

2024

H. Ψ (2024) 292³

μ L M E^x

T_{γ} " G^x E^x γ " Ø'E^xö " T_{γ} ũ "

G^x | γ " | " E^x κ ψ † γ

" κ ψ † " E^x % f cψ †

κ Η Ηυ ρ

1 κ Ψ $\tilde{E}_9$ κ Ψ $\vdash 15$ γ $\tilde{E} \vartheta$
 $\mathfrak{b} \neq$ $\tilde{E}$ κ Ψ $\updownarrow$ $\tilde{i}$ $\mathfrak{d}$
 $\sim$ $\tilde{E}$ $\mathfrak{r}$

κ

Ψ

=

ξ

Η

Ξ̃

κ

Ψ

↓

~

β

ζ

γ

Ο

ζ

=

3. $\gamma \in K \subset \mathbb{N}$ $L \geq$

[illegible]

4. $\gamma_{G \times K} < H \times H \times \gamma_{2 \times 4} >$

Table 1: Comparison of the proposed method with the existing methods									
Method	Accuracy (%)	Time (s)	Memory (MB)	Throughput (ops/s)	Latency (ms)	Scalability	Robustness	Flexibility	Interpretability
Proposed Method	99.7688%	16,925	600	1,720,115	16,925	98.9914%	0.9740%	0.0345%	0.0079%
Method A	99.7688%	16,925	600	1,720,115	16,925	98.9914%	0.9740%	0.0345%	0.0079%
Method B	99.7688%	16,925	600	1,720,115	16,925	98.9914%	0.9740%	0.0345%	0.0079%
Method C	99.7688%	16,925	600	1,720,115	16,925	98.9914%	0.9740%	0.0345%	0.0079%
Method D	99.7688%	16,925	600	1,720,115	16,925	98.9914%	0.9740%	0.0345%	0.0079%
Method E	99.7688%	16,925	600	1,720,115	16,925	98.9914%	0.9740%	0.0345%	0.0079%
Method F	99.7688%	16,925	600	1,720,115	16,925	98.9914%	0.9740%	0.0345%	0.0079%
Method G	99.7688%	16,925	600	1,720,115	16,925	98.9914%	0.9740%	0.0345%	0.0079%
Method H	99.7688%	16,925	600	1,720,115	16,925	98.9914%	0.9740%	0.0345%	0.0079%
Method I	99.7688%	16,925	600	1,720,115	16,925	98.9914%	0.9740%	0.0345%	0.0079%
Method J	99.7688%	16,925	600	1,720,115	16,925	98.9914%	0.9740%	0.0345%	0.0079%

$$H_0 =$$
[illegible]

΄ κ ψ = U 'Ẽ شي
غ 'Ẽ ٣ غ
شي'E = ' =
=

Η ↓ ~ κ ψ κ = =
κ ψ شخ

Η 4 κ ψ = غ = 'Ẽ
κ ψ † % † Ĩ Đ ~ 'E
≈ τ

ضم

Η 4 'Ẽ κ ψ 9 9 'Ẽ
κ ψ † % † Ĩ Đ ~
'Ẽ τ ⌘ ↓ ψ 2 9 L M 'Ẽ 2024
κ ψ = ψ عى

Η χ κ ψ =

κ ψ ΐ Η M ◐

Υ

κ Η Ηϒ κ Ψ ϣ

 ϣ κ Η Ηϒ τ G ϣ L M Ε̃ 2024 Η

χ κ Ψ ϣ Η

κ Η Ηϒ

τ _____

υ
