4

The Future of Intelligence: AI's Transformative Visions in Research Areas

Dr. Manju Chhikara
Assistant Professor
Zoology department
G.P.G.C.W, Rohtak
manjuchhikara32@gmail.com

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming the scientific research field, making discoveries quicker, more accurate and scalable in a wider variety of fields, including healthcare, materials science, climate modeling, neuroscience, and social sciences. The combination of hybrid knowledge representations, causal reasoning, simulated experimentation and federated learning enables AIs to rigorously, interpretably and efficiently improve the process of research. The responsible and fair deployment is guaranteed by cross-cutting methodologies and human-AI collaboration, the standards of reproducibility, and open science practices, as well as ethical, legal, and societal protection. Moreover, strong infrastructure, interdisciplinary facilities, and certification systems create the basis of scalable and reliable research based on AI. Taken together, these developments provide an overall model of the next-generation work, which is both technologically innovative and ethically responsible and impactful to the community.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Hybrid Knowledge Representation, Causal Reasoning, Simulation-Driven Experimentation.*

1. Introduction

The rapidly growing artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming the character of research in fields, not merely in healthcare and materials science, but also in climate and neuroscience, and the social sciences. The initial progress on symbolic logic and embedding of knowledge by means of statistics has facilitated AI to reason, generalize with little information and base the output on the prior existing knowledge in science (Zarri, 1992; Nebel, 1990; Boley et al., 1995). In addition to these procedures, causal and counterfactual reasoning systems can make sure that AI can generate mechanistic hypotheses and predict outcomes that can be used to develop a more robust and intelligible scientific result (Harris et al., 1996; Pearl, 1997; Kment, 2020). Simulation-based methodologies can also be used to optimize simulations and model validation under controlled conditions (Koziel and Leifsson, 2016; Sobie et al., 2018) and federated and privacy-preserving learning models can be done to make researchers collaborate with each other without data leakage (Briggs et al., 2021; Thapa et al., 2021).

Other fields of use of AI include precision medicine and health technology that integrates multi-omic data and probabilistic models of personalized therapeutics and adaptive clinical trials (Baran et al., 2014; Lucas et al., 2004), autonomous labs in the discovery of new materials (Yu et al., 2021), multi-scale environmental models (Kok et al., 2001), and climate predictions using Earth system models (Dufresne et al., 2013). Neural data AI-based analysis that is utilized in neuroscience has helped to formulate mechanistic theories of cognition, whereas a closed-loop neurotechnology can be used to develop therapeutic innovations (Albright et al., 2000). The social sciences and governance can find it beneficial to use computational modeling to address systemic risks, equity, and participatory policymaking using AI-based computational modeling (Sovacool, 2014). Together with ethical, legal, and social solutions to bias, consent, data sovereignty, and scientific integrity (Frenz and Lappe, 2005; Gordon et al., 2011; Kohl, 2022; Baraku et al., 2025; Pielke Jr. et al., 2019), cross-cutting approaches include hybrid human-AI protocols, reproducible metrics, open science practices (Correia et al., 2023; Lian et al., 20 Lastly, This is all a demonstration of a comprehensive view of the next-generation AI research which is scientifically sound, ethical, and has a meaningful impact on society in a favorable manner.

2. Literature Review

The development of hybrid knowledge representation systems has been a major concern to research of artificial intelligence. Zarri (1992) explored the descriptive component of hybrid knowledge representation languages as the synthesis of symbolic and procedural knowledge in an attempt to enhance computational reasoning. Similarly, Nebel (1990) has researched on the reasoning and revision procedure in hybrid systems that revealed that it is challenging to achieve consistency and inference in merging two or more knowledge paradigms. These concepts were further developed by Boley et al. (1995) in the concept of COLAB a laboratory system of hybrid knowledge representation and compilation, providing experience of the implementation and experimentation of such systems in the operational research environment.

Causal reasoning and counterfactual reasoning has also been another significant critical area in AI and cognitive science. Harris, German, and Mills (1996), studied the application of counterfactual in causal reasoning among children and determined the features of developmental impact on conditional reasoning. Pearl (1997) provided the theoretical framework of the causal inference in AI by delivering a formal framework of causation, action, and counterfactuals. Kment (2020) elaborated on the same line of thought that counterfactuals in causal thinking and decision making were added to the concept that bridges the gap between cognitive and computational theories.

There has been an increasing role of knowledge-based and simulation-oriented approaches in the field of engineering and machine learning applications. Koziel and Leifsson (2016) suggested response correction schemes in the application of simulation-based design with additional focus on optimization schemes, including domain knowledge. Sobie, Freitas, and Nicolai (2018) have applied the same principles in machine learning, only that they are fault classification bearing, which used simulation-augmented learning in which the integration of computational modeling and data-driven models were synergistic.

Privacy preserving and federated learning have been suggested as significant paradigms to distributed AI systems. Briggs, Fan, and Andras (2021) also conducted a comprehensive review of the subject of federated learning to the Internet-of-Things and have detailed how to ensure the preservation of data privacy and at the same time learn together with peers. Thapa, Chamikara, and Camtepe (2021) went ahead to elaborate on the advances made in the concepts of federated and split learning, and it is important to remember that in the new era AI systems, avoiding privacy loss is essential.

Finally, the application of AI in the infrastructure, interdisciplinary studies and technology management demonstrates the field of scope of the modern research problems. Hastings et al. (2003) talked about policy enablers of space-based infrastructure and King et al. (2008) proposed the models of interdisciplinary research in clinical organizations. Parker et al. (2023) and Leem and Lee (2004) have taken into consideration the operational and risk management of IT outsourcing and medical technology. The perspective of federated and open compute infrastructures in terms of big Earth data analytics has been highlighted by Backeberg et al. (2023) to illustrate how distributed systems are converting to computational systems. More data on how AI is used to simulate the sensory processing and interaction with the environment is possible based on the research of vision and the human perception as in the case of Frenz and Lappe (2005).

3. Technical Foundations for Next-Generation Research AI

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is slowly turning out to be recognized both as a pattern recognition solution and a revolution in the area of scientific studies. The future directions on the technical soundness, conceptual complexity, and ethical protection of research AI are required. Combination of hybrid representations The combination of causal reasoning, simulating-based experimentation, privacy-preserving collaboration, and explainability allows AI to extend the predictive role to the generating, testing, and verifying new scientific hypotheses. These rudimentary details are preconditions of more believable and trusted uses of AI in the areas of research.

Representations Hybrid Knowledge Representations Hybrid representations consist of symbolic systems such as logic, rules and ontologies together with statistical embeddings that capture patterns in the data. The first theoretical reviews established the merits of the symbolic reasoning to organize knowledge and identified the limitations of the systems based on rules only (Nebel, 1990). Zarri (1992) identified the descriptive capability of the systems involved in the hybrid that saw the abstract representations of the knowledge be compared to the computational processes. Similarly, Boley, Hanschke, Hinkelmann and Meyer (1995) came up with hybrid representations representation environments that not only had formal rigor but also had flexibility in their computations. The hybrid methods are an integration of symbolic abstractions and statistical techniques which enable AI to make extrapolations of small data sets without losing the relation to the scientific knowledge. Interestingly, the new research directions should be on the dynamic knowledge graphs that are updated according to the evidence that provide a verifiable network of logic between discrete logic and continuous data-driven representations.

Even though predictive power has been among the motivating force behind the development of AI, this is not the case in a real scientific inquiry because causal and counterfactual reasoning is required. Harris, German and Mills (1996) have demonstrated that counterfactual thinking is necessary even in the human cognitive development when it comes to causal situations and the mode of reasoning is natural. Pearl (1997) constructed structural causal models and do-calculus that is imperative in the establishment and testing of causal relationships and the precursors of the introduction of causality in AI systems. Subsequently, Kment (2020) highlighted the philosophical and methodological importance of the study of scientific explanation by the use of counterfactuals. The fact is that, one type of AI can be used to make hypotheses, interventions may be predicted and that the mechanistic implications may be studied rather than superficial relationships. This modification is essential to make sure that AI is an important factor in areas where interventions, experiments, and insights based on causation are the major features of the progress.

The concept of simulation-based experimentation has been given a central-stage of scientific system design by the experimental scientific modeling as it can provide a controlled environment in which hypotheses can be tested, and processes optimized, before being actually implemented. Koziel and Leifsson (2016) suggested methods of knowledge-based response correction, making simulations more akin to empirical performance, which facilitates the validity of computational models. Sobie, Freitas, and Nicolai (2018) proved that the simulation-based machine learning can be successfully applied to identify mechanical faults, and this fact underlines its usefulness in terms of engineering systems. The integration of AI and simulators of physics engines and differentiable together with the end-to-end optimization of experimental parameters can accomplish this combination. Speaking more precisely, the measurement of uncertainties and the relevance of the simulation results to the real-life situations should be considered in the future so that the information offered in the process of the simulation would become practical. It is a very powerful paradigm in materials science, drug discovery, and in other areas where experiments in the real-world are costly, time-constrained and inconclusive due to ethics.

Research works are sensitive and are distributed, this necessitates privacy preserving and collaborative learning approaches. Federated learning can also be used to train AI models in a large number of institutions without centralizing raw data, thereby assisting in the protection of sensitive information. The review presented by Briggs, Fan, and Andras (2021) on the topic of privacy-preserving approaches in federated learning under Internet-of-Things application is scalable and can be cross-domain. On this basis, Thapa, Chamikara, and Camtepe (2021) implemented split learning and advanced privacy-enhancing capabilities into it and showed their possibilities in the healthcare and genomics research. The ability of AI to continuously learn based on non-homogenous data sets and providing high privacy levels is the key to the creation of scientific collaboration in bulk in the future. Secure multiparty computing and differential privacy also ensure that the confidentiality does not influence the utilization of the sensitive research information, making a tradeoff between innovation and trust.

In order to become a dependable partner of scientific research, AI must not provide heuristic responses to questions, and it must provide verifiable and formally guaranteed responses. One path forward is the use of probabilistic programming and formal analysis to ensure that the claims of AI as applied to predictions and causal forms are subject to extremely rigorous analysis. The assertion of scientific confidence in the results of AI assistance is provided with statistical guarantees, e.g., error restrictions, or causal validation. The technical requirement of verification is an epistemological requirement too since the outcomes of AI-generated information are supposed to have demonstrated that they are congruent with the standards of scientific validity. These render explainability studies and formal guarantee research causes AI to be a valid and accountable participant in the research undertaking.

4. Domain Visions and Research Directions

The introduction of artificial intelligence (AI) into domain-specific research is rapidly transforming how domain-specific research is conceived, implemented, and utilized. Being able to find things accurately, merge multi-scale models, and deliver insight in any complex system, AI is becoming one of the important tools in the evolution of healthcare, materials science, climate studies, neuroscience and social sciences. The issues specific to each of the areas, whether it is the heterogeneity of the data or the ethical safeguard, affect the courses that the research and the further practice takes. The following sections are aimed at defining how AI should evolve in these spheres, and one of the transformative roles of AI is identified, and some concerns which are yet to be resolved in the future are identified.

The medical and healthcare field is changing due to the field of AI which expedites the process of finding precision and therapeutic development using multi-omic datasets, probabilistic reasoning models, automation pipelines. Lucas et al. (2004) show that Bayesian networks can be used to integrate heterogeneous biomedical data that can provide causal information to be used in making a decision to provide customized interventions. Simultaneously with this, as Baran, Kiani and Samuel (2014) note, biomedical technologies along with AI-based discovery pipelines have the potential to create synthetic biology and tailored medical regimens, and they can create adaptive systems that bridge laboratory discovery and clinical needs in real-time.

At the same time, AI is transforming the development of clinical evidence and raising serious issues of equity and safety. The adaptive trial design and the counterfactual estimation with the help of the electronic health records as emphasized by Lucas et al. (2004) are cost saving and, at the same time, improve representativeness in clinical research. Infrastructure federations proposed by Federated infrastructures (Baran et al., 2014) allow cooperation without privacy-related concerns that are vital to sensitive patient data. But in case of medical decision-making with AI, one should have a guard against bias and unfairness. The capability of risk sharing as well as participatory design with clinicians and communities with patients guided by the Bayesian reasoning will enable AI not only to construct the medical science but also to ensure the preservation of the fairness and trust in healthcare delivery.

AI development is transforming the field of materials science and chemistry with the automation of procedures and discovery via inverse design acceleration. Like in case of autonomous robots in the agricultural sector, as Yu et al. (2021) demonstrate, the same concepts of adaptive design and automation apply to a laboratory, where AI-controlled systems can arrange the tests, run hypotheses, and prove the findings. Such a relationship creates a cycle in which AI is exploring an enormous range of compositions, proposing novel paths of synthesis, and commands robotic labs to experiment, and thus, it becomes simpler to put the idea into practice. Such an approach is a radical shift in direction to independent labs that increase the efficiency and innovativeness of materials design.

At the same time, multi-scale modeling is important in the resolution of the complexity of materials research, as it requires the connection between quantum-level dynamics and continuum-scale phenomena. Kok et al. (2001) highlights the problem of multi-scale validation of spatial models, which is similar to the problem of accuracy of materials science of scale. The solution lies in the AI-based machine learning surrogates that can assist in reducing the cost of computation and preserving the power of prediction, nevertheless, it is not clear how the simulated prediction can be applied in the real world. Similarly, these gaps need to be addressed in order to ensure that the AI-based modeling not only accelerates the discovery but also provides rich and physical consistent insights into material behavior.

AI is becoming an increasingly important part of the development of climate science and research of the Earth system by meeting the computational burden of high-resolution modelling. Dufresne et al. (2013) emphasize that models of the Earth system like IPSL-CM5 are complex as they combine atmospheric, oceanic, and biogeochemical processes to forecast climate change scenarios. Although this type of model is necessary, it has extremely high computing demands. Surrogate models based on AI can also be used to obtain an analogous simulation at a lower computing cost and therefore can be used to test the scenario faster, quantify uncertainty more widely and acquire more readily available climate projections that can support global and regional planning.

In addition to modeling, AI is relevant in climate adaptation and mitigation by helping to connect scientific information to the decision-making process in society. As pointed out by Sovacool (2014), the best climate strategies should consider social aspects along with a technical one, being inclusive and equitable. Causal modeling frameworks that employ participatory techniques can also be used to make decisions aimed at local interventions, including community-specific adaptation policies or policy simulations that tradeoff between economic growth and sustainability. By doing this, AI does not only improve the accuracy of climate modeling but also builds governance frameworks that resonate with the goals of stakeholders in the provision of sustainable futures that follow scientific forecasts.

AI is transforming neuroscience and cognitive science by developing mechanistic cognition models by combining various neural data. Albright, Kandel and Posner (2000) note that to comprehend cognition, it is important to integrate the evidence form the electrophysiologic, brain imaging and behavioral research in explaining learning, memory and decision making. The multi-modal data streams can be synthesized using AI techniques that can develop models that are more complex and accurate in the neural processes.

These methods do not only perfect theoretical explanations of cognition but also create new avenues and possibilities of understanding the nature of how the brain functions bring about thought and behavior in a more precise manner.

Simultaneously, AI is at the heart of the creation of the closed loop neurotechnology that combine predictive models and real-time adaptive stimulation. Such systems have potential of therapeutic breakthroughs, including customized responses to neurological diseases, where the interventions are constantly changed depending on the neural feedback. However, at the same time the capability to affect the processes directly in the neural systems also poses urgent ethical issues of autonomy, identity, and long-term effects, as Albright et al. (2000) emphasize. To guarantee a balance between innovation and responsibility, it is crucial that these technologies are implemented in a strong ethical and clinical system to ensure that AI-based neurotechnology can be used to promote human well-being without toil on the basic values.

Artificial intelligence is making a significant impact on the social sciences, economics and governance, as it allows the analysis of massive amounts of social data to determine macro trends and systemic risks. According to Sovacool (2014), the traditional energy and social science research is usually characterized by the problem of confounding factors that might conceal causal relationships. With the inclusion of causal inference models, AI facilitates more rigorous simulations of the policy. AI enables researchers and decision-makers to take into consideration complex interdependencies without sacrificing the precision of their analysis. This can be especially useful in assessing interventions in economic systems, social programs and governance structures, where it is important to know the wider impacts of policies.

It is also vital to build participatory and transparent AI models that will assist in making decisions that are democratic. Sovacool (2014) states that social science research must be conducted in an inclusive and equal manner and argues in favor of models created by both sides, including different stakeholders. Policy tools that operate on AI and are developed with transparency can enhance the public trust and enable the citizens, and the policymakers to work on the scenario planning and policy simulation together. With the integration of computational capabilities and participatory schemes, AI can be used to make policies fair and knowledgeable and encourage policies to be responsive to the needs of society, minimizing the possibility of creating inequality and enhancing responsible governance.

5. Cross-cutting Methodologies and Experimental Designs

The research AI focuses on cross-cutting approaches that prioritize the combination of human knowledge, strict assessment models, and sound data management to further discovery in disciplines. An example of such an approach is hybrid human-AI research protocols, in which AI formulates hypotheses, humans contextualize them and confirm them, and AI refines propositions based on feedback. Such collaborative systems are proven to be more reliable and interpretable in terms of the AI-driven scient metric analyses (Correia et al., 2023). This balanced solution will mean AI supplements the human line of reasoning and will not displace the delicate judgment that is needed in a complex scientific investigation.

Discovery benchmarking needs more than just the conventional statistical scores of accuracies or AUC. According to Lian et al. (2024), there are indicators of evaluating the novelty, falsifiability, actionable impact, and robustness but emphasize that the hypotheses are not supposed to be repeated in multiple datasets. To augment these evaluative models, there is a need to have strong data governance and open science practices to deliver transparency and cumulative knowledge. Hrynaszkiewicz, Li and Edmunds (2018) emphasize the importance of metadata standards, provenance tracking, interoperable formats and alternatives like data citation badge or badges of reproducibility as incentives to align the behavior of researchers with the principles of open science. Lastly, the technique of simulation-as-experiment, such as using high-fidelity synthetic data, enables investigators to test the stress of models and fill epistemic gaps in the simulation of phenomena in the real world. In a perceptual scenario, proper calibration and domain adaptation is essential as Frenz and Lappe (2005) observe that the information obtained using synthetic or simulated data must be relevant and applicable in real-life scenarios.

6. Ethical, Legal, and Societal Considerations

Due to AI being a fast-tracking research and discovery tool, this means that responsible governance is a necessity to help reduce the dual-use risks of biosecurity threats or abuse of surveillance. Social contexts, according to Gordon et al. (2011) influence ethical considerations, and they be it out to the level of tiered access, oversight boards, and red-team protocols to strike a balance between openness and risk mitigation. Such measures will allow the process of scientific innovation to be safe, and some dangerous uses of AI-enabled research to be avoided.

An ethical AI deployment is concerned with equity, representation, and inclusion. Kohl (2022) emphasizes the importance of audit datasets and models of demographic and socio-economic bias and the community-based design practice implementation. Redistribution of research potential to institutions lacking enough resources also enhances inclusivity and equity. The following concepts are also crucial: privacy, consent, and data sovereignty, especially in the field of healthcare, where the indigenous knowledge, the framework of consent, and the privacy-preserving computation protect the participants as it is explained by Baraku et al. (2025). Lastly, contributions made by AI cast doubt on the scientific integrity, attribution, and reproducibility. According to Pielke Jr., Tucker, and Boye (2019), to acknowledge the use of machines to generate artifacts, changes in incentive structures and publication policies are needed to ensure ethical and scholarly standards are integrated with technological innovation.

7. Infrastructure and Policy

Data and computing resources Federated research infrastructures are vital to support collaboration at scale, yet provide local control of the data and computational infrastructure. As an alternative to monolith infrastructures, Backeberg et al. (2023) describe the advantages of open compute and data federations, where regional and international nodes can interoperate due to their sharing of APIs. This type of federated systems are used to foster collaboration between institutions and improve the usage of resources, as well as to support scalable research processes without storing sensitive or proprietary data centrally, consistent with distributed infrastructure development policy recommendations (Hastings et al., 2003).

Models of funding and interdisciplinary centers contribute even more to the effects of AI-enabled research by creating co-located groups of domain scientists, AI experts, ethicists and engineers to transform computational tools into real-world applications. According to King et al. (2008), innovation may be promoted by interdisciplinary research programs which include operational models which are structured to ensure that knowledge is integrated and that the translation into the real world happens faster. Concurrently, standards, certifications, and audits need to be put in place to ensure that trust and safety of research in high-risk areas is ensured. According to Leem and Lee (2004), certification and audit structures of IT services are described, and Parker et al. (2023) extend these ideas to medical technologies, which explains the necessity of open reporting, compliance inspection, and third-party assessment of models, data, and procedures. Federated infrastructures, supportive funding and high standards are used together to provide the building blocks of scalable, responsible, and high-impact research ecosystems.

Conclusion

The addition of AI to the research is radically changing the manner in which knowledge is produced, processed, and utilized in the scientific fields of knowledge. Through cutting-edge computational techniques, causal inference, simulated experimentation and distributed infrastructure, AI improves the accuracy, speed, and efficiency of research. It has usages in healthcare, materials science, climate modeling, neuroscience, and social sciences, and provides new understanding, optimization of interventions, and evidence-based decision-making. It is imperative that these advances are morally minded, transparent, and inclusive and when these are coupled with solid governance, open science practices and interdisciplinary collaboration, AI creates a system upon which scientific discovery can be responsible and impactful and socially relevant.

References

1. Albright, T. D., Kandel, E. R., & Posner, M. I. (2000). Cognitive neuroscience. *Current opinion in neurobiology*, *10*(5), 612-624.
2. Backeberg, B., Šustr, Z., Fernández, E., Donchyts, G., Haag, A., Oonk, J. R., ... & Chatzikyriakou, C. (2023). An open compute and data federation as an alternative to monolithic infrastructures for big Earth data analytics. *Big Earth Data*, *7*(3), 812-830.
3. Baraku, V., Ramadani, E., Paraskakis, I., Veloudis, S., & Yadav, P. (2025). Defining personal data Sovereignty: An ontologically-based framework facilitating subject privacy control. *Data and Information Management*, 100108.
4. Baran, G. R., Kiani, M. F., & Samuel, S. P. (2014). *Healthcare and Biomedical Technology in the 21st Century* (pp. 19-57). Springer.
5. Boley, H., Hanschke, P., Hinkelmann, K., & Meyer, M. (1995). COLAB: A hybrid knowledge representation and compilation laboratory. *Annals of Operations Research*, *55*(1), 9-79.
6. Briggs, C., Fan, Z., & Andras, P. (2021). A review of privacy-preserving federated learning for the Internet-of-Things. *Federated Learning Systems: Towards Next-Generation AI*, 21-50.

7. Correia, A., Grover, A., Jameel, S., Schneider, D., Antunes, P., & Fonseca, B. (2023). A hybrid human–AI tool for scientometric analysis. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, *56*(Suppl 1), 983-1010.

8. Dufresne, J. L., Foujols, M. A., Denvil, S., Caubel, A., Marti, O., Aumont, O., ... & Vuichard, N. (2013). Climate change projections using the IPSL-CM5 Earth System Model: from CMIP3 to CMIP5. *Climate dynamics*, *40*(9), 2123-2165.

9. Frenz, H., & Lappe, M. (2005). Absolute travel distance from optic flow. *Vision research*, *45*(13), 1679-1692.

10. Gordon, J. B., Levine, R. J., Mazure, C. M., Rubin, P. E., Schaller, B. R., & Young, J. L. (2011). Social contexts influence ethical considerations of research. *The American Journal of Bioethics*, *11*(5), 24-30.

11. Harris, P. L., German, T., & Mills, P. (1996). Children's use of counterfactual thinking in causal reasoning. *Cognition*, *61*(3), 233-259.

12. Hastings, D., Lamassoure, E. S., Weigel, A. L., & Saleh, J. H. (2003). Policy enablers for the development of a space-based infrastructure. In *Critical Infrastructures State of the Art in Research and Application* (pp. 123-137). Boston, MA: Springer US.

13. Hrynaszkiewicz, I., Li, P., & Edmunds, S. (2018). Open science and the role of publishers in reproducible research. In *Implementing Reproducible Research* (pp. 383-418). Chapman and Hall/CRC.

14. King, G., Currie, M., Smith, L., Servais, M., & McDougall, J. (2008). A framework of operating models for interdisciplinary research programs in clinical service organizations. *Evaluation and program planning*, *31*(2), 160-173.

15. Kment, B. (2020, July). Counterfactuals and causal reasoning. In *Perspectives on Causation: Selected Papers from the Jerusalem 2017 Workshop* (pp. 463-482). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

16. Kohl, K. (2022). *Driving justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion*. Auerbach Publications.

17. Kok, K., Farrow, A., Veldkamp, A., & Verburg, P. H. (2001). A method and application of multi-scale validation in spatial land use models. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, *85*(1-3), 223-238.

18. Koziel, S., & Leifsson, L. (2016). *Simulation-driven design by knowledge-based response correction techniques* (pp. 31-36). New York: Springer.

19. Leem, C. S., & Lee, H. J. (2004). Development of certification and audit processes of application service provider for IT outsourcing. *Technovation*, *24*(1), 63-71.

20. Lian, Z., Ma, Y., Li, M., Lu, W., & Zhou, W. (2024). Discovery Precision: An effective metric for evaluating performance of machine learning model for explorative materials discovery. *Computational Materials Science*, *233*, 112738.

21. Lucas, P. J., Van der Gaag, L. C., & Abu-Hanna, A. (2004). Bayesian networks in biomedicine and health-care. *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, *30*(3), 201-214.

22. Nebel, B. (1990). *Reasoning and revision in hybrid representation systems*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

23. Parker, M., Partridge, B., Svetcov, E., & Taylor, A. J. (2023). Managing Third-Party Risk: Framework Details for Risk Management in Medical Technology. In *Advanced Health Technology* (pp. 213-252). Productivity Press.

24. Pearl, J. (1997). Causation, action, and counterfactuals. In *Logic and Scientific Methods: Volume One of the Tenth International Congress of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science, Florence, August 1995* (pp. 355-375). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

25. Pielke Jr, R., Tucker, R., & Boye, E. (2019). Scientific integrity and the IAAF testosterone regulations. *The international sports law journal*, *19*(1), 18-26.

26. Sobie, C., Freitas, C., & Nicolai, M. (2018). Simulation-driven machine learning: Bearing fault classification. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, *99*, 403-419.

27. Sovacool, B. K. (2014). What are we doing here? Analyzing fifteen years of energy scholarship and proposing a social science research agenda. *Energy Research & Social Science*, *1*, 1-29.

28. Thapa, C., Chamikara, M. A. P., & Camtepe, S. A. (2021). Advancements of federated learning towards privacy preservation: from federated learning to split learning. In *Federated Learning Systems: Towards Next-Generation AI* (pp. 79-109). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

29. Yu, X., Fan, Z., Wang, X., Wan, H., Wang, P., Zeng, X., & Jia, F. (2021). A lab-customized autonomous

humanoid apple harvesting robot. *Computers & Electrical Engineering*, *96*, 107459.

30. Zarri, G. P. (1992). The "descriptive" component of a hybrid knowledge representation language. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, *23*(6-9), 697-7