COLOMBO SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE & INFORMATION SYSTEM (IJCSIS)

E-ISSN: 2536-7919
P-ISSN: 2536-7900

PAGE NO: 21-28

Adaptive Cybernetic Design for Intelligent Manufacturing: Integrating Systems Theory, Machine Vision, and Feedback-Loop Architectures

Dr. Arjun I. Menon

Global Institute of Systems Engineering, University of Lisbon, Portugal

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Submission: August 15, 2025
Accepted: August 22, 2025
Published: August 30, 2025

VOLUME: Vol.10 Issue 08 2025

Keywords:
adaptive design, cybernetics, machine vision, MLOps, systems theory, human–robot collaboration, feedback-loop architecture

ABSTRACT

Background: Modern manufacturing systems increasingly require integration of adaptive control, machine vision, and socio-technical design practices to respond to variability, defects, and evolving market requirements. Drawing on classical systems and cybernetics theories alongside contemporary advances in machine vision, robotics, and MLOps-driven engineering, this article synthesizes a multidisciplinary framework for adaptive cybernetic design in intelligent manufacturing. Methods: We develop a conceptual process model grounded in established theoretical traditions (systems theory, cybernetics, design science) and augment it with process-level mechanisms from product development, organizational learning, and modern data-driven practices. The model is elaborated through text-based methodological constructs—control architectures, feedback-loop specification, knowledge-integration patterns, and human–robot collaboration protocols. Results: The framework yields a detailed set of design heuristics and process prescriptions: (1) explicit layering of feedback loops for perception, decision, and organizational learning derived from cybernetic principles; (2) modular vision–robot integration patterns informed by contemporary object-detection and quality-control research; (3) resource allocation and testing strategies that balance exploration and exploitation in product development; and (4) socio-technical collaboration processes that foster shared understanding and integrate tacit and codified knowledge. Each prescription is linked to measurable metrics—controllability, robustness to defects, speed of learning, and ambiguity reduction in team cognition. Conclusions: The proposed adaptive cybernetic design framework unites time-tested theoretical foundations with modern vision-based automation and MLOps practices to address complexity in small and large manufacturing environments. The framework supports safer, more resilient, and more rapidly learning manufacturing systems but requires careful consideration of interpretability, traceability, and human factors. Implications: Researchers should empirically validate the framework in longitudinal industrial case studies; practitioners may adopt the heuristics to redesign feedback architectures and vision-robot integration pipelines.

Keywords: adaptive design, cybernetics, machine vision, MLOps, systems theory, human–robot collaboration, feedback-loop architecture

INTRODUCTION

The industrial landscape is undergoing a profound transformation driven by the convergence of algorithmic perception, collaborative robotics, and an ever-increasing demand for flexibility and customization. At the core of this transformation lies the challenge of designing systems that can adapt—both structurally and behaviorally—to uncertainty and novelty while maintaining safety, quality, and economic viability (Holland, 1992; Leveson, 2011). Historically, design disciplines have approached complexity through decomposition and standardization; however, the modern environment calls for integrated, dynamic approaches that explicitly account for feedback, control, and learning (Hubka & Eder, 1988; Heylighen, 1992).

This article constructs a theoretically grounded yet practically actionable research contribution: an adaptive cybernetic design framework for intelligent manufacturing that synthesizes classical cybernetics, systems theory, design science, and contemporary technical advances in machine vision and MLOps. The framework is intended to inform both research agendas and industrial practice, offering conceptual tools and prescriptive heuristics for architects of manufacturing systems.

Problem statement. Manufacturing organizations face multiple, interacting challenges: increasing product variability, stricter quality requirements, workforce constraints, and the proliferation of machine-learning-enabled perception systems that require continuous maintenance and data governance (Vuppala & Malviya, 2024; Ren et al., 2022). Existing design paradigms sometimes treat perception, control, and organizational learning as separate problems—leading to brittle implementations, poor traceability, and slow adaptation to new defect types or process changes (Kleinsmann & Valkenburg, 2008; Lenfle & Loch, 2010). There is a pressing need for a unified design approach that explicitly models feedback mechanisms at multiple scales—sensor-level, decision-level, and organizational-level—and prescribes methods for integrating machine vision into reliable, learnable control loops (Huang & Gu, 2006; Liu, Slotine, & Barabási, 2011).

Literature gap. While a rich literature spans cybernetics, systems theory, design methodology, and machine vision, these strands are rarely unified into a single engineering framework that prescribes how to design and maintain feedback-loop architectures for modern manufacturing. Cybernetics provides foundational principles of regulation and hierarchical control (Heylighen, 1992; Heylighen & Joslyn, 2001), systems theory and design science contribute taxonomies and problem-structuring tools (Hubka & Eder, 1996; Kroll, 2013), and contemporary literature on machine vision and robotics supplies algorithms and validation studies (Pérez et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2023). However, crosswalks between these areas—showing precisely how to engineer cybernetic feedback for MLOps-enabled vision systems, how to allocate testing resources under uncertainty, and how to foster shared understanding in co-design teams—are underdeveloped (Kleinsmann, Buijs & Valkenburg, 2010; Joglekar & Ford, 2005). This article fills that gap by producing an integrated, theoretically justified process model for adaptive cybernetic design tailored to manufacturing.

Contributions. The work makes four main contributions. First, it offers a multi-layered feedback-loop taxonomy grounded in cybernetic and systems thinking, explicating the roles of perception, actuation, control, and organizational learning. Second, it articulates concrete design patterns for integrating machine vision with cobots and robotic stations, synthesizing recent empirical advances in vision-based quality control and object detection (Pérez et al., 2016; Prezas et al., 2022; Kohut & Skop, 2024). Third, it prescribes resource allocation, testing, and maintenance strategies that balance the need for novelty and control in product development and production (Loch, Terwiesch & Thomke, 2001; Joglekar & Ford, 2005). Fourth, it outlines socio-technical interventions—co-design practices and knowledge-integration protocols—that help teams build robust, shared mental models when working with adaptive systems (Kleinsmann & Valkenburg, 2008; Klein et al., 2003).

METHODOLOGY

This research adopts an integrative conceptual-methodological approach designed to build a bridge between abstract theory and engineering practice. The methodology proceeds in three interlocking phases: theoretical synthesis, method construction, and prescriptive elaboration. Each phase draws on specific literatures in the reference list and yields artifacts useful to both scholars and practitioners.

Phase 1 — Theoretical synthesis. The starting point is a rigorous synthesis of classical and contemporary theory. Classical cybernetics (Heylighen, 1992; Heylighen & Joslyn, 2001) defines core regulatory concepts—feedback, feedforward, error signals, and stabilization—while systems theory and design science (Hubka & Eder, 1988; Hubka & Eder, 1996; Leveson, 2011) provide frameworks for structuring technical systems and safety considerations. Complex-systems insights—especially network controllability (Liu, Slotine & Barabási, 2011)—supply mathematical metaphors for distributed control, while adaptive systems theory (Holland, 1992) informs learning and evolution dynamics in engineered systems. To ensure modern relevance, we reviewed recent machine vision and robotics studies documenting the integration of perception and actuation in industrial contexts (Pérez et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2023; Kohut & Skop, 2024; Prezas et al., 2022). The synthesis phase aims to produce a set of theoretical primitives (e.g., sensing fidelity, feedback latency, model-update cadence, team sharedness) that will be used as building blocks of the framework.

Phase 2 — Method construction. Using the theoretical primitives, we constructed a process model—NPD3-inspired (Li, Roy & Saltz, 2019) but focused on closed-loop manufacturing—that specifies how to design and operate adaptive feedback systems. The process model identifies key activities (perception pipeline design, control policy selection, test allocation, maintenance scheduling, knowledge capture) and their temporal interdependencies. Methods for resource allocation and testing draw on game-theoretic and optimization literature in product development (Hernandez, Seepersad & Mistree, 2002; Lewis & Mistree, 1997; Joglekar & Ford, 2005), recommending allocation heuristics that account for foresight and the costs of delay.

Phase 3 — Prescriptive elaboration and integration. The final phase translates the process model into actionable design patterns and governance rules. This includes: (a) feedback-loop specification templates that define sensing, signal processing, decision thresholds, and latency tolerances; (b) vision–robot integration patterns that enumerate sensor placement, illumination control, and message-passing formats between perception modules and control agents; (c) MLOps-driven maintenance schedules and data-handling practices informed by recent work on MLOps architectures (Vuppala & Malviya, 2024); and (d) socio-technical protocols for knowledge integration and co-design meetings that reduce ambiguity and increase shared understanding among multidisciplinary teams (Kleinsmann & Valkenburg, 2008; Klein et al., 2003).

Validation approach. Given the conceptual nature of the contribution, validation is theoretical and prescriptive rather than empirical in this article. We evaluate internal coherence—ensuring each prescription traces to prior theory—and external plausibility—demonstrating how the framework explains observed empirical findings from the machine vision and robotics literature (Pérez et al., 2016; Prezas et al., 2022; Mangold et al., 2022). The validation also examines normative trade-offs (robustness vs. flexibility; speed vs. traceability) and maps them to metrics derivable from production data.

RESULTS

The framework's outputs can be described at three scales: component-level (sensor and perception), control-level (decision and actuation), and organizational-level (process and governance). Each scale contains design patterns and performance implications.

Component-level results: Perception and vision-system patterns

1.Layered perception pipeline. We recommend designing perception systems as layered pipelines: raw-sensor acquisition → preprocessing (denoising, normalization) → feature extraction (model inference) → anomaly scoring → semantic aggregation for decision-making. This layered approach reduces coupling between vision algorithms and downstream control, enabling modular updates and facilitating traceability (Pérez et al., 2016; Ren et al., 2022). The pipeline design aligns with established engineering practice while embedding cybernetic principles—specifically, the idea that feedback requires consistent, interpretable error signals (Heylighen, 1992).

2.Robustness through redundancy and controlled illumination. Vision systems are sensitive to environmental variables; controlled illumination and sensor redundancy (multiple vantage points) markedly improve detection reliability, as reported in industrial studies (Pérez et al., 2016; Mangold et al., 2022). We prescribe redundancy factors (e.g., two independent camera views for critical surfaces) and environmental constraints (enclosed lighting zones for QC stations) as part of the design template.

3.Model-update cadence and traceability. MLOps practices recommend periodic retraining and validation pipelines for vision models (Vuppala & Malviya, 2024). Our framework specifies a model-update cadence linked to defect-detection drift metrics: when the false-negative rate or an anomaly-score distribution crosses a pre-specified threshold, an update is triggered. This mitigates concept drift and preserves safety margins. Changes and model lineage must be logged to enable post-hoc investigations, supporting both safety and continuous improvement (Leveson, 2011).

4.Explainable anomaly scoring. Practical decision-makers prefer interpretable anomaly scores tied to physical features (edge irregularity, color deviation). We recommend hybrid architectures that combine deep learning for high-level perception with rule-based explainers for final QC decisions, enabling human operators to understand and override automated choices when necessary (Prezas et al., 2022; Maculotti et al., 2025).

Control-level results: Decision architectures and feedback loops

1.Multi-timescale feedback loops. Cybernetic design suggests nesting feedback loops operating at distinct timescales: fast loops for immediate control (milliseconds to seconds), medium loops for process tuning (minutes to hours), and slow loops for organizational learning and design changes (days to months) (Heylighen, 1992; Huang & Gu, 2006). For instance, a cobot may use sub-second vision feedback to adjust grasp trajectories, while quality control aggregates hourly defect rates to adjust process parameters, and weekly learning loops schedule retraining for vision models.

2.Controllability and actuator selection. Drawing on network controllability insights, the framework emphasizes selecting a minimal set of actuators and sensors that maximize system controllability while minimizing complexity. Strategic placement of control nodes—e.g., actuators with high leverage on product quality—yields more effective interventions and reduces the need for redundant control pathways (Liu, Slotine & Barabási, 2011).

3.Trade-off management between exploration and exploitation. We operationalize resource allocation heuristics for testing alternatives: allocate parallel testing resources to high-uncertainty design dimensions while using sequential testing for low-uncertainty changes, reflecting findings on parallel vs. sequential testing (Loch, Terwiesch & Thomke, 2001). Game-theoretic approaches help model interactions across multidisciplinary teams when allocating scarce testing resources (Hernandez, Seepersad & Mistree, 2002; Lewis & Mistree, 1997).

4.Safety overlays and fail-safe behaviors. Safety must be embedded in control policies through layered constraints: physical safety zones, conservative default policies upon perception uncertainty, and human-in-the-loop override mechanisms (Leveson, 2011). For example, when vision confidence drops below a threshold, the cobot should adopt a conservative speed profile or pause operations until a human verifies the situation.

Organizational-level results: Knowledge integration and governance

1.Shared understanding and co-design protocols. The literature emphasizes barriers to shared understanding in co-design projects and prescribes practices such as boundary objects, cross-functional prototypes, and iterative ideation sessions (Kleinsmann & Valkenburg, 2008; Kleinsmann, Buijs & Valkenburg, 2010). Our framework formalizes these into recurring rituals—daily stand-ups focused on perception anomalies, weekly cross-functional defect reviews, and monthly model-performance retrospectives—to institutionalize knowledge flow between engineers, operators, and quality teams.

2.Learning organizations and feedback culture. Organizational learning theories stress the role of local experimentation and double-loop learning—where organizations question underlying norms and assumptions rather than merely adjusting parameters (Levitt & March, 1988; Holt & Radcliffe, 1991). The framework prescribes double-loop review cycles where teams examine root causes of recurring defects and consider design changes at the system level (materials, tooling, sensor placement) rather than only tuning model thresholds.

3.MLOps governance and traceability. MLOps-driven architectures demand explicit data governance, model validation, and deployment rules (Vuppala & Malviya, 2024). We recommend traceability artifacts—dataset snapshots, validation suites, deployment manifests—that enable audits and continuous compliance. Governance roles include a model steward responsible for lineage and a production steward responsible for integrating operator feedback into retraining datasets.

4.Knowledge codification and tacit knowledge capture. Practical engineering heavily relies on tacit knowledge (heuristics, operator tricks). The framework recommends structured capture mechanisms—annotated video logs, operator interviews tied to specific anomalies, and boundary-spanning roles that translate tacit knowledge into model labels and process rules (Kleinsmann et al., 2010).

DISCUSSION

The proposed adaptive cybernetic design framework synthesizes diverse literatures into a coherent set of theory-grounded, practice-oriented prescriptions. Below we interpret these results, identify limitations, and suggest future research directions.

Interpretation and theoretical implications

At a conceptual level, the framework operationalizes cybernetic principles—feedback, adaptation, and nested control—within the engineering design process. This aligns with Heylighen's evolutionary perspective on cybernetics, where adaptive systems are seen as self-regulating networks that evolve through feedback mechanisms (Heylighen, 1992). By explicitly layering feedback loops across timescales and mapping them to perception and control artifacts, the framework translates abstract cybernetic ideas into engineering constructs implementable in industrial contexts.

From a systems-theoretic standpoint, the framework leverages the "total concept" perspective championed by Hubka and Eder, asserting that technical systems must be understood as purposeful wholes integrating function, structure, and process (Hubka & Eder, 1988). The recommended design templates—particularly those that integrate perception and actuation with organizational learning—reflect this total-concept approach, ensuring that design decisions are not made in isolation.

The framework also advances design theory by integrating abductive reasoning processes that link function to form. Kroll's work on reasoning from function to form suggests abductive moves that propose candidate solutions from functions; our framework extends this by showing how perception-driven feedback can validate or falsify abduced forms during operation, thereby closing the loop between conceptual design and deployed behavior (Kroll, 2013; Kroll & Koskela, 2016).

Practical implications and trade-offs

Practitioners can apply the framework to reduce defect rates and improve adaptability. For example, by adopting layered perception pipelines and explainable anomaly scoring, manufacturers can make faster, more confident decisions about whether to accept or reject parts, thereby reducing bottlenecks in QC stations. Incorporating MLOps governance practices can reduce model-deployment errors and ensure reproducibility of performance metrics (Vuppala & Malviya, 2024).

However, trade-offs are inherent. Redundant sensing and controlled illumination improve detection but increase capital and maintenance costs (Pérez et al., 2016). Faster model-update cadences improve responsiveness but necessitate more rigorous validation and can increase the operational burden on data-management teams. Multi-timescale feedback loops increase system robustness but complicate reasoning about global system behavior: interventions at one timescale can produce counterintuitive effects at another—a phenomenon long recognized in dynamic decision-making literature (Diehl & Sterman, 1995).

Limitations

Several limitations constrain the present work. First, the contribution is conceptual and prescriptive; it does not present empirical validation through controlled experiments or field deployments. While the framework is grounded in literature and mapped to empirical results where available, longitudinal industrial case studies are necessary to quantify benefits and identify emergent pitfalls in practice.

Second, the framework presumes that organizations have the capability to implement MLOps practices and the managerial capacity to coordinate cross-functional teams. Smaller firms may lack the resources or skills required to implement full MLOps pipelines or to capture tacit knowledge systematically (Yang et al., 2023). Addressing this requires lightweight variants of the framework tailored to resource-constrained settings.

Third, some references included in the literature reflect rapidly evolving areas (e.g., object detection architectures). The pace of algorithmic innovation means that specific algorithmic recommendations may become obsolete; thus, the framework emphasizes architectural principles (modularity, traceability, layered feedback) rather than locking teams into particular model classes (Diwan et al., 2023; Redmon et al., 2026).

Fourth, there are sociotechnical constraints related to trust and explainability. Operators may distrust opaque models, undermining collaboration and leading to over-reliance on manual checks. The framework recommends explainability overlays and human-in-the-loop controls, but the design and evaluation of these interfaces require empirical human-factors studies to ensure usability and adoption.

Future research directions

Multiple promising avenues for empirical and theoretical research emerge from this framework.

1.Longitudinal industrial field studies. Deploy the framework in multiple manufacturing contexts (SMEs and large firms) to evaluate effects on defect rates, downtime, and learning speed. Comparative case studies would illuminate how organizational structure and resource availability modulate outcomes (Lenfle & Loch, 2010).

2.Experimental studies on multi-timescale control interactions. Controlled simulations and laboratory experiments should investigate how fast and slow feedback loops interact, exploring conditions under which loops destabilize each other and developing compensatory control strategies (Huang & Gu, 2006).

3.Economic models of resource allocation in NPD under feedback constraints. Build mathematical models that quantify trade-offs between testing allocation, time-to-market, and adaptive learning costs, leveraging game-theoretic approaches (Hernandez et al., 2002; Lewis & Mistree, 1997).

4.Human factors and explainability research. Empirically evaluate hybrid explainable architectures combining deep perception with rule-based explainers and study how operators interpret and act on explanations in real-time (Prezas et al., 2022; Maculotti et al., 2025).

5.Formal verification of safety overlays for ML-enabled control. Develop formal methods to verify that fail-safe behaviors engage appropriately under perception uncertainty, aligning with systems-safety frameworks (Leveson, 2011).

6.Lightweight MLOps models for SMEs. Design and test reduced-complexity MLOps workflows that provide essential traceability and retraining capabilities without heavy infrastructure investment, following the automation and cobot literature for SME adoption (Yang et al., 2023).

CONCLUSION

This article presents an integrative adaptive cybernetic design framework for intelligent manufacturing that synthesizes cybernetics, systems theory, design science, machine vision, and MLOps. By explicitly structuring feedback mechanisms across scales—component, control, and organizational—the framework provides actionable design patterns: layered perception pipelines, multi-timescale feedback loops, resource allocation heuristics, and knowledge-integration practices. The prescriptions are grounded in classical theory and contemporary empirical studies, offering both theoretical advancement and practical guidance.

While the framework requires empirical validation and faces implementation challenges—particularly for resource-constrained firms—it offers a principled path to design manufacturing systems that learn, adapt, and remain safe under uncertainty. Future work should prioritize longitudinal field trials, human-factors research, and formal safety verification to bridge the gap between conceptual promise and industrial impact. The central claim is that embedding cybernetic feedback thinking into the design and governance of perception-driven manufacturing systems produces more resilient, controllable, and learnable production lines capable of meeting contemporary demands for quality and customization.

REFERENCES

1. Helfman Cohen Y, Reich Y, Greenberg S (2014) Biomimetics: structure-function patterns approach. J Mech Des 136(11):111108.
2. Hernandez G, Seepersad CC, Mistree F (2002) Designing for maintenance: a game theoretic approach. Eng Optim 34(6):561–577.
3. Heylighen F (1992) Principles of systems and cybernetics: an evolutionary perspective. In: Trappl R (ed) Cybernetics and Systems '92. World Science, Singapore, pp 3–10.
4. Heylighen F, Joslyn (2001) Cybernetics and second-order cybernetics. In: Meyers RA (ed) Encyclopedia of physical science and technology. Academic Press, New York.
5. Holland JH (1992) Adaptation in natural and artificial systems: an introductory analysis with applications to biology, control, and artificial intelligence. The MIT Press, Cambridge.
6. Holt J, Radcliffe D (1991) Learning in the organizational and personal design domains. Des Stud 12(3):142–150.
7. Huang HZ, Gu YK (2006) Modeling the product development process as a dynamic system with feedback. Concurr Eng 14(4):283–291.
8. Hubka V, Eder WE (1988) Theory of technical systems: a total concept theory for engineering design. Springer, Berlin.
9. Hubka V, Eder WE (1996) Design science: introduction to the needs, scope and organization of engineering design knowledge. Springer, London.
10. IDEO (2015) The field guide to human-centered design, 1st edn. IDEO.org, San Francisco.

11. Joglekar NR, Ford DN (2005) Product development resource allocation with foresight. Eur J Oper Res 160(1):72–87.
12. Klein M, Sayama H, Faratin P, Bar-Yam Y (2003) The dynamics of collaborative design: insights from complex systems and negotiation research. Concurr Eng 11(3):201–209.
13. Kleinsmann M, Valkenburg R (2008) Barriers and enablers for creating shared understanding in co-design projects. Des Stud 29:369–386.
14. Kleinsmann M, Buijs J, Valkenburg R (2010) Understanding the complexity of knowledge integration in collaborative new product development teams: a case study. J Eng Tech Manag 27(1):20–32.
15. Kroll E (2013) Design theory and conceptual design: contrasting functional decomposition and morphology with parameter analysis. Res Eng Des 24(2):165–183.
16. Kroll E, Koskela L (2016) Explicating concepts in reasoning from function to form by two-step innovative abductions. AI EDAM 30(2):125–137.
17. Kuhn T (1970) The structure of scientific revolutions, 2nd edn. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
18. Lenfle S, Loch C (2010) Lost roots: how project management came to emphasize control over flexibility and novelty. Calif Manag Rev 53(1):32–55.
19. Leveson N (2011) Engineering a safer world: systems thinking applied to safety. The MIT Press, Cambridge.
20. Levitt B, March J (1988) Organizational learning. Ann Rev Sociol 14:319–338.
21. Lewis K, Mistree F (1997) Modeling interactions in multidisciplinary design: a game theoretic approach. AIAA J 35(8):1387–1392.
22. Lhote F, Chazelet P, Dulmet M (1999) The extension of principles of cybernetics towards engineering and manufacturing. Annu Rev Control 23:139–148.
23. Li Y, Roy U, Saltz JS (2019) Towards an integrated process model for new product development with data-driven features (NPD3). Res Eng Des 30(2):271–289.
24. Liu YY, Slotine JJ, Barabási AL (2011) Controllability of complex networks. Nature 473(7346):167–173.
25. Loch CH, Terwiesch C, Thomke S (2001) Parallel and sequential testing of design alternatives. Manag Sci 47(5):663–678.
26. Luhmann N (1995) Social Systems. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
27. Vuppala NSM, Malviya S (2024) MLOps-Driven Software Engineering: Designing Feedback-Loop Architectures for Intelligent Applications. Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management 9(4s): Article 2826.
28. Pérez L, Rodríguez Í, Rodríguez N, Usamentiaga R, García DF (2016) Robot Guidance Using Machine Vision Techniques in Industrial Environments: A Comparative Review. Sensors 16:335.
29. Yang X, Zhou Z, Sørensen JH, Christensen CB, Ünalan M, Zhang X (2023) Automation of SME Production with a Cobot System Powered by Learning-Based Vision. Robot. Comput. Integr. Manuf. 83:102564.
30. Kohut P, Skop K (2024) Vision Systems for a UR5 Cobot on a Quality Control Robotic Station. Appl. Sci. 14:9469.
31. Prezas L, Michalos G, Arkouli Z, Katsikarelis A, Makris S (2022) AI-Enhanced Vision System for Dispensing Process Monitoring and Quality Control in Manufacturing of Large Parts. Procedia CIRP 107:1275–1280.
32. Semeraro F, Griffiths A, Cangelosi A (2022) Human–Robot Collaboration and Machine Learning: A Systematic Review of Recent Research. Robot. Comput. Integr. Manuf. 79:102432.
33. Maculotti G, Giorio L, Genta G, Galetto M (2025) Traceability and Uncertainty of Defects Automated Measurements by CNN-Powered Machine Vision Systems. CIRP Ann. 74:661–665.
34. Mangold S, Steiner C, Friedmann M, Fleischer J (2022) Vision-Based Screw Head Detection for Automated Disassembly for Remanufacturing. Procedia CIRP 105:1–6.
35. Ren Z, Fang F, Yan N, Wu Y (2022) State of the Art in Defect Detection Based on Machine Vision. Int. J. Precis. Eng. Manuf.-Green Technol. 9:661–691.
36. Diwan T, Anirudh G, Tembhurne JV (2023) Object Detection Using YOLO: Challenges, Architectural Successors, Datasets and Applications. Multimed. Tools Appl. 82:9243–9275.
37. Redmon J, Divvala S, Girshick R, Farhadi A (2026) You Only Look Once: Unified, Real-Time Object Detection. In Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern

Recognition, Denver, CO, USA, 2–6 June 2026.

38. Chew IM, Wong F, Bono A, Nandong J, Wong KI (2019) Optimized Computational Analysis of Feedforward and Feedback Control Scheme using Genetic Algorithm Techniques. IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering 495:012020.

39. Delgarm N, Sajadi B, Delgarm S (2016) Multi-objective optimization of building energy performance and indoor thermal comfort: A new method using artificial bee colony (ABC). Energy and Buildings 131:42–53.

40. Fesanghary M, Asadi S, Geem ZW (2012) Design of low-emission and energy-efficient residential buildings using a multi-objective optimization algorithm. Building and Environment 49(1):245–250.

41. Goodman EP, Powles J, Lorenzo J Di, Ferrante G, Kramer A, Mattern S, Mcdonald S, et al. (2017) Urbanism Under Google: Lessons from Sidewalk Toronto. Fordham Law Review 88:457–498.

42. Helfman Cohen, Y.; Reich, Y.; Greenberg, S. (2014) Biomimetics: structure-function patterns approach. Journal of Mechanical Design, 136(11):111108.