Fuzzy-Logic and Deep Learning for Environmental Condition-Aware Road Surface Classification

***Abstract*—Monitoring states of road surfaces provides valuable information for the planning and controlling vehicles and active vehicle control systems. Classical road monitoring methods are expensive and unsystematic because they require time for measurements. This article proposes an real time system based on weather conditional data and road surface condition data. For this purpose, we collected data with a mobile phone camera on the roads around the campus of the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology. We tested a large number of different image-based deep learning algorithms for road classification. In addition, we used road acceleration data along with road image data for training by using them as images. We compared the performances of acceleration-based and camera image-based approaches. The performances of the simple Alexnet, LeNet, VGG, and Resnet algorithms were compared as deep learning algorithms. For road condition classification, 5 classes were considered: asphalt, damaged asphalt, gravel road, damaged gravel road, pavement road and over 95% accuracy performance was achieved. It is also proposed to use the acceleration or the camera image to classify the road surface according to the weather and the time of day using fuzzy logic.**

Keywords—road condition, deep learning, CNN, classification, fuzzy logic, image based, AI, intelligent transport systems (ITS)

I. INTRODUCTION

For vehicle safety and comfort, knowledge of the road surface (anomalies, weather condition, type) is essential [1]. By integrating surface condition data into the vehicle's control and perception framework, autonomous systems can adapt their driving strategies such as speed, acceleration, or braking profiles to current road states, thereby enhancing both safety and passenger comfort [2]. In addition, proper road data is needed to ensure safe and comfortable driving with advanced driver assistance system(ADAS) [3]. Continuous road surface monitoring is vital, as changing surface conditions directly affect braking, traction, and stability. Real-time awareness enables autonomous systems to adapt to driving decisions, ensuring safer and more reliable operation.To avoid future problems such as accidents and road damage, road sections with a high density of problems should be inspected regularly [4].

Over the last few decades, problem detection and classification in pavement analysis has improved significantly. Traditionally, visual inspection along the route has been used by human experts to perform these tasks and calculating a certain index, the IRI [5], for the road surface condition [6]. The current practice is labour intensive, it is impossible to monitor all roads and the measurements take a while, so there is a need for automating monitoring of roads as a perfect case for automation.

Mustafa Demetgul
Institute of Applied Informatics and Formal Description Methods (AIFB), Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Kaiserstr. 89, 76133 Karlsruhe, Germany
mustafa.demetguel2@kit.edu
Sanja Lazarova Molnar
Institute of Applied Informatics and Formal Description Methods (AIFB), Karlsruhe Institute of Technology,Kaiserstr. 89, 76133 Karlsruhe, Germany
sanja.lazarova-molnar@kit.edu

Other instruments, such as dipstick profilers and profilographs, are much more accurate. However, they are either time-consuming or impractical to use due to slow scanning speeds.

Today, for many roadway applications, including automated inspection and monitoring, imaging technologies have been chosen [7]. A good road should have low smoothness, tire-road friction, and noise level [8]. Manually extracted features are usually not the most appropriate representation of road images [9]. Therefore, the use of convolutional neural networks (CNN) structures that do not require feature extraction provides advantages.

Another method of detecting road anomalies is to place a camera outside a vehicle and capture real-time 2D images. In this way, information about the size and location of the problem and the surface quality of the road can be collected. Nolte et al. [10] compared ResNet50 and InceptionV3 architectures for classifying six road surface types using vehicle-mounted camera images. Their focus was mainly on evaluating CNN performance for visual surface recognition. In contrast, Roychowdhury et al. [11] extended this approach by also estimating the road friction coefficient, linking visual information to vehicle dynamics and safety.. In [12], the extraction of road areas using CNNs was achieved with an accuracy of 98.33%, a precision of 97.74% and a recall of 95.21%. Some shaded areas were misclassified, but overall performance was unaffected[12]. In the detection of cracks in concrete surfaces, the fully convolutional encoder-decoder network achieved impressive performance. The model effectively identified cracks while minimizing false positives and negatives, demonstrating strong capabilities in terms of both accuracy and recall[13]. Gopalakrishnan et al. (2017) use deep CNNs and transfer learning for automatic pavement distress detection, aiming to classify issues like cracks and potholes[14]. Pereira et al. (2018) propose a deep learning-based approach for road pothole detection in Timor Leste. Their model utilizes convolutional neural networks (CNNs) for efficient detection of potholes from road images. Pereira et al. achieved impressive performance, with an accuracy of 99.80%, precision of 100%, recall of 99.60%, and an F-measure of 99.60% [15].

Since camera or sensor-based systems are expensive, many studies have been conducted on identifying road problems using mobile phones. Tedeschi et al [16] use an Android mobile device to perform real-time detection of anomalies, such as potholes and cracks. Optical, microphone, acceleration, laser, polarimetric radar, ultrasonic and microwave sensors are used for road surface classification [17]. However, all of these techniques are expensive approaches. Many studies also focus on the application of inertial sensors in smartphones to the classification of road conditions, as it does not require additional costs. Studies [18] and [19] used accelerometer and GPS data with SVM, achieving 69.4% accuracy in classifying road surfaces. Study [20] used smartphone sensors, achieving 87.68% accuracy in classifying asphalt, cobblestone, and dirt roads. Ngwangwa and Heyns [21] used acceleration sensors and neural networks to estimate road roughness. Vittorio et al [22] detected

potholes with over 80% accuracy on the basis of accelerometer data from smartphones. Kyriakou et al [23] trained an artificial neural network on accelerometer and gyroscope data and achieved an accuracy of more than 90% in the detection of road anomalies. Bajic et al. [24] used machine learning and Z-axis accelerometer and speed data to classify IRI levels with precision up to 0.67. Varona et al. [25] used smartphone accelerometer data with deep learning to classify road surfaces and identify potholes, achieving higher accuracy with CNN compared to LSTM and reservoir computing.

However, computer vision techniques have multiple disadvantages in situations where there is no light, reflections, fog, rain, snow, or at night. For this reason, it is important to use them in conjunction with extra data. The performance of object detection based algorithms in bad weather conditions has been investigated. Sharma et al. (2022) investigated how the YOLO computer vision algorithm can be used to identify cars, traffic lights and pedestrians in various weather conditions. The overall accuracy of 72.3% due to rainy weather conditions [26]. Apart from this study, studies have also been conducted on the performance of computer vision based techniques at night. Despite the many image processing techniques that Pillai et al.(2016) tried, they achieved a classification performance of around 70% in road classification [27]. The performance of camera-based object detection algorithms in foggy weather conditions was investigated by Abbasi et al. (2024) and pedestrian detection performance of around 80% was achieved [28].

To complete the above-mentioned deficiencies of computer vision, it is important to use acceleration data together with computer vision method. In [29], a combined predictive approach is presented for road surface classification from audio and video data. However, as shown in this study, when these data are combined, road classification performance decreases in bad weather conditions. Therefore, it is thought that using weather conditional based data and pretrained CNN according to weather and time of day will be more effective.

Fuzzy logic works in similar way to the processes of perceiving and interpreting human emotions, and here there is a fuzziness in the control of many things [30]. Because of these features, fuzzy logic is used in a wide range of control applications such as washing machines [31], dishwashers, vacuum cleaners [32], vehicle control, energy management [33], traffic control, and electricity charging [34].

In this study, we used acceleration and camera image data. Unlike other studies, since image-based CNN structures are better at classification, acceleration data are converted to images and road classification is performed using image-based algorithms. In addition, the use of weather conditional based data and CNN structures is suggested according to weather conditions and time of day. Since the if-then rule-based approach is not suitable for this study due to the fuzziness of changes in weather conditions, rain and light ratio, fuzzy logic, which is a successful algorithm in this field, was used. Five classes gravel, gravel with damage, asphalt, asphalt with damage, pavement are classified by deep learning algorithms. The classification performance of camera and smart sensor acceleration z-axis data are compared with deep learning algorithms. The performance of Resnet50, Resnet18, VGG19, VGG18, VGG16, LeNet, AlexNet algorithms are compared.

The paper is structured as follows: data collection, methodology of the study, processing, results and conclusion.

II. DATA COLLECTION

A. Routes for Data Collection

For our study, we collected data as video recordings for different speed limits at speeds of 10, 30, 50 km/h around the campus of the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT). This data collection was repeated several times. Different speed limits were not tried in these areas due to speed limits.



Figure1. Routes where data was collected

The routes where we collected data are shown in Figure 1 below. The recorded data was then converted into images using video processing. In total, 4000 images were obtained from this data. The road on the bottom left is pavement, and the road on the right is gravel. The roads above are asphalt. In addition, the problematic sections of these roads are evaluated as a separate class.

B. Data Collection Equipment

It is well known that there are many sensors in smart phones. In this study, the z-axis values of accelerometer of the smartphone were used. The routes shown in Figure 1 were used for data collection. Data was collected on roads with gravel, asphalt, and pavement. All images were examined together with the video recordings, and images of roads with road damage and roads in normal condition were separated and different classes were created. A BMW 2019 3-Series car was used for data collection. Acceleration data was collected using a Samsung S10 mobile phone. Road videos were recorded using a Samsung Galaxy A35. The mobile phone used as a camera is mounted in a car phone holder with a clear view to the front, and the mobile phone used as an accelerometer is mounted on the right side of the front panel with strong stabilisers.

C. Road Types for Data Collection

The data in the study were collected on different classes of roads (gravel, gravel with damage, asphalt, asphalt with damage, pavement). Examples of these roads are shown in Figure 2.

Figure2. Five different road surfaces where data was collected

As can be seen in Figure 3, different amplitude data are obtained from the accelerometer on different types of road. It can be seen that the amplitude values increase when a car comes to the damages on the road. The total data collection time was 20 minutes. The experiments were repeated 5 times on the same roads. As it is not possible to show all the data here, a representative acceleration data is shown in Figure 3. The first six data at the beginning were collected on the gravel road. The speed value on the gravel road is 10 km/h. The amplitude value (Z axis) is low on the normal road.



Figure3. Data obtained from the z-axis of the accelerometer under all road conditions.

However, in the case of road damage, there is a sudden change is seen in the data depending on the damage compared to the normal situation. The next data is the asphalt data. As the speed value on the asphalt road is 50 km/h, the amplitude value is higher than on the gravel road. Similarly, the amplitude value changes in the damaged areas compared to the normal asphalt. The last data is the pavement road data. There is no damaged road here. The data was collected at a speed of 30 km/h. As the road surface is very rough, a higher amplitude was obtained compared to the normal situation of the other roads. As there is no damage, there is no sudden change in the amplitude.

III. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

A. Selection of Test and Training Data

Figure 4 illustrates the overall framework of the proposed system. The left side of the figure shows the data flow, including data acquisition, training, and testing processes. On the right side, the fuzzy logic–based decision mechanism is presented. This mechanism determines whether image-based or time-series-based features should be prioritized based on the current environmental and sensor conditions. We obtained 4000 images by processing the videos taken by the camera with video processing. There are 800 data points for each class. 600 data points for five classes were used for validation and 600 data points for testing. The remaining data was used for training. The data obtained from the accelerometer was also divided into small pieces with a window and recorded. A total of 2000 data points were obtained. 400 data points were used for each class. 300 data points for five classes were used for validation and 300 data points for testing.



Figure4. Main flow diagram of the study

Image-based CNN (Convolutional Neural Network) is very good at visual pattern recognition and learning spatial relationships. Many studies have shown that converting time series data into image format improves classification performance [35]. Therefore, acceleration time series data are converted to image format. Demetgul et al. (2013) have performed a classification of machine axis misalignment based on motor current data. Since the data is very dense and complex, they obtained better classification performance with CNN by converting the current data to image format according to the time series approach [36]. Yazdanbakhsh and Dick (2019) performed human activity classification by converting time series data to image format [37].

For road classification, acceleration data was converted to time-frequency based and then used in image format for CNN training [38]. The size of the images is reduced due to the computational cost of the algorithms. They are reduced to a size of 224x224. The data is separated for 30% testing and validation as indicated above. On the right side, since the study has a weather-based decision mechanism, there is a fuzzy logic algorithm that decides whether the weather is foggy, sunny, rainy, night, or daytime based on the humidity, temperature, wind speed values received from weather stations and the information from the light ratio sensor on the car. After deciding whether the weather is clear, foggy, rainy, dark with the fuzzy logic algorithm, the road classification decision based on the acceleration sensor or camera is decided according to the if-the rule base in Figure 8. Five different classes are predicted. The main flow chart of the study is shown in Figure 4.

B. *Selection of Best CNN Structure*

Camera images and accelerometer z-axis data were given separately to the algorithms Resnet50, Resnet18, VGG19, VGG18, VGG16, LeNet, AlexNet and five different classifications were made. The performance of the algorithms was compared in terms of error, performance, accuracy, precision, recall and F1 values. Figure 5 shows the flowchart for finding the best CNN structure.



Figure5. Finding the best CNN structure

Seven different CNN structures are trained and their performance is compared. These CNN structures are Resnet50, Resnet 18, VGG16, VGG 18, VGG19, Alexnet. The validation performances are 73%, 90%, 97%, 90%, 96%, and 95% respectively for camera images. For acceleration data, they are 85%, 91%, 96%, 96%, 96%, and 94%, respectively. Here the VGG and AlexNet algorithms show good performance. A comparison of the overall performance is shown in Figure 6.



Figure6. Comparison of different CNN structures with performances

IV. AI STRUCTURES

Seven different CNN structures were used to classify five different roads, and VGG and Alexnet gave the best results. In addition, as the study uses fuzzy logic in weather-based classification and weather decision making, this is also briefly mentioned.Therefore, we examined these algorithms in more detail and share the corresponding results. We used seven different CNN structures in the classification of five different roads and the best results were given by VGG and AlexNet achieved the best results, as they are relatively shallow architectures, which suited the less detailed images. . Therefore, in this study, we have looked at these two algorithms examined in more detail, and we share all the corresponding results. Classical CNN structures consist of convolutional and pooling layers. These layers are used for feature extraction. Fully connected layers are used for the classification part. In this study, we use images captured by the camera and vibration data converted into images as input data. We classify five road conditions and compare different CNN architectures.

A. *VGG16 Structure*

VGG, a promising method for image classification and computer vision, has six widely used structures: VGG11, VGG11-LRN, VGG13, VGG16, VGG18 and VGG19 [39]. These algorithms have deep network layers and smaller convolution kernel sizes, which helps to reveal more detailed parts of the image. These features make VGG superior for classification. The VGGNet model was proposed by Simonyan and Zisserman from the Oxford University in 2014 [40]. VGGNet-16 is an algorithm developed by the Visual Geometry Group at the University of Oxford and was awarded a place in the 2014 ILSVRC competition. It is considered to be the successor of AlexNet [41-42]. The structure of the classic VGG16 consists of a max-pooling, a convolution layer, a flattening layer and a dense layer. In the structure, there is max pooling twice at the beginning after two layers. Then, there is three times max pooling after three layers. More features are extracted by decreasing the image size over time. Classification is done with the dense layer, and five different classes are predicted.

B. *AlexNet Structure*

With five convolutional and three fully connected layers, AlexNet is deeper than LeNet and GPU acceleration [43]. AlexNet excels in road classification with deep architecture, ReLU, normalisation, dropout and data augmentation to improve feature learning and task adaptability [44]. Although AlexNet is one of the first generation of CNNs, the pre-trained networks have been used successfully used for a variety of applications [45]. It consists of among the least number of layers. Therefore, it is computationally more efficient than other structural variants.

C. *Fuzzy Logic*

Fuzzy logic was first introduced by Zadeh in 1965 [46]. There is no study in the literature on weather-dependent acceleration and camera sensor decision making with fuzzy logic. However, some studies have been carried out on weather forecasting. Janarthanan et al (2021) used fuzzy logic to predict rainfall based on temperature and wind speed [30]. Another study used fuzzy logic to prioritise road repair and maintenance [47]. It has also been used to predict the performance of flexible pavements [48]. Małolepsza et al. (2024) used fuzzy logic in the analysis of weather conditions and used minimum, maximum temperature and wind as input parameters and predicted the weather as low, medium and high [49]. Ali et al. (2022) estimated the road condition index at different levels using fuzzy logic technique and emergency type, quantity, severity [50].

V. RESULTS

In our work, we used the Karlsruhe High Performance Computing System (HoreKa) at KIT to train deep learning algorithms. HoreKa is an innovative hybrid system with about 60,000 Intel processor cores, more than 220 terabytes of main memory and 668 NVDIA A100 GPUs. The data was divided into 70% training, 15% test and 15% validation data.

The learning rate was set as 0.0001 after different trials. The input image size was set to 224x224. The batch size was set to 16. The number of dense layer neurons was set to 256. Softmax was chosen as the activation function of the dense layer. Categorical cross entropy was used as the loss function. To improve training and avoid overfitting problems, 10 epochs were used as early stopping. Several metrics were used to better understand the results, such as: confusion matrix, loss, accuracy, and classification reports. At epoch 20, training was automatically stopped due to early stopping for camera image data.

One of the most important metrics to show the classification performance is the confusion matrix. In this study, the classification performance of five different classes (pavement, asphalt with damage, asphalt, gravel road with damage, gravel road) is shown in Figure 7. Pavement and gravel road is predicted in the test data with 100% performance. Gravel road with damage has a misclassification. Asphalt and asphalt with damage have ten misclassifications in about 120 data.



Figure 7. VGG16 Confusion Matrix Results using Camera Images

Table I presents the detailed VGG16 results based on camera images. Since the confusion matrix alone may not fully show performance, precision, recall, and F1-scores were also evaluated. For *pavement*, all metrics reached 100%. For *asphalt with damage*, precision was 92%, and other metrics exceeded 93%. For *asphalt*, precision was 93%, with recall and F1-score above 92%. For *gravel with damage*, recall reached 100%, and for *gravel*, precision was 100%, with remaining metrics above 97%.

TABLE I. Classification Report for Camera Images

	Precision	Recall	F1-Score	Support
Pavement	1.00	1.00	1.00	120
Asphalt with damage	0.92	0.93	0.93	120
Asphalt	0.93	0.92	0.92	120
Gravel road with damage	0.97	1.00	0.98	120
Gravel road	1.00	0.97	0.98	120
Accuracy				
Macro avg	0.96	0.96	0.96	600
Weighted avg	0.96	0.96	0.96	600

Figure 8 shows the confusion matrix results of the classification test of acceleration data converted to images. There were 60 data used for each class. Pavement was 100% correctly classified. Gravel had the worst classification result with 54 correct classifications and 6 incorrect classifications. When the acceleration data results were compared with the time series results, very good results were obtained.

TABLE II. Classification Report for Acceleration Images

	Precision	Recall	F1-Score	Support
Gravel road with damage	0.90	0.90	0.90	60
Pavement	1.00	1.00	1.00	60
Asphalt with damage	0.93	0.95	0.94	60
Asphalt	0.95	0.93	0.94	60
Gravel road	0.90	0.90	0.90	60
Accuracy				
Macro avg	0.94	0.94	0.94	300
Weighted avg	0.94	0.94	0.94	300



Figure 8. AlexNet Confusion Matrix Results using Acceleration Data Images

The confusion matrix alone is not sufficient for metrics. Therefore, the classification report is presented to examine the detailed classification results. This is shown in Table II. For pavement, all are 100%. Asphalt with damage precision is also 93% and for others 94% and 95%. For asphalt the precision is 95% and for others 93% and 94%. For gravel with damage class the recall is 90%. The others are also 90%. As can be seen from the results, although it classified other classes well according to the picture, it could not distinguish gravel and gravel with damage well from each other.

Many studies have used the Internet of Things (IoT) for weather forecasting. In this study, the mobile phone is proposed to collect weather information from the Internet or to receive instant data from weather stations [51]. Many

studies have been done on this topic. These applications are generally used for agriculture [52], aviation, autonomous vehicle control [53] and disaster management. Embedded maps are used for these systems [54]. There are also studies on weather monitoring and forecasting using mobile phones [55]. The rule base and membership functions were designed using expert knowledge from meteorology and automotive sensing domains, supported by previous fuzzy logic–based weather recognition studies [56-57].

Figure 9 shows the recommended weather conditional based data and CNN usage. In the proposed weather-conditional structure, pretrained CNN models are fine-tuned for each weather condition, and the appropriate model is selected at runtime based on the detected weather state. When the weather conditions are rainy, foggy, or during night driving, the system selects a CNN model that was previously trained on acceleration data, since image-based inputs are less reliable under low-visibility conditions. If it is sunny and daytime, the camera images obtained by video processing and the CNN structure are used. It is possible to access information about weather conditions from sites such as accuWeather, wunderground.com, openweathermap.org and weather.com, but these are estimates. There is also some fuzziness in some cases. Because light levels are measured using a sensor, the if-then rule-based approach sometimes does not work well.



Figure9. Recommended weather conditional based data usage and structure with If-Then

The direct use of this rule base should be to determine weather conditions according to certain thresholds or with the help of APIs. However, due to the vagueness of these conditions and the difficulty of always accessing these APIs, a decision based on fuzzy logic using wind speed, temperature, humidity data from weather stations and light level, rain sensor on the vehicle will give more accurate results. In this study, wind speed is given in the range of 0-10, light level is given in the range of 0-100, humidity is given in the range of 0-100, rain sensor is given in the range of 0-100 and temperature is given in the range of 0-45 and there are low, medium and high levels in the fuzzy logic. All the input values are not shown in the figure due to space limitations, but as can be seen in Figure 10, the wind speed is set as low for 0, 0, 3, 5, medium for 3, 5, 7 and high for 5, 7, 10, 10. The other important input variable, light level, was assigned values of 0, 0, 50, for medium level 0, 50, 100 and for high level 50, 100, 100 (Figure 11).



Figure10. Input data of Fuzzy Logic is membership function of wind speed



Figure11. Input data of Fuzzy Logic is membership function of light level

In addition, for humidity, 0, 0, 50 is low, 0, 50, 100 is medium and 50, 100, 100 is high. For temperature, 0, 0, 10, 20 is low, 10, 22, 30 is medium and 30, 35, 45, 45 is high. The output weather conditions are sunny, rainy, foggy, night, day. These are decided according to the four input variables. This is shown in Figure 12.



Figure12. Output of Fuzzy Logic is membership function of weather condition

Table III. Rule table between input data and output of Fuzzy Logic samples

Wind	Humidity	Light	Temperature	Rain Sensor	Weather Condition
Low	Low	Low	Low	None	Foggy
Low	Low	High	High	None	Day
Low	High	Low	High	None	Rainy
Low	High	High	Low	Heavy	Day
High	Low	Low	Low	None	Foggy
High	Low	High	High	None	Day
High	High	Low	High	None	Rainy
High	High	High	Low	Heavy	Day

Fuzzy logic also requires rules to determine the relationship between inputs and output membership functions. For this purpose, 32 rules were created. Representative 8 of them are shown in Table III.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this study, we aimed to classify five different roads using mobile phone sensors, deep learning algorithms, and fuzzy logic to reduce accidents and car damage, and use them to create speed control and road maps for unmanned or normal

vehicles. This work can also be done using sensors and high-resolution cameras. However, the aim of this study is to implement road condition classification in the most cost-effective way in terms of data collection and hardware.

In addition, the study aims to classify different road types using image-based deep learning CNN structures based on weather information. For this purpose, many CNN structures have been compared and weather information has been used to select image-based or acceleration-based prediction weights. Since the weather and illumination conditions are variable, fuzzy logic is used to decide the weather condition. Finally, the use of weather conditional based data and CNN structure is proposed according to weather and time zone.

The following conclusions have been drawn from the study:

In this study, Resnet18, Resnet50, VGG16, VGG18, VGG19, AlexNet camera data and acceleration data were used for classification. The best performing algorithms are VGG16 and AlexNet. Their performance is around 95% for both types of data. Therefore, these two algorithms are examined in more detail and their general results and metrics are given.

The sensor function of the mobile phone was used in the study. It was found that the z-axis of the mobile phone's accelerometer gives more meaningful results. Instead of time series classification, this data was converted to image format and classification was performed using image-based CNN structures. With this data, the performance of an approximate camera was achieved.

The main purpose of the study is that camera images do not perform well in bad weather conditions and at night. In this study, camera and acceleration data are selected according to weather conditions, fuzzy logic is used to decide on weather conditions, and road surfaces are classified using CNN techniques.

The study contributes to the literature by using acceleration data in image format, as image-based CNN structures give better results. It also suggests that image-based or acceleration sensor-based classification is more efficient depending on the weather conditions. Accordingly, fuzzy logic is used in the decision-making process due to the uncertainty of the weather conditions and the light ratio. The road surface images were labeled by two researchers, and the labels were checked for consistency.

Acknowledgment

The authors extend their thanks to the funding received from the TyreRoadNoise project, which is funded by the German Federal Ministry of Digital and Transport (BMDV) as part of the mFUND innovation initiative. This work is supported by the Helmholtz Association Initiative and Networking Fund on the HAICORE@KIT partition.

REFERENCES

[1] E. Hashemi, M. Pirani, A. Khajepour, A. Kasaiezadeh, S.-K. Chen, and B. Litkouhi, "Corner-based estimation of tire forces and vehicle velocities robust to road conditions," Control Eng. Pract., vol. 61, pp. 28–40, Apr. 2017.

[2] H. Guo, Z. Yin, D. Cao, H. Chen, and C. Lv, "A review of estimation for vehicle tire-road interactions toward automated driving," IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern., Syst., vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 14–30, Jan. 2019.

[3] K. B. Singh, M. A. Arat, and S. Taheri, "Literature review and fundamental approaches for vehicle and tire state estimation," Veh. Syst. Dyn., vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 1643–1665, Nov. 2019.

[4] M. Quintana, J. Torres, and J. M. Menéndez, "A simplified computer vision system for road surface inspection and maintenance," IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst., vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 608–619, Mar. 2016.

[5] P. Mú£ka, ``International roughness index specifications around the world," Road Mater. Pavement Des., vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 929-965, Jul. 2017.

[6] S. Paquis, V. Legeay, and H. Konik, "Road surface classification by threshold ingusing morphological pyramid," in Proc. IEEE ICPR, Barcelona, Spain, 2000, vol. 1, pp. 1334–1337.

[7] N. T. Sy, M. Avila, S. Begot, J. C. Bardet, "Detection of defects in road surface by a vision system," in Proc. IEEE MELECON, Ajaccio, France, 2008, pp. 847–851.

[8] R. Frisoni, "EU road surfaces: Economic and safety impact of the lack of regular road maintenance," Tech. Rep., 2014.

[9] T. Zhao, J. He, J. Lv, D. Min, and Y.Wei,. "A comprehensive implementation of road surface classification for vehicle driving assistance: Dataset, models, and deployment.", IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems, vol.24, no. 8, pp.8361-8370, 2023.

[10] M. Nolte, N. Kister, and M. Maurer, "Assessment of deep convolutional neural networks for road surface classification," in Proc. 21st IEEE Intell. Transp. Syst. Conf., Maui, HI, USA, Nov. 2018, pp. 381–386.

[11] S. Roychowdhury, M. Zhao, A. Wallin, N. Ohlsson, M. Jonasson, "Machine Learning Models for Road Surface and Friction Estimation using Front-Camera Images," 2018 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN), Rio de Janeiro, 2018, pp. 1–8.

[12] S. Park, S. Bang, H. Kam, and H. Kim, "Patch-based crack detection in black box images using convolutional neural networks," Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering, vol. 33, p. 5, 2019.

[13] M. M. M. Islam and J.-M. Kim, "Vision-based autonomous crack detection of concrete structures using a fully convolutional encoder-decoder network," Sensors, vol. 19, no. 19, p. 4251, 2019.

[14] K. Gopalakrishnan, S. K. Khaitan, A. Choudhary, and A. Agrawal, "Deep convolutional neural networks with transfer learning for computer vision-based data-driven pavement distress detection," Construction and Building Materials, vol. 157, pp. 322–330, 2017.

[15] V. Pereira, S. Tamura, S. Hayamizu, and H. Fukai, "A deep learning-based approach for road pothole detection in timorleste," in Proceedings of the 2018 IEEE International Conference on Service Operations and Logistics, and Informatics (SOLI), pp. 279–284, Singapore, July 2018.

[16] A. Tedeschi and F. Benedetto, ``A real-time automatic pavement crack and pothole recognition system for mobile Android-based devices," Adv. Eng.Inform., vol. 32, pp. 11-25, Apr. 2017.

[17] A. Bystrov, E. Hoare, T.-Y. Tran, N. Clarke, M. Gashinova, M. Cherniakov, "Sensors for Automotive Remote Road Surface Classification,"2018 IEEE International Conference on Vehicular Electronics and Safety (ICVES), Madrid, 2018, pp. 1–6.

[18] S. Wang, S. Kodagoda, L. Shi, and X. Dai, "Two-stage road terrain identification approach for land vehicles using feature-based and Markov random field algorithm," IEEE Intelligent Systems, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 29–39, 2018.

[19] S. Wang, S. Kodagoda, L. Shi, and H. Wang, "Road-terrain classification for land vehicles: Employing an acceleration-based approach," IEEE Vehicular Technology Magazine, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 34–41, 2017.

[20] V. M. Souza, "Asphalt pavement classification using smartphone accelerometer and complexity invariant distance," Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence, vol. 74, pp. 198 – 211, 2018.

[21] H. M. Ngwangwa and P. S. Heyns, ''Application of an ANN-based methodology for road surface condition identification on mining vehicles and roads,'' J. Terramechanics, vol. 53, pp. 59–74, Jun. 2014.

[22] A. Vittorio, V. Rosolino, I. Teresa, C. M. Vittoria, P. G. Vincenzo et al., "Automated sensing system for monitoring of road surface quality by mobile devices," Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, vol. 111, pp. 242–251, 2014.

[23] C. Kyriakou, S. E. Christodoulou, and L. Dimitriou, "Spatial roadway condition-assessment mapping utilizing smartphones and machine learning algorithms," J. Transp. Res. Rec., vol. 2675, no. 9, 2021, Art. no. 3611981211006105.

[24] G. Alessandroni, A. Carini, E. Lattanzi, V. Freschi, and A. Bogliolo, "A study on the influence of speed on road roughness sensing: The smartroadsense case," Sensors, vol. 17, no. 2, p. 305, Feb. 2017.

[25] B. Varona, A. Monteserin, and A. Teyseyre, ‘‘A deep learning approach toautomatic road surface monitoring and pothole detection,’’ Pers.Ubiquitous Comput., vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 519–534, Aug. 2020.

[26] T. Sharma, B. Debaque, N. Duclos, A. Chehri, B. Kinder, and P. Fortier, "Deep learning-based object detection and scene perception under bad weather conditions," Electronics, vol. 11, no. 4, p. 563, 2022.

[27] Pillai, P. J., Yalla, V., & Oguchi, K. (2016). “Ease of Driving” Road Classification for Night-time Driving Conditions (No. 2016-01-0119). SAE Technical Paper.

[28] A. Esmaeil Abbasi, A. M. Mangini, and M. P. Fanti, "Object and pedestrian detection on road in foggy weather conditions by hyperparameterized YOLOv8 model," Electronics, vol. 13, no. 18, p. 3661, 2024.

[29] F. Holzmann, M. Bellino, R. Siegwart, and H. Bubb, “Predictive estimation of the road-tire friction coefficient,” in 2006 IEEE Intern.Conference on Control Applications, 2006, pp. 885–890.

[30] R. Janarthanan, R. Balamurali, A. Annapoorani, and V. Vimala, "Prediction of rainfall using fuzzy logic," *Materials Today: Proceedings*, vol. 37, pp. 959-963, 2021.

[31] M. Demetgul, O. Ulkir, and T. Waqar, "Washing machine using fuzzy logic," *Automation, Control and Intelligent Systems*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 27, 2014.

[32] T. Waqar and M. Demetgül, "Fuzzy logic controlled automatic vacuum cleaner," *Journal of Engineering and Technology Research*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 93-100, 2014.

[33] M. Suhail, I. Akhtar, S. Kirmani, and M. Jameel, "Development of progressive fuzzy logic and ANFIS control for energy management of plug-in hybrid electric vehicle," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 62219-62231, 2021.

[34] G. C. Lazaroiu and M. Roscia, "Fuzzy logic strategy for priority control of electric vehicle charging," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 19236-19245, 2022.

[35] Z. Wang and T. Oates, "Imaging time-series to improve classification and imputation," arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.00327, 2015.

[36] M. Demetgul, M. Zihan, I. Heider, and J. Fleischer, "Misalignment detection on linear feed axis using sensorless motor current signals," The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology, vol. 126, no. 5, pp. 2677–2691, 2023.

[37] O. Yazdanbakhsh and S. Dick, "Multivariate time series classification using dilated convolutional neural network," arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.01697, 2019.

[38] M. Martinelli, M. Meocci, M. Dolfi, V. Branzi, S. Morosi, F. Argenti, et al., "Road surface anomaly assessment using low-cost accelerometers: A machine learning approach," Sensors, vol. 22, no. 10, p. 3788, 2022.

[39] Y. Que et al., “Automatic classification of asphalt pavement cracks using a novel integrated generative adversarial networks and improved VGG model”, *Eng. Struct.*, vol. 277, Feb. 2023.

[40] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, ``Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition," 2014, arXiv:1409.1556.

[41] J. Zou, G. Wenbin, and W.Feng, “A Study on Pavement Classification and Recognition Based on VGGNet-16 Transfer Learning.” *Electronics* 12, no. 15 (2023): 3370.

[42] Z. Chen, W. Lihua, and C. Zhengyu, “Research on Road Pothole Recognition Based on AlexNet Modeling and BP Neural Network.” In *2024 IEEE 2nd International Conference on Image Processing and Computer Applications (ICIPCA)*, pp. 1431-1434. IEEE, 2024.

[43] H. Samma, S. A. Suandi, N. A. Ismail, S. Sulaiman and L. L. Ping, “Evolving pre-trained CNN using two-layers optimizer for road damage detection from drone images”, *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 158215-158226, 2021.

[44] S. Wang, Z. Zhang, and K. Liang, “Classification of Potholed Roads Using Deep Convolutional Neural Network Model Based on AlexNet.” In *2024 IEEE 2nd International Conference on Control, Electronics and Computer Technology (ICCECT)*, pp. 809-812. IEEE, 2024.

[45] T. Lu, B. Han, and F. Yu, “Detection and classification of marine mammal sounds using AlexNet with transfer learning,” Ecol. Inform., vol. 61, p. 101277, 2021.

[46] E. H. Mamdani and S. Assilian, "Int. J. Man Mach. Stud.," vol. 7, pp. 1–13, 1975.

[47] D. Moazami, H. Behbahani, and R. Muniandy, "Pavement rehabilitation and maintenance prioritization of urban roads using fuzzy logic," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 38, no. 10, pp. 12869-12879, 2011.

[48] A. T. Olowosulu, J. M. Kaura, A. A. Murana, and P. T. Adeke, "Development of framework for performance prediction of flexible road pavement in Nigeria using Fuzzy logic theory," *International Journal of Pavement Engineering*, vol. 23, no. 11, pp. 3809-3818, 2022.

[49] O. Małolepsza, D. Mikołajewski, and P. Prokopowicz, "Using fuzzy logic to analyse weather conditions," *Electronics*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 85, 2024.

[50] A. Ali, U. Heneash, A. Hussein, and M. Eskebi, "Predicting pavement condition index using fuzzy logic technique," *Infrastructures*, vol. 7, no. 7, pp. 91, 2022.

[51] R. K. M. Math and N. V. Dharwadkar, "IoT based low-cost weather station and monitoring system for precision agriculture in India," in Proc. 2018 2nd Int. Conf. on I-SMAC (IoT in Social, Mobile, Analytics and Cloud) (I-SMAC), Aug. 2018, pp. 81–86.

[52] M. S. Murthy, R. R. Kumar, B. Saikiran, I. Nagaraj, and T. Annavarapu, "Real time weather monitoring system using IoT," in E3S Web of Conferences, vol. 391, p. 01142, 2023, EDP Sciences.

[53] B. Vaidya, P. P. Kaur, and H. T. Mouftah, "Provisioning road weather management using edge cloud and connected and autonomous vehicles," in Proc. 2021 Int. Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing Conf. (IWCMC), June 2021, pp. 1424–1429.

[54] Y. Rahut, R. Afreen, D. Kamini, and S. S. Gnanamalar, "Smart weather monitoring and real time alert system using IoT," *Int. Res. J. Eng. Technol.*, vol. 5, no. 10, pp. 848–854, 2018.

[55] D. Stepanova, T. Sukuvaara, and V. Karsisto, "Intelligent Transport Systems–Road weather information and forecast system for vehicles," in Proc. 2020 IEEE 91st Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2020-Spring), May 2020, pp. 1–5.

[56] Chen, C., & Hwang, J. (2019). “A fuzzy logic-based driver assistance system for weather condition recognition.” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems,* 20(7), 2591–2602.

[57] Bouchereau, F., et al. (2017). “Fuzzy inference system for environment perception under adverse weather conditions.” *Sensors,* 17(12), 2901.