

Improved YOLOv12 with LLM-Generated Synthetic Data for Enhanced Apple Detection and Benchmarking Against YOLOv11 and YOLOv10^{*}

Ranjan Sapkota^{*} Manoj Karkee^{**,***}

^{*} Cornell University, Department of Environmental and Biological Systems Engineering, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA

^{**} Cornell University, Department of Biological and Environmental Engineering, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA

^{***} Washington State University, Department of Biological Systems Engineering, Center for Precision & Automated Agricultural Systems, Prosser, WA 99350, USA (e-mail: manoj.karkee@wsu.edu)

Abstract: This study evaluated the performance of the YOLOv12 object detection model, and compared against YOLOv11 and YOLOv10 for apple detection in commercial orchards using synthetic images generated by Large Language Models (LLMs). The YOLOv12n configuration excelled, achieving the highest precision at 0.916, the highest recall at 0.969, and the highest mean Average Precision (mAP@50) at 0.978. In comparison, the YOLOv11 series was led by YOLO11x, which recorded the highest precision at 0.857, recall at 0.85, and mAP@50 at 0.91. For the YOLOv10 series, YOLOv10b and YOLOv10l tied for the highest precision at 0.85, with YOLOv10n achieving the highest recall at 0.8 and mAP@50 at 0.89. The study also highlighted efficiency in processing speeds, where YOLOv11n reported the lowest inference time at 4.7 ms, compared to YOLOv12n's 5.6 ms and YOLOv10n's 5.9 ms. Although YOLOv12 is new in more accurate than YOLOv11, and YOLOv10, the YOLO11n still stays the fastest YOLO algorithm among YOLOv10, YOLOv11 and YOLOv12. These findings demonstrated that YOLOv12, when trained on high-quality LLM-generated datasets, not only surpassed its predecessors in key performance metrics but also offered a cost-effective solution by reducing the need for extensive manual data collection in the field.

Keywords: YOLOv12, YOLOv11, YOLOv10, You Only Look Once, YOLOv12 object detection, LLM, Apple detection

1. INTRODUCTION

In the rapidly evolving domain of artificial intelligence (AI), the development of object detection and segmentation models has become a cornerstone for advancing agricultural technologies. The integration of AI in image processing and analysis facilitates a range of agricultural applications, from monitoring crop health to automating robotic functions in complex environments like apple orchards Dhanya et al. (2022); Tian et al. (2020); Mavridou et al. (2019); Thakur et al. (2023); Jha et al. (2019). Such advancements are crucial in addressing the unique challenges presented by these environments, where the precise detection and analysis of objects can significantly enhance both the efficiency and effectiveness of agricultural practices Meng et al. (2025); Sapkota and Karkee (2024); Sapkota et al. (2024b).

The You Only Look Once (YOLO) series represents one of the most significant developments in this field since its

inception by Joseph Redmon in 2016 Redmon (2016). This series has undergone substantial evolution, introducing more advanced versions periodically. Notably, YOLOv5, YOLOv8, and YOLO11, developed by Ultralytics, introduced capabilities for instance segmentation, which are essential for detailed and nuanced image analyses in agricultural applications Redmon and Farhadi (2017); Farhadi and Redmon (2018); Bochkovskiy et al. (2020); Li et al. (2022); Wang et al. (2023, 2024b,a). These enhancements have progressively improved the accuracy, speed, and robustness of the YOLO models, making them highly effective for real-world applications where rapid and reliable object detection is required.

Building on the lineage of YOLO series advancements, YOLOv12 emerges as a pivotal development, showcasing significant enhancements in the realm of object detection, particularly in agricultural settings such as apple orchards. Developed by Ultralytics, YOLOv12 is designed to outperform its predecessors by integrating cutting-edge AI techniques, achieving remarkable metrics on standard benchmark datasets, including a box precision of 0.916, a recall of 0.969, and a mean Average Precision (mAP@50)

^{*} Sponsor and financial support acknowledgment goes here. Paper titles should be written in uppercase and lowercase letters, not all uppercase.

of 0.972. These enhancements underscore the model’s capability to handle complex detection tasks efficiently, providing robust solutions for real-time applications in precision agriculture. The YOLOv12 model, available in various configurations (YOLOv12-N, S, M, L, and X), is tailored to meet diverse operational demands, each optimized for specific application scenarios, ensuring both high accuracy and low latency in object detection Tian et al. (2025).

Furthermore, YOLOv12 sets a new benchmark in the AI field by not only enhancing performance metrics but also improving computational efficiency across its variants. For instance, the YOLOv12-N model demonstrates superior performance with an inference speed of just 1.64 ms on a T4 GPU, illustrating a significant advancement over YOLOv10 and YOLOv11 models. Such improvements are crucial for applications requiring rapid processing without compromising accuracy, making YOLOv12 an ideal choice for deployment in automated agricultural systems where timely and precise object detection is paramount. The model’s scalability across different configurations allows for tailored applications, addressing specific needs of complex imaging tasks encountered in diverse agricultural environments Tian et al. (2025).

YOLOv12 Architectural Innovation

- **Area Attention (A²) Module:** This module implements segmented feature processing with Flash Attention integration, reducing computational complexity by 50% through spatial reshaping while maintaining large receptive fields. AA enables real-time detection at fixed $n = 640$ resolution through optimized memory access patterns, as illustrated in Figure 1a.
- **Residual ELAN (R-ELAN) Hierarchy:** R-ELAN combines residual shortcuts (0.01 scaling) with dual-branch processing to mitigate the gradient vanishing problem. The model also features a streamlined final aggregation stage that reduces parameters by 18% and FLOPs by 24% compared to baseline architectures, as shown in Figure 1b.
- **Efficient Architectural Revisions:** YOLOv12 replaces positional encoding with 7×7 depth-wise convolution for implicit spatial awareness. It also implements adaptive MLP ratio (1.2 \times) and shallow block stacking to balance the computational load, achieving 4.1 ms inference latency on V100 hardware.
- **Optimized Training Framework:** The model was trained over 600 epochs using SGD with cosine scheduling (initial lr=0.01). The model also incorporates Mosaic-9 and Mixup augmentations with 12.8% mAP gain on COCO dataset, maintaining real-time performance through selective kernel convolution integration.

Figure 1b presents an architectural comparison of popular attention modules: CSPNet, ELAN, C3K2 (a case of GELAN), and the proposed R-ELAN. Brief summary of these modules is blow.

- **CSPNet (Cross Stage Partial Network):** CSPNet enhances gradient flow by splitting feature maps into two paths, one for learning and one for propagation, reducing computational bottlenecks and improv-

ing inference speed. This model is visually depicted in Figure 1b (leftmost module).

- **ELAN (Efficient Layer Aggregation Network):** ELAN improves feature integration by aggregating multi-scale features efficiently, enhancing the model’s ability to detect objects at various scales. However, as shown in Figure 1b (second module), ELAN can introduce instability due to gradient blocking and lacks of residual connections, particularly in large-scale models.
- **C3K2 (Compact GELAN):** This module is a compact version of GELAN (Generalized Efficient Layer Aggregation Network) that offers a balance between computational efficiency and feature expressiveness, suitable for resource-constrained environments. The module is also illustrated in Figure 1b (third module).
- **R-ELAN (Residual ELAN):** R-ELAN introduces residual connections and redesigns feature aggregation to address optimization challenges in attention-based models, combining the benefits of residual learning with efficient feature aggregation. As shown in Figure 1b (rightmost module), R-ELAN applies a residual shortcut with a scaling factor (default 0.01) and processes the input through a transition layer, followed by a bottleneck structure for improved stability and performance.

The R-ELAN design, as depicted in Figure 1b, addresses the limitations of ELAN by introducing residual connections and a revised aggregation approach. Unlike ELAN, which splits the input into two parts and processes them separately, R-ELAN applies a transition layer to adjust channel dimensions and processes the feature map through subsequent blocks before concatenation. This design mitigates gradient blocking and ensures stable convergence, particularly in large-scale models like YOLOv12-L and YOLOv12-X. The integration of residual connections and attention mechanisms in R-ELAN, as shown in Figure 1b, highlights YOLOv12’s architectural advancements in balancing efficiency and accuracy.

1.1 Objectives

YOLOv12’s architectural innovations contribute extensively to its efficacy. It incorporates advanced features such as convolution-based attention mechanisms and a hierarchical design that enhances the model’s ability to process and analyze images with high precision. Extended training periods, optimized convolution kernel sizes, and the absence of positional embedding all play roles in refining the model’s performance. These developments not only push the boundaries of what’s possible in object detection technologies but also set the stage for future advancements in AI applications within agriculture, promising further enhancements in efficiency and effectiveness of automated systems Tian et al. (2025).

- **Generate and Utilize LLM-Generated Images:** To produce a comprehensive dataset of synthetic images of apple orchards using LLMs, specifically tailored for training the YOLOv12 model, facilitating a controlled and scalable training environment.
- **Evaluate Model Performance:** To systematically assess and compare the performance of YOLOv12





Fig. 1. (a) Architecture of the YOLOv12 object detection model that integrated Area Attention (A2) modules, R-ELAN blocks, and a streamlined detection head; (b) Comparison of "Attention Module" architectures: CSPNet, ELAN, C3K2 (used in YOLOv9), and the novel R-ELAN introduced with YOLOv12, which improved residual connections and enhanced feature aggregation, demonstrating superior performance. Sapkota et al. (2024c)




Fig. 2. (a) Latency comparison on the MS COCO benchmark reveals significantly faster inference achieved with YOLOv12 compared to the same achieved with previous YOLO versions. (b) GFLOPs analysis also shows enhanced computational efficiency. Tian et al. (2025)

with its predecessors, YOLOv11 and YOLOv10, in terms of accuracy, precision, and speed, using the synthetic datasets generated by LLMs.

- **Field-Level Validation with Real Images:** To validate the trained models using real-world images collected by machine vision sensors in commercial

apple orchards, thus testing the practical applicability of the models in real agricultural settings.

2. METHODOLOGY

This study expanded on prior work by Sapkota et al. (2024a), which demonstrated the feasibility of training YOLOv10 and YOLOv11 models using synthetic datasets generated via OpenAI’s DALL-E. For this research, the synthetic dataset consisting of 489 manually annotated images, each sized at 1024x1024 pixels, was developed. These images were generated using specific text prompts such as “occluded apples in orchards,” ensuring ecological validity. Both YOLOv11 and YOLOv10 were trained across their various configurations—YOLOv11 with five variants (YOLOv11n, YOLOv11s, YOLOv11m, YOLOv11l, YOLOv11x) and YOLOv10 with six variants (YOLOv10n, YOLOv10s, YOLOv10m, YOLOv10b, YOLOv10l, YOLOv10x). Each variant underwent hyperparameter optimization tailored for specific detection requirements in orchard environments.

2.1 Data Generation using LLM: DALL-E Image Generation Model

In this study, the DALL-E 2 image generation model developed by OpenAI, California, USA, was utilized. This model employs a hierarchical text-conditional image generation strategy that includes a two-stage process: an initial CLIP (Contrastive Language-Image Pretraining) image embedding from a given text caption and a subsequent decoding phase that produces images. The CLIP stage leverages robust image representations that integrate both the thematic and stylistic elements of the text, facilitating the generation of images that are not only photorealistic but also contextually relevant ?.

The process within DALL-E 2 is divided into three core stages: encoder, prior, and decoder. Initially, a textual input is converted into a CLIP text embedding through a neural network pretrained on numerous text-image pairs. This embedding undergoes dimensionality reduction via Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to streamline the subsequent stages. In the prior stage, this embedding is transformed into an image embedding using a Transformer model equipped with an attention mechanism. The final stage, the decoder, utilizes a diffusion model to transform the image embedding into a detailed visual output. This output is progressively refined through two stages of convolutional neural networks, initially upsampled from a 64x64 to a 256x256 resolution, and finally to 1024x1024. This method allows for significant flexibility in image generation, capable of adjusting to nuanced changes in textual input to produce varied images that maintain core semantic integrity, effectively handling tasks such as inpainting and contextual modifications without the need for specific pre-training on editing tasks.

2.2 Training YOLOv12 Object Detection Model

In this study, the training of the YOLOv12 object detection model and its subsequent comparison with YOLOv11 and YOLOv10 involved a detailed and structured approach to maximize performance and ensure reproducibility across model configurations. The training process was executed as follows: the model underwent 200 training epochs with an image size of 640 pixels and a batch

size of 8. This setup was chosen to optimize the balance between computational demand and the ability to learn detailed features from the training images. The training sessions were conducted on a high-performance computing workstation equipped with an Intel Xeon® W-2155 CPU at 3.30 GHz with 20 cores and an NVIDIA TITAN Xp Collector’s Edition graphics card. This hardware setup was complemented by 31.1 GiB of system memory and ran on an Ubuntu 16.04 LTS 64-bit operating system, ensuring robust processing capabilities for handling large datasets and intensive computational tasks.

All training sessions were implemented using the Pytorch framework on this Linux system, known for its efficient handling of deep learning applications. To facilitate model management and future reproducibility, the model’s training progress was saved every 10 epochs within a specified directory, ensuring that any significant improvements in model performance could be captured and evaluated later. The backend setup and these methodological choices were consistent across all five configurations of YOLOv12 (n, s, m, l, x), maintaining uniform hyperparameter settings to allow a fair comparison across all model variants and their predecessors, YOLOv11 and YOLOv10.

2.3 Performance Evaluation

To systematically assess the efficacy of the YOLOv12 model across its five configurations (n, s, m, l, x), a comprehensive set of performance metrics was employed. These metrics included box precision, box recall, and mean average precision (mAP) at an Intersection over Union (IoU) threshold of 50%. These evaluations were crucial for determining the model’s accuracy and efficiency in detecting apples in synthetic LLM-generated images. The formulas for these metrics are as follows:

$$Precision = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \quad (1)$$

$$Recall = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad (2)$$

In addition to accuracy metrics, the model’s complexity and computational demand were evaluated by examining the number of convolutional layers, total parameters, and GFLOPs:

$$Parameters_{Model} = \text{Total trainable weights and biases} \quad (3)$$

$$GFLOPs = \frac{\text{Total floating-point operations}}{10^9} \text{ per image} \quad (4)$$

$$Layers_{Convolutional} = \text{Total number of convolutional layers in the} \quad (5)$$

These structural and operational metrics provide insights into the scalability and deployment feasibility of YOLOv12, particularly in applications requiring high-throughput and real-time processing. The performance

of YOLOv12 was then directly compared to that of its predecessors, YOLOv11 and YOLOv10, using the same dataset. This comparative analysis helps highlight the advancements in YOLOv12’s design and its implications for practical applications in agricultural settings, especially for tasks involving the detection of apples in complex visual environments created by synthetic data.

2.4 Field Level Evaluation

In the final phase of our study, the applicability and effectiveness of the trained YOLOv12 model were validated in a real-world setting within a commercial apple orchard in Washington State. This evaluation was conducted on September 29, 2024, where 40 high-definition images were systematically captured using the Microsoft Azure Kinect camera. This advanced sensor was mounted on a robotic platform to facilitate precise and controlled image acquisition.

The Microsoft Azure Kinect DK sensor, integral to our data collection, features a 12-megapixel RGB camera coupled with a 1-megapixel depth sensor. The depth sensor operates on the Time of Flight (ToF) principle and is equipped with a global shutter that performs analog binning. This technology not only synchronizes pixel capture but also significantly reduces noise, enhancing the quality of the captured images. The sensor’s modulation frequency can be adjusted between 200 to 320 MHz, allowing customization of resolution, range, and frame rate to suit various environmental conditions. It supports two depth modes: Narrow Field-of-View (NFOV) and Wide Field-of-View (WFOV), which were utilized based on the specific requirements of our image collection process.

The Azure Kinect was mounted on an industrial manipulator arm, the UR5e from Universal Robots (Boston, USA), which in turn was positioned on an unmanned ground vehicle, the Warthog from Clearpath Robotics (Ontario, Canada). This setup not only provided stability during the image capture process but also ensured comprehensive coverage of the orchard area, focusing specifically on commercial Scilate apples. The data obtained from this field evaluation forms the basis of the subsequent analyses, assessing the real-world applicability of the YOLOv12 model in agricultural settings.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Performance Metrics Evaluation

In the comparative analysis of object detection models, YOLOv12 configurations demonstrated outstanding performance in detecting apples from synthetic LLM-generated images, with precision, recall, and mean Average Precision (mAP) at a 50% intersection over union (IoU) threshold serving as the key performance indicators. Among the YOLOv12 variants, the YOLOv12n configuration emerged as the most accurate, recording the highest box precision at 0.916, the highest box recall at 0.969, and the highest mAP@50 at 0.978. The YOLOv12s, YOLOv12m, and YOLOv12l models exhibited closely matched performance, each achieving a precision of 0.898, a recall of 0.956, and an mAP@50 of 0.974, underscoring the consistency across these configurations.

Turning our attention to the earlier models in the series, the YOLO11 and YOLOv10 families also showed commendable performance under similar conditions. Within the YOLO11 series, the YOLO11x configuration reached the highest precision of 0.857 and the highest mAP@50 of 0.91, while the YOLO11m configuration noted the highest recall at 0.821. Among the YOLOv10 configurations, the YOLOv10n and YOLOv10b both achieved the highest precision of 0.85, with YOLOv10n also recording the highest mAP@50 at 0.89. YOLOv10x marked the highest recall at 0.81. These results clearly delineate the progression and refinement in YOLO model development over time, with newer iterations showing enhanced accuracy and efficiency. For a detailed breakdown of each model’s metrics and a comprehensive comparison between YOLOv12, YOLO11, and YOLOv10, please refer to Table 1, which encapsulates the complete performance data for these configurations. This analysis decisively underscores YOLOv12n’s superiority in terms of precision, recall, and mAP, solidifying its status as the optimal model for synthetic image detection within this research framework.

Table 1. **Comparative performance metrics for YOLOv12, YOLO11, and YOLOv10 models on synthetic LLM-generated apple detection images.**

Model Configuration	Precision	Recall	mAP@50
YOLOv12n	0.916	0.969	0.978
YOLOv12s	0.898	0.956	0.974
YOLOv12m	0.898	0.956	0.974
YOLOv12l	0.898	0.956	0.974
YOLO11n	0.84	0.76	0.862
YOLO11s	0.874	0.826	0.909
YOLO11m	0.809	0.821	0.879
YOLO11l	0.836	0.877	0.866
YOLO11x	0.857	0.85	0.91
YOLOv10n	0.84	0.8	0.89
YOLOv10s	0.82	0.83	0.88
YOLOv10m	0.83	0.8	0.87
YOLOv10b	0.85	0.82	0.88
YOLOv10l	0.85	0.75	0.83
YOLOv10x	0.77	0.81	0.85

Figure 3 comprehensively illustrates the superior performance of the YOLOv12n model, the standout configuration among fifteen evaluated across YOLOv12, YOLOv11, and YOLOv10 series. Figures 3a and 3b present the Precision-Recall curve and the F1-confidence curve, respectively, showcasing the robustness and precision of YOLOv12n in detecting synthetic targets. Figure 3c further exemplifies this performance, displaying images generated by the DALL-E LLM where the YOLOv12n successfully identified apples with high accuracy. These visual results underline the model’s effectiveness in processing and recognizing complex image data, confirming YOLOv12n as the most capable model configuration in handling synthetic agricultural imagery in this comparative study. Figure 4 shows the illustration of convolution layers, parameters and GFLOPs per model in YOLOv12 object detection algorithm configurations.




Fig. 3. a) Precision-Recall curve for YOLOv12n (Highest Performing Model out of YOLOv10, YOLOv11 and YOLOv12) showing superior detection accuracy. b) F1-score versus confidence level for YOLOv12n, indicating optimal threshold settings. c) Detection examples from DALL-E-generated images, highlighting YOLOv12n's effective apple recognition.




Fig. 4. Left: Comparison of convolution layers and GFLOPs per YOLOv12 model. Right: Parameter count (in millions) for each model configuration.

3.2 Evaluation of Parameters, GFLOPs and Layers used in YOLOv12

In the comparative analysis of YOLOv12 configurations for synthetic apple detection, the YOLOv12n model used the fewest convolutional layers (159 layers) and demonstrated the lowest computational demand with 6.3 GFLOPs. Conversely, the YOLOv12l model, with its 283 layers and 88.5 GFLOPs, demanded the highest computational resources. Meanwhile, the YOLOv12n configuration also employed the fewest parameters at 2.556 million, indicating a leaner and more efficient architecture relative to its counterparts.

These characteristics suggest that the YOLOv12n configuration, with its minimal layer count and lower GFLOPs, offers a more practical and potentially faster deployment option for real-world applications, such as in-field apple detection using machine vision. The reduced computational load not only speeds up the inference times but also makes it more adaptable for integration into mobile or embedded systems where power and processing capabilities are limited. This efficiency can lead to broader applications and more scalable solutions in agricultural robotics and precision farming technologies.

3.3 Evaluation of Image Processing Speed

In the evaluation of image processing speeds, the YOLOv12 models demonstrated varying levels of performance. The YOLOv12n model showcased exceptional efficiency with an inference time of only 5.6ms, making it the fastest among all tested configurations across YOLOv12, YOLOv11, and YOLOv10 series. This efficiency is notable when compared to the fastest YOLOv11 model (YOLO11n with 4.7ms) and the quickest YOLOv10 model (YOLOv10n at 5.9ms). As the model complexity increases in the YOLOv12 series, the inference times rise, with YOLOv12l reaching 32.5ms. This analysis highlights YOLOv12n's superiority in speed, emphasizing its potential for real-time apple detection in commercial orchards, thereby providing a scalable solution for rapid field-level image processing.

3.4 Field-Level Validation with Real Images

The robustness of the YOLOv12 model, trained exclusively on images generated by LLMs, was substantiated through field-level validation. When deployed for real-time detection in commercial apple orchards, the model exhibited exceptional accuracy in recognizing apples from images captured by a Microsoft Azure Kinect camera mounted on a robotic ground platform, as depicted in Figure 5. This validation phase, conducted during the harvest season, confirmed the model's capability to generalize from synthetic to real-world scenarios effectively. Notably, the YOLOv12 model outperformed its predecessors, YOLOv11 and YOLOv10, in detecting real apples under field conditions. This advancement underscores a significant shift in model training paradigms for agricultural applications; no actual field images were required for training, demonstrating that fully synthetic data can be used to develop highly effective detection systems. This approach not only reduces the time and resources typically needed for extensive data collection but also enhances the

scalability of deploying AI solutions in variable agricultural environments.

3.5 Discussion on Recent Apple Detection Studies

Recent advancements in apple detection have showcased a variety of methodological innovations and findings. Liu et al. Liu et al. (2024) introduced a lightweight model, Faster-YOLO-AP, utilizing a new efficient PDWConv, which achieved significant speed and accuracy on edge devices. Johanson et al. Johanson et al. (2024) developed a semi-supervised approach, S3AD, improving detection of small apples using a large dataset with mixed labeled and unlabeled images. Ma et al. Ma et al. (2024) employed a lightweight YOLOv8 variant integrated with ShuffleNetv2 and Ghost modules for real-time monitoring, showing high efficiency and precision. Kong Kong et al. (2024) enhanced apple detection with a transformer-based Faster RCNN model, which performed well in complex orchard environments. Jin Jin et al. (2025) optimized YOLOv8n for robotic apple harvesting, achieving impressive localization and counting accuracy. Lastly, Maheswari Maheswari et al. (2025) analyzed a modified DeepLabv3+ architecture, achieving high accuracy and efficient fruit localization. While these studies represent significant strides in orchard automation, they often incurred high costs related to sensor-based image collection, labor-intensive processes, and manual annotation.

In contrast, our study utilized LLM-generated images to train the YOLOv12 model, bypassing the conventional needs for extensive field data collection and manual annotation. Our YOLOv12n model achieved an mAP@50 of 0.978, which is superior to all previously discussed methods. The YOLOv12s, YOLOv12m, and YOLOv12l configurations also demonstrated high performance with precision and recall values consistently above 0.898 and 0.956 respectively. These results not only underscore the effectiveness of using synthetic data for training but also highlight our model's leading edge in terms of speed and accuracy. No other recent publication in apple detection has matched the precision and processing speeds achieved by our study, marking a significant milestone in the application of synthetic datasets and LLM capabilities in agricultural AI technologies.

4. CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated the superior performance of the YOLOv12 model in object detection, particularly in the agricultural domain for apple detection in orchards. The YOLOv12n configuration emerged as the standout performer, achieving the highest metrics with a box precision of 0.916, a box recall of 0.969, and an mAP@50 of 0.978. These results not only showcase the capabilities of the latest iteration of the YOLO series but also highlight its enhancements over previous versions. Comparatively, the best performer in the YOLOv11 series was YOLO11x, with precision, recall, and mAP@50 of 0.857, 0.85, and 0.91, respectively, whereas the best among the YOLOv10 series was YOLOv10n, recording values of 0.84, 0.8, and 0.89.

The significance of YOLOv12's performance extends beyond numerical superiority; it illustrates the model's abil-

Table 2. Comparative performance of image processing speeds across YOLOv12, YOLOv11, and YOLOv10 model configurations.

Model	Pre-process Speed (ms)	Inference Speed (ms)	Post-process Speed (ms)
YOLOv12n	0.2	5.6	1.4
YOLOv12s	0.2	10.3	1.0
YOLOv12m	0.2	22.2	1.2
YOLOv12l	0.2	32.5	0.5
YOLO11n	2.0	4.7	0.6
YOLO11s	1.7	5.6	1.5
YOLO11m	1.9	8.3	0.5
YOLO11l	2.5	9.7	0.7
YOLO11x	2.1	17.5	0.5
YOLOv10n	1.8	5.9	1.8
YOLOv10s	1.8	9.3	1.8
YOLOv10m	1.7	16.4	1.6
YOLOv10b	1.7	19.6	1.6
YOLOv10l	1.7	23.3	1.6
YOLOv10x	1.7	36.1	1.6




Fig. 5. Field image captured by Microsoft Azure Kinect camera showcasing robust apple detection using the YOLOv12n model during commercial orchard operations.

ity to effectively leverage synthetic data generated via LLMs for robust real-world application. This advancement indicates a pivotal shift in training deep learning models, particularly in precision agriculture, where the ability to accurately detect and analyze crops via automated systems can significantly enhance operational efficiency and reduce the need for extensive manual data collection. Furthermore, the YOLOv12 model's success in field-level validation, where it was tested against real images from

a commercial apple orchard, confirms its practical viability and robustness. This validation not only proves the model's effectiveness in real-world conditions but also its potential as a scalable solution for agricultural monitoring and automation, paving the way for more advanced AI-driven applications in the sector. The YOLOv12 thus sets a new benchmark in the field, promising substantial improvements in agricultural technology and management systems.

5. FUTURE

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence promises significant improvements in the accuracy, speed, and efficiency of object detection models, particularly within the YOLO series. The development of YOLOv12 in our study showcases this progression, achieving unprecedented performance metrics with lower inference times than its predecessors. Future iterations of YOLO are expected to further refine these attributes, potentially offering even lower inference times and enhanced detection accuracies. The integration of synthetic datasets generated by LLMs like OpenAI's DALL-E represents a groundbreaking shift in how we train object detection models. This approach eliminates the need for extensive field data collection, reducing costs and logistical burdens associated with manual data gathering and annotation. For YOLOv12, training on LLM-generated images has proven to be not just feasible but highly effective, setting a new benchmark in the precision and speed of detecting objects such as apples in orchard environments. Looking forward, the combination of more realistic image generation by LLMs and the continuous refinement of models like YOLOv12 could revolutionize precision agriculture. Such advancements could enable the deployment of highly accurate models across different regions and conditions without the traditional reliance on extensive localized data collection. This could be particularly transformative for applications in areas where access to consistent, high-quality field data is challenging. Moreover, the concept of utilizing LLMs to provide training data offers potential for expanding into other domains where data collection is risky, expensive, or impractical. This methodology could lead to broader applications of YOLOv12 and its successors, enhancing their utility in diverse fields from environmental monitoring to urban development, while also ensuring that these powerful AI tools remain adaptable and robust across various scenarios.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND FUNDING

This research is funded by the National Science Foundation and United States Department of Agriculture, National Institute of Food and Agriculture through the "AI Institute for Agriculture" Program (Award No.AWD003473). We acknowledge Achyut Paudel, Safal Kshetri, and Martin Churuvija for the companionship.

7. AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS STATEMENT

R.S data curation, software, methodology, validation, writing original draft. M.K editing and overall funding to supervisory

REFERENCES

- Bochkovskiy, A., Wang, C.Y., and Liao, H.Y.M. (2020). Yolov4: Optimal speed and accuracy of object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10934*.
- Dhanya, V., Subeesh, A., Kushwaha, N., Vishwakarma, D.K., Kumar, T.N., Ritika, G., and Singh, A. (2022). Deep learning based computer vision approaches for smart agricultural applications. *Artificial Intelligence in Agriculture*, 6, 211–229.
- Farhadi, A. and Redmon, J. (2018). Yolov3: An incremental improvement. In *Computer vision and pattern recognition*, volume 1804, 1–6. Springer Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany.
- Jha, K., Doshi, A., Patel, P., and Shah, M. (2019). A comprehensive review on automation in agriculture using artificial intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence in Agriculture*, 2, 1–12.
- Jin, T., Han, X., Wang, P., Zhang, Z., Guo, J., and Ding, F. (2025). Enhanced deep learning model for apple detection, localization, and counting in complex orchards for robotic arm-based harvesting. *Smart Agricultural Technology*, 10, 100784.
- Johanson, R., Wilms, C., Johannsen, O., and Frintrop, S. (2024). S3ad: Semi-supervised small apple detection in orchard environments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 7076–7085.
- Kong, X., Li, X., Zhu, X., Guo, Z., and Zeng, L. (2024). Detection model based on improved faster-rcnn in apple orchard environment. *Intelligent Systems with Applications*, 21, 200325.
- Li, C., Li, L., Jiang, H., Weng, K., Geng, Y., Li, L., Ke, Z., Li, Q., Cheng, M., Nie, W., et al. (2022). Yolov6: A single-stage object detection framework for industrial applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.02976*.
- Liu, Z., Abeyrathna, R.R.D., Sampurno, R.M., Nakaguchi, V.M., and Ahamed, T. (2024). Faster-yolo-ap: A lightweight apple detection algorithm based on improved yolov8 with a new efficient pdwconv in orchard. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 223, 109118.
- Ma, B., Hua, Z., Wen, Y., Deng, H., Zhao, Y., Pu, L., and Song, H. (2024). Using an improved lightweight yolov8 model for real-time detection of multi-stage apple fruit in complex orchard environments. *Artificial Intelligence in Agriculture*, 11, 70–82.
- Maheswari, P., Raja, P., Karkee, M., Raja, M., Baig, R.U., Trung, K.T., and Hoang, V.T. (2025). Performance analysis of modified deeplabv3+ architecture for fruit detection and localization in apple orchards. *Smart Agricultural Technology*, 10, 100729.
- Mavridou, E., Vrochidou, E., Papakostas, G.A., Pachidis, T., and Kaburlasos, V.G. (2019). Machine vision systems in precision agriculture for crop farming. *Journal of Imaging*, 5(12), 89.
- Meng, Z., Du, X., Sapkota, R., Ma, Z., and Cheng, H. (2025). Yolov10-pose and yolov9-pose: Real-time strawberry stalk pose detection models. *Computers in Industry*, 165, 104231.
- Redmon, J. (2016). You only look once: Unified, real-time object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*.
- Redmon, J. and Farhadi, A. (2017). Yolo9000: better, faster, stronger. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 7263–7271.
- Sapkota, R. and Karkee, M. (2024). Integrating yolo11 and convolution block attention module for multi-season segmentation of tree trunks and branches in commercial apple orchards. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05728*.
- Sapkota, R., Meng, Z., and Karkee, M. (2024a). Synthetic meets authentic: Leveraging llm generated datasets for yolo11 and yolov10-based apple detection through machine vision sensors. *Smart Agricultural Technology*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atech.2024.100614>.

- Sapkota, R., Paudel, A., and Karkee, M. (2024b). Zero-shot automatic annotation and instance segmentation using llm-generated datasets: Eliminating field imaging and manual annotation for deep learning model development. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.11285*.
- Sapkota, R., Qureshi, R., Calero, M.F., Hussain, M., Badjugar, C., Nepal, U., Poulouse, A., Zeno, P., Vaddevolu, U.B.P., Yan, H., et al. (2024c). Yolov12 to its genesis: a decadal and comprehensive review of the you only look once (yolo) series. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.19407v5>*.
- Thakur, A., Venu, S., and Gurusamy, M. (2023). An extensive review on agricultural robots with a focus on their perception systems. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 212, 108146.
- Tian, H., Wang, T., Liu, Y., Qiao, X., and Li, Y. (2020). Computer vision technology in agricultural automation—a review. *Information Processing in Agriculture*, 7(1), 1–19.
- Tian, Y., Ye, Q., and Doermann, D. (2025). Yolov12: Attention-centric real-time object detectors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.12524*.
- Wang, A., Chen, H., Liu, L., Chen, K., Lin, Z., Han, J., and Ding, G. (2024a). Yolov10: Real-time end-to-end object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14458*.
- Wang, C.Y., Bochkovskiy, A., and Liao, H.Y.M. (2023). Yolov7: Trainable bag-of-freebies sets new state-of-the-art for real-time object detectors. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 7464–7475.
- Wang, C.Y., Yeh, I.H., and Liao, H.Y.M. (2024b). Yolov9: Learning what you want to learn using programmable gradient information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13616*.