOLO is You Only Look Once; CLIP is Contrastive Language–Image Pretraining; GDINO is Ground DINO; ALPD is Auto-labeling of large poultry datasets; MAE is the mean absolute error; MSE is the mean squared error; RMSE is the root mean squared error; FNR is the false negative rate.

Semi-supervised models demonstrated remarkable performance despite being trained on a significantly smaller dataset of just 50 labeled images (30 for training, 10 for validation, and 10

for testing), as shown in Fig. 7. For instance, YOLOv8s-ALPD achieved an overall F1 score of 97.6% and a low FNR of 0.9%, closely matching the results of fully supervised models trained on 400 labeled images (240 train, 80 val, 80 test). The semi-supervised YOLOv9s-ALPD and YOLO-World-ALPD models also maintained competitive accuracy, achieving F1 scores of 97.3% and 96.6%, respectively. In contrast, supervised models like YOLOv8s and YOLOv8s-World achieved slightly higher F1 scores (98.3% and 98.7%) but required substantially more labeled data. These results underscore the efficiency of semi-supervised approaches, which achieved near-supervised performance while reducing the dependency on large labeled datasets. This makes semi-supervised learning particularly valuable when data labeling is costly or time-consuming.




Fig. 7. Detection results of broiler (right) and hen (left) using different models.

3.3. Hybrid AI detection model performance evaluation using text-based embeddings

Table 8 presents the performance metrics of various hybrid detection models for broilers and hens. Among the models, YOLO + CLIP and YOLOWorld + CLIP demonstrated competitive results, showcasing their ability to combine strong feature extraction with detection. The YOLOWorld + CLIP hybrid achieved an overall F1 score of 97.6%, with a precision of 99.1% and recall of 96.1%. This model exhibited superior performance for broilers, with a mean absolute error (MAE) of 0.3 and a root mean squared error (RMSE) of 0.6, highlighting its robustness in identifying broilers with minimal false negatives (FNR of 0.7). However, the model’s performance declined slightly for hens, evidenced by a higher FNR of 7.2 and an RMSE of 2.6, suggesting room for improvement in hen detection. Comparatively, YOLO-World with the YOLOv8 backbone outperformed other hybrids' overall detection accuracy, achieving an F1 score of 98.7%, with a balanced precision (98.2%) and recall (99.4%). This model demonstrated excellent detection of both broilers and hens (**Fig. 8**), with notably low MAE (0.3 for broilers and 0.6 for hens), underscoring its robustness and consistency.

Table 8. Predicted performance metrics comparison of hybrid detection models.

Hybrid detection Model	Class	MAE	MSE	RMSE	Precision	Recall	F1 Score	FNR
YOLO + CLIP	Broiler	0.8	2.5	1.6	97.2	99.5	98.3	0.6
	Hen	1.4	5.9	2.4	97.6	94.3	96.0	5.7
	Overall	1.1	4.2	2.0	97.4	96.9	97.2	3.2
YOLOWorld +CLIP	Broiler	0.3	0.4	0.6	99.3	99.3	99.3	0.7
	Hen	1.4	6.6	2.6	98.9	92.9	95.8	7.2
	Overall	0.9	3.5	1.6	99.1	96.1	97.6	4.0
YOLO-World + YOLOv8	Broiler	0.3	0.4	0.6	99.2	99.5	99.4	0.5
	Hen	0.6	1.9	1.4	97.1	99.2	98.1	0.8
	Overall	0.5	1.2	1.09	98.2	99.4	98.8	0.7
YOLO + GDINO	Broiler	11.4	366.0	19.1	99.7	50.2	66.8	49.8
	Hen	5.6	104.0	10.2	99.9	67.1	80.3	32.9
	Overall	8.5	235.0	14.7	99.8	58.7	73.6	41.4

Where YOLO is You Only Look Once; CLIP is Contrastive Language–Image Pretraining; GDINO is Ground DINO; MAE is the mean absolute error; MSE is the mean squared error; RMSE is the root mean squared error; FNR is the false negative rate.




Fig. 8. Detected results for broilers and hens using hybrid models a) YOLO + CLIP, b) YOLOWorld + CLIP, c) YOLO-Worldv2 + YOLOv8 backbone, and d) YOLO + GDINO. The left side shows detected broilers, while the right side shows detected hens. YOLO is You Only Look Once; CLIP is Contrastive Language–Image Pretraining; GDINO is Ground DINO.

Similarly, the YOLO + GDINO hybrid, combining a zero-shot model with a supervised detection model, showed unique performance trends. While the overall F1 score (73.5%) and recall (58.7%) were lower compared to other hybrids, this model exhibited high precision (99.8%), particularly excelling in broiler detection (precision of 99.7%). These results highlight the potential of zero-shot models when integrated with supervised architectures, as they may enhance certain performance aspects like precision while compensating for deficiencies in recall. However, the YOLO + GDINO model struggled with higher error metrics, such as MAE (8.5) and RMSE (14.7), which indicate reduced generalization across classes. These findings suggest that while zero-shot models alone may not be optimal, their strategic integration with robust supervised and semi-supervised models can unlock new avenues for performance enhancement in hybrid systems.

3.4. Different amounts of image labeling

Table 9 and **Fig. 9** illustrate the performance metrics for broiler and hen detection across varying image quantities (I50, I100, I200, and I400). The results reveal a clear trend in the enhancement of model performance with the increase in the number of training images. For broiler detection, all key metrics, including precision, recall, F1-score, mAP_0.50, and mAP_0.50-0.95, consistently improved as the dataset size increased. At I50, the precision was 94.0%, and recall was 96.6%,

progressively increasing to 98.1% and 98.6%, respectively, with 400 images. The mAP_0.50 also showed a steady rise from 97.8% at I50 to 99.3% at I400, with the F1-score following a similar trajectory from 95.3% to 98.3%. This trend indicates that increasing the dataset size enhances the model’s ability to detect broilers more accurately and consistently, improving generalization and reducing overfitting. These results are consistent with the theory that larger training datasets enable the model to capture more diverse variations in the target object, thereby improving detection performance (Djologna et al., 2021).

Table 9. Validation performance metrics for broiler and hen detection across various image quantities.

Name	Class	Precision	Recall	mAP_0.50	mAP_0.50-0.95	F1-score
I50	Broiler	94.0	96.6	97.8	69.6	95.3
	Hen	93.7	82.1	92.9	54.2	87.5
	Overall	93.8	89.3	95.4	61.9	91.5
I100	Broiler	92.3	96.5	97.9	71.6	94.4
	Hen	95.9	75.0	94.7	61.9	84.2
	Overall	94.1	85.8	96.3	66.7	89.8
I200	Broiler	95.2	97.1	98.8	72.6	96.1
	Hen	94.8	85.3	95.2	66.6	89.8
	Overall	95.0	91.2	97.0	69.6	93.1
I400	Broiler	98.1	98.6	99.3	72.9	98.3
	Hen	94.9	91.0	96.3	69.0	92.9
	Overall	96.5	94.8	97.8	71.0	95.6

where mAP is the mean average precision; I50, I100, I200, and I400 are the quantities 50, 100, 200, and 400 images, respectively.




Fig. 9. Performance comparison of different image quantities for broiler and hen detection with a) precision, b) recall, c) mAP_0.50, d) mAP_0.50-0.95, and e) F1-score. mAP is the mean average precision; I50, I100, I200, and I400 are the quantities 50, 100, 200, and 400 images, respectively.

In contrast, while showing improvements across all metrics, hen detection did not exhibit as substantial gains as broiler detection with the increasing dataset size. At I50, precision was 93.7%, and recall was 82.1%, which gradually improved to 94.9% and 91.0% at I400. The mAP_0.50 metric also showed a similar improvement, rising from 92.9% with I50 to 96.3% with I400, while the F1-score increased from 87.5% to 92.9%. These findings suggest that although expanding the dataset improves hen detection performance, the model's ability to capture the unique characteristics of hens was somewhat limited compared to broilers. Nonetheless, the consistent upward trend across all metrics confirms that more training data, even if less influential than for broiler detection, contributes positively to the model's accuracy and robustness. Overall, the data demonstrates that increasing the number of images for training significantly enhances the

performance of detection models, particularly for broilers, and although the improvements for hens were relatively less pronounced. This still reflects the benefits of incorporating more diverse data into the training process. However, large datasets may not always be beneficial; proper regularization and handling of noisy examples or outliers are crucial (Zhu et al., 2012).

The performance comparison of the I50, I100, I200, and I400 datasets demonstrates that increasing the number of labeled images significantly enhances model performance, particularly in training (**Fig. 10**). I400, which uses the most labeled images, consistently shows the lowest training box_loss and classification loss, outperforming the other models. While I400 exhibits the highest training dfl_loss, this trade-off is acceptable, given the improvements in classification accuracy. In validation performance, I400 maintains competitive results with a box_loss and a classification loss, reflecting a strong ability to generalize despite the increased complexity of the dataset. This suggests that incorporating more labeled images improves training accuracy and enhances the model's ability to handle diverse data. It leads to better overall performance. Therefore, I400 demonstrates the benefits of using larger labeled datasets, resulting in improved model accuracy and robustness.




Fig. 10. Performance comparison of varying image quantity for broiler and hen detection across a) Train box loss, b) Validation box loss, c) Train class loss, d) Validation class loss, e) Train dfl loss, and f) Validation dfl loss. mAP is the mean average precision; Val is validation; cls is class; dfl is distribution focal loss; I50, I100, I200, and I400 are the quantities 50, 100, 200, and 400 images, respectively.

Similarly, the confusion matrices in **Fig. 11** demonstrate the detection performance of models trained on datasets with increasing image quantities: I50, I100, I200, and I400. The results reveal an improvement in detection accuracy as the dataset size increases. Higher true positive detection

generally leads to better accuracy in a model. This is because accuracy measures the proportion of correct predictions (both true positives and true negatives) out of all predictions made (Bist et al., 2023c). For I50, the broiler detection confidence score accuracy is 98.0%, with minor misclassifications into other categories. However, the hen detection is less robust, with an accuracy of 84.0% and considerable misclassification as the background. As the dataset grows to I100 and I200, the detection performance for hens improves to 83.0% and 88.0%, respectively, with reduced misclassification. The I400 dataset yields the best performance, with broiler and hen detection accuracies of 99.0% and 93.0%, respectively, and minimal misclassification. These findings underscore the importance of larger datasets in enhancing detection accuracy, particularly for challenging classes such as hens, while also reducing false positives in the background class.




Fig. 11. Confusion matrices for hen and broiler detection using models trained on datasets with varying image quantities: a) I50, b) I100, c) I200, and d) I400. mAP is the mean average precision; I50, I100, I200, and I400 are the quantities 50, 100, 200, and 400 images, respectively.

Table 10 presents the prediction performance metrics for broiler and hen detection across various image quantities. The results show a consistent improvement in model performance as the number of training images increases, particularly for broiler detection. At I50, the broiler detection model achieved a mean absolute error (MAE) of 0.9 and a root mean square error (RMSE) of 1.6, with a precision of 97.0%, recall of 99.3%, and an F1 score of 98.2%. As the dataset size increased, the MAE decreased to 0.4 and RMSE to 0.8 at I400, while precision and recall increased to 99.1% and 99.4%, respectively, with an F1 score of 99.2%. These results highlight the positive impact of larger datasets on broiler detection, with significant reductions in error and increase in precision and recall. The FNR also slightly increased to higher image quantities for broiler, particularly at I400. This indicates some trade-off between sensitivity and false negatives, but the model’s overall performance improved substantially.

Table 10. Prediction performance metrics for broiler and hen detection across various image quantities.

Quantity	Class	MAE	MSE	RMSE	Precision	Recall	F1 Score	FNR (%)
I50	Broiler	0.9	2.6	1.6	97.0	99.3	98.2	0.7
	Hen	1.8	10.9	3.3	90.7	99.7	95.0	0.3
	Overall	1.4	6.8	2.5	93.9	99.5	96.6	0.5
I100	Broiler	0.9	3.5	1.9	96.5	99.4	98.0	0.4
	Hen	1.0	4.0	2.0	94.6	99.7	97.1	0.3
	Overall	1.0	3.8	2.0	95.6	99.6	97.6	0.4
I200	Broiler	0.4	0.9	1.0	98.6	99.5	99.1	0.6
	Hen	0.9	2.8	1.7	95.5	99.4	97.4	0.6
	Overall	0.7	1.9	1.4	97.1	99.5	98.3	0.6
I400	Broiler	0.4	0.6	0.8	99.1	99.4	99.2	0.6
	Hen	0.5	1.6	1.3	97.3	99.9	98.6	0.2
	Overall	0.5	1.1	1.1	98.2	99.7	98.9	0.4

where mAP is the mean average precision; MAE is the mean absolute error; MSE is the mean square error, RMSE is the root mean square error; FNR is the False negative rate; I50, I100, I200, and I400 are the quantities 50, 100, 200, and 400 images, respectively.

For hen detection, while the trend of improved performance with increasing image quantity was observed, the gains were less pronounced compared to broiler detection in predicted images (**Fig. 12**), the same as validation datasets. At I50, hen detection had a higher MAE of 1.8 and RMSE of 3.3, with a precision of 90.7% and recall of 99.7%. As the dataset size grew to I100 and I200, the MAE and RMSE decreased, with precision and recall improving, though the precision for hen detection at I200 remained somewhat lower compared to broiler detection. At I400, the MAE

dropped to 0.5 and RMSE to 1.3, with precision reaching 97.3% and recall at 99.9%. The F1 score for hen detection also improved from 95.0% at I50 to 98.6% at I400, reflecting better model generalization. The false negative rate (FNR) was generally lower for hen detection, particularly at I400, where it decreased to 0.2%. These results demonstrate that while the model's performance for hen detection improved with more images, the relative improvements were less significant than for broilers. It can be possibly due to the more complex and varied characteristics of hens that were harder to capture with the dataset. Nevertheless, the overall findings indicate that increasing the image quantity enhances detection accuracy and robustness for both broilers and hens.




Fig. 12. Detected images of broilers and hens at different image quantities a) I50, b) I100, c) I200, and d) I400. The left side shows detected broilers, while the right side shows detected hens. I50, I100, I200, and I400 are the quantities 50, 100, 200, and 400 images, respectively.

3.5. Comparison based on different confidence levels

Table 11 and **Fig. 13** present the performance metrics for broiler and hen detection across various confidence score thresholds. The results highlight the impact of confidence score levels on detection performance. At a 12.5% confidence level, broiler detection achieved a precision of 98.2%, recall of 97.8%, and an F1 score of 98.0%, while hen detection had a precision of 91.9%, recall of 92.8%, and an F1 score of 92.3%. The overall performance for both classes was strong, with the model achieving a precision of 95.0% and an F1 score of 95.1%. As the confidence threshold increased to 25%, 50%, and 75%, precision and recall for broiler detection showed slight improvements, with the highest performance at the 75% confidence level. Specifically, at 75%, broiler detection reached a precision of 98.7%, recall of 95.7%, and an F1 score of 97.2%, while hen detection reached a precision of 95.8%, recall of 88.3%, and an F1 score of 91.9%. Therefore,

a higher confidence threshold leverages consistency regularization between strongly augmented views of an image using confidence-weighted pseudo-labels and demonstrates significant performance improvements over existing methods (Kim et al., 2022). However, this study observed the highest recall (94.5%), mAP_{0.50} (97.8%), and F1-score (95.6%) at a 50% confidence interval. Higher confidence over 50% sometimes might miss true positive detections, reducing overall performance.

Table 11. Validation performance metrics for broiler and hen detection across various confidence scores.

Confidence level	Class	Precision	Recall	mAP_{0.50}	mAP_{0.50-0.95}	F1-score
Conf12.5	Broiler	98.2	97.8	99.1	73.2	98.0
	Hen	91.9	92.8	96.4	70.5	92.3
	all	95.0	95.3	97.8	71.8	95.1
Conf25	Broiler	98.7	97.6	99.1	73.6	98.1
	Hen	93.7	91.2	96.4	71.2	92.4
	all	96.2	94.4	97.8	72.4	95.3
Conf50	Broiler	98.4	97.7	99.1	74.0	98.1
	Hen	94.9	91.3	96.5	72.1	93.1
	all	96.7	94.5	97.8	73.0	95.6
Conf75	Broiler	98.7	95.7	98.8	74.9	97.2
	Hen	95.8	88.3	95.7	73.4	91.9
	all	97.2	92.0	97.3	74.2	94.5

Where, mAP- mean average precision; Conf12.5, Conf25, Conf50, and Conf75 are the confidence interval of 12.5%, 25%, 50%, and 75%, respectively.




Fig. 13. Performance comparison of different confidence scores for broiler and hen detection with a) precision, b) recall, c) mAP_0.50, d) mAP_0.50-0.95, and e) F1-score. Where, mAP- means average precision; Conf12.5, Conf25, Conf50, and Conf75 are the confidence interval of 12.5%, 25%, 50%, and 75%, respectively.

Similarly, the overall results demonstrate that as the confidence threshold increased, there was a corresponding decrease in recall for hens. This suggests that higher thresholds may filter out more detections but also reduce the number of false positives. For broiler detection, however, higher confidence levels (especially at 50% and 75%) led to a more balanced improvement in precision and recall, with F1 scores improving from 98.0% at 12.5% to 97.2% at 75%. Despite these

improvements, hen detection remained more challenging, with the highest F1 score of 93.1% observed at the 50% confidence threshold. This suggests that a mid-range confidence threshold (50%) may provide the best balance for hen detection, whereas broiler detection benefits from higher confidence levels, particularly at 75%. Overall, these findings suggest that confidence thresholds play a crucial role in optimizing detection performance. Lower thresholds are better for recall, but higher thresholds provide more precise results especially for broiler detection.

Moreover, the results from the training and validation datasets across different confidence intervals demonstrate how varying confidence thresholds affect model performance (**Fig. 14**). Training loss decreases as the confidence interval increases. Conf75 shows the lowest values for `box_loss`, `cls_loss`, and `dfl_loss`, indicating better optimization. Compared with Conf50, which shows slightly higher training losses (`box_loss`, `cls_loss`, and `dfl_loss`), Conf75 appears to be more efficient regarding training performance. However, Conf75 in the validation phase exhibits slightly higher `val_box_loss` and `val_cls_loss` than Conf50. It suggests that a higher confidence threshold improves training efficiency, however it may lead to a marginal decrease in generalization ability. This suggests that increasing the confidence interval enhances training performance. It should be balanced against validation accuracy to ensure robust model performance across both phases.




Fig. 14. Performance comparison based on varying confidence levels for broiler and hen detection across a) Train box loss, b) Validation box loss, c) Train class loss, d) Validation class loss, e) Train dfl loss, and f) Validation dfl loss. Where, mAP- mean average precision; Conf12.5, Conf25, Conf50, and Conf75 are the confidence interval of 12.5%, 25%, 50%, and 75%, respectively; Val is validation; cls is class; dfl is distribution focal loss.

Similarly, the confusion matrices in **Fig. 15** illustrate the impact of varying confidence thresholds on the detection performance of broilers, hens, and backgrounds. At the lowest threshold (Conf12.5), the model achieves high detection counts for broilers and hens but with considerable misclassifications of hens into the background and false positives for the background. As the threshold increases to Conf25 and Conf50, the detection accuracy for hens improves, and

background misclassifications decrease. However, broiler and hen detection accuracy at the highest threshold (Conf75) dropped significantly with broiler misclassification rising to 122 and background false positives increasing to 206. This analysis highlights a trade-off between confidence thresholds and detection performance. Higher thresholds reduce false positives but may compromise the overall detection accuracy for hens and broilers. Adjusting the confidence threshold optimally is critical to balancing precision and recall for effective detection in practical applications.




Fig. 15. Confusion matrices for hen and broiler detection across different confidence thresholds: a) Conf12.5, b) Conf25, c) Conf50, and d) Conf75. mAP- mean average precision; Conf12.5, Conf25, Conf50, and Conf75 are the confidence interval of 12.5%, 25%, 50%, and 75%, respectively.

Additionally, prediction results must be evaluated to determine the actual detection accuracy (**Fig. 16**). **Table 12** presents the prediction performance metrics for broiler and hen detection across different confidence levels. The model demonstrates high recall for broilers and hens at lower confidence levels (12.5% and 25%), with broiler detection achieving near-perfect recall at 99.7% and then detection achieving 100.0% recall at both levels. However, precision for hen detection remains lower compared to broilers, especially at 12.5%, where it drops significantly. As the confidence level increases, particularly at 50%, the model improves precision for both classes, with broiler detection achieving the highest precision and F1 score. Incorporating confidence thresholds ensures that only high-confidence pseudo-labeled samples are included in the retraining process, reducing errors and improving model reliability (Wang et al., 2021). However, recall for broilers and hens at 50% shows a slight decrease compared to the lower thresholds, indicating a trade-off between recall and precision. The F1 score for broilers and hens peaks at this threshold, with the model effectively balancing both metrics.

Table 12. Prediction performance metrics for broiler and hen detection across various confidence levels.

Confidence level	Class	MAE	MSE	RMSE	Precision (%)	Recall (%)	F1 Score (%)	FNR (%)
Conf12.5	Broiler	1.4	7.4	2.7	94.6	99.7	97.1	0.3
	Hen	3.1	28.6	5.4	84.5	100.0	91.6	0.0
	Overall	2.3	18.0	4.1	89.6	99.9	94.4	0.2
Conf25	Broiler	0.9	3.1	1.8	96.4	99.7	98.0	0.3
	Hen	2.1	14.9	3.9	89.1	100.0	94.2	0.0
	Overall	1.5	9.0	2.9	92.8	99.9	96.1	0.2
Conf50	Broiler	0.6	1.2	1.1	98.5	99.1	98.8	0.9
	Hen	0.9	2.8	1.7	95.7	99.1	97.4	0.9
	Overall	0.8	2.0	1.4	97.1	99.1	98.1	0.9
Conf75	Broiler	1.4	6.7	2.6	99.9	94.1	96.9	5.9
	Hen	1.8	12.5	3.5	99.6	89.6	94.3	10.4
	Overall	1.6	9.6	3.1	99.8	91.9	95.6	8.2

Where, MAE is the mean absolute error; MSE is the mean square error, RMSE is the root mean square error; FNR is the False negative rate; Conf12.5, Conf25, Conf50, and Conf75 are the confidence interval of 12.5%, 25%, 50%, and 75%, respectively.




Fig. 16. Detected images of broilers and hens at different confidence levels: a) Conf12.5, b) Conf25, c) Conf50, and d) Conf75. The left side shows detected broilers, while the right side shows detected hens. Conf12.5, Conf25, Conf50, and Conf75 are the confidence intervals of 12.5%, 25%, 50%, and 75%, respectively.

High confidence intervals enable an uncertainty-aware pseudo-label assignment strategy, eliminating the need for manually designed thresholds and reducing noisy labels (Wang et al., 2021). At the highest confidence level (75%), precision further improves for both broilers and hens, reaching near-perfect values. However, this comes at the cost of a significant drop in recall, especially for hens, which falls to around 90%. The overall performance at this level reflects this imbalance, with an increase in precision but a reduction in recall, leading to a slight decrease in the F1 score. Moreover, as the confidence levels rise, the false negative rate (FNR) also goes up. This means that although the model becomes more certain about its predictions, it tends to overlook some hens and broilers. Thus, the results highlight the challenge of balancing precision and recall, with higher confidence thresholds favoring precision at the expense of recall. It ultimately affects the F1 score and the model’s ability to avoid false negatives.

3.6. Performance comparison of manual and conf50 methods

This study utilizes active learning to correct or label unlabeled or mislabeled images. Specifically, we compared two active learning approaches, the confidence threshold at 50% (conf50) and manual annotation with minimal human intervention, to determine which method yields better results. The confidence threshold was selected based on the comparison above, with conf50

yielding better detection accuracy. **Table 13** and **Fig. 17** compare broiler and hen detection performance metrics using the conf50 method and minimal manual correction. While the minimal manual correction method consistently demonstrated superior performance across all metrics, the conf50 approach still showcased notable strengths, particularly its ability to achieve high precision and recall. For broilers, the conf50 method achieved a precision of 98.4%, recall of 97.7%, and an F1-score of 98.1%, indicating robust detection performance with automated thresholding. Similarly, for hens, the conf50 approach attained a commendable F1-score of 93.1% and a precision of 94.9%, highlighting its reliability in scenarios where minimal manual correction is infeasible.

Table 13. Validation performance metrics of manual and conf50 methods for broiler and hen detection across various models.

Correction Method	Class	Precision	Recall	mAP_0.50	mAP_0.50-0.95	F1-score
Conf50	Broiler	98.4	97.7	99.1	74.0	98.1
	Hen	94.9	91.3	96.5	72.1	93.1
	all	96.7	94.5	97.8	73.0	95.6
Manual	Broiler	99.6	99.1	99.4	80.8	99.4
	Hen	98.6	97.4	99.4	88.9	98.0
	all	99.1	98.3	99.4	84.9	98.7

Where mAP is the mean average precision, and Conf50 is the confidence interval of 50%. Manual and Conf50 are trained on 400 images of each broiler and hen.




Fig. 17. Performance comparison of manual and conf50 methods for broiler and hen detection with a) precision, b) recall, c) mAP_0.50, d) mAP_0.50-0.95, and e) F1-score. conf50 – confidence level at 50% or more. mAP is mean average precision; Conf50 is confidence interval of 50%. Manual and Conf50 are trained on 400 images of each broiler and hen.

However, the manual correction method outperformed conf50 in refining detection accuracy, particularly in complex scenarios. It achieved a precision of 99.6%, a recall of 99.1%, an F1-score of 99.4% for broilers, and a mAP_0.50-0.95 of 80.8%, compared to conf50's 74.0%. For hens, the manual method also excelled with precision and an F1-score, alongside a notably higher mAP_0.50-0.95 versus conf50. Overall, the manual method yielded a combined F1-score of 98.7%

and mAP_0.50-0.95 of 84.9%, significantly surpassing the conf50 values of 95.6% and 73.0%, respectively. Hence, minimal manual correction will be the best approach when resources are available. With this minimal effort, the model's robustness in accurately detecting can be improved.

The results presented on **Fig. 18** demonstrate the detection performance of the model for broilers, hens, and backgrounds under two evaluation approaches: conf50 and manual labeling. Under the conf50 threshold, the model successfully detected 1799 broilers and 1275 hens, but some false detections were noted, with 48 broilers and 107 hens incorrectly detected as background. Additionally, 31 broilers and 81 hens were misclassified under background predictions. When evaluated with manual labeling, the model exhibited enhanced detection accuracy, with 1820 broilers and 1342 hens detected correctly and only 15 broilers and 38 hens incorrectly labeled as background. The manual labeling approach also significantly reduced background detection errors, with only 10 broilers and 14 hens mislabeled as background. These results indicate that manual labeling provides a more accurate reflection of the model's detection capability while highlighting the need for further improvements in reducing false detections in background areas.




Fig. 18. Confusion matrix for hen and broiler detection: a) conf50 threshold and b) manual labeling. Conf50 is a confidence interval of 50%. Manual and Conf50 are trained on 400 images of each broiler and hen.

Similarly, based on the training and validation losses from **Fig.19**, comparing the Manual and Conf50 methods reveals distinct performance trends. Conf50 consistently outperforms Manual for training in terms of box_loss, cls_loss, and dfl_loss, showing more efficient optimization with lower values across all metrics. However, the Manual demonstrates a significant advantage when examining the validation losses, especially in box_loss, where it achieves a lower value than Conf50. This trend is also observed in the validation cls_loss and dfl_loss, where the Manual

performs better. Despite Conf50's better training losses, its higher validation losses suggest that it may be overfitting the training data and struggling to generalize effectively to unseen data, like the behavior seen with Faster R-CNN in other comparisons. These results highlight the importance of balancing training and validation performance, as a model's superior training losses do not always translate to better generalization on validation and test datasets.




Fig. 19. Performance comparison of manual and conf50 methods for broiler and hen detection across a) Train box loss, b) Validation box loss, c) Train class loss, d) Validation class loss, e) Train dfl loss, and f) Validation dfl loss. Conf50 is a confidence interval of 50%; Val is validation; cls is

class; dfl is distribution focal loss. Manual and Conf50 are trained on 400 images of each broiler and hen.

In addition, the test performance metrics for broiler and hen detection using the confidence threshold at 50% and manual correction methods, as shown in **Table 14**, highlight the clear superiority of the manual method in terms of accuracy. For broiler detection, the manual method significantly outperformed conf50, with an MAE of 0.3, MSE of 0.3, and RMSE of 0.6, all of which were notably lower than the corresponding values for conf50 (MAE = 0.6, MSE = 1.2, RMSE = 1.1). Additionally, the manual correction method achieved higher precision, recall, and F1-score than conf50 with a precision of 98.5%, recall of 99.1%, and F1-score of 98.8%. The FNR was also lower for the manual method (0.4%) compared to conf50 (0.9%), further emphasizing the improved accuracy and fewer missed detections with the manual correction. Unlike traditional methods that rely on manually defined thresholds, this strategy ensures a more accurate and efficient labeling process by automatically prioritizing high-confidence predictions.

Table 14. Prediction performance metrics of manual and conf50 methods for broiler and hen detection across various models.

Correction Method	Class	MAE	MSE	RMSE	Precision	Recall	F1 Score	FNR(%)
Conf50	Broiler	0.6	1.2	1.1	98.5	99.1	98.8	0.9
	Hen	0.9	2.8	1.7	95.7	99.1	97.4	0.9
	Overall	0.8	2.0	1.4	97.1	99.1	98.1	0.9
Manual	Broiler	0.3	0.3	0.6	99.3	99.6	99.4	0.4
	Hen	0.6	2.1	1.4	96.6	99.8	98.2	0.2
	Overall	0.5	1.2	1.0	98.0	99.7	98.8	0.3

Where MAE is the mean absolute error; MSE is the mean squared error; RMSE is the root mean squared error; FNR is the false negative rate; and Conf50 is the confidence threshold at 50%; Manual and Conf50 are trained on 400 images of each broiler and hen.

While the manual method consistently performed better, the Conf50 method still demonstrated competitive results for hen detection (**Fig. 20**), with precision of 95.7%, recall of 99.1%, and F1-score of 97.4%. The manual method again outperformed with precision, recall, and an F1-score, alongside a lower FNR of 0.2% compared to conf50's 0.9%. Despite these differences, the prediction results for the test datasets were quite similar. This suggests that a 50% confidence threshold could still improve accuracy, especially when manual labeling resources aren't available. Moreover, leveraging high confidence intervals allows for a dynamic pseudo-label assignment approach that adapts to uncertainty, effectively minimizing the inclusion of noisy labels (Wang et al., 2021). The conf50 method offers a reasonable alternative when speed and efficiency are prioritized, making it suitable for real-time applications with limited computational resources.

However, if we have to choose the best method for model robustness, minimal manual annotation is the best approach.




Fig. 20. Detected images of broilers and hens at a) Conf50 and b) Manual labeling methods. The left side shows detected broilers, while the right side shows detected hens.

3.7. Behaviors detection and auto-labeling

3.7.1. Behavior comparison with different models

Table 15 and **Fig. 21** comprehensively compare validation performance metrics for behavior detection across various models. The evaluation metrics encompass precision, recall, mAP_{0.50}, mAP_{0.50-0.95}, and F1-score across behaviors such as feeding, foraging, drinking, dustbathing, preening, perching, wing-flipping, mortality, pecking, mislaying, and piling. Among the YOLO models, YOLOv8s demonstrated higher precision in behaviors like pecking (92.0%) and mislaying (96.5%), although it performed poorly for wing-flipping (49.3%) and preening (56.9%). YOLOv9s slightly outperformed YOLOv8s' overall precision, particularly in pecking (93.5%) and mislaying (100.0%). In addition, it showed the highest recall in feeding, drinking, wing-flipping, mortality, pecking, and piling. Overall, precision, recall, mAP_{0.05}, and mAP_{0.50-0.95} were the highest compared to other models. YOLOv10s showed notable success in dustbathing (F1-score of

94.9%), wing-flipping (precision of 56.0%), and piling (recall of 100.0%) but had challenges with other behaviors. YOLO11s performed well in behaviors like foraging, drinking, preening, and perching, though it struggled with wing-flipping, pecking, and mislaying. YOLO-World exhibited high precision for feeding and perching but had a low recall for behaviors like pecking. However, the performance metrics for feeding were highest compared to other models. RT-DETR showed moderate precision in several behaviors, including foraging (76.8%) and piling (100.0%), but had lower recall for behaviors such as foraging (54.5%) and pecking (52.5%). Lastly, Faster-RCNN displayed the weakest performance across all behaviors.

Table 15. Validation performance metrics results comparison for behavior detection across various models.

Models	Metrics	Feeding	Foraging	Drinking	Dustbathing	Preening	Perching	Wing-Flipping	Mortality	Pecking	Mislaying	Piling	Overall
YOLOv8s	Precision	82.1	74.8	83.8	92.1	56.9	82.9	49.3	77.4	92.0	96.5	91.9	80.0
	Recall	85.9	64.7	91.6	93.5	58.8	90.3	58.8	34.7	37.7	91.3	100.0	73.4
	mAP_0.50	88.0	71.3	86.3	95.4	55.3	88.5	61.1	64.0	53.2	93.1	99.5	77.8
	mAP_0.50-0.95	49.5	40.8	47.4	51.6	33.8	44.0	33.2	30.1	31.8	63.1	61.7	44.3
	F1-score	84.0	69.4	87.5	92.8	57.8	86.4	53.6	47.9	53.5	93.8	95.8	76.6
YOLOv9s	Precision	83.0	75.7	82.1	85.3	59.4	82.6	56.1	100.0	93.5	90.5	84.4	81.1
	Recall	87.9	64.2	92.8	95.2	64.7	90.0	64.7	67.1	47.2	82.6	100.0	77.9
	mAP_0.50	87.0	73.3	88.0	93.0	60.6	87.9	59.9	91.2	60.5	84.2	98.1	80.4
	mAP_0.50-0.95	47.8	41.0	47.9	48.9	35.8	44.9	36.3	51.5	34.0	54.8	67.1	46.4
	F1-score	85.4	69.5	87.1	90.0	61.9	86.1	60.1	80.3	62.7	86.4	91.5	79.5
YOLOv10s	Precision	82.4	76.7	84.7	94.7	64.2	84.3	56.0	54.7	92.0	82.3	91.1	78.5
	Recall	85.3	63.5	88.5	95.2	53.7	87.2	52.9	24.7	26.2	73.9	100.0	68.3
	mAP_0.50	87.6	72.6	89.5	96.9	56.2	88.0	51.7	56.7	46.6	88.1	98.8	75.7
	mAP_0.50-0.95	47.9	41.9	49.6	52.0	34.0	43.5	28.5	25.7	28.3	62.5	69.9	44.0
	F1-score	83.8	69.5	86.6	94.9	58.5	85.7	54.4	34.0	40.8	77.9	95.3	73.0
YOLO11s	Precision	82.4	75.4	86.1	95.9	66.1	85.9	39.5	100.0	78.7	72.3	87.5	79.1
	Recall	85.6	64.1	91.3	87.1	59.6	89.6	49.9	52.6	52.5	78.3	100.0	73.7
	mAP_0.50	88.2	77.0	92.0	96.0	67.0	89.5	45.9	71.5	53.9	81.8	98.8	78.3
	mAP_0.50-0.95	47.8	43.8	50.8	48.5	42.0	44.8	24.4	42.3	29.9	44.3	63.2	43.8
	F1-score	84.0	69.3	88.6	91.3	62.7	87.7	44.1	68.9	63.0	75.2	93.3	76.3
YOLO-World	Precision	87.3	70.8	83.2	91.8	59.2	86.3	35.8	85.9	88.8	93.1	95.1	79.7
	Recall	83.3	69.4	91.6	93.5	59.6	87.9	58.8	61.1	36.1	78.3	90.9	73.7
	mAP_0.50	90.8	76.9	90.5	95.9	57.3	87.6	50.6	77.6	50.6	81.2	97.1	77.8
	mAP_0.50-0.95	49.7	43.1	49.3	49.5	35.0	43.6	25.3	39.9	26.4	51.3	63.0	43.3
	F1-score	85.3	70.1	87.2	92.6	59.4	87.1	44.5	71.4	51.3	85.1	93.0	76.6
RT-DETR	Precision	83.3	76.8	82.3	77.3	49.8	81.2	54.8	61.9	67.3	76.6	100.0	73.7
	Recall	86.6	54.5	90.3	96.8	67.2	87.7	64.7	60.0	52.5	91.3	67.2	74.4
	mAP_0.50	89.4	67.2	89.0	96.80	61.5	87.0	71.0	55.6	52.0	93.1	98.8	78.3
	mAP_0.50-0.95	49.2	38.5	49.6	55.1	38.9	43.6	39.7	26.9	28.1	56.6	70.4	45.2
	F1-score	84.9	63.8	86.1	86.0	57.2	84.3	59.3	60.9	59.0	83.3	80.4	74.0

Faster-RCNN	Precision	34.9	24.4	37.0	33.5	17.7	34.5	23.7	23.9	4.9	48.6	65.6	31.7
	Recall	47.6	42.9	50.5	46.0	40.2	45.8	30.0	29.0	10.3	52.6	70.0	42.3
	mAP_0.50	65.6	55.0	67.6	64.1	48.3	65.1	54.3	54.6	35.5	79.2	96.2	62.3
	mAP_0.50-0.95	35.0	24.4	37.0	33.5	17.7	34.5	23.7	24.0	4.9	48.6	65.6	31.7
	F1-score	40.3	31.1	42.7	38.8	24.6	39.4	26.5	26.2	6.6	50.5	67.7	36.2

Where mAP is mean average precision; YOLO stands for You Only Look Once; RT-DETR is a Real-Time DEtection TTransformer; RCNN is the Region-based Convolutional Neural Network.




Fig. 21. Performance comparison of different models for behavior detection with a) precision, b) recall, c) mAP_{0.50}, d) mAP_{0.50-0.95}, and e) F1-score. mAP is mean average precision; YOLO stands for You Only Look Once; RT-DETR is a Real-Time DEtection TRansformer; RCNN is the Region-based Convolutional Neural Network.

When comparing these findings with previous research, YOLO-based models consistently demonstrate superior performance in behavior detection, particularly in poultry (Hao et al., 2022). For example, an improved Faster R-CNN achieved precision, recall, and F1-score of 90.1%, 79.1%, and 84.3% for feeding behavior detection (Hao et al., 2022). However, our YOLOv9s model surpassed these metrics, reflecting advancements in YOLO's architecture. While previous researchers used YOLO models and CNN models to detect individual behaviors, their focus on behaviors without ground truth comparison or classification limits the robustness of their findings (Bist et al., 2023c, 2023a; Hao et al., 2022; Paneru et al., 2024b, 2024a; Subedi et al., 2023). In contrast, this study emphasizes detecting and classifying multiple behaviors, providing more comprehensive and impactful results. Additionally, our findings align with prior observations about the difficulty of detecting less frequent or challenging behaviors, such as pecking, wing-flipping, preening, and Piling, which often show lower recall rates, even with advanced YOLO models. This research advances the state of the art by addressing critical gaps like multi-behavior detection and classification accuracy, offering a more robust and reliable approach to precision livestock farming.

Further, upon reviewing the performance metrics of the models, several trends emerge (**Fig. 22**). RT-DETR demonstrates superior training efficiency, notably low `box_loss`, `cls_loss`, and `dfl_loss`, outperforming the other models in training and validation phases. In comparison, Faster-RCNN, while exhibiting extremely low training `box_loss` and `cls_loss`, shows a significant discrepancy in its validation performance, with higher `box_loss` and `cls_loss`, suggesting potential overfitting or lack of generalization to unseen data. YOLOv8s, YOLOv8s-World, and YOLOv9s, although showing slightly higher training losses, maintain a more consistent balance across both training and validation datasets, with YOLOv8s and YOLOv9s yielding the most favorable results. YOLOv10s and YOLOv11s exhibit the highest training losses, especially in `dfl_loss`, which could indicate convergence issues or architectural limitations. These findings highlight RT-DETR's robustness, while the performance of Faster-RCNN and YOLO variants, despite promising training results, raises concerns about their generalization capabilities, emphasizing the importance of improving model adaptability and validation strategies.




Fig. 22. Performance comparison of different models for individual behavior detection across a) Train box loss, b) Validation box loss, c) Train class loss, d) Validation class loss, e) Train dfl loss, and f) Validation dfl loss. YOLO stands for You Only Look Once; RT-DETR is a Real-Time Detection TRansformer; RCNN is the Region-based Convolutional Neural Network; Val is validation; cls is class; dfl is distribution focal loss.

3.7.2. Behavior identification based on supervised and semi-supervised model

Table 16 presents the validation performance metrics for behavior detection using semi-supervised conf50 active learning and supervised models, evaluated on precision, recall, mAP_0.50, mAP_0.50-0.95, and F1-score. The semi-supervised model trained with 200 labeled images, achieved a precision of 82.6% and an overall F1-score of 79.5%, excelling in detecting behaviors such as dustbathing (89.8%), wing-flipping (82.5%), mislaying (100.0%), and piling (97.7%). However, its recall and mAP_0.50-0.95 were notably low for behaviors like foraging (44.7% and 29.0%). In contrast, the supervised I-640 model outperformed in both precision and recall across most behaviors, achieving an overall F1-score of 79.5%. It exhibited a higher recall for perching (90.0%) and mortality (67.1%) and achieved superior mAP scores across most categories. While the supervised model demonstrated the advantages of a larger labeled dataset for improving performance across metrics, the semi-supervised model showed promising results, highlighting its potential for effective detection with fewer labeled images and trained on 2500 pseudo-labeled images (**Fig. 23**).

Table 16. Validation performance metrics results comparison for behavior detection across supervised and semi-supervised models.

Models	Metrics	Feeding	Foraging	Drinking	Dustbathing	Preening	Perching	Wing-Flipping	Mortality	Pecking	Mislaying	Piling	Overall
Semi-supervised I-200	Precision	81.4	66.5	77.7	84.3	58.6	77.5	71.1	100.0	81.8	92.4	86.7	79.8
	Recall	79.4	47.1	84.7	96.7	64.3	86.2	66.7	57.8	55.6	100.0	100.0	76.2
	mAP_0.50	83.8	56.9	88.0	94.7	61.2	85.3	67.2	68.5	59.6	99.5	99.5	78.6
	mAP_0.50-0.95	48.7	31.9	46.7	48.2	34.2	41.7	46.6	30.1	28.9	79.2	71.9	46.2
	F1-score	80.4	55.1	81.0	90.1	61.3	81.6	68.8	73.3	66.2	96.0	92.9	78.0
Supervised I-6400	Precision	83.0	75.7	82.1	85.3	59.4	82.6	56.1	100.0	93.5	90.5	84.4	81.1
	Recall	87.9	64.2	92.8	95.2	64.7	90.0	64.7	67.1	47.2	82.6	100.0	77.9
	mAP_0.50	87.0	73.3	88.0	93.0	60.6	87.9	59.9	91.2	60.5	84.2	98.1	80.4
	mAP_0.50-0.95	47.8	41.0	47.9	48.9	35.8	44.9	36.3	51.5	34.0	54.8	67.1	46.4
	F1-score	85.4	69.5	87.1	90.0	61.9	86.1	60.1	80.3	62.7	86.4	91.5	79.5
Semi-supervised	Precision	80.6	64.9	81.3	89.8	52.3	79.8	82.5	98.6	80.7	100.0	97.7	82.6
	Recall	80.2	44.7	84.2	96.7	66.7	84.0	66.7	66.7	55.6	98.9	100.0	76.7
	mAP_0.50	81.7	49.5	84.8	96.6	52.9	82.5	72.0	77.7	64.2	99.5	99.5	78.3
	mAP_0.50-0.95	47.9	29.0	48.5	47.0	28.7	40.4	49.5	33.4	33.6	80.2	63.7	45.6
	F1-score	80.5	53.0	82.7	93.3	58.7	81.8	73.9	79.6	65.9	99.5	98.9	79.5

Where mAP is the mean average precision




Fig. 23. Performance comparison of different supervised and semi-supervised models for behavior detection with a) precision, b) recall, c) mAP_{0.50}, d) mAP_{0.50-0.95}, and e) F1-score. mAP is mean average precision.

Comparing the semi-supervised models trained with 200 labeled images and 2500 pseudo-labeled images reveals a noticeable improvement as the dataset size increases. The semi-supervised model with 2500 pseudo-labeled images achieved higher precision and recall in most behaviors, with an overall F1-score of 79.5%. It nearly matches that of the supervised model. While the model trained on 2500 pseudo-labeled images performed better in terms of precision (dustbathing, wing-flipping, piling, and mislaying), the recall was still lower than in the supervised case, particularly foraging

(44.7%). The findings indicate that semi-supervised models, especially when using larger datasets, can nearly match the performance of supervised models. However, they still fall short in terms of recall and mAP_0.50-0.95, which are essential for accurately detecting behaviors in real-world scenarios. This comparison highlights how crucial labeled data is for training deep learning models. It also shows that semi-supervised learning methods can make significant progress when there's enough unlabeled data to work with. Therefore, a semi-supervised model with little human intervention is required.

As shown in **Fig. 24**, the model's performance reveals interesting trends in both training and validation losses. The semi-supervised model with Conf50 consistently shows the lowest training losses across all metrics: `box_loss`, `cls_loss`, and `df_l_loss`. However, this model demonstrates the highest validation losses with `box_loss`, `cls_loss`, and `df_l_loss`. This indicates that the semi-supervised model benefits from using additional unlabeled data during training, but it faces challenges in generalizing unseen data (Jabbar and Khan, 2015). In contrast, the supervised I-200 model, with training losses of `box_loss`, `cls_loss`, and `df_l_loss`, exhibits lower validation losses compared to the semi-supervised model, with `box_loss`, `cls_loss`, and `df_l_loss`. The supervised I-640 model shows the highest training losses (`box_loss`, `cls_loss`, `df_l_loss`), but it performs better than both the supervised I-200 and semi-supervised models in validation, with `box_loss` and `cls_loss`. This means that even though the supervised I-640 model has the highest training loss, it generalizes the best and performs better than the other models when it comes to validation.




Fig. 24. Performance comparison between supervised and semi-supervised models for behavior detection across a) Train box loss, b) Validation box loss, c) Train class loss, d) Validation class loss, e) Train dfl loss, and f) Validation dfl loss. Val is validation; cls is class; dfl is distribution focal loss.

In addition, the results in **Fig. 25** confusion matrices illustrate the performance of supervised and semi-supervised models for individual behavior detection of hens. The supervised I-640 method exhibited the highest overall accuracy, with significant improvements in detecting behaviors like feeding, foraging, and drinking compared to the supervised I-200 and semi-supervised methods. The supervised I-640 demonstrated the lowest identification of mislaying, pecking, and piling, though it showed moderate misclassifications in the background and less frequent behaviors. Conversely, the semi-supervised model performed comparably in detecting feeding, foraging, and drinking. However, it showed enhanced detection for piling, pecking, mislaying, perching, and dustbathing highlighting its potential to generalize with limited labeled data. The supervised I-200

model, while achieving decent detection accuracy, had difficulty distinguishing certain behaviors. This suggests that higher-resolution datasets or semi-supervised approaches might be needed to accurately identify these more subtle behaviors. Across all models, background noise consistently introduced classification challenges which underscore the need for refined preprocessing techniques or model architecture. These findings emphasize the effectiveness of high-resolution supervised models and the adaptability of semi-supervised methods for real-world applications.




Fig. 25. Confusion matrices for individual behavior detection of hens using a) supervised I-200, b) supervised I-640, and c) semi-supervised model.

The final evaluation compares predicted dataset performance metrics in **Table 17** and **Fig. 26**. The supervised I-640 model achieved a strong performance with an overall F1 score of 84.2%, significantly improving over the supervised I-200 model, which had an overall F1 score of 77.5%. Notably, behaviors such as pecking, piling, and mortality exhibited excellent precision, with

mortality and wing-flipping showing perfect recall (100.0%). The semi-supervised model slightly decreased the overall F1 score compared to the supervised I-640 model but gave excellent predictions of detecting behaviors like drinking and pecking. However, it performed well on other behaviors, demonstrating the potential of semi-supervised models to perform comparably to supervised ones when sufficient unlabeled data is available.

Table 17. Prediction performance metrics comparison for behavior detection across various supervised and semi-supervised models.

Model	Class	MAE	MSE	RMSE	Precision	Recall	F1 Score	FNR (%)
Supervised I-200	Feeding	0.8	1.7	1.3	82.2	92.5	87.1	7.5
	Foraging	2.2	10.7	3.3	85.3	72.7	78.5	27.3
	Drinking	1.2	7.4	2.7	63.6	98.8	77.4	1.2
	Dustbathing	0.3	1.0	1.0	87.5	70.0	77.8	30.0
	Preening	0.4	0.6	0.8	58.6	85.0	69.4	15.0
	Perching	1.1	4.9	2.2	95.1	85.7	90.1	14.3
	Wing-Flipping	0.1	0.1	0.2	100.0	71.4	83.3	28.6
	Mortality	0.1	0.1	0.2	75.0	75.0	75.0	25.0
	Pecking	0.1	0.1	0.4	50.0	40.0	44.4	60.0
	Mislaying	0.1	0.2	0.4	76.9	83.3	80.0	16.7
	Piling	0.1	0.1	0.3	100.0	81.8	90.0	18.2
	Overall	0.6	2.5	1.2	79.5	77.8	77.6	22.2
Supervised I-640	Feeding	0.7	1.3	1.1	84.9	93.3	88.9	6.7
	Foraging	2.0	7.7	2.8	82.7	81.6	82.2	18.4
	Drinking	0.9	4.6	2.2	70.4	97.6	81.8	2.4
	Dustbathing	0.3	0.7	0.8	95.0	63.3	76.0	36.7
	Preening	0.4	0.5	0.7	60.0	75.0	66.7	25.0
	Perching	1.1	3.5	1.9	92.1	88.8	90.5	11.2
	Wing-Flipping	0.0	0.0	0.2	87.5	100.0	93.3	0.0
	Mortality	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
	Pecking	0.1	0.1	0.2	100.0	60.0	75.0	40.0
	Mislaying	0.1	0.1	0.3	90.0	75.0	81.8	25.0
	Piling	0.1	0.1	0.2	100.0	81.8	90.0	18.2
	overall	0.5	1.7	1.0	87.5	83.3	84.2	16.7
Semi-supervised	Feeding	0.9	2.4	1.5	79.9	92.5	85.7	7.5
	Foraging	2.3	10.5	3.2	83.0	74.4	78.5	25.6
	Drinking	1.4	8.0	2.8	60.6	100.0	75.5	0.0
	Dustbathing	0.4	1.3	1.1	80.8	70.0	75.0	30.0
	Preening	0.5	0.9	0.9	51.4	90.0	65.5	10.0
	Perching	1.3	4.5	2.1	89.2	88.4	88.8	11.6
	Wing-Flipping	0.1	0.1	0.2	100.0	71.4	83.3	28.6
	Mortality	0.1	0.1	0.3	60.0	75.0	66.7	25.0

Pecking	0.1	0.1	0.3	66.7	40.0	50.0	60.0
Mislaying	0.1	0.2	0.4	78.6	91.7	84.6	8.3
Piling	0.0	0.0	0.2	91.7	100.0	95.7	0.0
Overall	0.7	2.6	1.2	76.5	81.2	77.2	18.8

Where, MAE is the mean absolute error; MSE is the mean squared error, RMSE is the root mean squared error; FNR is the False negative rate.




Fig. 26. Detected images of individual hen behaviors: a) Supervised I-200, b) Supervised I-640, and c) Semi-supervised model.

These results are consistent with earlier findings that larger datasets with supervised settings have generally enhanced model performance. However, the semi-supervised models in this study still show promise because their performance improves significantly with the increase in unlabeled data. It indicates their potential for real-world applications where annotated data might be limited. In addition, a semi-supervised model with minimal human intervention is needed to improve detection accuracy compared to Conf50. Nonetheless, the variations in F1 scores for different

behaviors show how challenging it can be to detect some of them. To achieve better performance across all behaviors, further improvements like data augmentation or more advanced model architecture might be needed.

3.7.3. Zero-shot hybrid fusion model

Table 18 summarizes the prediction performance metrics of the optimal hybrid AI model (YOLOWorld with a YOLOv8 backbone) for poultry behavior detection. This model was selected for the study due to its superior performance among zero-shot integration models utilizing the best.pt configuration from the above discussion. The Hybrid AI model outperformed the supervised model in overall precision, recall, F1 score, and FNR (**Table 17**). When compared with the supervised I-200 model (precision: 79.5%, recall: 77.8%, F1 score: 77.5%), the Hybrid AI model achieved an overall precision of 88.4%, recall of 83.1%, and F1 score of 84.5%, which represents a 9.1% improvement in precision, a 6.7% improvement in recall, and a 7% increase in the F1 score. The FNR of the Hybrid AI model was significantly lower at 16.9%, compared to 22.2% for the Supervised I-200 model, marking a 23.9% improvement. On a class-wise basis, the Hybrid AI model showed better performance in detecting behaviors such as drinking (91.1% F1 score vs. 77.4%), preening (79.1% vs. 69.4%), and pecking (78.7% vs. 44.4%). Although the Hybrid AI model had slightly lower precision for certain behaviors, like dustbathing (85.5% vs. 87.5%) and perching (93.3% vs. 95.1%), it excelled in recall and F1 scores for most behaviors, indicating a better balance between sensitivity and accuracy. In addition, the Hybrid AI model also shows slight improvement compared with the supervised I640 model. These results highlight the Hybrid AI model's superior ability to detect and classify behaviors effectively, especially when minimizing false negatives is critical. Using text prompts, users can define specific behaviors or objects to detect with a single-word input, simplifying the image annotation process and reducing manual labeling time. The text-based model significantly outperforms the supervised models (**Table 17**) across most performance metrics.

Table 18. Prediction performance metrics comparison for behavior detection with the best hybrid AI model.

Class	MAE	MSE	RMSE	Precision	Recall	F1 Score	FNR
Feeding	0.7	1.4	1.2	88.5	90.5	89.5	9.5
Foraging	2.1	11.3	3.4	79.1	95.8	86.7	4.2
Drinking	0.6	1.7	1.3	86.9	95.8	91.1	4.2
Dustbathing	0.2	0.5	0.7	85.5	75.8	80.3	24.2
Preening	0.5	1.3	1.2	78.9	79.4	79.1	20.6
Perching	1.0	3.6	1.9	93.3	92.7	93.0	7.3
WingFlipping	0.1	0.2	0.4	60.0	91.3	72.4	8.7

Mortality	0.0	0.0	0.2	100.0	75.0	85.7	25.0
Pecking	0.1	0.1	0.4	100.0	64.9	78.7	35.1
Mislaying	0.0	0.1	0.2	100.0	68.4	81.3	31.6
Piling	0.0	0.0	0.1	100.0	84.6	91.7	15.4
Overall	0.5	1.8	1.0	88.4	83.1	84.5	16.9

Where, MAE is the mean absolute error; MSE is the mean squared error, RMSE is the root mean square error; FNR is the False negative rate.

3.8. Text-based model detection and labeling

Table 19 presents the YOLOWorld model with YOLOv8s backbone (YOLOv8sWorld) integration for text-prompt detection and auto-labeling of images. Integrating text prompts with YOLOv8s-World showed significant improvements in behavior detection and labeling accuracy, demonstrating the model’s potential to automate the image annotation process effectively. By allowing users to define detection criteria via simple text inputs, the model significantly reduces the time and effort traditionally required for manual labeling. This text-prompt functionality enhances the model's versatility and makes it an intuitive tool for researchers and practitioners working in fields where large datasets are common, particularly in agriculture and livestock management. Using natural language for object and behavior detection represents a meaningful advancement, simplifying the user interface and providing an easier, more scalable solution for image annotation tasks. Combined with the model's high detection accuracy, this capability makes it an invaluable tool for large-scale data processing, where manual labeling would otherwise be prohibitively time-consuming and resource intensive.

Table 19. YOLOWorld with YOLOv8s backbone model integration for text-prompt detection and auto-labeling of images

Model: YOLOWorld with YOLOv8s backbone model integration for text-prompt detection and Auto-Labeling
<pre> # Image-based detection !pip install ultralytics import os from ultralytics import YOLO from PIL import Image, ImageDraw, ImageFont model = YOLO("yoloworld+v8backbone/weights/best.pt") standard_colors = [] behavior_class_colors = {} image_dir = "/images/" output_image_dir = "/Outputimages/" output_labels_dir = "/Outputlabels/" os.makedirs(output_image_dir, exist_ok=True) os.makedirs(output_labels_dir, exist_ok=True) font_path = "/ttf/Times_New_Roman.ttf" </pre>

```

font = ImageFont.truetype(font_path, 24)
def filter_classes_by_prompt(prompt):
    available_classes = []
    if isinstance(prompt, str):
        prompt = [prompt]
    return [cls for cls in available_classes if any(p.lower() in cls.lower() for p in prompt)]
prompt = [" "]
filtered_classes = filter_classes_by_prompt(prompt)
results = model.predict(image_dir)
for i, result in enumerate(results):
    img_path = result.path
    img_name = os.path.basename(img_path)
    image = Image.open(img_path).convert("RGB")
    draw = ImageDraw.Draw(image)
    yolo_labels = []
    for box, cls, conf in zip(result.bboxes.xyxy, result.bboxes.cls, result.bboxes.conf):
        x1, y1, x2, y2 = box
        class_id = int(cls)
        confidence = conf.item()
        class_name = model.names[class_id]
        if class_name not in filtered_classes:
            continue
        class_color = behavior_class_colors.get(class_name, (255, 255, 255))
        draw.rectangle([x1, y1, x2, y2], outline=class_color, width=3)
        text = f"{class_name}: {confidence:.2f}"
        text_bbox = draw.textbbox((x1, y1), text, font=font)
        text_width = text_bbox[2] - text_bbox[0]
        text_height = text_bbox[3] - text_bbox[1]
        text_x = x2 - text_width
        text_y = y1 - text_height - 5
        draw.text((text_x, text_y), text, fill=class_color, font=font)
        x_center = (x1 + x2) / 2 / image.width
        y_center = (y1 + y2) / 2 / image.height
        width = (x2 - x1) / image.width
        height = (y2 - y1) / image.height
        yolo_labels.append(f"{class_id} {x_center} {y_center} {width} {height}")
    output_image_path = os.path.join(output_image_dir, f"labeled_{img_name}")
    image.save(output_image_path)
    output_label_path = os.path.join(output_labels_dir, f"{os.path.splitext(img_name)[0]}.txt")
    with open(output_label_path, 'w') as label_file:
        for label in yolo_labels:
            label_file.write(label + "\n")
    print(f"{img_name} - Saved labeled image and YOLO labels.")
print("Processing complete. All labeled images and YOLO labels have been saved.")

```

When compared to existing methods in the literature, the YOLOv8s-World model offers several advantages over traditional object detection systems (Cheng et al., 2024; Ultralytics, 2024). While deep learning-based models like YOLO have been widely recognized for their efficiency in object detection, integrating text-prompt capabilities marks a major leap forward in usability and functionality. Previous studies on text-based image recognition, such as CLIP (Contrastive Language-Image Pre-training), have explored the benefits of combining language and vision models, showing the potential for improved accuracy (OpenAI, 2024; Wolff et al., 2023). However, challenges such as ambiguous text prompts and the need for task-specific fine-tuning remain in many of these systems. In contrast, the YOLOv8s-World model simplifies this process by allowing a streamlined integration of text inputs with detection capabilities. Thereby overcoming many of the hurdles typically faced by more complex language-vision models. The combination of high detection accuracy and the ability to respond to text prompts makes this integration highly effective for real-world applications.

Beyond its utility in improving detection and labeling accuracy, the YOLOv8s-World model's text-prompt feature can provide specific advantages for farmers and producers working in the agricultural sector. One of the model's key strengths lies in its ability to detect specific behaviors of interest with just a single word input. This feature allows users to quickly identify behaviors tailored to their needs, such as feeding, drinking, or pecking. In addition to detecting individual behaviors, the model also enables producers to efficiently monitor problematic behaviors within video footage. For example, if a specific behavior emerges or deviates from the expected pattern, farmers can use the model to detect and analyze these cases in real-time, facilitating early intervention and targeted solutions (**Fig. 27**). This capability enhances not only the efficiency of behavior monitoring but also the ability to act proactively, identifying potential issues before they escalate. By automating behavior detection and offering real-time insights, this integration empowers producers to optimize their operations, improve animal welfare, and contribute to the sustainability and productivity of agricultural practices.




Fig. 27. YOLOv8s-World model integration for text-prompt detection and auto-labeling showing broilers, hens, and their behaviors.

3.9. Human labeling, semi-supervised and unsupervised zero-shot auto labeling

Labeling a dataset of 3,000 images containing 118,679 instances (approximately 50 instances per image) revealed significant differences in efficiency between human labeling and semi-supervised auto-labeling methods. Human annotation required 141.7 ± 12.3 seconds per image, totaling 118.1 ± 10.2 hours or nearly 5 days (4 days and 22 hours \pm 10 hours 13 minutes) to complete the entire dataset. Assuming an uninterrupted 8-hour workday, excluding weekends, this process would require approximately 15 working days to complete. In contrast, semi-supervised auto-labeling alone processed all 3,000 images in only 2.4 ± 0.3 seconds, with an average of 0.0008 ± 0.0001 seconds per image, completing the task in mere seconds overall. For refinement, human intervention guided by a Query by Committee strategy added 28.7 ± 19.6 seconds per image, or 23.9 ± 16.4 hours in total. When accounting for an 8-hour workday, this hybrid method would

require approximately 3 working days, achieving significant time savings over manual labeling while maintaining label quality.

Our results underscore the superiority of combining machine learning-driven labeling with targeted human input compared to previous work. As documented in earlier studies, fully manual methods are accurate but labor-intensive, requiring weeks, months, or years to annotate large datasets, making them impractical for rapid model development (Gudivada et al., 2017). On the other hand, unsupervised approaches, while faster, often compromise quality due to the lack of domain-specific corrections (Chen et al., 2021). Our semi-supervised approach bridges this gap by leveraging machine learning for rapid initial annotations and incorporating active learning methods (conf50 and minimal human expertise) for precise refinement. The hybrid method with minimal human intervention reduces annotation time by approximately 80% compared to manual labeling, completing the task in about 3 working days under the same conditions. This balance of speed, scalability, and accuracy establishes our method as an efficient and practical solution for annotating large-scale datasets in machine-learning workflows. A detailed performance evaluation of these labeling techniques, including their accuracy, precision, and other attributes, is clearly illustrated in **Table 20**, providing a comparative analysis of human, semi-supervised, and zero-shot auto-labeling techniques (Bist et al., 2023c; Gudivada et al., 2017; Huang et al., 2014; Li et al., 2015; Nassar et al., 2021; Shorewala et al., 2021).

Table 20. Comparison of human labeling, semi-supervised auto-labeling, and zero-shot/unsupervised auto-labeling methods.

Factor	Human Labeling	Semi-Supervised Auto-Labeling	Zero-shot or Unsupervised Auto-Labeling
Accuracy & Precision	High accuracy, but prone to human error and subjectivity.	Depending on the initial model's performance, it may be less accurate due to noisy labels.	Varies widely; can be inaccurate for complex tasks or rare classes.
Consistency	Varies between annotators; prone to subjective inconsistencies.	Generally, it is more consistent, especially for large datasets, but can suffer from model bias.	High consistency but can propagate errors if the initial clustering or segmentation is poor.
Scalability	Not scalable for large datasets; slow process.	Scalable can label massive datasets efficiently once the model is trained.	Highly scalable, as no manual intervention is needed for labeling.
Cost-Effectiveness	High labor costs, especially for large datasets.	Lower cost once the model is trained; initial setup may incur costs.	Very low cost, as no manual labeling is needed, but may require extensive computing resources.

Label Quality & Reliability	High-quality labels, particularly for complex tasks.	Label quality varies based on the model's confidence and initial training.	Quality can be poor, especially if the model is not properly trained or the data is noisy.
Adaptability to New Data	Human annotators can easily adapt to new classes or data.	It can adapt but may require retraining or fine-tuning to handle new data.	Limited adaptability to new classes may require clustering methods to handle new data.
Handling Ambiguity & Uncertainty	Humans can resolve ambiguity with contextual understanding.	May struggle with ambiguity; confidence thresholds can help reduce uncertainty.	Struggles with ambiguity, as unsupervised methods typically don't handle context well.
Model Transferability & Improvement	N/A (doesn't apply to human labeling).	Model improves over time with more data, leading to better pseudo-labels.	It can improve over time but requires fine-tuning or additional supervision for accuracy.
Ease of Use	Straightforward but time-consuming and labor-intensive.	Once set up, it is fast, efficient, and requires less manual input.	Fully automated; minimal manual input but requires good initial setup and computing resources.
Reliability for Large Datasets	Prone to errors with large-scale data.	Can reliably process large datasets with minimal human input.	Very reliable for large datasets, as no human input is required. However, errors may go unnoticed.

3.10. Limitations of this study

Besides several challenges mentioned above, semi-supervised auto-labeling techniques in poultry datasets face further limitations that could impact their performance. One such limitation is the model's sensitivity to noise in the data, which can significantly affect the performance of the semi-supervised auto-labeling system. It can lead to inaccurate predictions and lower-quality labels. These variations in the training set can degrade the model's ability to generalize and correctly label new, unseen instances. To address this limitation, incorporating minimal manual annotation or exploring other ideas could be beneficial. Another critical limitation is the difficulty of incorporating domain-specific knowledge into the semi-supervised framework. Poultry datasets often contain subtle behavioral differences that may require expert interpretation to label correctly. The reliance on auto-labeling alone may not fully capture these nuances, potentially affecting the model's accuracy and its ability to distinguish between similar behaviors. Therefore, using domain adaptation and advanced models for semi-supervised learning could be one of the best choices to address these limitations.

Despite these challenges, semi-supervised auto-labeling remains an attractive option for large-scale poultry behavior detection, especially when paired with high-quality labeled data. However, as a previous study indicates, semi-supervised methods are prone to propagate errors from the initial labeling phase, which can result in a cascading effect on downstream predictions

(Xu et al., 2023). Researchers demonstrated that while semi-supervised models can significantly reduce manual labeling efforts, they still require high-quality labeled data to perform optimally. In contrast, other studies on fully supervised learning methods have emphasized the importance of curated datasets for achieving robust model performance, but they are often limited by the time and labor needed to produce such datasets (Sapkota et al., 2024). Overall, these findings highlight the need for continued refinement of semi-supervised techniques to address issues of data quality, noise, and behavior variability in poultry datasets.

3.11. Future direction

As noted, the effectiveness of deep learning applications is heavily reliant on large, diverse datasets that accurately reflect real-world conditions. Current research has highlighted the challenges associated with semi-supervised ALPD, particularly regarding noise. Therefore, future research should focus on improving data collection methodologies to enhance the dataset's diversity and accuracy, which could involve utilizing advanced data augmentation techniques and more robust data preprocessing to mitigate issues of noise and imbalance. Furthermore, semi-supervised models would benefit from being integrated with active learning strategies, where the model can selectively query labels on uncertain or ambiguous instances. A critical area of exploration should also be incorporating domain-specific knowledge into these models. Expert-driven label refinement could help address subtle behavioral differences in poultry, thus improving the precision of the auto-labeling process. Additionally, incorporating multi-modal data, such as combining visual, acoustic, and environmental data, may lead to better detection and classification of poultry behaviors, particularly in variable conditions.

Moreover, exploring their generalizability and scalability across different poultry breeds and farming conditions is crucial as semi-supervised learning techniques evolve. By focusing on more robust semi-supervised frameworks including domain adaptation that can adapt to changing environmental conditions, researchers could enhance the practical applicability of AI tools in poultry farming. This includes developing scalable systems that can handle large volumes of real-time data for decision-making in precision livestock farming. Research efforts should also explore integrating such models into automated monitoring systems that can provide continuous feedback to farmers and help to enable faster response times to health and behavioral issues in poultry. This advancement could lead to more efficient and sustainable poultry management practices. In addition, it also contributes to the overall goal of improving animal welfare and productivity in the agricultural sector.

4. Conclusions

This research highlights the potential of semi-supervised learning techniques to improve poultry behavior detection, especially in large datasets where manual labeling is both time-consuming and resource intensive. Combining human annotation with pseudo-labeling significantly boosts the speed and accuracy of data labeling. This approach can be particularly beneficial for large-scale

operations looking to enhance their detection systems efficiently. Among the models tested, YOLOv8s-World and YOLOv9s performed exceptionally well under supervised learning conditions, with YOLOv8s-ALPD achieving the highest precision (96.1%) and recall (99.0%) among semi-supervised models. The CLIP zero-shot model showed promising results for breed detection, with a precision of 76.5% and recall of 64.1%. However, integrating zero-shot models with other models, such as YOLO-World with the YOLOv8s backbone, resulted in a text-prompt hybrid model for breed detection that delivered superior performance, with an RMSE of 1.0, precision of 99.2%, recall of 99.4%, and an F1 score of 98.7%. Similarly, there was a 6-31% improvement in precision and a 6-16% increase in F1 score for certain behaviors. In addition, the minimal manual annotation active learning approach improved semi-supervised model robustness in detecting broilers, hens, and their behaviors. If a minimal manual annotator is unavailable, then conf50 can be a good alternative.

The fusion of semi-supervised learning and zero-shot models offers a powerful solution to the challenges of behavior detection in dynamic agricultural environments, where datasets are diverse and constantly changing. This hybrid approach, coupled with human-in-the-loop annotation systems, greatly reduces the dependency on large, labeled datasets while improving detection accuracy. Text-prompt models further enhance the precision of behavior detection, enabling real-time identification of behaviors such as mislaying, pecking, piling, feeding patterns, or mortality. This system streamlines the training process and supports farmers and producers by providing actionable insights for timely intervention. By merging semi-supervised learning, zero-shot models, and human annotation, this research presents an efficient, scalable solution for poultry behavior monitoring, ultimately contributing to advancing precision livestock farming and more sustainable agricultural practices.

Acknowledgments

This project was supported by NSF Data Analytics that are Robust and Trusted (DART, #OIA-1946391), USDA-NIFA AFRI (2023-68008-39853); University of Arkansas' Center for Food Animal Wellbeing; Georgia Research Alliance (Venture Fund); The Egg Industry Center (EIC);

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Ramesh Bahadur Bist: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Investigation, Visualization, Validation, Supervision, Software, Methodology, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Lilong Chai:** Writing – review & editing, Resources, Investigation, Methodology, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Shawna Weimer:** Writing – review & editing, Resources, Methodology, Data curation, Investigation. **Hannah Atungulu:** Data curation. **Chantel Pennicott:** Writing – review & editing, Investigation. **Xiao Yang:** Writing – review & editing, Investigation. **Sachin Subedi:** Writing – review & editing, Investigation. **Chaitanya Pallerla:** Writing – review & editing, Investigation. **Yang Tian:** Writing – review & editing, Investigation. **Dongyi Wang:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Project

administration, Resources, Investigation, Visualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that no competing financial interests or personal relationships could have influenced the work presented in this paper.

Data availability

Data will be made available on request

References

- Adsule, A., Roy, S., Sharma, A.K., Sengupta, S., 2024. SiamALNet: A Semi-supervised Siamese Neural Network with Active Learning Approach for Auto-Labeling, in: Tripathi, A.K., Anand, D., Nagar, A.K. (Eds.), *Proceedings of World Conference on Artificial Intelligence: Advances and Applications*. Springer Nature, Singapore, pp. 257–269. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-4496-1_20
- Ahn, S., Kim, S., Ko, J., Yun, S.-Y., 2023. Fine tuning pre trained models for robustness under noisy labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17668*.
- Alzubaidi, L., Bai, J., Al-Sabaawi, A., Santamaría, J., Albahri, A.S., Al-dabbagh, B.S.N., Fadhel, M.A., Manoufali, M., Zhang, J., Al-Timemy, A.H., Duan, Y., Abdullah, A., Farhan, L., Lu, Y., Gupta, A., Albu, F., Abbosh, A., Gu, Y., 2023. A survey on deep learning tools dealing with data scarcity: definitions, challenges, solutions, tips, and applications. *Journal of Big Data* 10, 46. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-023-00727-2>
- Appleby, M., 2004. What causes crowding? Effects of space, facilities and group size on behaviour, with particular reference to furnished cages for hens. *Animal Welfare* 13, 313–320.
- Appleby, M., Duncan, I., McRae, H.E., 1988. Perching and floor laying by domestic hens: experimental results and their commercial application. *British Poultry Science* 29, 351–357.
- Appleby, M.C., 1984. Factors affecting floor laying by domestic hens: a review. *World's Poultry Science Journal* 40, 241–249.
- Appleby, M.C., Mench, J.A., Hughes, B.O., 2004. *Poultry behaviour and welfare*. Cabi.
- Bist, R.B., Subedi, S., Yang, X., Chai, L., 2023a. A Novel YOLOv6 Object Detector for Monitoring Piling Behavior of Cage-Free Laying Hens. *AgriEngineering* 5, 905–923.
- Bist, R.B., Subedi, S., Yang, X., Chai, L., 2023b. Automatic Detection of Cage-Free Dead Hens with Deep Learning Methods. *AgriEngineering* 5, 1020–1038. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriengineering5020064>
- Bist, R.B., Yang, X., Subedi, S., Bist, K., Paneru, B., Li, G., Chai, L., 2024. An automatic method for scoring poultry footpad dermatitis with deep learning and thermal imaging. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 226, 109481. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2024.109481>
- Bist, R.B., Yang, X., Subedi, S., Chai, L., 2023c. Mislaying behavior detection in cage-free hens with deep learning technologies. *Poultry Science* 102729.

- Boesch, G., 2024. The Fundamental Guide to Faster R-CNN [2025] [WWW Document]. viso.ai. URL <https://viso.ai/deep-learning/faster-r-cnn-2/> (accessed 12.31.24).
- Cao, K., 2024. Enhancing Machine Learning With Data-Efficient Methods.
- Chen, P., Li, L., Wu, J., Dong, W., Shi, G., 2021. Unsupervised Curriculum Domain Adaptation for No-Reference Video Quality Assessment, in: 2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). Presented at the 2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), IEEE, Montreal, QC, Canada, pp. 5158–5167. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV48922.2021.00513>
- Chen, W., Lin, L., Yang, S., Xie, D., Pu, S., Zhuang, Y., 2022. Self-supervised noisy label learning for source-free unsupervised domain adaptation, in: 2022 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS). IEEE, pp. 10185–10192.
- Cheng, T., Song, L., Ge, Y., Liu, W., Wang, X., Shan, Y., 2024. Yolo-world: Real-time open-vocabulary object detection, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 16901–16911.
- Culman, M., Delalieux, S., Beusen, B., Somers, B., 2023. Automatic labeling to overcome the limitations of deep learning in applications with insufficient training data: A case study on fruit detection in pear orchards. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 213, 108196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2023.108196>
- Djulonga, J., Yung, J., Tschannen, M., Romijnders, R., Beyer, L., Kolesnikov, A., Puigcerver, J., Minderer, M., D'Amour, A., Moldovan, D., 2021. On robustness and transferability of convolutional neural networks, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 16458–16468.
- Gudivada, V., Apon, A., Ding, J., 2017. Data quality considerations for big data and machine learning: Going beyond data cleaning and transformations. *International Journal on Advances in Software* 10, 1–20.
- Hao, H., Fang, P., Jiang, W., Sun, X., Wang, L., Wang, H., 2022. Research on Laying Hens Feeding Behavior Detection and Model Visualization Based on Convolutional Neural Network. *Agriculture* 12, 2141. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture12122141>
- Huang, G., Song, S., Gupta, J.N., Wu, C., 2014. Semi-supervised and unsupervised extreme learning machines. *IEEE transactions on cybernetics* 44, 2405–2417.
- Jabbar, H., Khan, R.Z., 2015. Methods to avoid over-fitting and under-fitting in supervised machine learning (comparative study). *Computer Science, Communication and Instrumentation Devices* 70, 978–981.
- Kim, J., Min, Y., Kim, D., Lee, G., Seo, J., Ryoo, K., Kim, S., 2022. ConMatch: Semi-Supervised Learning with Confidence-Guided Consistency Regularization. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2208.08631>
- Li, H., Rajbahadur, G.K., Lin, D., Bezemer, C.-P., Ming, Z., Jiang, 2024. Keeping Deep Learning Models in Check: A History-Based Approach to Mitigate Overfitting. *IEEE Access* 12, 70676–70689. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3402543>
- Li, J., Chen, D., Qi, X., Li, Z., Huang, Y., Morris, D., Tan, X., 2023. Label-efficient learning in agriculture: A comprehensive review. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 215, 108412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2023.108412>
- Li, X., Guo, Y., Schuurmans, D., 2015. Semi-Supervised Zero-Shot Classification with Label Representation Learning, in: 2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). Presented at the 2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), IEEE, Santiago, Chile, pp. 4211–4219. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV.2015.479>
- Liu, F., Tian, Y., Chen, Y., Liu, Y., Belagiannis, V., Carneiro, G., 2022. ACPL: Anti-curriculum Pseudo-labelling for Semi-supervised Medical Image Classification, in: 2022 IEEE/CVF Conference

- on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). Presented at the 2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), IEEE, New Orleans, LA, USA, pp. 20665–20674. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR52688.2022.02004>
- Liu, S., Zeng, Z., Ren, T., Li, F., Zhang, H., Yang, Jie, Jiang, Q., Li, C., Yang, Jianwei, Su, H., 2025. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection, in: European Conference on Computer Vision. Springer, pp. 38–55.
- Munir, M.A., Khan, M.H., Khan, S., Khan, F.S., 2023. Bridging Precision and Confidence: A Train-Time Loss for Calibrating Object Detection, in: 2023 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). Presented at the 2023 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), IEEE, Vancouver, BC, Canada, pp. 11474–11483. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR52729.2023.01104>
- Nassar, I., Herath, S., Abbasnejad, E., Buntine, W., Haffari, G., 2021. All labels are not created equal: Enhancing semi-supervision via label grouping and co-training, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 7241–7250.
- OpenAI, 2024. openai/CLIP.
- Paneru, B., Bist, R., Yang, X., Chai, L., 2024a. Tracking perching behavior of cage-free laying hens with deep learning technologies. *Poultry Science* 103, 104281. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psj.2024.104281>
- Paneru, B., Bist, R., Yang, X., Chai, L., 2024b. Tracking dustbathing behavior of cage-free laying hens with machine vision technologies. *Poultry Science* 103, 104289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psj.2024.104289>
- Qazi, F., Naseem, M., Aslam, S., Attaria, Z., Jan, M.A., Junaid, S.S., 2024. AnnoVate: Revolutionizing Data Annotation with Automated Labeling Technique. *VFAST Transactions on Software Engineering* 12, 24–30.
- Ren, S., He, K., Girshick, R., Sun, J., 2017. Faster R-CNN: Towards Real-Time Object Detection with Region Proposal Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 39, 1137–1149. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2016.2577031>
- Sapkota, R., Paudel, A., Karkee, M., 2024. Zero-Shot Automatic Annotation and Instance Segmentation using LLM-Generated Datasets: Eliminating Field Imaging and Manual Annotation for Deep Learning Model Development. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2411.11285>
- Shaikh, T.A., Rasool, T., Lone, F.R., 2022. Towards leveraging the role of machine learning and artificial intelligence in precision agriculture and smart farming. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 198, 107119.
- Shen, A., Dai, M., Hu, J., Liang, Y., Wang, S., Du, J., 2024. Leveraging Semi-Supervised Learning to Enhance Data Mining for Image Classification under Limited Labeled Data. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2411.18622>
- Shorewala, S., Ashfaq, A., Sidharth, R., Verma, U., 2021. Weed Density and Distribution Estimation for Precision Agriculture Using Semi-Supervised Learning. *IEEE Access* 9, 27971–27986. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3057912>
- Subedi, S., Bist, R., Yang, X., Chai, L., 2023. Tracking pecking behaviors and damages of cage-free laying hens with machine vision technologies. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 204, 107545.
- Ultralytics, 2024. Models Supported by Ultralytics [WWW Document]. URL <https://docs.ultralytics.com/models> (accessed 12.27.24).
- Usama, M., Qadir, J., Raza, A., Arif, H., Yau, K.A., Elkhatib, Y., Hussain, A., Al-Fuqaha, A., 2019. Unsupervised Machine Learning for Networking: Techniques, Applications and Research Challenges. *IEEE Access* 7, 65579–65615. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2916648>

- USDA, 2024. Selected U.S. farm production expenses, 2023–24F [WWW Document]. URL <http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/chart-gallery/gallery/chart-detail/?chartId=82241> (accessed 12.27.24).
- Wang, X. (Annie), Tang, J., Whitty, M., 2022. Data-centric analysis of on-tree fruit detection: Experiments with deep learning. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 194, 106748. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2022.106748>
- Wang, Y., Peng, J., Zhang, Z., 2021. Uncertainty-Aware Pseudo Label Refinery for Domain Adaptive Semantic Segmentation. Presented at the Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, pp. 9092–9101.
- Wolff, M., Brendel, W., Wolff, S., 2023. The Independent Compositional Subspace Hypothesis for the Structure of CLIP’s Last Layer, in: ICLR 2023 Workshop on Mathematical and Empirical Understanding of Foundation Models.
- Xu, X., Zhou, F., Zhang, K., Liu, S., 2023. CCGL: Contrastive Cascade Graph Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 35, 4539–4554. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2022.3151829>
- Xu, Y., Goodacre, R., 2018. On Splitting Training and Validation Set: A Comparative Study of Cross-Validation, Bootstrap and Systematic Sampling for Estimating the Generalization Performance of Supervised Learning. *J. Anal. Test.* 2, 249–262. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41664-018-0068-2>
- Yang, J., Lu, J., Batra, D., Parikh, D., 2017. A faster pytorch implementation of faster r-cnn.
- Yang, X., Bist, R., Subedi, S., Chai, L., 2023a. A deep learning method for monitoring spatial distribution of cage-free hens. *Artificial Intelligence in Agriculture*.
- Yang, X., Bist, R., Subedi, S., Wu, Z., Liu, T., Chai, L., 2023b. An automatic classifier for monitoring applied behaviors of cage-free laying hens with deep learning. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 123, 106377. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2023.106377>
- Zhang, B., Wang, Y., Hou, W., Wu, H., Wang, J., Okumura, M., Shinozaki, T., 2022. FlexMatch: Boosting Semi-Supervised Learning with Curriculum Pseudo Labeling. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2110.08263>
- Zhu, X., Vondrick, C., Ramanan, D., Fowlkes, C.C., 2012. Do We Need More Training Data or Better Models for Object Detection?., in: *BMVC*. Citeseer.