
INTEGRATING CAUSAL FOUNDATION MODEL IN PRESCRIPTIVE MAINTENANCE FRAMEWORK FOR OPTIMIZING PRODUCTION LINE OEE

A PREPRINT

Felix Saretzky*

Department of Engineering
University of Luxembourg
6, rue Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi
1359 Luxembourg, Luxembourg
felix.saretzky@uni.lu

Lucas Andersen

Department of Computer Science
University of Luxembourg
2, place de l'Université
4365 Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg
lucas.andersen@uni.lu

Thomas Engel

Department of Computer Science
University of Luxembourg
2, place de l'Université
4365 Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg
thomas.engel@uni.lu

Fazel Ansari

Chair of Production and
Maintenance Management
TU Wien
Theresianumgasse 27
1040 Vienna, Austria
fazel.ansari@tuwien.ac.at

December 2, 2025

ABSTRACT

The transition to prescriptive maintenance in manufacturing is critically constrained by a dependence on predictive models. These models tend to rely on spurious correlations rather than identifying the true causal drivers of failures, often leading to costly misdiagnoses and ineffective interventions. This fundamental limitation results in a key-challenge: while we can predict *that* a failure may occur, we lack a systematic method to understand *why* a failure occurs, thereby providing the basis for identifying the most effective intervention. This paper proposes a model based on causal machine learning to bridge this gap. Our objective is to move beyond diagnosis to active prescription by simulating and evaluating potential *fixes* toward optimizing KPIs such as Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE). For this purpose a pre-trained causal foundation model is used as a "what-if" model to estimate the effects of potential *fixes*. By measuring the causal effect of each intervention on system-level KPIs, it provides a data-driven ranking of actions to recommend at the production line. This process not only identifies root causes but also quantifies their operational impact. The model is evaluated using semi-synthetic manufacturing data and compared with a baseline machine learning model. This paper sets the technical basis for a robust prescriptive maintenance framework, allowing engineers to test potential solutions in a causal environment to make more effective operational decisions and reduce costly downtimes.

Keywords Prescriptive Maintenance · Causal Machine Learning · In-context Learning · Foundation Model · Root Cause Analysis

*Corresponding author. Tel.: (+352) 46 66 44 5777.

1 Introduction

Prescriptive analytics (PA) is considered the most complex and sophisticated form of business analytics. Its primary purpose is to identify the best course of action for achieving a specific desired outcome Wissuchek and Zschech [2025]. Unlike descriptive or predictive models, which focus on summarising the past or predicting the future, PA aims to answer the crucial question: "What needs to be done/should be done, and what do I need to do to achieve this?" Wissuchek and Zschech [2025]. The core objective is to generate *actionable decisions* Ansari et al. [2019] that support or automate complex decision-making processes. Wissuchek and Zschech [2025] divide this decision-making process into three phases. In phase 1, evaluation of alternatives, problems are identified and alternative courses of action are generated and evaluated. In phase 2, the most suitable alternative is selected and executed, and phase 3 involves evaluating the effectiveness and results of the decision made. The extensive digitalisation of industrial processes, frequently linked to smart manufacturing and cyber-physical production systems, has generated significant research interest in data-driven decision-making processes, particularly in the context of maintenance planning as applied in prescriptive maintenance Wissuchek and Zschech [2025], Orošnjak, M.; Saretzky, F.; Kedziora, S. [2025]. The objective in this context is to provide *actionable recommendations* for decision-making in order to optimise future maintenance processes and minimise the probability of failures Ansari et al. [2019], Nemeth et al. [(2018)]. The development of prescriptive maintenance models requires the systematic combination of information from the three fundamental stages of knowledge-based maintenance – descriptive, diagnostic and predictive analytics Ansari et al. [2019]. Decision recommendations are generated from derived combination rules Ansari et al. [2019] or predictions based on identified failure patterns Nemeth et al. [(2018)]. These prediction models themselves are based on statistical correlations and patterns present in the training data. To derive recommendations for action and decision-making, predictive models are supported by the use of explainable artificial intelligence Madathil et al. [2025]. For this purpose, post-hoc explanations Belmouadden et al. [2025] and intrinsic models are used to find critical features or perform root cause analysis Muaz et al. [2025], the results of such analyses being used to support decision-making. The application of these methods can lead to reliance on models whose reliability is compromised by the learning of arbitrary or spurious correlations Carloni et al. [2025]. Therefore, predictions from machine and deep learning models alone are often insufficient for data-driven decisions, as a comprehensive understanding of the consequences of an intervention is required Abécassis et al. [2025]. In order to minimise the occurrence of costly misdiagnoses and ineffective technical interventions, it is essential to determine the underlying *cause* of an event as well as quantify the *interventional effect*. Causal inference is a foundational methodology focused on distinguishing true cause-effect relationships from mere statistical associations, essential for robust decision-making and predicting the effects of deliberate interventions Carloni et al. [2025], Abécassis et al. [2025], Pearl [2009]. Causal AI specifically aims to equip machines with the ability to discern these causal relations by modelling underlying data-generating processes Hennebold et al. [2025] to reason across the distinct layers of the causal hierarchy: association, intervention, and counterfactual reasoning Pearl [2009].

Consequently, a gap exists as current prescriptive maintenance methods, rooted in associational logic, are often insufficient for quantifying the causal consequences of an intervention, a challenge this paper addresses: (1) We integrate causal machine learning into the prescriptive maintenance framework in the form of a technical basis. (2) We construct a data generation prior that has been adapted to a manufacturing environment. (3) Our trained foundation model PriMa-Causa for estimating conditional average treatment effects is evaluated using semi-synthetic data sets.

In section 2, we present the decision-making process in prescriptive maintenance, its problems and solutions through causal machine learning. Section 3 presents an automatable technical basis for prescriptive maintenance recommendations and the model architecture. In section 4, we evaluate our model on semi-synthetic manufacturing data. Finally, section 5 summarises the main results and outlines future perspectives.

2 Background

2.1 Generating Recommendations for Action in Prescriptive Maintenance

In phase one of the three-phase decision-making process, according to Wissuchek and Zschech [2025], an adaptive prescriptive analysis system (PAS) identifies problems, generates alternative recommendations for action and classifies them. PriMa is a comprehensive model for prescriptive maintenance with an architecture consisting of four layers. Of particular relevance to the process are layer three, the recommendation and decision support dashboard, and layer four, the semantic learning and inference layer. Layer three is responsible for aggregating the results of the predictive analyses (from layer two) and translating them into concrete recommendations for action. This is primarily done using dynamic rule-based methods. These rules are triggered by combinations of quality-based parameters and the calculated remaining useful life of components. The overarching fourth layer adds a semantic level to this process. It uses case-based reasoning to learn from past experiences and transfer problem solutions to new, similar cases. In addition, ontologies are used to formally structure maintenance knowledge. The combination of these two layers

enables PriMa not only to make predictions, but also to generate optimised recommendations for action and to improve these through continuous learning from previous decisions. In contrast, Padovano et al. [2021] utilize the digital twin as a scenario analysis and testing module to simulate different maintenance and production schedule alternatives and compare their forecasted key performance indicators (KPIs) to determine the best-performing plan. Similarly, Torayev et al. [2023] employ a reinforcement learning agent that, rather than simulating all alternatives, learns an optimal policy to sequentially recommend the most cost-effective manufacturing configurations, proving robust in stochastic environments.

2.2 Challenges with Standard Machine Learning and XAI in Prescriptive Maintenance

Production machines and systems are complex networked technical processes in which faults can propagate, implying that the cause of a fault can produce different symptoms at different locations. In such environments, the causal mechanism is typically determined by physical processes Saretzky et al. [2025]. Another challenge is the dynamic nature of the production process. Due to wear and tear, process modernisation, constantly changing customer requirements and shorter product cycles, components or systems are iteratively replaced or completely retooled. This can limit the availability of data regarding known and unknown causes of machine failures, as there is increasingly more data available on production operated with high OEE and less on production errors or the effects of interventions Hennebold et al. [2025], von Enzberg et al. [2024]. Modelling temporal-spatial dependencies of sensor data as illustrated in Figure 1 requires a methodology that goes beyond the predictive accuracy of machine learning models to decide how to intervene. Standard machine learning methods typically train based on minimising a prediction error, such as the mean square error. However, as Doutreligne and Varoquaux [2025] demonstrate, this approach is insufficient for causal questions, as a model with high predictive quality can systematically provide inaccurate causal estimates. A primary driver of this discrepancy is confounding bias, where unobserved common causes create spurious correlations between the intervention and the outcome Carloni et al. [2025], Abécassis et al. [2025], Doutreligne and Varoquaux [2025]. Relying on purely correlative models, which cannot distinguish these flawed patterns from true effects, therefore carries a significant risk of deriving misleading and potentially costly recommendations for action.




Figure 1: Illustration of the complex dependencies between production data across multiple process stations. Green nodes represent the observed sensor data, while purple nodes represent a latent variable. The arrows represent the physical dependencies.

2.3 Causal Machine Learning in Technical Processes

Several studies use causal artificial intelligence frameworks to improve decision-making in industrial manufacturing and maintenance systems Schwarz et al. [2024], Youssef [2025], Vanderschueren et al. [2022], Madreiter and Ansari [2025]. The challenge is to decouple prescriptive decision-making from potentially error-prone correlation and replacing it with a foundation in causality. Schwarz et al. [2024] developed a framework that uses double machine learning to estimate the causal effect of rework decisions and thus derive a profit-increasing guideline for semiconductor manufacturing. Vanderschueren et al. [2022] use generative models for causal inference to

create individualised and cost-efficient prescriptive maintenance plans from service data based on the estimation of potential outcomes. Madreiter and Ansari [2025] proposed an Overall Sustainable Equipment Effectiveness (OSEE) framework using Dynamic Bayesian Networks to model the causal interdependencies between operational, environmental, and social indicators, supporting prescriptive decision-making through scenario-based simulations. These application-specific approaches are part of a broader trend that Youssef [2025] describes as causality-driven AI. A paradigm that uses methods such as structural causal models (SCMs) to create robust solutions for process optimisation and fault diagnosis. The overarching objective of these studies is to replace purely correlative prescriptions with explicit cause-and-effect models, thereby ensuring that the decision-making frameworks are robust, unbiased, and actionable.

2.4 Summary of Research Gaps

Based on section 1, subsections 2.1 and 2.2, we summarise the gaps as follows:

- (i) Recommendations for action in prescriptive maintenance are often based on expert knowledge and derived rules rather than purely data-driven approaches Ansari et al. [2019], Nemeth et al. [(2018)].
- (ii) The derivation of robust prescriptions is limited by the unavailability structured data regarding fault root causes, executed maintenance measures, and their corresponding interventional outcomes, particularly given the high cost of generating counterfactual evidence through randomised trials von Enzberg et al. [2024]
- (iii) Standard predictive models are insufficient for intervention decisions (prescriptions). Their optimisation for correlative accuracy does not guarantee valid causal inference Carloni et al. [2025], Abécassis et al. [2025], Doutreligne and Varoquaux [2025].
- (iv) Causal methods such as SCMs require causal graphs, which cannot always be derived Hennebold et al. [2025], Saretzky et al. [2025], Madreiter and Ansari [2025].

3 PriMa-Causa




Figure 2: Illustration of the technical basis. Both tasks, on the left, finding root causes of failures, and on the right, recommendations for action, are based on the causal model, which estimates the effects of interventions.

3.1 Technical Basis

To overcome the limitations summarized in subsection 2.4, we introduce a technical basis for actionable recommendations and decision support measures based on causal inference. The core of this technical basis is a pre-trained causal foundation model that is optimised for production machines and functions as a "what-if" simulator, as explained in the following subsections. Figure 2 illustrates that the PriMa-Causa foundation model addresses two main tasks: (1) root cause analysis and (2) prescriptive decision-making. If we use Figure 1 as a reference production machine, the model in (1) addresses *reverse causal questions*, for example Q1: "Why was the quality Y classified as non-conforming for the last ten manufactured units?". While a reverse causal question may not have a single, clearly defined answer Gelman and Imbens [2013], we propose using a series of testable *forward causal questions* or "what-if" simulations regarding potential root causes. Q1 is formulated as an analysis of the causal effect of an intervention on a potential root cause B_1 on the target KPI Y such as quality or OEE. Instead of the observed distribution, the conditional interventional distribution $p(Y|do(B_1 = b_{median}))$ is estimated to quantify the impact of the "what-if" condition. This allows to reliably simulate the causal effects of potential causes on the target metric. Thus, it is possible to validate whether an

intervention at B_1 would remedy the observed non-conforming quality at the target Y or not. In (2), PriMa-Causa can be used to answer forward causal questions, which forms the basis for prescriptive individualized decision-making. Questions such as Q2: "What is the optimal intervention T to optimise a defined target metric Y , given the specific system context X ?" are addressed. The core metric for quantifying this context-specific impact is the Conditional Average Treatment Effect (CATE), formally defined as:

$$\tau(x) = E[Y|do(T = 1), X = x] - E[Y|do(T = 0), X = x] \quad (1)$$

CATE quantifies the expected difference in outcome Y when performing an intervention ($T=1$) versus a reference action ($T=0$), given the specific conditions $X = x$. By comparing the CATE estimates for feasible measures, the system can select and communicate the optimal recommended course of action that is likely to yield the best outcome. This integrated process is illustrated in Figure 2.

3.2 Causal Effect Estimation

Following recent work on causal foundation models Ma et al. [2025], Robertson et al. [2025], PriMa-Causa is based on the Prior-data Fitted Network (PFN) framework Müller et al. [(2022), Hollmann et al. [2025], a methodology employing a transformer architecture to perform Bayesian inference through in-context learning. This approach is adapted for causal effect estimation by pre-training the model exclusively on synthetic datasets generated from a diverse prior over SCMs. During the process of inference, PriMa-Causa employs in-context learning to estimate conditional interventional distributions from observational data. Consequently, the requirement for re-training specific to datasets and the need for a causal graph is eliminated. Robertson et al. demonstrate in Robertson et al. [2025] that a PFN based foundation model can predict interventional outcomes from observational data, and prove that it provides an optimal approximation of the conditional interventional distribution (CID) with respect to the chosen prior over data-generating models. Ma et al. also show that their CausalFM framework Ma et al. [2025], pre-trained with an SCM-based prior, achieves competitive results in estimating CATEs, and this without the need for re-training at inference time. While preserving the underlying transformer architecture, we adapt the synthetic data generation 3.3, model architecture and pre-training to better reflect the specific characteristics of the production environment.

3.3 Synthetic Data Generator

In order to train a PFN, a prespecified prior distribution is required during pre-training. We present a procedural generator that produces synthetic datasets based on SCMs, whereby the topology of these SCMs has been specifically restricted to reflect the known sequential and physical dependencies of a production line shown in Figure 1. The primary goal of this generator is to provide diverse and causally grounded training data to train our model for estimating causal effects Ma et al. [2025], Robertson et al. [2025]. The process of generating a single training batch is deterministic and follows sequential logic to ensure causally interpretable data. Since production processes often have categorical variables (machine states, tool type, quality, etc.) as well as continuous variables (temperature, pressure, cutting speed, etc.), our data generator is based on a Mixed Additive Noise Model (MANM) Ruicong et al. [2025]. As a first step, a directed acyclic graph is instantiated, which maps a technical process chain, as in Figure 1. The graph is generated as a causal process graph (CPG) Saretzky et al. [2025] by topological sorting, whereby the edge probability decreases exponentially with the node distance and the maximum input degree is limited. The graph is also constrained to have a single sink node, which represents the end of the production line. In the second step, a structural causal model is formulated. The abstract CPG is enriched with concrete functional mechanisms. Each node X_i is assigned a structural equation. For continuous target variables, the MANM according to Yao et al. Ruicong et al. [2025] uses an additive noise model. Here, a variable X_i is modelled as a linear or non-linear function of its parent variable PA_i and an additive independent noise term N_i

$$X_i := f_i(PA_i) + N_i. \quad (2)$$

This variable thus describes, for example, the production yield X_i of a process as a function of temperature and pressure PA_i and added randomness N_i . For categorical variables, we use a K-level argmax model as in Ruicong et al. [2025]. A latent score is calculated for each of the K possible categories of a variable X_i . This score is composed of a function of the parent variable PA_i and a noise term $N_{i,k}$ specific to this category. The variable X_i ultimately assumes the category with the maximum score.

$$X_i := \operatorname{argmax}_{k \in 1, \dots, K} (f_{i,k}(PA_i) + N_{i,k}). \quad (3)$$

This variable describes, for example, a welding process whose result is classified into quality classes 1, 2 or 3 ($K = 3$). After assigning the nodes to categorical and continuous, a SCM is available. In the third step, this SCM is used to generate the datasets required for pre-training. First, an observational dataset \mathcal{D}_{obs} is sampled from the SCM to serve as the context, simulating the data available in a real-world setting. Second, an interventional dataset \mathcal{D}_{int} is generated by applying the *do*-operator (e.g., $do(T = t)$) Pearl [2009] within the identical SCM instance to yield the ground-truth potential outcomes. This interventional data serves as the ground-truth data for pre-training.

3.4 Foundation Model

We use the CausalFM Ma et al. [2025] architecture as a basis. A sequence of samples is forwarded as the input to the model. Each sample consists of the current machine state, which comprises all measurable parameters (e.g. the operational temperature in K, or availability of material OK/NOK), whether a treatment is applied (yes/no), and the outcome (e.g. product quality score). We transfer the CausalFM model to the manufacturing domain by generating manufacturing-style SCMs as described in Section 3.3 and further pretrain the foundation model on 1000 additional graphs ($\approx 10\%$ of total pretraining data). This allows us to compute the expected interventional treatment effect (ITE), which is then predicted by the model. The model parameters are updated based on the mean squared error between the predicted and expected loss. We use the Adam optimizer with $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.999$ and a weight decay of $1\text{E} - 5$. In addition, a learning rate scheduler was used with a maximal learning rate of $1\text{E} - 5$ that further decreases the rate when the loss plateaus.

4 Industrial Use Case

In order to use PriMa-Causa to answer questions such as Q1 and Q2 from subsection 3.1, we evaluate the CATE estimation capability, which includes the estimation of the conditional interventional distribution. The evaluation of causal estimation methods is complicated by the fundamental problem of causal inference, as counterfactual outcomes cannot be directly observed for any observation sample. In order to enable an evaluation with a known true causal effect, we construct semi-synthetic data sets based on real production machine data. Our data sets are based on real covariates X from production machines for fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) and are supplemented by a known, synthetically added causal effect to obtain a treatment T and potential outcomes Y_1 and Y_0 . Variations were made in terms of the complexity of the structural relationships (linear, non-linear, treatment probability, overlap, causal effect strength, outcome noise and proportion of treated units). In practice, this technical evaluation serves to validate the core industrial application: enabling a production engineer to provide the current machine state X as in-context data and query the foundation model for the causal effect of a potential intervention T on product quality Y . This quantified CATE estimation provides a direct, evidence-based recommendation, enabling the engineer to prioritize interventions and make prescriptive decisions to optimize the production line OEE.

4.1 Results: CATE Evaluation

We evaluate CATE estimates using the precision of heterogeneous effects (PEHE), calculated using the root mean square error (RMSE) of $\tau(x)$. As a baseline, we use the S-learner Künzel et al. [2019]. Figure 3 visualizes the CATE estimation performance and Table 1 the PEHE results across ten semi-synthetic datasets.

Table 1: Comparison of PEHE results over 10 semi-synthetic FMCG datasets. The PriMa-Causa model demonstrates a lower mean error.

#	PriMa-Causa	S-Learner Künzel et al. [2019]
1	0.615	0.830
2	0.739	0.783
3	0.658	0.828
4	0.691	0.892
5	0.735	0.897
6	0.723	0.841
7	0.638	0.830
8	0.642	0.885
9	0.761	0.846
10	0.757	0.892
mean	0.696	0.852
std.	± 0.054	± 0.038




Figure 3: Global evaluation of CATE estimation performance. The scatter plot compares the predicted versus true CATE for the proposed PriMa-Causa foundation model (teal) and the S-Learner baseline (purple), aggregated across 10 semi-synthetic datasets. The dashed diagonal line represents perfect prediction ($y = x$)

5 Conclusion and Outlook

By integrating causal machine learning, specifically through the development of the PriMa-Causa foundation model, we established a robust technical basis for decision-making in manufacturing environments. The proposed methodology leverages a transformer-based architecture trained on a domain-specific prior of SCMs. This approach enables the estimation of conditional average treatment effects, eliminating the need for manual causal graph construction for machine maintenance. The evaluation based on semi-synthetic FMCG datasets in Figure 3 and Table 1 showed that PriMa-Causa achieved a comparable prediction error (PEHE) with the S-Learner that was specifically optimised for each individual dataset. In particular, a key advantage of PriMa-Causa is that it may be used for different machines since it directly bases its causal effect estimation on the input dataset as compared to S-Learners, which have to be optimised for each machine individually. Moreover, if the machine state changes, for example due to temperature fluctuations, the S-Learner may have to be refitted while PriMa-Causa dynamically incorporates such changes. Future work will focus on expanding the complexity of the synthetic data generator and optimising PEHE accuracy. In addition, we aim to deploy the framework in a production environment to validate the economic impact of the generated recommendations on reducing downtime and maintenance costs in practice, as well as the capability of root cause analysis. Finally, we plan to benchmark our framework’s performance against existing machine and deep learning approaches and to further specialise the model towards the manufacturing context.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the Python libraries utilized in this research. Our implementation uses the CausalPlayground library Sauter et al. [2024] to construct the SCMs. Additionally, we incorporated code from the CausalFM framework Ma et al. [2025] and from TabPFN Hollmann et al. [2025].

References

C. Wissuchek and P. Zschech. Prescriptive analytics systems revised: a systematic literature review from an information systems perspective. *Inf Syst E-Bus Manage*, 2025. doi:10.1007/s10257-024-00688-w.

-
- F. Ansari, R. Glawar, and T. Nemeth. PriMa: a prescriptive maintenance model for cyber-physical production systems. *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing*, 2019. doi:10.1080/0951192X.2019.1571236.
- Orošnjak, M.; Saretzky, F.; Kedziora, S. Prescriptive maintenance: A systematic literature review and exploratory meta-synthesis. *Appl. Sci.*, 2025. doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/app15158507.
- T. Nemeth, F. Ansari, W. Sihn, B. Haslhofer, and A. Schindler. PriMa-X: A Reference Model for Realizing Prescriptive Maintenance and Assessing its Maturity Enhanced by Machine Learning. In *Procedia CIRP*, (2018). doi:10.1016/j.procir.2018.03.280.
- Abhilash Puthanveetil Madathil, Xichun Luo, Qi Liu, Charles Walker, Rajeshkumar Madarkar, and Yi Qin. A review of explainable artificial intelligence in smart manufacturing. *International Journal of Production Research*, 2025. doi:10.1080/00207543.2025.2513574.
- M. Belmouadden, C. Dadouchi, and R. Pellerin. Real-Time Decision Support System for Dynamic Optimization in Multi-Product Process Manufacturing. *IEEE Access*, 2025. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2025.3553034.
- M. Muaz, S. Sajid, T. Schulze, C. Liu, N. Klasen, and B. Drescher. Explainable AI for correct root cause analysis of product quality in injection moulding. *Journal of Manufacturing Processes*, 2025. doi:10.1016/j.jmapro.2025.03.114.
- G. Carloni, A. Berti, and S. Colantonio. The Role of Causality in Explainable Artificial Intelligence. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 2025. doi:10.1002/widm.70015.
- J. Abécassis, É. Dumas, J. Alberge, and G. Varoquaux. From prediction to prescription: Machine learning and causal inference. *Annual Review of Biomedical Data Science*, 2025. doi:10.1146/annurev-biodatasci-103123-095750.
- J. Pearl. *Causality*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Christoph Hennebold, Jonas Krauß, and Marco F. Huber. Synthetic data generation using causal models for injection molding processes. *Procedia CIRP*, 2025. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2025.02.202.
- Antonio Padovano, Francesco Longo, Letizia Nicoletti, Lucia Gazzaneo, Alessandro Chiurco, and Simone Talarico. A prescriptive maintenance system for intelligent production planning and control in a smart cyber-physical production line. *Procedia CIRP*, 2021. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2021.11.307.
- Agajan Torayev, Jose Joaquin Peralta Abadia, Giovanna Martínez-Arellano, Mikel Cuesta, Jack C Chaplin, Felix Larrinaga, David Sanderson, Pedro-José Arrazola, and Svetan Ratchev. Optimal manufacturing configuration selection: Sequential decision making and optimization using reinforcement learning. *Procedia CIRP*, 2023. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2023.09.112.
- Felix Saretzky, Thomas Engel, and Fazel Ansari. Network-based root cause identification to improve oee in high-precision manufacturing. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 2025. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2025.09.406.
- Sebastian von Enzberg, Julian Weller, Jonathan Brock, Silke Merkelbach, Melina Panzner, Jonas Lick, Arno Kühn, and Roman Dumitrescu. On the current state of industrial data science: Challenges, best practices, and future directions. *Procedia CIRP*, 2024. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2024.10.266.
- M. Doutreligne and G. Varoquaux. How to select predictive models for decision-making or causal inference. *Giga-Science*, 14, 2025. doi:10.1093/gigascience/giaf016.
- P. Schwarz, O. Schacht, S. Klaassen, D. Grunbaum, S. Imhof, and M. Spindler. Management Decisions in Manufacturing using Causal Machine Learning – To Rework, or not to Rework?, 2024.
- S. Youssef. *Causality-Driven AI for Manufacturing Systems*, 2025.
- T. Vanderschueren, R. Boute, T. Verdonck, B. Baesens, and W. Verbeke. Prescriptive maintenance with causal machine learning, 2022.
- Theresa Madreiter and Fazel Ansari. Prescriptive decision-making for sustainable production management: An overall sustainable equipment effectiveness (osee) framework using causal ai. *International Journal of Prognostics and Health Management*, 2025. doi:10.36001/ijphm.2025.v16i4.4253.
- Andrew Gelman and Guido Imbens. Why ask why? forward causal inference and reverse causal questions. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2013.
- Y. Ma, D. Frauen, E. Javurek, and S. Feuerriegel. Foundation Models for Causal Inference via Prior-Data Fitted Networks, 2025.
- J. Robertson, A. Reuter, S. Guo, N. Hollmann, F. Hutter, and B. Schölkopf. Do-PFN: In-Context Learning for Causal Effect Estimation, 2025.
- S. Müller, N. Hollmann, S. P. Arango, J. Grabocka, and F. Hutter. Transformers can do bayesian inference. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, (2022). doi:https://arxiv.org/pdf/2112.10510.

-
- N. Hollmann, S. Müller, and L. et al. Purucker. Accurate predictions on small data with a tabular foundation model. *Nature*, 2025. doi:10.1038/s41586-024-08328-6.
- Y. Ruicong, T. Verdonck, and J. Raymaekers. Causal discovery in mixed additive noise models. In *Proceedings of The 28th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2025. doi:https://proceedings.mlr.press/v258/yao25a.html.
- Sören R. Künzel, Jasjeet S. Sekhon, Peter J. Bickel, and Bin Yu. Metalearners for estimating heterogeneous treatment effects using machine learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2019. doi:10.1073/pnas.1804597116.
- Andreas Sauter, Erman Acar, and Aske Plaat. Causalplayground: Addressing data-generation requirements in cutting-edge causality research. *ArXiv*, 2024. doi:https://arxiv.org/pdf/2405.13092.