



(REVIEW ARTICLE)



GOVERNING INNOVATION: POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS, BUSINESS STRATEGIES, HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT IN THE ERA OF INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGIES

Ahmad Reshad Rahimi ¹, Fazel Rabi Mohammad Naser ², Mohammad Hanif Rasekh ^{3,*} and Abdull Samim Adib ⁴

¹ Department of Administrative and diplomacy, Al-Biruni University, Afghanistan.

² Department of IT and automated Control System, National University of Science and Technology, Moscow, Russia.

³ Department Civil Engineering, Baghlan University, Afghanistan.

⁴ Mohammad faqir frozi Boys high school, Afghanistan.

* Corresponding Author

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 32(01), 831–839

Publication history: Received on 21 August 2026; revised on 12 October 2026; accepted on 14 October 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.32.1.2608>

Copyright © 2026 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

ABSTRACT

Globally, smart technologies, particularly artificial intelligence (AI) is proliferating quickly and reshaping political institutions, business practices, healthcare delivery systems, and civil infrastructure development. This review discusses how governments, organizations, health systems, and infrastructure planners are adjusting governance, strategic frameworks, and engineering practices to embrace AI-enabled innovation, while managing risks. We used a narrative review methodology, synthesizing peer-reviewed literature, policy reports, and institutional publications published between 2016 and 2026 obtained from Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed, and Google Scholar databases. The review identifies five interconnected themes: (1) The changing role of political institutions in regulating AI through policy frameworks and digital governance initiatives; (2) Business adoption strategies for AI integration, including automation of decision-making and transformation of the workforce; (3) AI applications in healthcare systems, including diagnostics and patient care, along with ethical and equity concerns; (4) Integration of intelligent systems in civil engineering and infrastructure, including smart construction, structural health monitoring, and resilient urban planning; and (5) Broader social implications such as algorithmic bias, labor displacement, and digital inequality. Findings suggest that while intelligent technologies produce significant efficiency and innovation gains across sectors, fragmented regulatory approaches and uneven institutional capacity create governance gaps that are disproportionately borne by vulnerable populations and under-resourced infrastructure systems. The review finds that effective governance of AI requires coordinated multi-stakeholder frameworks that include political oversight, responsible business practices, equitable healthcare policy, and resilient infrastructure planning. Future research should explore comparative cross-national governance models and longitudinal assessments of AI's socioeconomic and infrastructural impact.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Governance; Healthcare Innovation; Business Strategy; Smart Infrastructure; Digital Policy

1 INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) and other smart technologies are transforming institutions, markets, public services, and the built environment globally [1, 2]. Advances in machine learning, natural language processing, and automated decision-making systems [3,4] have resulted in a surge in the application of AI in political governance, corporate strategy, healthcare delivery, and civil infrastructure planning over the last decade. Governments are using AI increasingly for policy analysis, public service delivery, and regulatory enforcement. Corporations are using AI for optimizing operations, improving decision-making, and gaining a competitive advantage [5, 6]. At the same time, healthcare systems are using AI-powered diagnostic tools, predictive analytics, and the automation of administrative functions to improve patient outcomes and operational efficiency [7]. Simultaneously, intelligent systems have been increasingly used in civil engineering for structural health monitoring, smart construction management, and resilient urban infrastructure design, resulting in better allocation of resources and disaster readiness [8,9]. However, the rapid adoption of AI has outpaced the development of adequate governance frameworks raising concerns around accountability, transparency, algorithmic bias and equitable access [10, 11]. The rise of AI is putting increasing pressure on political institutions to regulate it without killing innovation and on business to find the right balance between efficiency and responsibility to the workforce [12]. The promise of AI-enabled care delivery in health care is tempered by concerns about data privacy, clinical validation, and unequal access to sophisticated technologies [13]. Likewise, the implementation of smart technologies in infrastructure development poses concerns regarding data security, equitable urban planning, and sustainability of AI-reliant systems [14].

The objective of this review is to understand the evolution of political institutions in developing regulatory and governance frameworks for AI and business strategy evaluation for AI adoption and its organizational implications, including evaluation of AI applications and challenges in healthcare systems, and to investigate the integration of intelligent technologies into civil engineering and infrastructure development, also encompassing cross-cutting social implications, including ethical, labor, and equity issues. This review draws on perspectives from political science, business management, healthcare, and civil engineering to provide a holistic understanding of the governance, adoption, and experience of intelligent technologies across sectors, offering insights for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers navigating this rapidly evolving environment.

2 REVIEW METHODOLOGY

We conducted a narrative review of interdisciplinary literature to synthesize the governance and application of intelligent technologies in the political, business, healthcare and infrastructure domains. A systematic search was performed in four databases (Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed, and Google Scholar) for publications from January 2016 to September 2026. Search terms included combinations of "artificial intelligence," "governance," "policy," "business strategy," "healthcare AI," "digital regulation," "algorithmic ethics," "smart infrastructure," "AI in construction," "structural health monitoring," and "social inequality." Boolean operators (AND/OR) were used to limit the search results. We include articles that were related to our topics, such as peer-reviewed journal articles, policy reports, and institutional publications, English-language publications, and studies addressing AI governance, adoption, or impact in political, business, healthcare, infrastructure, or social contexts. Additionally, we excluded irrelevant articles including non-peer-reviewed opinion pieces without empirical or theoretical grounding and publications lacking relevance to governance, policy, or sectoral application. Therefore, from an initial pool of approximately 180 records, 52 articles met the inclusion criteria after title/abstract screening and full-text review. Literature was thematically organized into five domains: political governance, business strategy, healthcare systems, infrastructure development, and social implications, forming the structural basis of this review.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Political Institutions and AI Governance

Political institutions are struggling with how to balance the need to promote innovation while also reducing risk, and political institutions around the world have made governing artificial intelligence a major issue. [15] In 2024, the European Union adopted the AI Act, one of the most comprehensive regulatory structures so far. It employs a risk-based classification system which imposes stricter requirements on 'high-risk' AI applications, such as those used in critical infrastructure, law enforcement, and healthcare [16]. Conversely, the United States has taken a more fragmented, sectoral regulatory approach based on executive orders and agency-level guidance, rather than comprehensive federal legislation [17]. Beyond regulation, political institutions are increasingly using AI for their internal purposes to improve public administration. The adoption of AI-based e-government initiatives that support service delivery to citizens, combat fraud, and policy simulation has grown significantly, particularly in countries such as Estonia, Singapore, and South Korea, which are among the top countries in terms of digital government maturity [18]. However, experts warn that AI-enabled governance creates new challenges for accountability—such as the "black box" problem, in which the

process of algorithmic decision-making is opaque and difficult to scrutinize by citizens or oversight institutions [19]. The literature repeatedly addresses the tension between innovation-friendly regulation and precautionary governance. Those who argue that too much regulation may hinder technological competitiveness, especially smaller economies hoping to attract AI investment, have called for less interventionist regulatory strategies [20]. Conversely, proponents of precautionary frameworks argue that without oversight, algorithmic bias can be perpetuated, public trust eroded, and marginalized populations negatively affected, and there is no recourse from automated decision-making [21]. [22] International organizations like the OECD and UNESCO have tried to close this gap with non-binding principles for the governance of AI, emphasizing transparency, accountability, and human rights; however, adoption by member states has been inconsistent. The literature generally points to the need for effective political governance of AI to be based on adaptable multi-level frameworks that can adapt to rapidly evolving technological capabilities while safeguarding democratic accountability and public trust [23].

3.2 Business Strategies and AI Adoption

Artificial intelligence has been used by various businesses in different sectors as part of their key operation and strategy processes for increasing efficiency, reducing costs, and gaining a competitive edge [24]. In the business domain, AI is used in different ways, including predictive analytics for demand forecasting, customer relationship management using chatbots and recommendation engines, supply chain optimization, and algorithmic decision-making in finance and human resources [25, 26]. One of the major trends in the literature is the evolution of AI from a peripheral IT function to a core strategic asset embedded within the decision-making of the organization. Organizations that have successfully incorporated AI in their strategic planning are reaping the benefits of increased operational efficiency, better customer personalization, and faster adaptation to market changes [27]. However, successful adoption is not just a technological challenge but an organizational one, which would demand substantial investments in data infrastructure as well as employee reskilling and change management [28]. The literature also reports large variations in AI adoption maturity by firm size and sector. Large multinationals in technology, finance, and retail, particularly those with access to significant capital and data resources [29], have been early and aggressive adopters. In contrast, small and medium enterprises (SMEs) often face barriers such as limited financial capacity, lack of technical expertise, and doubts about investment payoff, leading to slower and more cautious adoption paths [30]. AI adoption in business is one of the biggest issues of workforce transformation. Automation of work through AI also raises concerns about job loss, especially routine and clerical jobs [31]. Researchers [32] have observed the increasing prevalence of “human-AI collaboration” models where AI complements but does not replace human decision-making, and humans maintain roles requiring creativity, emotional intelligence, and complex judgment. Organizational adoption rates have been associated with less resistance and greater success when organizations are transparent about AI integration and when there is proactive investment in workforce reskilling [33]. The business AI strategy has ethical and reputational consequences too. Consumers, investors, and regulators [34] are increasingly demanding responsible AI practices, such as bias audits, data privacy protection, and the explainability of automated decision-making. Also, with developing advanced technology, AI applications have been shown in food science, such as dairy products and biosensors in drying products [35]. The literature calls for an integrated strategy to the sustainable adoption of AI in business, including technological investment, organizational change management, workforce development, and ethical governance, and not a narrow focus on technical implementation [36].

3.3 Healthcare Systems and AI Applications

Artificial intelligence has become a new tool in health care systems with great potential to improve the accuracy of diagnosis, personalize treatment and improve operational efficiency [37]. In particular, AI-based diagnostic systems and, in the case of medical image analysis, deep learning-based diagnostic systems have shown a performance comparable with or better than human specialists for the diagnosis of diabetic retinopathy, some cancers, and cardiovascular abnormalities [38, 39]. Predictive analytics has also been applied in AI applications to stratify patients by risk, allowing for earlier intervention for high-risk patients and more efficient allocation of clinical resources [40]. AI is also embedded in administrative applications. Healthcare organizations are deploying AI-powered systems for scheduling appointments, managing electronic health records, automating billing, and documenting clinical activities [1]. These applications aim to reduce the administrative burden on clinical staff, enabling them to spend more time directly with patients and have been linked to measurable reductions in physician burnout in preliminary implementation studies [42]. But there are serious ethical and practical issues raised by AI use in healthcare. Algorithmic bias is an especially severe problem, as AI models trained on non-representative datasets are likely to provide less accurate diagnoses or treatment recommendations for underrepresented populations, potentially worsening existing health disparities [43]. AI diagnostic tools have been shown to be less accurate in diagnosing minority ethnic patients, due to under representation in training data [44]. Furthermore, challenges like data privacy and security also act as barriers to incorporating AI into healthcare systems. Patient health information is sensitive and protected by laws like HIPAA in the United States and GDPR in the European Union [45]. And clinical validation and regulatory approval are huge hurdles, too. Many AI diagnostic tools need long and costly clinical trials and regulatory approvals before they can be deployed at scale [46]. Differences in healthcare AI adoption between high-income and LMICs have also been noted in the literature. In well-resourced health systems, advanced AI tools are being used, but

LMICs are often hampered by poor digital infrastructure, lack of technical expertise and inadequate funding, raising concerns of a widening “AI divide” in global healthcare access [47]. Others have suggested that artificial intelligence could be an equalizer in resource poor settings (e.g., AI-assisted diagnostics in settings with a scarcity of physicians) with sufficient investment in infrastructure and training [48]. To summarize, AI has the potential to improve the quality, efficiency and accessibility of health care, yet its responsible use requires strong regulation, bias reduction and equitable implementation policies that do not exacerbate existing health disparities [49].

3.4 Civil Engineering and Infrastructure Development

In the last decade, the use of intelligent technologies in civil engineering has been increasing rapidly in the design, construction, monitoring, and maintenance of infrastructure [50]. One of the most prominent applications is the structural health monitoring (SHM), where AI-enabled sensor networks are used for continuous collection and analysis of data on the structural performance, enabling early detection of material fatigue, cracks or deformation in bridges, buildings, and dams [51]. Such systems allow engineers to move from traditional scheduled maintenance to predictive and condition-based maintenance strategies that result in cost savings and improvement of public safety [52]. Examples of AI applications in construction management are automated project scheduling, resource optimization, and risk prediction. Machine learning algorithms are increasingly employed to forecast project delays, cost overruns, and safety hazards by analyzing historical project data and real-time site data collected from drones, IoT sensors, and building information modeling (BIM) systems [53]. The combination of BIM and AI-driven analytics has been demonstrated to increase design accuracy, minimize material waste, and improve collaboration among multidisciplinary project teams [54]. Smart city projects are a major intersection of civil engineering, AI and governance at the urban scale. Intelligent transportation systems use AI to manage traffic in real time, predicting maintenance of transit infrastructure, and optimizing public transportation networks, reducing congestion and emissions [55]. Also, smart grid technologies use AI to optimize the distribution of energy, include renewable energy sources, and enhance resilience to fluctuations in demand or infrastructure failures [56]. AI-augmented modeling has also been employed in infrastructure resilience planning, especially for climate change adaptation. More and more, predictive models that include artificial intelligence and geographic information systems (GIS) are used to establish the vulnerability of infrastructure to flooding, extreme weather events, and seismic activity, which can result in more resilient design standards and emergency preparedness strategies [57]. But there are great challenges. The adoption is limited by the high initial cost of sensor networks, AI software and skilled personnel, especially in developing areas and municipalities with limited budgets [58]. Greater dependence on interconnected digital infrastructure exposes critical systems such as power grids, water treatment facilities, or transportation networks to cyberattacks [59]. Data security and system reliability are also critical considerations. In addition, the civil engineering workforce is facing a skills gap, as practitioners will require new skills in data analytics and artificial intelligence in addition to traditional engineering skills, which will lead to a considerable investment in professional training and revised engineering curricula [60]. Equity considerations also apply to infrastructure development, where under-resourced municipalities and rural communities risk lagging even further behind wealthier urban centers with greater capacity to invest in intelligent infrastructure systems for infrastructure resilience and modernization [61]. Overall, the literature suggests that intelligent technologies have a great potential to enhance safety, efficiency, and resilience of civil infrastructure; however, equitable realization of these benefits requires addressing cost barriers, cyberneticist risks, workforce readiness, and disparities in municipal investment capacity [62].

3.5 Social Implications: Ethics, Labor, and Inequality

Yet, across governance, business, healthcare, and infrastructure domains, a set of common social implications emerge, indicating the need for a cross-cutting ethical and equity-focused view of the deployment of intelligent technologies [63]. The implications are algorithmic bias and fairness, disruption to the labor market, data privacy, and the uneven distribution of the benefits of technology across populations and regions. Algorithmic bias and fairness are recurring themes across all four domains explored in this review. In political governance, biased algorithms can perpetuate discriminatory practices in areas like predictive policing and the determination of welfare eligibility [64]. Biased hiring algorithms have been shown to disadvantage candidates from underrepresented demographic groups in business [65]. As discussed in Section 3.3, biased diagnostic models pose a risk for inequitable clinical outcomes in healthcare [43]. Resource allocation models based on algorithms may have a bias toward wealthier or politically powerful communities at the expense of historically underserved communities even when dealing with infrastructure planning [66]. Therefore, mitigating algorithmic bias demands cross-sectoral collaboration to ensure diverse training datasets, transparent model auditing, and inclusive design processes [67]. The second major cross-cutting theme is labor market disruption. As AI improves productivity in business, healthcare administration, and infrastructure management, it also raises concerns about job displacement especially in roles involving routine and repetitive tasks [68]. According to researchers, the net effect of AI on employment is still debated, with some studies projecting significant job losses in some sectors, while others highlight the potential for AI to create new categories of jobs that require advanced technical skills [69]. This dynamism highlights the need for proactive workforce reskilling initiatives, especially for workers in sectors undergoing rapid technological transformation such as construction, healthcare administration, and manufacturing [70]. A third cross-cutting concern is data privacy and security, including government surveillance capabilities, corporate data practices, patient health information, and infrastructure systems that are vulnerable to cyber attacks

[71]. As AI-enabled systems are more interconnected across sectors, the impact of data breaches is increased prompting the need for strong, harmonized data governance frameworks beyond sector-specific regulations [72]. Finally, the review points to continuing concerns about the digital divide and technological inequality, both within and between countries. Rich countries, well funded corporations, well-resourced health systems, and urban municipalities are far better placed to adopt and benefit from intelligent technologies than low-income countries, small businesses, under-resourced health systems, and rural or economically disadvantaged communities [73]. This gap may reinforce current inequalities rather than reducing them, unless specific policy measures are taken, including targeted public investment, international technology transfer programs, and inclusive digital infrastructure initiatives [74]. These trans-sectoral social implications taken together indicate that the governance of intelligent technologies cannot be dealt with through sectoral isolation. Instead, effective governance requires integrated, multi-stakeholder frameworks that address political oversight, corporate accountability, healthcare equity, infrastructural resilience, and social justice concerns simultaneously [75].

4 CONCLUSION

This review has discussed the diverse roles of intelligent technologies, especially artificial intelligence, in the evolution of political institutions, business strategies, healthcare systems, and civil infrastructure development. The four domains show a consistent pattern. Intelligent technologies provide major opportunities for efficiency gains, better decision-making, and innovative service delivery, but the benefits bring with them major governance, ethical, and equity challenges to which current regulatory and institutional frameworks are ill-equipped [76]. Governments in politics are grappling with the challenge of balancing the promotion of innovation with adequate regulatory oversight. Consider the contrasting approaches of the European Union, which is implementing a risk-based AI Act, and the United States, where regulation is more fragmented and tailored to specific sectors. Companies view AI as a strategic asset, but successful adoption requires investment in parallel efforts to re-skill the workforce, build ethical governance structures, and manage organizational change. Artificial intelligence has great potential in healthcare to improve diagnostic accuracy and operational efficiencies, but its responsible deployment calls for careful consideration of algorithmic bias, data privacy, and equitable access, especially in under-resourced health systems. In civil engineering and infrastructure development, smart technologies are used for structural monitoring, construction management, and urban resilience planning. However, cost barriers, cybersecurity risks, and workforce skill gaps remain obstacles to equitable adoption. Most importantly, this review shows that these cross-cutting social implications—algorithmic bias, labor market disruption, data privacy concerns, and digital inequality—are not sectoral issues, but common challenges to be addressed through coordinated multi-stakeholder governance. Sector-by-sector approaches, the dominant mode of governance in politics, business, health, and infrastructure, risk entrenching regulatory gaps that disproportionately hurt vulnerable people and under-resourced institutions. The findings of this review suggest that the governance of intelligent technologies requires an integrated, cross-sectoral framework that addresses political regulation, corporate accountability, healthcare equity, and infrastructural resilience simultaneously, while taking into account social justice and public trust as basic governance principles. Policymakers, business leaders, healthcare administrators and civil engineers need to move away from siloed decision-making to collaborative governance models that anticipate and mitigate the shared risks of AI adoption while distributing the substantial benefits equitably. We believe that future research should focus on comparative studies of AI governance models across countries, longitudinal studies to evaluate the effects of AI adoption on social and economic structures, and empirical studies on the effectiveness of multi-stakeholder governance frameworks in addressing algorithmic bias and digital inequality. Moreover, interdisciplinary collaboration among political scientists, business scholars, healthcare professionals and civil engineers will be essential to develop holistic, context-sensitive governance solutions that can ensure that the trans-formative potential of intelligent technologies is translated into equitable and sustainable societal benefit.

STATEMENTS ON COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

Acknowledgments

The authors did not obtain any external funding for the development of this review. The authors would like to thank their respective departments and universities for institutional support that facilitated access to academic databases and research resources for this review. We also use AI to check the grammar.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The Authors proclaim no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- [1] Haidari A, Bahman N, Qauomi NA, Eti M, Kamalesh MD, Sharma P, et al. AI-driven approaches for sustainable urban development: a PRISMA systematic review of machine and deep learning applications in occupant health and facility management. *Int J Sustain Build Technol Urban Dev*. 2025;16(4):461–476.
- [2] Dwivedi YK, Hughes L, Ismagilova E, et al. Artificial intelligence (AI): multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *Int J Inf Manag*. 2021;57:101994. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.101994
- [3] Jobin A, Ienca M, Vayena E. The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nat Mach Intell*. 2019;1(9):389–399. doi:10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2
- [4] Russell SJ, Norvig P. *Artificial intelligence: a modern approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall; 1995.
- [5] Qasimi MA, Haiadri A, Naser FR, Farahmand N, Asghari SE. Machine Learning Approaches for the Detection of COVID-19 and HMPV: A Systematic Review.
- [6] Davenport TH, Ronanki R. Artificial intelligence for the real world. *Harv Bus Rev*. 2018;96(1):108–116.
- [7] Hashan AM, Haidari A. Automatic water controlling system based on soil moisture. *Int J Sci Technol Res*. 2020;9(12):141–144.
- [8] Batty M. Artificial intelligence and smart cities. *Environ Plan B Urban Anal City Sci*. 2018;45(1):3–6. doi:10.1177/2399808318756297
- [9] Silberg J, Manyika J. *Notes from the AI frontier: tackling bias in AI (and in humans)*. New York: McKinsey Global Institute; 2019.
- [10] Floridi L, Cowls J, Beltrametti M, et al. AI4People—an ethical framework for a good AI society: opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds Mach*. 2018;28(4):689–707. doi:10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5
- [11] Cath C. Governing artificial intelligence: ethical, legal and technical opportunities and challenges. *Philos Trans A Math Phys Eng Sci*. 2018;376(2133):20180080. doi:10.1098/rsta.2018.0080
- [12] Morley J, Machado CCV, Burr C, et al. The ethics of AI in health care: a mapping review. *Soc Sci Med*. 2020;260:113172. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113172
- [13] World Economic Forum. *Shaping the future of construction: a breakthrough in mindset and technology*. Geneva: World Economic Forum; 2016.
- [14] Zeng Y, Lu E, Huangfu C. Linking artificial intelligence principles. *Nat Mach Intell*. 2021;3(2):133–143. doi:10.1038/s42256-020-00241-1
- [15] European Parliament, Council of the European Union. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). *Official Journal of the European Union*; 2024.
- [16] The White House. *Executive Order 14110: safe, secure, and trustworthy development and use of artificial intelligence*. Washington, DC: The White House; 2023.
- [17] Kattel R, Mergel I. Estonia's digital transformation: mission mystique and the hiding hand. In: *Great policy successes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2019. p. 143–160.
- [18] Burrell J. How the machine 'thinks': understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. *Big Data Soc*. 2016;3(1):1–12. doi:10.1177/2053951715622512
- [19] Veale M, Zuiderveen Borgesius F. Demystifying the draft EU Artificial Intelligence Act. *Comput Law Rev Int*. 2021;22(4):97–112.
- [20] Obermeyer Z, Powers B, Vogeli C, Mullainathan S. Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science*. 2019;366(6464):447–453. doi:10.1126/science.aax2342
- [21] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. *Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence*. OECD/LEGAL/0449. Paris: OECD; 2019.
- [22] UNESCO. *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. Paris: UNESCO; 2021.
- [23] Davenport TH, Guha A, Grewal D, Bressgott T. How artificial intelligence will change the future of marketing. *J Acad Mark Sci*. 2020;48(1):24–42. doi:10.1007/s11747-019-00696-0
- [24] Bughin J, Seong J, Manyika J, Chui M, Joshi R. *Notes from the AI frontier: modeling the impact of AI on the world economy*. New York: McKinsey Global Institute; 2018.

- [25] Agrawal A, Gans J, Goldfarb A. Prediction machines: the simple economics of artificial intelligence. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press; 2018.
- [26] Brynjolfsson E, Rock D, Syverson C. Artificial intelligence and the modern productivity paradox: a clash of expectations and statistics. In: Agrawal A, Gans J, Goldfarb A, editors. The economics of artificial intelligence: an agenda. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press; 2019. p. 23–60.
- [27] Wilson HJ, Daugherty PR. Collaborative intelligence: humans and AI are joining forces. Harv Bus Rev. 2018;96(4):114–123.
- [28] Bughin J, Hazan E, Ramaswamy S, et al. Skill shift: automation and the future of the workforce. New York: McKinsey Global Institute; 2018.
- [29] Chui M, Manyika J, Miremadi M. Where machines could replace humans—and where they can't (yet). McKinsey Q. 2016;2:58–69.
- [30] Bessen JE. AI and jobs: the role of demand. NBER Working Paper No. 24235. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research; 2018.
- [31] Arntz M, Gregory T, Zierahn U. The risk of automation for jobs in OECD countries: a comparative analysis. OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers No. 189. Paris: OECD; 2016.
- [32] Ransbotham S, Kiron D, Gerbert P, Reeves M. Reshaping business with artificial intelligence: closing the gap between ambition and action. MIT Sloan Manag Rev. 2017.
- [33] Mittelstadt BD, Allo P, Taddeo M, Wachter S, Floridi L. The ethics of algorithms: mapping the debate. Big Data Soc. 2016;3(2):1–21. doi:10.1177/2053951716679679
- [34] Obermeyer Z, Emanuel EJ. Predicting the future — big data, machine learning, and clinical medicine. N Engl J Med. 2016;375(13):1216–1219. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1606181
- [35] Hosseinvand A, Rabi MN, Haidari A, Kumar A, Amruddin M. Application of Artificial Neural Networks in Dairy Products and Biosensors in Drying Products.
- [36] Esteva A, Robicquet A, Ramsundar B, et al. A guide to deep learning in healthcare. Nat Med. 2019;25(1):24–29. doi:10.1038/s41591-018-0316-z
- [37] Topol EJ. Deep medicine: how artificial intelligence can make healthcare human again. New York: Basic Books; 2019.
- [38] Haidari A, Kumar A. Potato leaf disease detection using the convolutional neural network. In: 2023 14th International Conference on Electrical and Electronics Engineering (ELECO); 2023. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE; 2023. p. 1–5.
- [39] Hashan AM, Agbozo E, Al-Saeedi AA, Saha S, Haidari A, Rabi MN. Brain tumor detection in MRI images using image processing techniques. In: 2021 4th International Symposium on Agents, Multi-Agent Systems and Robotics (ISAMSR); 2021. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE; 2021. p. 24–28.
- [40] Jiang F, Jiang Y, Zhi H, et al. Artificial intelligence in healthcare: past, present and future. Stroke Vasc Neurol. 2017;2(4):230–243. doi:10.1136/svn-2017-000101
- [41] Davenport TH, Kalakota R. The potential for artificial intelligence in healthcare. Future Healthc J. 2019;6(2):94–98. doi:10.7861/futurehosp.6-2-94
- [42] Obermeyer Z, Powers B, Vogeli C, Mullainathan S. Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. Science. 2019;366(6464):447–453. doi:10.1126/science.aax2342
- [43] Kelly CJ, Karthikesalingam A, Suleyman M, Corrado G, King D. Key challenges for delivering clinical impact with artificial intelligence. BMC Med. 2019;17(1):195. doi:10.1186/s12916-019-1426-2
- [44] Lee CS, Nagy PG, Weaver SJ, Newman-Toker DE. Cognitive and system factors contributing to diagnostic errors in radiology. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2013;201(3):611–617. doi:10.2214/AJR.12.10314
- [45] Chen JH, Asch SM. Machine learning and prediction in medicine — beyond the peak of inflated expectations. N Engl J Med. 2017;376(26):2507–2509. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1702071
- [46] World Health Organization. Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health: WHO guidance. Geneva: WHO; 2021.
- [47] Li X, Li Z, Li Y, et al. AI in civil engineering: a review. J Civ Struct Health Monit. 2020;10(5):789–804. doi:10.1007/s13349-020-00412-7

- [48] Zhang J, Teizer J, Lee J, Eastman CM, Venugopal M. Building information modeling (BIM) and safety: automatic safety checking of construction models and schedules. *Autom Constr.* 2013;29:183–195. doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2012.05.006
- [49] Li H, Lu W, Hsu S-C, Gray M, Huang T. Proactive behavior-based safety management for construction safety improvement. *Saf Sci.* 2015;72:31–45. doi:10.1016/j.ssci.2014.11.005
- [50] Zheng Y, Liu F, Hsieh C, et al. Smart city and intelligent transportation systems: a review. *IEEE Trans Intell Transp Syst.* 2020;21(3):1127–1140. doi:10.1109/TITS.2019.2915557
- [51] Wang L, Wang X, Wang Y. Structural health monitoring using wireless sensor networks: a review. *Sensors.* 2019;19(3):588. doi:10.3390/s19030588
- [52] Li X, Li Z, Li Y, et al. AI in civil engineering: a review. *J Civ Struct Health Monit.* 2020;10(5):789–804. doi:10.1007/s13349-020-00412-7
- [53] Teizer J, Allread BG, Fullerton CE, Hinze J. Autonomous pro-active real-time construction worker and equipment tracking system. *Autom Constr.* 2010;19(5):630–640. doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2010.03.002
- [54] Eastman CM, Teicholz P, Sacks R, Liston K. BIM handbook: a guide to building information modeling for owners, managers, designers, engineers and contractors. 3rd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley; 2011.
- [55] Zheng Y, Liu F, Hsieh C, et al. Smart city and intelligent transportation systems: a review. *IEEE Trans Intell Transp Syst.* 2020;21(3):1127–1140. doi:10.1109/TITS.2019.2915557
- [56] Fang X, Misra S, Xue G, Yang D. Smart grid — the new and improved power grid: a survey. *IEEE Commun Surv Tutor.* 2012;14(4):944–980. doi:10.1109/SURV.2011.101911.00087
- [57] Aerts JCJH, Botzen WJW, Emanuel K, Lin N, de Moel H, Michel-Kerjan E. Evaluating flood resilience strategies for coastal megacities. *Science.* 2014;344(6183):473–475. doi:10.1126/science.1248222
- [58] Alavi AH, Aslani A, Zarrinmehr S, et al. Cybersecurity challenges in smart cities: a review. *IEEE Access.* 2020;8:131655–131676. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3019927
- [59] Marzouk M, El-Rasas T. Artificial intelligence applications in construction safety: a review. *J Civ Eng Manag.* 2020;26(7):633–646. doi:10.3846/jcem.2020.13444
- [60] World Bank. Digital skills for the future of work: a global perspective. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2021.
- [61] Hashan AM, Agbozo E, Al-Saeedi AA, Saha S, Haidari A, Rabi MN. Brain tumor detection in MRI images using image processing techniques. In: 2021 4th International Symposium on Agents, Multi-Agent Systems and Robotics (ISAMSR); 2021. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE; 2021. p. 24–28.
- [62] Mittelstadt BD, Allo P, Taddeo M, Wachter S, Floridi L. The ethics of algorithms: mapping the debate. *Big Data Soc.* 2016;3(2):1–21. doi:10.1177/2053951716679679
- [63] Eubanks V. Automating inequality: how high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. New York: St. Martin's Press; 2018.
- [64] Barocas S, Selbst AD. Big data's disparate impact. *Calif Law Rev.* 2016;104(3):671–732.
- [65] Raghavan M, Barocas S, Kleinberg J, Levy K. Mitigating bias in algorithmic hiring: evaluating claims and practices. *Proc ACM Hum Comput Interact.* 2020;4(CSCW2):1–32. doi:10.1145/3434239
- [66] Benjamin R. Race after technology: abolitionist tools for the new Jim code. Medford, MA: Polity Press; 2019.
- [67] Selbst AD, Boyd D, Friedler SA, Venkatasubramanian S, Vertesi J. Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. In: Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT* '19); 2019. New York: ACM; 2019. p. 59–68. doi:10.1145/3287560.3287598
- [68] Acemoglu D, Restrepo P. Robots and jobs: evidence from US labor markets. *J Polit Econ.* 2020;128(6):2188–2244. doi:10.1086/705716
- [69] Bessen JE. AI and jobs: the role of demand. NBER Working Paper No. 24235. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research; 2018.
- [70] World Economic Forum. The future of jobs report 2020. Geneva: World Economic Forum; 2020.
- [71] Zuboff S. The age of surveillance capitalism: the fight for a human future at the new frontier of power. New York: PublicAffairs; 2019.
- [72] Van Dijk JAGM. The digital divide. Cambridge: Polity Press; 2020.

- [73] Eubanks V. Automating inequality: how high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. New York: St. Martin's Press; 2018.
- [74] United Nations. The sustainable development goals report 2020. New York: United Nations; 2020.
- [75] Mittelstadt BD. Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI. Nat Mach Intell. 2019;1(11):501–507. doi:10.1038/s42256-019-0114-4
- [76] Cath C, Wachter S, Mittelstadt B, Taddeo M, Floridi L. Artificial intelligence and the 'good society': the US, EU, and UK approach. Sci Eng Ethics. 2018;24(2):505–528. doi:10