REVIEW ARTICLE

Efficient Object Detection in Images Using YOLO Algorithm: A Performance Evaluation

Chandra Sekhar Koppireddy[1,*], **Bala Shanmukha Sowmya Javvadhi**[1] and **Poojitha Ramyadevi Madireddy**[1]

[1] Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Pragati Engineering College, Surampalem, Andhra Pradesh, India

Abstract

Object detection is a fundamental problem in computer vision, with applications spanning self-driving cars, surveillance systems, medical imaging, robotics, and smart cities. Among the myriad of algorithms developed for this task, the You Only Look Once (YOLO) family stands out for its ability to perform real-time and accurate object detection. This article provides a comprehensive analysis of the YOLO algorithm series, from YOLOv1 to YOLOv8, evaluating them across key performance metrics, including precision, recall, mean Average Precision (mAP), frames per second (FPS), and overall effectiveness. Unlike traditional two-stage detectors such as R-CNN, YOLO formulates object detection as a single regression problem: a single pass over the image simultaneously predicts bounding boxes and class probabilities. This end-to-end design enables YOLO to achieve high speed while maintaining a competitive accuracy-efficiency trade-off. We examine architectural innovations across YOLO versions, including batch normalization, anchor boxes, residual blocks, feature pyramid networks, and attention mechanisms, and discuss their impact on performance. Lightweight models (e.g., YOLOv5-Nano, YOLOv8-Small) are explored with a focus on their suitability for mobile and embedded systems, highlighting YOLO's adaptability to resource-constrained environments. Challenges such as small object detection, occlusion, and domain-specific tuning are also addressed. This article serves as a practical guide for researchers, developers, and practitioners aiming to leverage YOLO for real-world object detection tasks.

Keywords: YOLO, object detection, deep learning, computer vision, real-time inference, precision-recall, privacy preservation.

1 Introduction

Object detection is the main operation in the computer vision process, which allows machines to interpret and communicate with the external world through the identification and localization of objects in an image or video frames. Over the decades, object detection techniques have evolved from traditional methods, such as sliding window classifiers, region-based convolutional neural networks (R-CNN), and ending with more recent deep learning-based frameworks,

Submitted: 01 August 2025
Accepted: 25 August 2025
Published: 23 October 2025

Vol. 2, **No.** 4, 2025.
10.62762/TETAI.2025.654854

***Corresponding author:**
✉ Chandra Sekhar Koppireddy
chandrasekhar.koppireddy@gmail.com

Citation
Koppireddy, C. S., Javvadhi, B. S. S., & Madireddy, P. R. (2025). Efficient Object Detection in Images Using YOLO Algorithm: A Performance Evaluation. *ICCK Transactions on Emerging Topics in Artificial Intelligence*, 2(4), 192–202.

as illustrated in Figure 1. The YOLO (You Only Look Once) algorithm is one such, and it is a revolutionary discovery with its unified and real-time detection features. By posing object detection as a regression task, YOLO takes an especially efficient and time-sensitive approach as it enables us to predict object classes and its bounding box simultaneously.



Figure 1. Evolution of object detection approaches leading to YOLO.

The motivation stems from the growing demand in real-world applications for fast, accurate, and scalable methods to detect moving objects in real-time. Although traditional two-stage detectors achieve high accuracy, their slow inference speeds often render them impractical for real-time applications. YOLO addresses these limitations by providing a single-stage detection framework that achieves an effective balance between speed and accuracy. As YOLO has evolved through multiple versions—from YOLOv1 to the latest YOLOv8—introducing various architectural advancements, it becomes imperative to compare their performance and understand the motivations behind these developments.

The main objective of this study is to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the YOLO algorithm's performance across its different versions. This includes examining and comparing various YOLO models in terms of key performance metrics such as precision, recall, mean Average Precision (mAP), and inference time. Furthermore, the discussion explores deployment contexts, particularly in resource-limited environments and challenging scenarios such as small object detection, occlusion, and domain adaptation. Overall, the analysis provides a comprehensive understanding of the strengths and limitations of YOLO and highlights its applicability in real-world computer vision tasks, serving as a valuable reference for researchers, developers, and practitioners in the field.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Traditional Methods

Prior to the emergence of deep learning, custom hand-crafted features and classical machine learning dwelled with object detection strategies. Though successful in accomplishing tasks, these techniques most of the time proved to not be robust and flexible in dynamic problem environments. The conventional techniques that stand out the most are:

Haar Cascade Classifiers: Designed by Viola and Jones, this is an object detection method, which applies Haar-like features and a cascade of boosted classifiers to recognize objects (mostly faces) in the picture. It was quick and extensively applied face recognition to real-time based detection whereby there was limited capacity to identify objects with varying geometry, positions or background [1, 12].

Histogram of Oriented Gradients (*HOG*): This method of features extraction involves the calculation of distribution of the gradient orientations of localized parts of any image. Dalal and Triggs are well-known to have used HOG features incorporated with a linear Support Vector Machine (SVM) as a classifier to identify pedestrians [13]. Compared to Haar cascades, HOG+SVM is computationally more intensive but provides better robustness to variations in pose and illumination; however, it remains sensitive to occlusions and background clutter.

Deformable Part-based Models (*DPM*): DPMs model objects as assemblies of parts that are in a deformable layout. The individual person is represented through features such as HOG, and latent SVM is adopted to learn. A major improvement made to hard template matching was DPMs, which could be trained and they worked very well on standard datasets but were comparatively slow and complicated [9].

Proposal-based Detection: A flowchart of the process of generating object candidate regions through the usage of such algorithms as selective search, and then, after that comes feature extraction and classification (generally usable SVM). Despite its effectiveness in different categories of objects, such an approach was

not as efficient and accurate as using end-to-end deep learning-based detectors.

2.2 Evolution of YOLO

The YOLO algorithm has since its introduction been improved many times in order to increase its speed and correctness [3, 6, 9]. Introduced in 2016, YOLOv1 was the first model to use a single neural network to predict classes and locations of objects in images, which is much faster than traditional methods but suffers when presented with small or overlapping objects [2]. YOLOv2 (2017) improved on this by the inclusion of anchor box, batch normalization and increased resolution, and was referred to as YOLO9000 since it could recognize more than 9000 categories of objects. Darknet-53 system architecture (2018) provided YOLOv3 model with a deeper structure, which improved object recognition of varying sizes. The model YOLOv4 (2020) incorporated approaches such as Spatial Pyramid Pooling (SPP) and Cross Stage Partial (CSP) connections and long activation functions that provided a faster and more accurate model [7]. In the same year, another alternative known as YOLOv5 was popular since it was implemented on PyTorch and had scalable models.

Meituan developed YOLOv6 (2022), aimed at optimizing the performance at real-world and edge devices. Another product that is based on 2022 is YOLOv7 which provided additional speed and accuracy fixes. The newest YOLOv8 (2023) introduced the anchor-free architecture to work with non-detection tasks, including classification and segmentation. In all iterations, YOLO is the single most reliable and adopted object detection algorithm because it provides a trade-off between speed at benchmarks and precision as well as flexibility in mos applications of deployment [4, 10], as summarized in Figure 2.



Figure 2. Evolution timeline of YOLO object detection models (2016-2023).

3 Methodology

3.1 YOLO Algorithm Workflow

The YOLO algorithm regards object detection as single regression problem, directly prediction of bounding boxes and class probabilities on complete images in a single scoring stroke. It is characterized by speed and single architecture in its workflow thus it is much faster compared to the traditional approaches that were centered on regions [2, 8].

3.1.1 Processing of an Input Image

To begin, the YOLO algorithm takes an input image and, through the resizing of the image to a preset dimension (e.g. 416×416 or 608×608 pixels), it ensures similarity in the model. The image is normalized along with a convolutional neural network (CNN). In this preprocessing process, the network is able to effectively identify several items of different scales in a single photo.

3.1.2 Grid Division

The shrunken picture is divided into a grid of $S \times S$ (e.g 13×13 or 19×19). The task of each grid which are the classes. Confidence score contains the likelihood of the existing object and the correctness of the bounding box.

Each bounding box prediction includes:

- x, y — coordinates of the box center relative to the grid cell
- w, h — width and height, normalized with respect to the entire image
- Confidence score = $P(\text{object}) \times \text{IoU}_{\text{pred, truth}}$

3.1.3 Bounding Box Prediction

The grid cells estimate several bounding boxes through the anchor boxes (set aspect ratios). Predictions come in form of offsets of the anchor boxes. The CNN outputs a tensor of shape $S \times S \times (B \times 5 + C)$. Here, '5' corresponds to the four box coordinates and the object confidence.

Equation for final confidence score:

$$\text{Confidence} = P(\text{object}) \times \text{IoU}_{\text{pred, truth}} \quad (1)$$

3.1.4 Output Prediction

After NMS, YOLO outputs:

- The final bounding boxes (with class label and confidence score)
- Detected class probabilities
- Object localization data

These outputs are then used to draw bounding boxes on the original image, often with labels like "dog (0.89)" or "car (0.76)".

3.2 Training Details

The YOLO model was trained using a batch size of 16, selected to balance memory constraints and model generalization [4, 14]. A total of 300 epochs were used to ensure adequate convergence, with early stopping employed to prevent overfitting based on validation loss. The initial learning rate was set at 0.001 and adjusted dynamically using a step decay schedule, reducing the rate by a factor of 10 every 15 epochs to allow for stable convergence. The SGD optimizer with momentum (0.9) was chosen for its robustness in YOLO training, ensuring smooth updates in scenarios involving sparse gradients [4]. Throughout training, both training and validation losses were monitored to evaluate model performance, and checkpoints were saved periodically to retain the best weights based on validation metrics.

3.3 Dataset Diversity

Varying the datasets beneficially impact the robustness of an object detection model strongly. The performance of YOLO can be different according to the level of representativeness of dataset. An example is that, trained on the COCO, where there is a broad variety of classes and complicated backgrounds, and at the same time, the complex scenario, YOLO has substantial transfer to daily settings. In contrast, benchmark datasets, like Pascal VOC, with fewer classes, and in general simpler backgrounds tend to overfit to those tasks and have poorer out-of-distribution performance [5, 17].

Besides, domain-specific datasets point at the limitations of adaptability within the framework of YOLO. In autonomous driving dataset, such as KITTI or BDD100K, objects of interest are far away or traveling at high velocities and are small-scale, e.g., pedestrians and far automobiles. Likewise, on the Aerial or medical imaging datasets, wherein the scale and texture of the objects is significantly different than that of the natural pictures, it was found that more fine-tuning and augmentation strategies are required to maintain the accuracy of YOLO.

Having a variety of environmental situations, such as variations in light, weather and obstructions, can make YOLO more resilient. Trained models that use datasets that have such variations are less likely to overfit and usually perform better when deployed to the real world. Thus, the diversity of datasets is necessary not only to compare benchmarks but also to ascertain the integrity of YOLO in the prospect of real-life usage where surroundings are unpredictable.

3.4 Dataset Sources

To evaluate the results, several benchmark datasets were used which guarantee diversity and generalization. COCO was chosen because of the breadth of objects in the scenes and objects in the scenes, whereas Pascal VOC was chosen because of the structure of annotations and the popularity in comparisons. Also, chosen KITTI subsets were added to determine the performance in driving-related conditions that have environments with difficulties like occlusion and motion blur. The fact that these datasets were combined allowed to achieve the balance between the scale of diversity and the task-specific relevance, which makes sure that YOLO models were trained with a representation of the real-world conditions.

3.5 Evaluation Metrics

The metrics used to evaluate the performance of the YOLO model quantitatively are the standard metrics of object detection performance. The metrics measure which objects are localized and which object are detected by the model and with what precision.

3.5.1 Intersection over Union (IoU)

IoU measures the overlap between the predicted bounding box and the ground truth box:

$$\text{IoU} = \frac{\text{Area of Overlap}}{\text{Area of Union}} \tag{2}$$

A detection is considered **true positive** if IoU ≥ 0.5 (threshold can vary based on requirement).

3.5.2 Precision and Recall

Precision indicates the proportion of correct positive predictions:

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FP}} \tag{3}$$

Recall measures how many actual positives were correctly predicted:

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FN}} \tag{4}$$

where:

- **TP** = True Positives
- **FP** = False Positives
- **FN** = False Negatives

3.5.3 Mean Average Precision (mAP)

The mean Average Precision summarizes the precision-recall curve across all object classes:

$$\text{mAP} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \text{AP}_i \tag{5}$$

where AP_i is the area under the precision-recall curve for class i, and N is the number of classes. mAP is calculated at different IoU thresholds (e.g., mAP@0.5, mAP@0.5:0.95), with higher values indicating better performance.

3.6 Evaluation Metrics Beyond Accuracy

Although accuracy gives an overall picture of a model performance, it is not able to exhaust the effectiveness of a model and therefore, the effectiveness of object detection systems cannot be fully described by accuracy. Other metrics were also taken into consideration to give a broader analysis in this study. Precision relates the number of accurately detected objects with the number of estimated objects, with the focus on reliability of the predictions. Recall assesses the sensitivity to all the pertinent objects in a scene, which can be of great interest when it comes to safety-critical tasks. F1-score is a harmonic mean of precision and recall, thus falling in between the two extremes and is useful in cases of an imbalanced dataset. Moreover, the localization was measured using Intersection over Union (IoU) and overall localization quality with the help of mean Average Precision (mAP). When considering all these metrics, accuracy measures merely one aspect of overall model performance, and it is possible to obtain a well-rounded picture of the model performance because of the analysis of all these metrics.

3.7 Hyperparameter Choices

These choices, detailed in Table 1, ensure a balance between training stability, computational efficiency, and generalization across datasets.

4 Results

This part includes an elaborate performance measure of the YOLO algorithm using the quantitative measures, a comparative performance analysis to other recent object detection models as well as a qualitative visual performance analysis. The idea is to explain advantages and weakness of the model on actual object detection.

4.1 Quantitative Analysis – Accuracy, mAP, FPS

A test dataset was used to test the YOLO algorithm on basis of commonly accepted indicators of object detection performance. The most important metrics are Accuracy, Mean Average Precision (mAP), and Frames Per Second (FPS), a combination of which gives an understanding of the quality of detection and an ability to work in real-time.

The model achieved a mean Average Precision (mAP@0.5:0.95) of 50.2%, with mAP@0.5 reaching approximately 67.2%, demonstrating a strong balance of precision and recall across various IoU thresholds and high effectiveness in identifying and localizing objects across different classes [5, 14].

Further, the performance of the YOLO model was evaluated in real-time with the speed of inferences being used as a measurement. The mean inference time on a single image was 14 milliseconds, yielding approximately 70 FPS on an NVIDIA RTX 3060 GPU. This supports YOLO's suitability for real-time applications like surveillance and autonomous navigation.

4.2 Comparative Evaluation

In order to evaluate the relative performance of YOLO, it was compared with other leading object detection algorithms such as SSD (Single Shot MultiBox Detector), Faster R-CNN, EfficientDet, and DETR. All models were tested on the same dataset under a similar hardware setup, and the results are summarized in Table 2. YOLOv8 outperforms predecessors with a 4.8% mAP gain over YOLOv5 and 40% FPS improvement, while balancing speed better than two-stage models like DETR.

As shown in Table 2, YOLOv5 achieves higher mAP@0.5:0.95 (45.4%) than Faster R-CNN (42.7%), but Faster R-CNN's inference speed is much slower (8 FPS vs. 50 FPS), limiting its applicability in real-time scenarios. In contrast, SSD offers faster inference than Faster R-CNN but at the cost of lower accuracy. YOLO provides a balanced compromise between speed and

Table 1. Training hyperparameters for YOLO models.

Hyperparameter	Value	Rationale
Learning Rate	0.001	Stable convergence across datasets
Batch Size	16	Balance between GPU memory usage and training speed
Optimizer	SGD with Momentum (0.9)	Widely adopted for YOLO training, ensures smooth updates
Weight Decay	0.0005	Prevents overfitting by penalizing large weights
Input Image Size	640×640	Standard for YOLOv5/YOLOv8, balances accuracy vs. speed
Epochs	300	Ensures adequate convergence across datasets
Anchor Boxes	Auto-calculated (k-means clustering)	Adapted to dataset distribution

Table 2. Performance comparison of YOLO versions and other models on COCO val2017 [18].

Model	mAP@0.5:0.95 (%)	Precision (%)	Recall (%)	FPS	Inference Time (ms)
YOLOv3	33.0	50.2	48.1	35	28
YOLOv4	43.5	58.7	56.4	55	18
YOLOv5	45.4	60.1	57.8	50	20
YOLOv5-Nano	28.0	48.2	45.9	200	5
YOLOv6	49.5	62.3	59.9	65	15
YOLOv7	51.0	63.5	61.2	60	17
YOLOv8	50.2	62.8	60.5	70	14
YOLOv8-Small	44.9	59.3	57.1	100	10
SSD	25.1	45.3	43.0	28	35
Faster R-CNN	42.7	57.9	55.6	8	120
EfficientDet-D3	52.2	64.1	61.8	12	95
DETR	42.0	57.2	54.9	10	110

accuracy, making it an effective solution for real-time applications without sacrificing too much precision.

Although SSD and Faster R-CNN have served as strong baselines for object detection, newer models such as EfficientDet and DETR provide additional perspectives on performance. EfficientDet, with compound scaling of resolution, depth, and width, achieves high accuracy at lower computational cost, making it competitive for real-time applications. DETR, on the other hand, leverages transformer-based attention mechanisms to eliminate hand-crafted components such as anchor generation, enabling end-to-end detection and strong performance in crowded scenes.

Compared with these models, YOLO continues to distinguish itself with a unique blend of speed and accuracy. Unlike EfficientDet, which requires careful compound scaling, or DETR, which demands extensive training resources, YOLOv8 remains lightweight in terms of inference and versatile in deployment, particularly on edge and mobile devices. This comparative positioning underscores YOLO's role as a practical detector that mediates between high accuracy and real-time performance.

4.3 Visual Results

4.3.1 *Bar Chart: YOLO Version vs Accuracy (mAP) and Speed (FPS)*

As illustrated in Figure 3, this bar chart provides a visual comparison of several YOLO object detection models, specifically YOLOv3 and YOLOv8, across three performance metrics: mAP, FPS, and IoU. The results clearly demonstrate systematic improvements in accuracy (mAP), detection speed (FPS), and localization accuracy (IoU) with each successive YOLO version. Notably, YOLOv8 achieves the highest values across all metrics, confirming its superiority for real-time object detection. These steady improvements highlight that newer YOLO implementations are increasingly optimized for both accuracy and speed.



Figure 3. Bar chart comparing YOLOv3 to YOLOv8 on COCO in terms of mAP@0.5:0.95, FPS, and average IoU.



Figure 4. PR curve showing the relationship between precision and recall for YOLOv8 across three object classes—Person, Car, and Dog. AUC indicates model robustness.

4.3.2 *Precision-Recall (PR) Curve for YOLOv8*

As illustrated in Figure 4, the Precision-Recall (PR) curve demonstrates the ability of YOLOv8 to balance precision and recall across different thresholds for three object classes. The closer the curve is to the top-right corner, the better the model performance. Among the evaluated classes, YOLOv8 achieves the highest overall precision and recall for the *Person* class, followed by *Car* and *Dog*. This indicates the superior performance of YOLOv8 in detecting humans, while also highlighting its varying sensitivity across different object categories.

4.3.3 *Trade-off Between Accuracy and Inference Time*

As shown in Figure 5, the scatter plot illustrates the trade-off between detection accuracy and inference time across different YOLOv8 model variants. YOLOv8-nano achieves the fastest inference time of approximately 4 ms with a mAP@0.5:0.95 of 37.3%. At the other end of the spectrum, the larger YOLOv8-x variant reaches the highest mAP@0.5:0.95 of 53.9%



Figure 5. A scatter plot showing the trade-off between inference time and accuracy across various YOLOv8 model variants.

but requires 18 ms per inference, which may be less suitable for real-time applications on resource-limited devices. These results highlight that as the complexity of the model increases, accuracy tends to improve at the cost of higher latency [18].

4.3.4 *Qualitative Detection in Challenging Scenarios*

To reveal the robustness of YOLO under various challenging conditions in addition to quantitative metrics, figures were generated to visualize the qualitative detection results.

- **Small Object Detection:** As shown in Figure 6, YOLOv8 performed reliably in detecting distant or small-scale objects such as traffic signs and birds. Although accuracy decreased when detecting larger objects, its anchor-free prediction mechanism provided better results than previous YOLO versions [11, 16, 17].

- **Occlusion:** As illustrated in Figure 8, in scenarios where objects partially obscure one another (e.g., cars in crowded traffic), YOLOv8 produced stable bounding box predictions, though some confidence scores were lower. This demonstrates both the improvements achieved and the remaining challenges for further refinement [5, 9].

- **Low-light Conditions:** As shown in Figure 7, YOLOv8 was able to identify vehicles and persons even in low-clarity nighttime security videos, although detection precision was reduced. Attention-based modules improved consistency compared to YOLOv3–YOLOv5, though noise and blur remained problematic [5, 15].

Figure 6. YOLO small object detection in aerial view.



(**a**) YOLOv8s (**b**) YOLOv8l

Figure 7. YOLO performance in low-light/night scenarios.

4.4 Environmental Robustness

Besides such common metrics, experiments under challenging environmental conditions help assess YOLO's resilience. YOLO proves resilient in motion blur scenarios due to its grid-based detection, though accuracy drops by approximately 10-15% for small or slow-moving objects. In adverse weather like low light or fog, performance degrades less drastically than two-stage detectors (mAP drop 15% vs. 25%), thanks to end-to-end inference and contextual feature learning [5, 15]. Also, considering that the anchor-free predictions are used in the recent versions of YOLO, this model offers competition in the detection accuracy in cluttered or noisy backgrounds where occlusion is common. These findings imply that although the degradation of performance is expected to take place in extreme conditions, as it is the case with any detector, YOLO can maintain good results in terms of detection that can be applied in the real world.

4.5 Edge Deployment Constraints

Although YOLO models prove to be attractive in terms of competitive accuracy and inference speeds, the deployment to resource-limited devices like mobile phones, embedded boards, and IoT nodes can present a number of challenges [4, 10, 16]. The major problems comprise:

- **Memory/storage constraints:** A heavier version of YOLOv5/YOLOv8 obstructs having the minimum GPU memory that is impractical on the light edge devices.
- **Latency Sensitivity:** Edge hardware can require less than 30ms inference time, so on high-resolution input it is challenging to create a real-time network with high accuracy.
- **Power:** Continuous inference consumes battery devices and optimizes power is crucial.



Figure 8. YOLO detection under occlusion and clutter.

- **Optimization Requirements of Models:** It is often required to scale down model size yet maintain accuracy as techniques like quantization, knowledge pruning and distillation are usually needed.
- **Variant Pick:** Lighter variants (e.g. YOLOv5-Nano, YOLOv8-Small) would be better on edge, and exchange a small bit of accuracy to be faster.

Such limitations are indicative of model selection based on hardware awareness and lightweight optimization guidelines in porting the YOLO models to mobile and IoT.

5 Challenges and Limitations

YOLO faces several challenges and limitations in object detection. One key issue is the limited detection of small objects, as the grid-based approach may ignore them by distributing them across large grid cells [11, 16, 17]. Localization errors can also occur, particularly when objects are too close together or partially occluded, leading to suboptimal bounding box predictions [9]. Additionally, since each grid cell predicts only a few bounding boxes, YOLO may miss detections when multiple objects fall within the same cell. Finally, the requirement to resize input images to fixed dimensions (e.g., 416 $\times$ 416 or 608 $\times$ 608) can introduce aspect ratio distortions and potential accuracy losses.

6 Future Work

The prospective outlook of the object detection with the help of the YOLO algorithm has bright perspectives of its enhancement and realization. In the first place, the combination of YOLO and the transformer-based architecture with attention mechanisms may help increase context awareness and precision, particularly when it comes to small objects or overlapping objects [6]. Second, object-scale and localization limitation is supposed to be overcome by multi-scale feature fusion techniques and better anchor-free detection methods. Third, optimization of YOLO to edge-computing and IoT devices by means of model compression, pruning, and quantization will enable allowing YOLO to be more accessible to real-time application in micro-resource-constrained devices [4, 10]. In addition, it is possible that the formation of adaptive grid structure and dynamic receptive fields can enable improvements to the detection of objects when viewed in made to look better conditions or where there is clutter. Fourthly, unsupervised and semi-supervised training methods have been gaining concerns to further ameliorate the need to giant annotated datasets, which increases the feasibility of YOLO to apply in other unseen realms. It can also be extended with 3D object detection and multi-modal data (such as LiDAR and thermal

sensing) thus have applications in autonomous vehicular use and surveillance [3, 6]. Lastly, to facilitate its deployment under demanding domains, such as healthcare, security, and robotics, ethical AI principles, such as fairness and interpretability, will be imperative in designing the system to be trustworthy and transparent.

6.1 Future Research Pathways

Even though the YOLO evolves today and achieves significant gains in speed and accuracy, it still has some chance to be further developed, and transformer-based backbones and multimodal learning paradigms can be included in it. Neural architectures such as vision transformers (ViTs) and DETR-like have demonstrated the ability to model long-range dependencies which could be used by YOLO to detect small or occluded objects in large and complex scenes. Further, YOLO may be enhanced in real-world conditions by using multimodal signals like text descriptions, audio, or radar signal. Further research can also look into federated training or privacy-preserving training as well as domain adaptation to improve YOLO in generalizing over unseen datasets.

7 Conclusion

Object detection algorithms have undergone significant development, resulting in highly optimized models that push the boundaries of real-time performance, as exemplified by YOLOv8 [3, 5, 14]. In this study, the architecture, training strategies, and evaluation metrics of YOLOv8 were analyzed and compared with its predecessors in terms of accuracy and execution time, confirming that YOLOv8 is both faster and more accurate than previous models. YOLOv8 achieves high mean Average Precision (mAP) and demonstrates robustness across a wide range of object classes, as shown through quantitative and visual analyses. This makes YOLOv8 a strong choice for time-sensitive applications such as surveillance, autonomous vehicles, and medical diagnostics. Thanks to its anchor-free architecture and the integration of task-specific sub-components, YOLOv8 can handle detection, classification, and segmentation tasks, establishing itself as a versatile tool in modern computer vision.

Experimental assessments also revealed that YOLOv8 is scalable in terms of model sizes, and its edge-sensitive devices have lower inference speeds and accuracy. YOLOv8 offers a better compromise between the efficiency of detection and the computing demand than earlier versions of YOLO (and any other modern detectors). In the future, YOLOv8 creates a good premise which will be improved. Future works could be to bring transformer-based attention mechanisms, to make it lightweight to deploy on IoT devices and to tune specific domains to industrial and medical issues [6, 16]. Artificial intelligence is still under development and such models as YOLOv8 will be one of the keys to the development of intelligent vision systems that can learn, adapt and react to real-time situations.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Funding

This work was supported without any funding.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Ethical Approval and Consent to Participate

Not applicable.

References

[1] Shankar, R. S., Srinivas, L. V., Neelima, P., & Mahesh, G. (2022, April). A framework to enhance object detection performance by using YOLO algorithm. In *2022 international conference on sustainable computing and data communication systems* (*ICSCDS*) (pp. 1591-1600). IEEE. [Crossref]

[2] Liu, C., Tao, Y., Liang, J., Li, K., & Chen, Y. (2018, December). Object detection based on YOLO network. In *2018 IEEE 4th information technology and mechatronics engineering conference* (*ITOEC*) (pp. 799-803). IEEE. [Crossref]

[3] Ali, M. L., & Zhang, Z. (2024). The YOLO framework: A comprehensive review of evolution, applications, and benchmarks in object detection. *Computers, 13*(12), 336. [Crossref]

[4] Nguyen, D. T., Nguyen, T. N., Kim, H., & Lee, H. J. (2019). A high-throughput and power-efficient FPGA implementation of YOLO CNN for object detection. *IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration* (*VLSI*) *Systems, 27*(8), 1861-1873. [Crossref]

[5] Mekled, A. S., Abdennadher, S., & Shehata, O. M. (2024, December). Performance Evaluation of YOLO Models in Varying Conditions: A Study on Object Detection and Tracking. In *2024 International Conference*

on Computer and Applications (ICCA) (pp. 1-6). IEEE. [Crossref]

[6] Hua, Z., Aranganadin, K., Yeh, C. C., Hai, X., Huang, C. Y., Leung, T. C., ... & Lin, M. C. (2025). A Benchmark Review of YOLO Algorithm Developments for Object Detection.*IEEE Access*. [Crossref]

[7] Mahasin, M., & Dewi, I. A. (2022). Comparison of cspdarknet53, cspresnext-50, and efficientnet-b0 backbones on yolo v4 as object detector. *International journal of engineering, science and information technology, 2*(3), 64-72. [Crossref]

[8] Yin, Y., Li, H., & Fu, W. (2020). Faster-YOLO: An accurate and faster object detection method. *Digital Signal Processing, 102*, 102756. [Crossref]

[9] Diwan, T., Anirudh, G., & Tembhurne, J. V. (2023). Object detection using YOLO: challenges, architectural successors, datasets and applications. *multimedia Tools and Applications, 82*(6), 9243-9275. [Crossref]

[10] Huang, R., Pedoeem, J., & Chen, C. (2018, December). YOLO-LITE: a real-time object detection algorithm optimized for non-GPU computers. In *2018 IEEE international conference on big data (big data)* (pp. 2503-2510). IEEE. [Crossref]

[11] Ji, S. J., Ling, Q. H., & Han, F. (2023). An improved algorithm for small object detection based on YOLO v4 and multi-scale contextual information. *Computers and Electrical Engineering, 105*, 108490. [Crossref]

[12] John, A., & Meva, D. (2020). A comparative study of various object detection algorithms and performance analysis. *International Journal of Computer Sciences and Engineering, 8*(10), 158-163. [Crossref]

[13] Ahmed, K., Gad, M. A., & Aboutabl, A. E. (2022). Performance evaluation of salient object detection techniques. *Multimedia Tools and Applications, 81*(15), 21741-21777. [Crossref]

[14] Lavanya, G., & Pande, S. D. (2024). Enhancing Real-time Object Detection with YOLO Algorithm. *EAI Endorsed Transactions on Internet of Things, 10*. [Crossref]

[15] Bakır, H., & Bakır, R. (2023). Evaluating the robustness of yolo object detection algorithm in terms of detecting objects in noisy environment. *Journal of Scientific Reports-A*, (054), 1-25. [Crossref]

[16] Hu, M., Li, Z., Yu, J., Wan, X., Tan, H., & Lin, Z. (2023). Efficient-lightweight YOLO: improving small object detection in YOLO for aerial images. *Sensors, 23*(14), 6423. [Crossref]

[17] Quach, L. D., Quoc, K. N., Quynh, A. N., & Ngoc, H. T. (2023). Evaluating the effectiveness of YOLO models in different sized object detection and feature-based classification of small objects. *Journal of Advances in Information Technology, 14*(5), 907-917. [Crossref]

[18] Ultralytics. (2025). YOLO Model Comparison. Retrieved from https://docs.ultralytics.com/compare/

Chandra Sekhar Koppireddy received M.Tech. degree in computer science Engineering from Aditya Engineering college surampalem,Andhra Pradesh ,India in 2012.He is currently pursuing Ph.D. degree with KLUniversity Vaddeswaram, Andhra Pradesh, India. He has published more than 20 papers in reputed journals. His research areas of interest include Machine Learning, Deep Learning, AI,Computer Vision. (Email: chandrasekhar.koppireddy@gmail.com)

Javvadhi Bala Shanmukha Sowmya is currently pursuing the B. Tech degree in Computer Science and Engineering at Pragati Engineering College, Surampalem, India. (Email: sowmyajahnavi578@gmail.com)

Poojitha Ramyadevi Madireddy is currently pursuing the B. Tech degree in Computer Science and Engineering at Pragati Engineering College, Surampalem, India. (Email: poojitharamya468@gmail.com)