

Artificial Intelligence-Assisted Development of Flexible Ferroelectric Materials for Emerging Electronic and Sensor Applications

Krish C. Varma

Department of Computer Science, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA.
krish1988@gmu.edu

Elliot L. Mendoza

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV, USA.
mendoza704@unr.edu

Walid Schmidt

Department of Computer Science, University of Houston, Houston, TX, USA.
walidmail@uh.edu

Abstract

Flexible ferroelectric materials occupy a critical position in next-generation electronic and sensor systems because they combine switchable polarization, piezoelectric response, and mechanical deformability. However, their development is constrained by complex processing requirements, substrate compatibility limits, fatigue under cyclic strain, and the need to preserve functional properties across multiple length scales. Artificial intelligence has emerged as a powerful instrument for navigating this complexity, but its effective application requires more than predictive modeling. This paper presents a system-level analysis of artificial intelligence-assisted development of flexible ferroelectric materials for emerging electronic and sensor applications. It examines structural trade-offs among ferroelectric performance, mechanical flexibility, process controllability, and manufacturing scalability. The discussion emphasizes data infrastructure, interoperability, autonomous experimentation, governance, robustness, fairness, and lifecycle sustainability. Rather than treating machine learning as a standalone optimization tool, the paper argues that durable progress depends on integrating algorithmic systems with experimental automation, institutional data governance, and responsible innovation frameworks. A central concern is the alignment between model-driven recommendations and physical realities such as thermal budgets, bending-induced depolarization, electrode adhesion, and long-term operational reliability. The analysis further explores deployment pathways in wearable sensors, conformable memory, soft robotics, and distributed environmental monitoring. It concludes that sustainable artificial intelligence-assisted materials development requires a coordinated socio-technical architecture that balances predictive power, experimental validation, equitable access to research infrastructure, and environmental accountability.

Keywords

artificial intelligence; ferroelectric materials; flexible electronics; materials informatics; data infrastructure; sustainability; policy.

1. Introduction

Flexible ferroelectric materials are increasingly recognized as enabling components for wearable health monitors, conformable memory devices, tactile sensors, energy harvesters, and soft robotic interfaces. Ferroelectric oxides offer spontaneous polarization that can be switched by an external electric field, alongside piezoelectric and pyroelectric responses that are valuable for sensing and actuation. The transition from rigid ceramic substrates to flexible polymer or ultrathin metal substrates introduces substantial performance constraints because many ferroelectric oxides require high-temperature crystallization, while flexible substrates generally impose low thermal budgets and mechanical compliance requirements. Artificial intelligence and materials informatics have begun to reshape this design space by accelerating the identification of promising compositions, processing windows, and device architectures. Broad advances in machine learning for molecular and materials science have enabled the construction of surrogate models that relate composition and processing parameters to functional properties [1]. Materials informatics has further provided systematic strategies for extracting patterns from heterogeneous experimental and computational datasets [2]. In parallel, research on thin-film ferroelectric materials has clarified the roles of epitaxial strain, domain structure, and interface effects in determining switching behavior [3]. The application landscape for modern ferroelectrics extends well beyond conventional capacitors and transducers to include nonvolatile memory, infrared sensing, and microelectromechanical systems [4]. Reviews of flexible perovskite oxide ferroelectric films highlight that mechanical transfer, substrate selection, and electrode integration remain persistent challenges for practical devices [5]. These lines of work demonstrate that artificial intelligence cannot simply replace physical insight; instead, it must be embedded within a broader system that coordinates data generation, model inference, process control, and device validation.

The present paper adopts a systems perspective rather than a narrow algorithmic focus. The central argument is that artificial intelligence-assisted development of flexible ferroelectric materials must be understood as a socio-technical infrastructure problem. Predictive accuracy is only one dimension of success. Equally important are the architecture of data pipelines, the reproducibility of automated experiments, the governance of shared datasets, the robustness of model-guided manufacturing, and the sustainability of the entire materials lifecycle. In the sections that follow, the paper examines systemic challenges, artificial intelligence architectures, structural trade-offs, data infrastructure, governance, sustainability, and deployment pathways. This orientation reflects the reality that flexible ferroelectric devices are not isolated laboratory artifacts but components of larger electronic systems that must satisfy reliability, cost, and environmental constraints across diverse operating conditions.

2. Systemic Challenges in Flexible Ferroelectric Materials Development

Ferroelectric ceramics have a long history of industrial optimization, but that optimization has largely occurred within rigid form factors and well-characterized thermal processing regimes [6]. The dielectric and piezoelectric properties of ferroelectric thin films and ceramics are closely tied to grain size, orientation, defect chemistry, and electrode interfaces, all of which become more difficult to control when devices are thinned and transferred to flexible substrates [7]. Mechanical bending introduces tensile or compressive strain that can alter domain configurations, reduce remnant polarization, and accelerate fatigue. Flexible formats also demand compatibility with polymer layers that cannot withstand the temperatures typically used for sintering oxide films. These constraints create a multidimensional trade-off space in which gains in mechanical flexibility often come at the expense of ferroelectric stability, leakage current, or long-term retention.

Traditional experimental exploration of this space has relied heavily on trial-and-error synthesis and post hoc characterization. A substantial amount of generated data remains underused because failed experiments are rarely published or systematically curated. Yet unsuccessful trials contain valuable information about phase stability, processing limits, and failure modes [8]. Active learning approaches have been proposed as a way to use such heterogeneous data more efficiently, allowing experimental resources to be concentrated in regions of the design space where model uncertainty is high or predicted performance is promising [9]. In the context of flexible ferroelectric films, active learning can guide decisions about composition, annealing temperature, thickness, and substrate treatment. However, active learning alone does not resolve the structural challenge of managing multiple coupled objectives. The system must simultaneously optimize polarization retention, mechanical endurance, manufacturability, and cost.

Recent work on aqueous tape casting for ultrathin multilayer ceramic capacitor applications illustrates the process-intensive nature of high-performance ferroelectric film fabrication [10]. Although that work addresses multilayer ceramic capacitors rather than fully flexible sensor arrays, it demonstrates the importance of controlling slurry formulation, tape thickness, binder behavior, and sintering conditions. For flexible ferroelectric devices, similar process sensitivity is amplified by the need to preserve adhesion between brittle oxide layers and compliant substrates. Artificial intelligence systems must therefore be designed to ingest data from multiple process stages, including precursor synthesis, tape casting, transfer, annealing, and electrode deposition. The challenge is not merely to predict a final property but to maintain traceable relationships between intermediate process states and device-level outcomes. This requires a system architecture that can combine historical knowledge, physics-based simulations, and real-time sensor measurements without collapsing important contextual information into overly simplified feature vectors.

3. Artificial Intelligence Architectures for Materials Discovery and Process Optimization

The artificial intelligence architectures suited to flexible ferroelectric materials development extend beyond static regression models. A productive arrangement often includes supervised learning for property prediction, uncertainty quantification for risk-aware decisions, and sequential experimental design for iterative refinement. Closed-loop materials discovery systems have demonstrated the feasibility of coupling machine learning predictions with automated synthesis and characterization, enabling the exploration of larger compositional spaces than would be possible through human-directed experimentation alone [11]. Large-scale data platforms such as the Materials Project have further supported this transformation by providing consistent computed data for thousands of compounds, thereby creating a shared reference layer for model training and validation [12]. Despite these advances, data-driven materials science still faces persistent limitations related to data heterogeneity, missing metadata, and the transferability of models across different synthesis routes [13].

At a system level, the materials genome paradigm has reframed materials development as an information-processing problem in which experimental and computational modules must be integrated through common data standards and workflow orchestration [14]. Emerging materials intelligence ecosystems extend this idea by embedding machine learning within broader loops of synthesis, characterization, and decision-making [15]. For flexible ferroelectrics, the architecture must accommodate multiple measurement modalities including X-ray diffraction, piezoresponse force microscopy, polarization-electric field hysteresis, bending fatigue tests, and impedance spectroscopy. Each modality has distinct sampling rates,

noise characteristics, and metadata requirements. A robust architecture must therefore include modality-specific preprocessing, feature extraction, and uncertainty calibration, while also maintaining a unified representation of the material state.

Process optimization architectures introduce additional temporal complexity. Manufacturing a flexible ferroelectric device is not a single-step prediction problem; it is a sequence of interdependent decisions. A model may recommend a particular annealing temperature, but the consequence of that choice depends on prior film thickness, substrate type, and downstream electrode deposition. Bayesian optimization and reinforcement learning can be used to manage such sequential decisions, but they require reliable reward signals that are often delayed and noisy. In practice, the architecture should separate fast surrogate models that guide local process adjustments from slower physics-based or experimental validations that anchor long-term learning. This layered approach helps prevent overconfidence in local predictions and reduces the risk of propagating errors across multiple manufacturing stages.

4. Structural Trade-offs in AI-Assisted Fabrication and Device Integration

The integration of artificial intelligence into flexible ferroelectric fabrication exposes structural trade-offs that are not visible when models are evaluated only on retrospective datasets. One fundamental trade-off concerns the allocation of experimental effort between exploration and exploitation. Exploration generates diverse data that improve model generalization but consumes time and materials. Exploitation uses current knowledge to produce near-optimal devices but may lock the system into local optima. Active learning and Bayesian optimization provide principled methods for balancing these objectives, yet the optimal balance depends on the maturity of the material system and the cost of failed experiments. Autonomous materials discovery platforms increasingly rely on structured data management to preserve the provenance of experimental actions and observations, because without such structure the feedback loop between model and experiment becomes unreliable [16].

A second structural trade-off arises between model complexity and physical interpretability. Machine learning methods for solid-state materials science have grown in sophistication, allowing high-dimensional representations of composition, structure, and processing [17]. In some cases, models originally developed for one class of materials have been successfully transferred to another, as illustrated by machine learning models of superconducting critical temperature that informed broader materials discovery workflows [18]. However, high-capacity models may identify correlations that do not generalize across substrates or fabrication lines. For flexible ferroelectric systems, interpretability matters because process engineers need to understand why a recommendation is made before altering expensive manufacturing steps. The challenge is to combine flexible black-box predictors with interpretable surrogate modules that expose the dominant physical constraints.

Machine learning in materials science also confronts the problem of experimental sparsity and uneven data coverage. Historical datasets tend to concentrate on compositions that are easy to synthesize or commercially important, leaving large regions of the design space unrepresented [19]. High-throughput library generation can reduce this imbalance, but it also generates data with systematic biases related to synthesis method and characterization protocol [20]. For flexible ferroelectrics, the transferability of models between rigid and flexible architectures is particularly uncertain. A model trained on rigid thin-film data may not capture strain relaxation, substrate clamping, or bending-induced domain reorientation. System designers

must therefore construct validation gates that explicitly test model recommendations under device-relevant mechanical conditions before scaling.

5. Data Infrastructure, Interoperability, and Experimental Automation

The long-term value of artificial intelligence in flexible ferroelectric development depends on data infrastructure that can support reproducible, comparable, and searchable experimental records. Materials genome platforms have demonstrated the benefits of centralized repositories with standardized calculation parameters and accessible application programming interfaces [21]. Smart automation has further enabled high-throughput experimentation in energy materials by coordinating robotic synthesis, characterization, and data logging [22]. For flexible ferroelectric materials, similar automation must capture not only composition and electrical properties but also mechanical strain, bending radius, number of cycles, environmental humidity, and substrate curvature. These contextual variables are essential for modeling reliability, yet they are frequently absent from conventional materials databases.

Interoperability requires more than shared file formats. It demands ontologies that distinguish between raw measurements, processed features, and inferred material states. For example, a polarization-electric field loop is a raw measurement, while remnant polarization and coercive field are processed features. A fatigue model may require the full sequence of loops across thousands of cycles, while a process optimization model may need only summary statistics. The data infrastructure must preserve both levels of representation and link them to the exact instrument settings, calibration records, and sample history. Without this provenance, machine learning models trained on shared datasets may learn artifacts of measurement protocol rather than intrinsic material behavior.

Experimental automation introduces another layer of system design. Autonomous laboratories can execute complex workflows, but they also concentrate risk in software and control systems. A failure in robotic sample handling or sensor calibration can generate large volumes of erroneous data that contaminate downstream models. Robust automated systems therefore require fault detection, data quality filters, and periodic human oversight. In flexible ferroelectric research, automation can be particularly valuable for repetitive bending fatigue tests and large compositional libraries, but the mechanical variability of flexible samples demands careful normalization. The integration of real-time process analytics with machine learning enables dynamic adjustment of deposition or annealing parameters, but it also raises questions about latency, data volume, and the stability of feedback loops in manufacturing environments.

6. Governance, Fairness, and Reproducibility in AI-Driven Materials Research

Governance frameworks for artificial intelligence-assisted materials development must address the reliability of model predictions, the equity of access to data and computational resources, and the reproducibility of published results. In materials science, reproducibility is often undermined by incomplete reporting of synthesis conditions, raw data unavailability, and differences in instrument calibration. Machine learning can compound these problems when models are evaluated on curated datasets that do not reflect real-world measurement noise or distribution shifts. Governance structures should therefore require that models intended for process optimization be accompanied by clear statements of applicability, uncertainty, and known failure modes. This is particularly important for flexible ferroelectric devices because their performance is sensitive to mechanical history and environmental exposure.

Fairness in this context has both epistemic and institutional dimensions. Epistemic fairness concerns the representativeness of training data across material families, processing routes, and geographic research traditions. If datasets are dominated by a small number of well-funded laboratories using similar equipment, model recommendations may implicitly favor those conditions and exclude viable alternatives. Institutional fairness concerns the distribution of benefits from accelerated materials discovery. Automated platforms and proprietary datasets may concentrate advantage in organizations that can afford advanced robotics and computational infrastructure. Policy interventions, open data requirements, and shared research facilities can mitigate some of these disparities, but they must be designed carefully to avoid imposing burdens that smaller institutions cannot meet.

Reproducibility and fairness also intersect with model governance. When machine learning systems are used to make decisions about expensive experiments or manufacturing lines, the logic of those decisions should be auditable. Auditability does not require full interpretability of every model component, but it does require that the system logs key inputs, outputs, uncertainty estimates, and human overrides. For flexible ferroelectric development, audit trails are valuable because process changes may have delayed effects on device reliability that are not evident in immediate electrical measurements. Governance frameworks that integrate auditability, data stewardship, and responsible innovation principles can help align artificial intelligence systems with broader societal expectations for safety and accountability.

7. Sustainability and Lifecycle Implications for Emerging Electronic Systems

The sustainability of flexible ferroelectric devices depends on material selection, manufacturing energy, operational lifetime, and end-of-life recovery. Artificial intelligence can support sustainability by reducing the number of physical experiments needed to identify viable materials, thereby lowering chemical waste and energy consumption during research [23]. However, the computational demands of large model training and high-throughput simulation also carry environmental costs. A comprehensive lifecycle perspective must account for the energy used in data centers, the raw materials consumed by sensors and automated equipment, and the environmental impact of disposing or recycling flexible electronic waste. Flexible devices often combine oxide layers with polymer substrates and metal electrodes, creating heterogeneous structures that are more difficult to recycle than conventional rigid electronics.

Artificial intelligence systems can be designed to optimize not only ferroelectric performance but also sustainability metrics such as processing temperature, solvent toxicity, material scarcity, and recyclability. Multi-objective optimization frameworks can incorporate these lifecycle indicators alongside electrical and mechanical targets. For example, a model might identify a lower-temperature processing route that slightly reduces polarization but greatly decreases energy consumption and enables the use of biodegradable substrates. Such trade-offs require explicit value judgments that cannot be resolved by algorithmic optimization alone. The environmental politics of artificial intelligence also matter beyond direct materials research; the extraction of minerals for computing hardware and the global distribution of computational workloads shape the broader sustainability footprint of AI-assisted science [24]. These systemic impacts call for governance that links materials informatics to environmental accounting and circular economy strategies.

Robustness and sustainability are closely linked in flexible ferroelectric systems. A device that degrades quickly under bending or humidity requires more frequent replacement, increasing material throughput and waste. AI-assisted reliability modeling can extend

operational lifetimes by identifying compositions and architectures that resist fatigue and environmental degradation. Yet the data needed to train such models are difficult to obtain because long-term aging studies are slow and expensive. Federated data sharing across institutions can accelerate reliability research, but it must be accompanied by clear data governance and incentives for long-term data curation. Sustainable materials development therefore depends on institutional arrangements that reward not only novel discoveries but also the careful maintenance of shared knowledge over extended time horizons.

8. Deployment Scenarios and Socio-Technical Integration

Deployment of flexible ferroelectric devices spans multiple application domains, each with distinct requirements for sensitivity, durability, power consumption, and form factor. Wearable health monitoring systems require sensors that maintain stable piezoelectric response under repeated bending and skin contact. Conformable memory arrays demand low-voltage switching, high endurance, and integration with flexible transistor backplanes. Soft robotic skins benefit from ferroelectric tactile sensors that can detect pressure while conforming to curved surfaces. Distributed environmental sensing applications may require energy harvesting from mechanical vibration or thermal gradients, where ferroelectric and pyroelectric properties provide additional functionality. In each scenario, artificial intelligence can assist not only in material selection but also in the co-design of device geometry, readout electronics, and signal processing.

The transition from laboratory prototypes to deployed systems introduces constraints that are frequently absent from research datasets. Manufacturing variability, user handling, temperature fluctuations, and mechanical wear produce distribution shifts that challenge models trained on controlled experimental data. Robust deployment requires continuous monitoring and periodic recalibration of predictive models. Edge computing can support real-time analysis of sensor data and dynamic adjustment of device operation, but it raises concerns about data privacy, energy consumption, and long-term software maintenance. The integration of artificial intelligence into deployed flexible electronics should therefore be viewed as a lifecycle responsibility rather than a one-time design activity.

Socio-technical integration also involves standards, regulatory approvals, and public trust. Flexible electronic devices that contact the human body must comply with safety and biocompatibility requirements. Sensors embedded in public infrastructure must meet reliability and cybersecurity standards. Policy frameworks for responsible innovation emphasize the importance of anticipating unintended consequences, including diverse stakeholders, and reflecting on the purposes of technological development [25]. In the context of flexible ferroelectric materials, responsible innovation means engaging clinicians, environmental scientists, manufacturing engineers, and community representatives in decisions about which applications to prioritize and which risks to tolerate. Artificial intelligence can support these deliberative processes by making trade-offs more visible, but it cannot substitute for democratic accountability and ethical judgment.

9. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence-assisted development of flexible ferroelectric materials holds substantial promise for accelerating the design of wearable sensors, conformable electronics, and energy-efficient devices. However, the successful realization of this promise depends on more than predictive accuracy. The field must develop integrated systems that connect machine learning models with robust data infrastructure, automated experimentation, and

physically grounded validation. Structural trade-offs between ferroelectric performance and mechanical flexibility cannot be resolved by algorithmic optimization alone; they require careful attention to processing history, substrate interactions, and long-term reliability. Governance frameworks must ensure reproducibility, fairness, and auditability, while sustainability considerations must extend from laboratory energy use to lifecycle environmental burdens and recyclability. Deployment in real-world settings introduces additional demands related to manufacturing variability, edge computing, user safety, and regulatory compliance. A system-level perspective reveals that artificial intelligence is not an isolated tool but an infrastructural layer that reshapes how materials knowledge is produced, shared, and translated into devices. The most durable advances will occur when predictive models are embedded within accountable socio-technical systems that value experimental evidence, equitable access, environmental responsibility, and transparent governance.

References

1. Butler, K. T., Davies, D. W., Cartwright, H., Isayev, O., & Walsh, A. (2018). Machine learning for molecular and materials science. *Nature*, 559(7715), 547–555. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0337-2>
2. Ramprasad, R., Batra, R., Pilania, G., Mannodi-Kanakkithodi, A., & Kim, C. (2017). Machine learning in materials informatics: Recent applications and prospects. *npj Computational Materials*, 3(1), 54. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41524-017-0056-5>
3. Martin, L. W., & Rappe, A. M. (2017). Thin-film ferroelectric materials and their applications. *Nature Reviews Materials*, 2(2), 16087. <https://doi.org/10.1038/natrevmats.2016.87>
4. Scott, J. F. (2007). Applications of modern ferroelectrics. *Science*, 315(5814), 954–959. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1129564>
5. Gao, W., Zhu, Y., Wang, Y., Yuan, G., & Liu, J.-M. (2020). A review of flexible perovskite oxide ferroelectric films and their applications. *Journal of Materiomics*, 6(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmat.2019.11.001>
6. Haertling, G. H. (1999). Ferroelectric ceramics: History and technology. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society*, 82(4), 797–818. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1151-2916.1999.tb01840.x>
7. Damjanovic, D. (1998). Ferroelectric, dielectric and piezoelectric properties of ferroelectric thin films and ceramics. *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 61(9), 1267–1324. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0034-4885/61/9/002>
8. Raccuglia, P., Elbert, K. C., Adler, P. D. F., Falk, C., Wenny, M. B., Mollo, A., Zeller, M., Friedler, S. A., Schrier, J., & Norquist, A. J. (2016). Machine-learning-assisted materials discovery using failed experiments. *Nature*, 533(7601), 73–76. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature17439>
9. Lookman, T., Balachandran, P. V., Xue, D., & Yuan, R. (2019). Active learning in materials science with emphasis on adaptive sampling using uncertainties for targeted design. *npj Computational Materials*, 5(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41524-019-0153-8>

10. Luan, S., He, H., Zhang, L., Yu, J., Cao, X., Wang, J., ... & Sun, R. (2025). Fabrication of High Performance BaTiO₃ Films via Aqueous Tape Casting for ultrathin MLCC applications. *Ceramics International*.
11. Kusne, A. G., Yu, H., Wu, C., Zhang, H., Hattrick-Simpers, J., DeCost, B., Sarker, S., Oses, C., Toher, C., Curtarolo, S., Davydov, A. V., Agarwal, R., Bendersky, L. A., Li, M., Mehta, A., & Takeuchi, I. (2020). On-the-fly closed-loop materials discovery via Bayesian active learning. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), 5966. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19597-w>
12. Jain, A., Ong, S. P., Hautier, G., Chen, W., Richards, W. D., Dacek, S., Cholia, S., Gunter, D., Skinner, D., Ceder, G., & Persson, K. A. (2013). Commentary: The Materials Project: A materials genome approach to accelerating materials innovation. *APL Materials*, 1(1), 011002. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4812323>
13. Himanen, L., Geurts, A., Foster, A. S., & Rinke, P. (2019). Data-driven materials science: Status, challenges, and perspectives. *Advanced Science*, 6(21), 1900808. <https://doi.org/10.1002/advs.201900808>
14. De Pablo, J. J., Jackson, N. E., Webb, M. A., Chen, L.-Q., Moore, J. E., Morgan, D., Jacobs, R., Pollock, T. M., Schlom, D. G., Toberer, E. S., Analytis, J., Dabo, I., DeLongchamp, D. M., Fazzio, A., Gregoire, J. M., Hautier, G., Jones, T. E., Lookman, T., Marzari, N., ... Hawker, C. J. (2019). New frontiers for the materials genome initiative. *npj Computational Materials*, 5(1), 41. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41524-019-0173-4>
15. Batra, R., Song, L., & Ramprasad, R. (2021). Emerging materials intelligence ecosystems propelled by machine learning. *Nature Reviews Materials*, 6(8), 655–678. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41578-020-00255-y>
16. Maffettone, P. M., Friederich, P., Baird, S. G., Blaiszik, B., Brown, K. A., Campbell, S. I., ... & Aspuru-Guzik, A. (2023). The need for structured data in autonomous materials discovery. *Matter*, 6(10), 3311–3327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matt.2023.09.011>
17. Schmidt, J., Marques, M. R. G., Botti, S., & Marques, M. A. L. (2019). Recent advances and applications of machine learning in solid-state materials science. *npj Computational Materials*, 5(1), 83. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41524-019-0221-0>
18. Stanev, V., Oses, C., Kusne, A. G., Rodriguez, E., Paglione, J., Curtarolo, S., & Takeuchi, I. (2018). Machine learning modeling of superconducting critical temperature. *npj Computational Materials*, 4(1), 29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41524-018-0085-8>
19. Morgan, D., & Jacobs, R. (2020). Opportunities and challenges for machine learning in materials science. *Annual Review of Materials Research*, 50, 71–103. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-matsci-070218-010015>
20. Vasudevan, R. K., Choudhary, K., Mehta, A., Smith, R., Kusne, G., Tavazza, F., Vlcek, L., Ziatdinov, M., Kalinin, S. V., & Hattrick-Simpers, J. (2019). Materials science in the artificial intelligence age: High-throughput library generation, machine learning, and a pathway from correlations to the underpinning physics. *MRS Communications*, 9(3), 821–838. <https://doi.org/10.1557/mrc.2019.95>
21. Suh, C., Fare, C., Warren, J. A., & Pyzer-Knapp, E. O. (2020). Evolving the materials genome: How machine learning is fueling a new generation of materials discovery.

Annual Review of Materials Research, 50, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-matsci-082019-105100>

22. Tabor, D. P., Roch, L. M., Saikin, S. K., Kreisbeck, C., Sheberla, D., Montoya, J. H., Dwaraknath, S., Aykol, M., Ortiz, C., Tribukait, H., Amador-Bedolla, C., Brabec, C. J., Maruyama, B., Persson, K. A., & AspuruGuzik, A. (2018). Accelerating the discovery of materials for clean energy in the era of smart automation. *Nature Reviews Materials*, 3(5), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41578-018-0005-z>
23. Häse, F., Roch, L. M., & Aspuru-Guzik, A. (2019). Next-generation experimentation with self-driving laboratories. *Trends in Chemistry*, 1(3), 282–291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trechm.2019.02.007>
24. Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.
25. Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. *Research Policy*, 42(9), 1568–1580. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.05.008>