

Building Trustworthy AI for Materials Discovery: From Autonomous Laboratories to Z-scores

Benhour Amirian ^{*}1, Ashley S. Dale ^{*†}1, Sergei Kalinin ², and Jason Hattrick-Simpers ^{‡1, 3, 4, 5}

¹Department of Materials Science and Engineering, University of Toronto, 27 King's College Cir, Toronto, ON, Canada

²Department of Materials Science and Engineering, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996, USA

³Acceleration Consortium, University of Toronto, 27 King's College Cir, Toronto, ON, Canada.

⁴Vector Institute for Artificial Intelligence, 661 University Ave, Toronto, ON, Canada.

⁵Schwartz Reisman Institute for Technology and Society, 101 College St, Toronto, ON, Canada.

ABSTRACT. Accelerated material discovery increasingly relies on artificial intelligence and machine learning, collectively termed “AI/ML”. A key challenge in using AI is ensuring that human scientists trust the models are valid and reliable. Accordingly, we define a trustworthy AI framework *GIFTERS* for materials science and discovery to evaluate whether reported machine learning methods are *generalizable*, *interpretable*, *fair*, *transparent*, *explainable*, *robust*, and *stable*. Through a critical literature review, we highlight that these are the trustworthiness principles most valued by the materials discovery community. However, we also find that comprehensive approaches to trustworthiness are rarely reported; this is quantified by a median GIFTERS score of 5/7. We observe that Bayesian studies frequently omit fair data practices, while non-Bayesian studies most frequently omit interpretability. Finally, we identify approaches for improving trustworthiness methods in artificial intelligence and machine learning for materials science by considering work accomplished in other scientific disciplines such as healthcare, climate science, and natural language processing with an emphasis on methods that may transfer to materials discovery experiments. By combining these observations, we highlight the necessity of human-in-the-loop, and integrated approaches to bridge the gap between trustworthiness and uncertainty quantification for future directions of materials science research. This ensures that AI/ML methods not only accelerate discovery, but also meet ethical and scientific norms established by the materials discovery community. This work provides a road map for developing trustworthy artificial intelligence systems that will accurately and confidently enable material discovery.

1 Introduction

Artificial intelligence and machine learning (AI/ML) methods are moving materials discovery towards data-driven approaches that yield more successes with fewer resources [30, 33, 71, 174]. AI/ML methods promise to accelerate first principles computations [228], predict experimental process parameters [63], coordinate high-throughput laboratory experiments [2], and more. However, sustaining rapid growth in these areas requires human scientists to trust that AI/ML methods are valid, reliable, and correct.

Trustworthiness in artificial intelligence describes AI/ML models with properties that enable humans to trust the model’s predictions and has been identified as an important component of human-machine interaction [203, 235]. Trustworthy artificial intelligence (TAI) frameworks help AI/ML practitioners address trustworthiness in applications such as healthcare [5], criminal justice [159], natural language processing [46], computer vision [73], and economics [50]. In these cases, TAI frameworks guide the development and implementation of AI by connecting discipline-based methodologies to principles such as *fairness*, *robustness*, and *explainability*. The purpose of

^{*}These authors contributed equally to this work.

[†]ashley.dale@utoronto.ca

[‡]jason.hattrick.simpers@utoronto.ca

this review is to contextualize current best practices within materials science and discovery using a proposed TAI framework for AI/ML methods.

The journey toward TAI began with initiatives such as the European Commission's High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence (HLEG AI) [84], the "trust comparison index" proposed by Floridi et al. [49], and early TAI frameworks [6]. In 2021, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) formalized principles on artificial intelligence [25]. These frameworks guide AI systems beyond technical proficiency and towards ethical integrity, transparency, and reliability—qualities that support responsible AI/ML usage in technical domains.

Proposed frameworks in disciplines beyond materials science vary which aspects of trustworthiness are emphasized. For example, a proposed TAI framework for computer vision identifies transparency, safety and security, privacy, fairness and justice, responsibility, freedom and autonomy, sustainability, and robustness as key elements [73]. Important elements of TAI for natural language processing include machine ethics, toxicity, privacy, fairness and justice, stereotyping, robustness on adversarial demonstrations, and out-of-distribution robustness [46]. TAI for healthcare includes explainable robotics, predictiveness, explainable decision support, trustworthy review of healthcare, data security, transparency, and trustworthy internet of medical things [5]. These technologically-driven frameworks share an emphasis on transparency/explainability/interpretability, social responsibility and fairness, a robustness to attack, and data privacy while emphasizing universal challenges in their respective disciplines. Importantly, these frameworks emphasize principles important to those affected by untrustworthy AI rather than performance metrics.

Trustworthy AI for materials science and engineering represents stakeholder interests in these algorithms and models. Existing TAI frameworks may be adapted to materials science after acknowledging any unique challenges in the domain and the values of the community surrounding the use of these models, including the alignment of AI/ML models with fundamental scientific laws [158, 169] and the integration of data with varying levels of fidelity [10, 31, 43, 225]. This review shows that many principles of TAI are already part of common practice in the materials science field in the form of uncertainty quantification (UQ); a longer discussion of the distinction and connection between TAI and UQ is presented in §2.

We explicitly clarify that the lack of methods to improve, verify, and explain trustworthiness is not unique to materials science and is shared by other disciplines that leverage AI/ML methods. However, because materials discovery intersects physical sciences, engineering, and data science, the materials discovery community possesses a unique perspective on TAI methods that may contribute towards a unifying theory of trustworthiness within the larger AI/ML community. Accordingly, we summarize the state-of-the-art for TAI practices in materials science by contextualizing existing best practices in the materials discovery community with the first proposed trustworthy AI framework for materials science.

The review is organized in the following manner: in section §2, we provide concrete definitions and examples of the proposed framework principles: *generalizability*, *interpretability*, *fairness*, *transparency*, *explainability*, *robustness*, and *stability* (GIFTERS). We next provide case studies for various AI/ML models and applications in materials discovery in §3 that highlight the relationship between the TAI framework and UQ in an experimental context. In §4, we summarize efforts towards TAI methods from outside the materials discovery community followed by a discussion in §5 of directions where TAI will be expected. We hope that this provides a path towards improved AI/ML methodologies in general, and contributes new directions for AI/ML materials discovery research.

2 Components of a Trustworthy AI Framework for Materials Science

In this section, we propose a trustworthy AI framework **GIFTERS**, grounded in the values and needs of the materials science community based on trends observed in the literature. The proposed principles of the framework are *Generalizability*, *Interpretability*, *Fairness*, *Transparency*, *Explainability*, *Robustness*, and *Stability*. In practice, these principles frequently overlap in their methodologies. For example, analysis examining a model's interpretability may also provide information about its explainability [87, 125, 139]. A dataset preparation approach that addresses fairness will likely have implications for the model's generalizability [79, 90, 121]. Accordingly, we emphasize that as the vocabulary surrounding these topics continues to evolve and that depending on usage, there may be overlap, ambiguity, and differences in the naming conventions proposed by various authors cited in this work for their methods. In this work, principles of GIFTERS are quantified based on apparent author intent for the purpose of emphasizing the methods applied to different principles of GIFTERS trustworthiness. We are grateful

for the contributed work in this field, and hope that any re-framing or shift in terminology will not cause offense.

A completely trustworthy AI model may likely—depending on context and use case—require additional principles (e.g., human alignment [82, 170], human accountability [136], environmental impact [12]). There is also an overlap between TAI and the study of ethical AI [134]. The narrow scope of the *GIFTERS* framework omits specific ethical concerns and instead connects common methodologies in the materials science community to the proposed framework principles. Our assertion is that any model ignoring the *GIFTERS* principles will fail to achieve trustworthiness and ethicality when *trustworthiness* and *ethicality* are defined in a broader sense than the proposed framework. The above principles are therefore foundational without being comprehensive.

Each component of the framework is described in more detail in the following subsections, and informs case studies in §3 *Evaluating Models Using GIFTERS Framework*. The descriptions are followed by a discussion of how uncertainty quantification supports trustworthy AI by connecting uncertainty quantification methods to trustworthy AI principles.

Generalizability

A key part of trustworthy AI is generalizability of model performance on unseen data, enabling trust in model predictions when ground-truth values are unknown. Akrouit et al. [4] decompose generalization into three properties: first, a model should maintain performance under distribution shifts, it should be able to learn continuously from different scenarios, and it should adapt quickly to larger datasets and increasingly complex computational environments.

Interpretability

A model is interpretable when its internal reasoning and behavior (i.e., parameters, architecture, and logical process) can be expressed in human-understandable ways. Interpretability enables trust by providing insight into how predictions are produced through a decision-making process that is meaningful to human practitioners [55, 139]. Interpretable AI leverages model design methods such as surrogate modeling [29], selection of different basis kernels [8], or decision trees [166]. Interpretable methods for non-linear models may leverage feature engineering [131, 176] or symbolic regression [104, 120]. However, most large, non-linear model architectures (including neural networks, convolutional neural networks, and transformers) leverage explainability methods as discussed *vide infra*, sacrificing interpretability for improved performance.

Fairness

A fairly trained model avoids introducing or amplifying data biases, whether those affect individuals [126], groups [80, 95], or, in materials science, classes of materials [78, 101, 124]. For a comprehensive overview of fairness strategies see Barocas et al. [11]; proposed techniques for bias mitigation include addressing selection, sampling, and labeling biases, and fair training protocols discussed involve resampling, adversarial learning, and post hoc calibration.

Transparency

A transparent model provides open access to a model’s structure and parameters, training and testing data, and the software for training, testing, and deploying the model. This enables future model users to understand and repeat each step in the development process of the model. Transparency has been recognized as an important issue [172, 197, 218], and efforts to standardize transparency are presented at length in §4.

Explainability

Explainability enables trust through model predictions that can be understood in the context of input data, typically by implementing a second model to explain the first model. Single instance explainability methods, such as counterfactual explanations [212], are distinct from methods that explain global feature usage such as SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) analysis [118], Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations (LIME) analysis [157], and partial dependence plots [161]; the latter are ubiquitous within machine learning for materials science [154, 187]. For a comprehensive overview of different explainability methods, we refer the reader to existing reviews of this topic [139, 198, 234].

Robustness

Robustness enables trust that the model has learned a meaningful representation of the problem that is not dependent on noise in the data. Within materials science, robustness ensures meaningful predictions in the presence of variations in data due to noise. Noise, the stochastic perturbations that obscure true material properties, is a key aspect of data and well documented within materials science research. Measurement noise arises from experimental imprecision such as shot noise in X-ray diffraction [178], and sampling noise may be introduced by limited or biased dataset curation [48]. Table 1 lists the key methods for quantifying different types of noise in materials ML.

Table 1: Methods and tools for quantifying different types of noise in machine learning for materials discovery.

Type of Noise	Methods/Tools	Description	References
Measurement Noise	Gaussian process regression (GPyTorch), Bayesian neural networks (PyTorch)	Estimate noise in experimental data by modeling it statistically, giving confidence levels for predictions.	[56]
Sampling noise	Stratified sampling, Discrepancy measures (Scikit-learn)	Ensure data represents all material types, reducing bias in predictions.	[143]
Label noise	Confident learning (cleanlab), Robust loss functions (PyTorch)	Identify and fix wrong labels by checking model agreement or using error-tolerant math.	[57, 135]

Stability

Given small variations in model hyperparameters or model weights, a stable model will converge to an equivalent final state after training. Stability enables trust that the model results are representative of the data, and not due to selections in hyperparameters. The predictions of a stable model depend more on the input data than on hyperparameters such as random seed, batch size, or learning rate used when training the model. This property provides evidence that the data is featurized and the optimization problem is formulated in a way to promote accurate outcomes [221]. Within materials science, the requirement for model predictions to be driven by data and not by hyperparameters is motivated by the desire for physically-aligned modeling approaches.

Uncertainty Quantification and Trustworthy AI

Uncertainty quantification (UQ) for materials science is a well-developed and continually growing area of research [97, 171]. To connect UQ to trustworthy AI, it is helpful to briefly review sources of uncertainty and the two existing statistical approaches exist for uncertainty estimation. Bayesian uncertainty incorporates prior physical knowledge, such as crystal symmetries, into posterior distributions [60]. In contrast, non-Bayesian uncertainty leverages frequentist methods such as ensemble-based variance decomposition that estimate uncertainty through model diversity without relying on explicit priors [7], and can introduce flexibility at the cost of interpretability[70]. Finally, UQ estimates are commonly calibrated against an arbitrary statistical model [70, 141, 149].

Although UQ is a source of methodologies and metrics, its contribution to trustworthiness originates in how UQ values are calculated, implemented and reported. Different methods of predicting uncertainty are known to result in different uncertainty estimates as visualized in Figure 1 Tran et al. [195] where a combined modeling approach, convolution-fed Gaussian process (CFGP), outperformed Bayesian neural networks [86] and Gaussian process models [17]. When an ensemble model method is used to predict the uncertainty [151], the uncertainty may speak to the stability of the modeling approach rather than uncertainty in the data.




Figure 1: Overview of various machine learning-based UQ methods. The figure illustrates six different strategies for predicting DFT-calculated adsorption energies (ΔE) and their associated uncertainties, including a standard crystal graph convolutional neural network (CGCNN), Bayesian neural network, in-series NN (NN Δ NN), Gaussian process, dropout NN, and the CFGP. Each method differs in how it estimates prediction mean (μ) and standard deviation (σ), with the CFGP achieving the best overall performance in terms of calibration, sharpness, and negative log-likelihood. Reproduced with permission [195]. Copyright 2020 IOP Publishing.

Finally, there are aspects of TAI that are not connected to established UQ metrology. Specifically, *transparency* specifies access to information about the model and not just access to the model itself. Metrics for software and hyperparameter accessibility exist [69, 175], but the social sciences grounding these metrics center human-alignment and stakeholder interests rather than statistical models. Broader principles of TAI may not use any analytical model for evaluating aspects of trust. For example, human accountability may be evaluated in the context of whether model development has followed an established procedure [220], while environmental impact (e.g., as quantified by energy consumption [64]) may be evaluated using experimental data. As a result, UQ informs and provides a mathematical approach to some aspects of trustworthy AI, but cannot substitute for a trustworthy AI framework.

3 Evaluation Using GIFTES Framework

Trustworthy AI/ML for materials discovery is particularly beneficial when experiments are expensive with uncertainty outcomes. Bayesian methods for scientific research minimize uncertainty by combining prior knowledge with new data, then generate predictions with confidence estimates. Non-Bayesian approaches typically emphasize performance, and may consider uncertainty through a separate process such as quantile or heteroscedastic regression for aleatoric noise and deep ensembles or bootstrap resampling for epistemic variance [180]. In the following section, we evaluate Bayesian and non-Bayesian studies with the GIFTES framework.

Selection and Scoring Approach

To examine GIFTERS principles in state-of-the-art research, we examined 63 papers selected for their use of experimental data in model validation, diverse model architectures and algorithms, and the inclusion of both Bayesian [1, 13, 34, 35, 37, 44, 59, 62, 66, 88, 92, 96, 102, 114, 119, 140, 142, 155, 162, 173, 181, 183, 184, 190, 192, 199, 202, 208, 223, 231, 233] and frequentist approaches to statistics [29, 36, 39, 61, 72, 85, 97, 99, 100, 107–109, 124, 127, 130, 132, 138, 156, 163, 168, 177, 179, 189, 204, 205, 207, 214, 219, 229, 232, 234, 237]. The purpose is to capture a broad picture of how the materials science community uses AI/ML by creating a benchmark analysis of commonly included trustworthiness aspects. Each study was scored (i.e., 0 or 1) against the seven core attributes of trustworthy AI in the GIFTERS framework: generalizability, interpretability, fairness, transparency, explainability, robustness, and stability, as shown in Figure 2. The evaluation results are presented in Table 2.




Figure 2: GIFTERS-based categorization of trustworthiness attributes for Bayesian and non-Bayesian AI/ML papers: generalizability, interpretability, fairness, transparency, robustness, explainability, and stability.

The most commonly discussed attribute in all studies was generalizability where the method for demonstrating generalizability typically relied on selecting a test set with specific properties (e.g. an omitted material group) or preserved performance of a model trained using theoretical data when evaluating experimental data as in [107, 124, 204]. Transparency is typically demonstrated in these works through open, interpretable workflows including model design, training code, and UQ logic; unless a unique method was implemented we omit discussing methods for transparency in the following case studies. Fairness appears least often in Bayesian approaches, with five papers discussing it directly. For non-Bayesian approaches, stability was most often overlooked. In the following section, we present case studies from materials science to explain how each of these attributes is addressed in greater detail.

Materials Discovery Case Studies

We begin with a study that emphasizes trustworthiness through a structured approach to uncertainty-aware prediction in catalysis using Bayesian neural networks [62]. This work benchmarks three UQ methods—k-fold ensembling [14], Monte Carlo dropout [52], and evidential regression [145]—within a crystal graph convolutional neural network architecture [222] to predict adsorption energies in the OC20 dataset. The outputs are scored using a set of five diagnostic metrics: accuracy, sharpness, dispersion, calibration, and tightness, as shown in Figure 3.

Table 2: GIFTERS scores for every paper reviewed, sorted alphabetically by first author. Items scored “1” are shaded for visibility.

Reference	G	I	F	T	E	R	S	Score
Adams et al. [1]	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	5
Battalgazy et al. [13]	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4
Chatterjee and Ray [29]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Chitturi et al. [34]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
De Backer et al. [35]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Deng et al. [36]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Diwale et al. [37]	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	4
Drakoulas et al. [39]	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	5
Feng et al. [44]	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	4
Gongora et al. [59]	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4
Griffin et al. [61]	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	5
Gruich et al. [62]	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	5
Hart et al. [66]	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
Hong et al. [72]	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	5
Jones et al. [85]	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	5
Kailkhura et al. [88]	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	5
Khatamsaz et al. [92]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Kondo et al. [99]	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	6
Kobayashi et al. [96]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Koizumi et al. [97]	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Kovacs et al. [100]	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	4
Kusne et al. [102]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Li et al. [109]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Li et al. [108]	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
Li et al. [107]	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	5
Liang et al. [114]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Mäkinen et al. [119]	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	5
Merchant et al. [124]	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	5
Moon et al. [127]	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	5
Mousavi et al. [130]	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	4
Muroga et al. [132]	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3
Owen et al. [140]	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	6
Oviedo et al. [138]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Ray et al. [155]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Reinbold et al. [156]	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	4
Sabanza-Gil et al. [162]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Sarma et al. [163]	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	5
Sharma et al. [168]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Shields et al. [173]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Singh et al. [177]	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4
Sodaei et al. [179]	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	5
Startt et al. [181]	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4
Talapatra et al. [184]	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	4
Tagade et al. [183]	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	4
Tian et al. [189]	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	5
Tian et al. [190]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Todorović et al. [192]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Vandermause et al. [199]	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	5
Wakabayashi et al. [202]	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	5
Wang et al. [208]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Wang et al. [205]	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	6
Wang et al. [207]	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	4
Wang et al. [204]	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	5
Wieczorek et al. [214]	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	5
Wu et al. [219]	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	4
Xu et al. [223]	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	5
Zhang et al. [229]	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	4
Zhao et al. [231]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Zheng et al. [232]	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	4
Zhong et al. [234]	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	6
Zhong et al. [233]	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Zou and Tiwary [237]	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	4
Average	0.8709	0.7258	0.4677	0.7742	0.7903	0.6935	0.6451	4.967




Figure 3: Three-step uncertainty-aware workflow. Step 1 applies one of three UQ modules, k-fold ensemble, Monte Carlo dropout, or evidential regression, to generate predictions with error bars. Step 2 scores those outputs with accuracy, sharpness, dispersion, calibration, and tightness metrics. Step 3 charts high versus low trust cases, giving users an assessment of model reliability. Reproduced with permission [62]. Copyright 2023 IOP Publishing.

This figure captures how UQ methods are commonly implemented in materials science studies [173], and how stability (via convergence sensitivity tests with respect to loss hyperparameter λ and ensemble size) and interpretability (with CGCNN as an accurate and interpretable architecture) are incorporated into a clear approach for building trust in the study outcomes.

While handling uncertainty is key, interpretability and explainability also shape how predictions guide real-world materials design. Startt et al. [181] explore this through a multi-objective Bayesian optimization framework for finding optimal high-entropy alloy compositions (Figure 4). The goal is simple: search composition space

efficiently, make the trade-offs visible, and check the best picks with an independent physics model.




Figure 4: Workflow for multi-objective Bayesian optimization of high-entropy alloys using TS-EMO, illustrating interpretable surrogate modeling, explainable decision acquisition, and generalizability across compositional space. Reproduced with permission [181]. Copyright 2024 Nature Publishing Group UK London.

TS-EMO supports TAI interpretability through Gaussian process surrogates that make model behavior legible. Explainability comes from the acquisition logic and Pareto visualization, which show why a composition is selected and what is gained along the front. The workflow also shows stability: repeated optimizations converge to similar Pareto fronts and hypervolume values. Robustness is suggested by consistent trends across MD and DFT, even without explicit noise tests.

In chemical synthesis, experimental design via Bayesian optimization (EDBO) framework explored large reaction spaces with over 100,000 configurations [173]. Synthesis planning improved when combining model-based optimization, automated experiments, and mechanistic insight (Figure 5).




Figure 5: Summary of the EDBO framework: (a) reaction space and synthetic complexity for a multistep inhibitor target; (b) mechanistic input, experimental design, and surface modeling; and (c) visualization of optimization trajectory within a high-dimensional design space, balancing exploration and exploitation. Reproduced with permission [173]. Copyright 2021 Nature Publishing Group UK London.

Mechanistic variables and reaction-specific features improve interpretability. Using t-distributed stochastic neighbor embedding (t-SNE) projections to visualize model decisions across the design space and differentiate between exploration and exploitation behavior improves explainability. The paper also speaks to robustness and stability.

Repeated runs and alternative encodings show low variance and low worst-case loss, and similar outcomes from different starts.

While the previous example focused on chemical synthesis, Kailkhura et al. [88] build a reliable and explainable pipeline for materials data that emphasizes fairness. It tackles skewed datasets, makes decisions traceable, and checks confidence. Figure 6 puts the pieces together.




Figure 6: Workflow and results from the reliable and explainable machine-learning pipeline for accelerated materials discovery: (a) end-to-end process showing class partitioning, balanced training, per-class modeling, and rationale generation; (b) histograms of property distributions, highlighting data imbalance; (c) class-specific performance metrics for a baseline gradient-boosted regressor, revealing weaker predictions for minority classes; and (d) performance gains from the proposed method with transfer learning, showing the largest improvements in minority classes. Reproduced with permission [88]. Copyright 2019 Nature Publishing Group UK London.

This study touches on many parts of trustworthy AI. In addition to fairness, interpretability comes from using separate models for each class instead of one large, opaque model. The rationale generator and clear routing steps make the decision process easier to follow, improving explainability. Robustness is strengthened by adding uncertainty estimates and a trust score that flags predictions in risky regions. Finally, stability shows up in the consistent results seen under different thresholds and cross-validation folds.

Bayesian methods can also support faster discovery by improving how experiments are planned across different levels of accuracy and cost. Sabanza et al. [162] explored this in a multi-fidelity optimization framework for materials and molecular discovery. The method balances high-fidelity (costly and accurate) with low-fidelity (inexpensive and approximate) experiments under resource constraints. Figure 7 illustrates the rule-based decision chart, principled kernel design, and an iterative selection mechanism to decide when multi-fidelity approaches are advantageous.




Figure 7: Overview of multi-fidelity Bayesian optimization (MFBO) strategy: (a) the iterative selection process between low-fidelity (LF) and high-fidelity (HF) experiments, followed by model retraining; (b) simple regret curves showing MFBO outperforming single-fidelity and random strategies across budget; (c) ratio of LF to HF queries used across three chemistry tasks; and (d) a decision guide recommending MFBO when the LF source is inexpensive and sufficiently predictive. Reproduced with permission [162]. Copyright 2025 Nature Publishing Group US New York.

This study addresses several core TAI attributes. Stability comes from careful hyperparameter choices, including kernel scaling factors $l_0 = \frac{2}{3}$ and $l_1 = \frac{1}{3}$, which preserve meaningful cross-fidelity correlations. Robustness is evident in consistent performance across different LF cost and quality settings. Interpretability relies on simple regret metrics, structured decision rules, and clear kernel formulations. Explainability benefits from visual summaries that link performance to cost and fidelity use.

An example of TAI principles implemented in high-throughput screening study with non-Bayesian modeling was reported by Li et al. [107] and visualized in Figure 8. The dataset was de-biased by resampling, introducing fairness. Two independently-trained ensembles demonstrated stability. The feed-forward neural network (FNN) models in this work are not interpretable according to the definition of §2, SHAP [118] analysis was introduced for explainability.




Figure 8: Machine learning-guided screening and experimental validation of heat-resistant polysulfates for electrostatic energy storage: (a) three-dimensional design space of predicted T_g , E_g , and dielectric constant k used to select candidates P4, P5, and P6; (b) comparison of these candidates against commercial and lab-customized dielectric polymers; and (c) illustration of the FNN model architecture and input features, including Morgan fingerprint and Morgan fingerprint with frequency to explore the transition temperature, T_g versus electronic bandgaps, E_g , for various dielectric constants, k , across the full polymer library. Reproduced with permission [107]. Copyright 2025 Nature Publishing Group.

A unique approach to non-Bayesian TAI was used when identifying a polarization switching mechanism for ferroelectric thin films [61]. Explainable methods such as k-means clustering were combined with fair data approaches to remove outlier and noisy data that would otherwise bias the model. The dimensionality reduction technique implemented an interpretable model with two hyperparameters, and a model stability study found that the predicted switching mechanism depended on the hyperparameter selection.

Another example of comprehensive TAI is demonstrated by Merchant et al. [124], where graph-based models were tasked with predicting new compounds (Figure 9).




Figure 9: A summary of the GNoME-driven discovery process illustrates how model-based filtering and DFT validation form: (a) data flywheel that continuously enhances prediction accuracy; (b) the exploration powered by GNoME has resulted in the identification of 381,000 new stable materials—nearly an order of magnitude more than previously reported efforts; and (c) the framework demonstrates emergent generalization capabilities when evaluated on out-of-domain structures generated via random structure search, highlighting GNoME’s potential as a universal energy prediction model. Reproduced with permission [124]. Copyright 2023 Nature Publishing Group.

Deep ensembles indicated stability, and uncertainty quantification used the median rather than the mean statistic. Fairness was addressed through an unique encoding scheme that prevented identical samples from accidentally appearing in both training and testing data splits. Robustness was evaluated by training the model on data sampled at $T = 400\text{K}$, then evaluating the model on data sampled at both $T = 400\text{K}$ and $T = 1000\text{K}$.

Summary of GIFTES Analysis

These studies show that both Bayesian and non-Bayesian approaches contribute to TAI in materials science by integrating data-driven models with physics-based insights, offering scalable alternatives to probabilistic methods. However, some common trends were found in the works reviewed using the GIFTES framework.

First, most works prioritized a few aspects of TAI and omitted others; this is captured by an average GIFTES score of 4.96/7 and a median score of 5 as shown in Table 2. In some cases, omitting an aspect of TAI (i.e., interpretability for large neural network models) was justifiable, and indicates a need for new and better methods. However, an average of 4.96 indicates that most works omitted at least two of the seven principles included in the GIFTES framework. In addition to four materials science studies that included all GIFTES principles [36, 109, 138, 208], the following section presents a study from climate research that demonstrates a comprehensive approach to TAI in other scientific domains as an example of how other domains are addressing this challenge.

A second trend observed concerns *transparency*. In this review, if authors fully or partially released open source software to support their published results, their work received a “1” for *transparency* to emphasize that the authors viewed transparency as important. However, software quality and associated metrics were not reported in any study, and standard software engineering methods such as unit testing for correctness were rarely implemented. This omission speaks directly to the reproducibility crisis in scientific results [150, 167]. Expecting materials data-scientists to test and document their software is reasonable, in the same way that implementing calibration standards and reporting calibration results for experimental equipment is standard practice. Metrics for quantifying and reporting AI/ML software quality are leveraged in other domains, and we discuss these methods in the following section.

Like transparency, *generalizability* of machine learning models and methods was emphasized in the works reviewed. However, there was less clarity when reporting the difference between generalization for *interpolation* tasks versus *extrapolation* tasks. This distinction is important to scientific AI/ML; physical models that capture fundamental characteristics and mechanisms are expected to generalize from one dataset to the next [211]. Metrics to evaluate differences in data distributions exist (e.g., earth mover distance [21], Jensen-Shannon divergence [41]), and in the following section we present studies where these metrics are leveraged to add trustworthiness to statements regarding generalizability.

Differences appear between how trustworthiness is reported for Bayesian and non-Bayesian methods in materials science; we first discuss work using Bayesian methods. Bayesian work rightfully focuses on correctly quantifying uncertainty and estimating the posterior. The main risk is learning the wrong posterior. For example, data augmentation can change the effective likelihood, priors and likelihoods can be misspecified, and approximate inference can introduce bias [123]. These risks are supported by data from full batch Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) studies [77]. This connects directly to fairness. An imbalanced materials science dataset will still yield a confident posterior that reflects the imbalance [101]. Reporting uncertainty, physics-informed modeling, or implementing priors does not remove data bias. Instead, active strategies like stratified sampling, rebalancing, or fairness constraints during training are necessary to address fairness.

In non-Bayesian ML for materials science, model stability studies may be de-prioritized in favor of reporting high accuracy or novel discoveries. Testing stability often means repeating the training process for a model with different hyperparameters [47], increasing required compute resources. Without this additional evaluation, what looks solid may in fact be fragile and the true strength of the model remains unknown [45, 133]. The complexity of machine learning optimization means small changes lead to different results, so that hyperparameter optimization is de-emphasized. Only when it is evident that results are not dependent on a single selection of hyperparameters can one have confidence in these models.

4 Trustworthy AI Methods in the Broader Community

Trustworthy AI is no longer optional, especially in areas where decisions have real-world impact. Earlier in this review, we explored how methods contribute to building trustworthy AI/ML systems for materials discovery. We also identified key gaps in how some attributes are handled; broadly speaking, there is a strong (but inconsistent) reliance on statistical methods for evaluating models, a deficiency when considering methods that quantify transparency, and a tendency to consider reporting a few principles of trustworthiness sufficient. Because the materials science community has already indicated it considers TAI important, there is a need for methodologies and best-practices that support trustworthiness.

Importantly, these challenges are not unique to materials science. Other domains such as healthcare, environmental science, and public safety are confronting similar issues and have reported practical approaches to address them. Their experiences offer valuable insights that can be adapted and extended to the needs of materials discovery. In the following sections, we identify works with methods that may transfer well to materials science problems and illustrate how trustworthiness is discussed in a broader context.

Comprehensive Trustworthiness

A strong example of comprehensive trustworthiness from outside materials science comes from climate research. A recent review showed how AI is used to detect, predict, and explain extreme events (e.g., floods, heatwaves, wildfires, and droughts) (Figure 10). The work addresses core TAI principles through methods familiar to materials science such as SHAP values and gradient maps, but also leveraged potentially-valuable techniques. For example adapting prototype layers in neural networks [112] that use real-world examples which closely match a prediction could help material scientists trace specific outcomes back to microstructural features or chemical compositions. Another technique, counterfactual reasoning [200], explored what might have happened under different conditions such as what outcome results if a heatwave had not been driven by greenhouse gases. Counterfactual approaches for materials science are being developed [188] but not widely implemented; this could enable researchers to test ideas before running expensive experiments or simulations, e.g., whether material behavior might alter under different conditions.




Figure 10: Overview of AI methods applied to extreme climate events with emphasis on trust elements: (a) drought analysis integrates explainable AI with multimodal data and feature attribution; (b) heatwave prediction uses interpretable feature engineering and dimensionality reduction; (c) wildfire and PyroCb forecasting combines explainable models with causal inference; and (d) flood modeling illustrates risk communication and AI-driven report generation for preparedness and response. Reproduced with permission [24]. Copyright 2025 Nature Publishing Group UK London.

The review also highlighted the role of communication in building trust, relating aspects of transparency, explainability, and generalizability to broader TAI ideas of human alignment and accountability. Interfaces such as warning dashboards, simplified summaries generated by language models, and standard report formats help public safety officials understand predictions and uncertainties quickly. In materials science, making results easier to understand could support human-in-the-loop analysis, leading to better human accountability and checks for human alignment.

Fair Data Practices

Building on the climate science example, we now turn to another domain where trust in AI/ML is not optional: healthcare. A recent paper by [105] introduces a multimodal artificial intelligence for ventricular arrhythmia risk stratification (MAARS), a multimodal model designed to predict sudden arrhythmic death in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. What makes MAARS stand out is not just its performance, but how it actively addresses key elements of TAI including fair data practices.




Figure 11: Subgroup performance analysis of the MAARS model versus clinical risk guidelines in predicting sudden cardiac death among hypertrophic cardiomyopathy patients. Panels (a) and (b) show AUROC and balanced accuracy across sex, while (c) and (d) present the same metrics across three age categories. Reproduced with permission [105]. Copyright 2025 Nature Publishing Group UK London.

In this work, the authors reported balanced accuracy within 0.05 and stable area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC) across age and sex groups. In addition to methods already discussed such as SHAP and attention maps [160], a key method used in this work was the mid-fusion transformer, which let different data types (e.g., images, reports, and clinical records) interact within the model by creating a separate model branch for each kind of data; this addressed dataset fairness by reducing dataset bias while preventing overfitting due to reduced variance. Materials research often combines microscopy, diffraction, and composition data, so multimodal data fusion could be useful.

The criminal justice field provides another example of the need for fair data practices. A recent study introduced the recidivism clustering network (RCN), a framework that reduces bias and improves trust in risk predictions [28]. The approach combines multiple methods: class balancing (SMOTE), clustering methods (k-means, principal component analysis, t-SNE), deep learning, and SHAP explanations to assess recidivism. High accuracy was emphasized, along with decisions that can be explained, reviewed, and aligned with legal standards. Fairness in this study addressed data and features. For example, class imbalance was corrected with SMOTE so that minority cases were not lost during training. Class proportions were maintained constant in training and validation using a stratified 80/20 split. The model's feature usage was evaluated using SHAP to ensure predictions were not influenced by proxy variables. Complementing this, clustering with k-means, PCA, and t-SNE helped check whether particular groups were over- or under-represented. These methods can be turned into practical steps for fair data use in materials science. For instance, rare phases or underrepresented processing routes can be balanced by using oversampling or augmentation. Instead of sampling artifacts, stratified splits guarantee that reported performance accurately represents the distribution of materials. Once bias is found, the fairness issue can be resolved by adjusting the feature, reweighting the data, and repeating the process. Fairness is incorporated into the model's interpretation of the data to minimize imbalance and proxy effects at their origin.




Figure 12: Overview of the RCN framework for criminal justice applications. The pipeline integrates case data, data rebalancing (synthetic minority over-sampling technique), clustering, deep neural modeling, and SHAP-based explainability to support fair and interpretable court decision predictions. Visualizations at left and right show input feature distributions and learned offender clusters. Reproduced with permission [28]. Copyright 2025 Elsevier.

Educational AI is another high-stakes setting for data fairness because model decisions can shape access, achievement, and long-term opportunities for students. Pham et al. [146] strengthen trustworthiness by moving fairness upstream into the data itself. Their method offers a practical way to create more equitable educational analytics by reducing group disparities without compromising accuracy on both public and institutional datasets. (Figure 13).




Figure 13: Fairness evaluation of machine learning models in educational applications: (a) key fairness metrics; (b) fairness results showing how each model handles bias for attributes like gender, race, age, disability, health, debtor status, and birthplace; (c) SPD values across sensitive features when using the baseline, LTDD, and the new FAIREDU method; and (d) SPD results across datasets, showing that FAIREDU improves fairness compared with baseline and LTDD while preserving accuracy. Reproduced with permission [146]. Copyright 2025 Elsevier.

Fairness in this study is addressed at the data stage, before any model is trained. The authors present FAIREDU, a pre-processing technique that eliminates statistical connections between sensitive (e.g., age, gender, or race) and non-sensitive (e.g., math score) variables in order to improve feature representation. This is achieved through multivariate regression on the training set applied to the test set, preventing downstream models from learning proxy signals. The repaired data is evaluated with standard fairness metrics (Figure 13a). Because the method is model-agnostic, it can be compared fairly against a wide set of baselines, including fair-SMOTE, reweighing (RW), disparate impact remover (DIR), and linear-regression-based training data debugging (LTDD).

These steps map directly to fair-data practices in materials science. In this case, sensitive attributes could be the instrument type, synthesis route, or lab or site of origin. To eliminate hidden proxies, regression-based correction may be applied to compositional features or microstructural descriptors. To make sure that evaluations represent actual distributions rather than sampling bias, stratified k-fold splits across phases, composition ranges, or processing routes are used. Reporting fairness metrics across significant subgroups and comparing them to re-sampling or reweighting techniques can convey trustworthiness. Collectively, the main takeaway is fix the features first, then use metrics to confirm.

Quantifying Generalizability

Generalization can be achieved by using various methods during training the model, including data manipulation, representation learning, and learning paradigms [75, 83, 185, 194, 201, 206]. Generalization is ideally evaluated by quantifying model performance on out-of-distribution (OOD) test datasets [110, 113]. Different measures such as the Wasserstein distance and Mahalanobis distance can be used to measure the difference between the data distribution used during training and the OOD data distribution used during testing [103, 147]. Additional methods for quantifying OOD-ness include embedding trajectory for generative language models [209], and considering which features are used to generate a prediction [182].

Researchers have begun to tackle generalization errors due to domain shift, continual learning, and scaling by developing ways to test and track generalization (Figure 14).




Figure 14: Quantify generalizability across AI systems: (a) summarizes an evaluation taxonomy that links desired properties (e.g., few-shot learning, robustness to shifts/OOD data, compositionality, explainability) to appropriate testing protocols [76]; (b) continual-learning performance traces (AUC vs. training epochs) across sequential tasks, illustrating forgetting and recovery under shifts in class, time, modality, and institution [94]; (c) a compositional-generalization setup: data flow and procedure (exposure, guessing, production, memorization, generalization) alongside a model with shared encoders and contrastive/generative components used to measure production similarity, generalization score, and convergence on unseen combinations [53]; and (d) Wasserstein-based OOD detection (WOOD), where an augmented classifier uses a Wasserstein score to separate in-distribution from OOD samples, enabling thresholded decisions and standard OOD metrics [210]. Reproduced with permission [76]. Copyright 2025 Nature Publishing Group. Reproduced with permission [94]. Copyright 2021 Nature Publishing Group. Reproduced with permission [53]. Copyright 2024 Nature Publishing Group. Reproduced with permission [210]. Copyright 2023 IEEE.

One study shows that Wasserstein-based detection can be used to guide training so that in-distribution samples collapse toward one-hot outputs while out-of-distribution samples spread toward uniform predictions [210].

This setup makes it easier to produce reliable AUROC scores for classification tasks. Another study in continual learning with cardiac signals introduces metrics like backward transfer, its time-dependent variants, and forward transfer [94]. These measures capture both how much knowledge is forgotten and how quickly models adapt and demonstrate that task curricula based on similarity improve both accuracy and retention. Using convergence measures, generalization scores, and production similarity, another study on compositional generalization demonstrates when models recombine known elements to handle unseen cases [53]. A broader perspective suggests that real progress will come only when evaluation methods move beyond numbers and begin to capture human expectations [76]. In order to identify out-of-distribution data, facilitate incremental learning, and strike a balance between systematic reasoning and scalable training, Ilievski et al. [76] suggest compositional stress testing, instance-based retrieval, and neurosymbolic techniques.

These developments provide useful strategies for materials science to quantify generalizability. Out-of-distribution scoring can be modified for use with diffraction, spectroscopy, or microscopy data. When new chemistries, phases, or processing routes appear, continual-learning metrics provide a check if models retain what they have learned. Structure-aware checks can be used on compositional and microstructural descriptors to see if models are recombining known elements in a systematic way when predicting the properties of new materials. These approaches can move the field away from ad hoc performance reports toward the more rigorous measure of generalizability essential for TAI in accelerated materials discovery.

Advancing Transparency in AI/ML Methods

Transparency in model structure, parameters, data, and software has been proposed as a partial solution to the reproducibility crisis [150, 167] in scientific machine learning, and is therefore a central part of TAI. In the works reviewed, materials science researchers addressed transparency by releasing model weights and an accompanying code repository. However, reproducibility as discussed by reproducibility researchers [150] also encompasses repeatability, replicability, adaptability, model selection, data quality, incentive for scientific rigor, and maintainability. Full transparency requires effort beyond open source code.

This broader understanding of transparency is evident in the literature, where expectations for transparent AI/ML vary among disciplines. In a pure AI/ML context, Semmelrock et al. [167] identify seven artifacts which must be shared for an experiment to be “complete”: hypothesis, prediction method, source code, hardware specifications, software dependencies, experiment setup, and experiment source code. In healthcare, checklists have been proposed to evaluate whether the use of AI/ML in a published work is suitable and transparent [22, 40, 165], with the International Journal of Medical Informatics now requiring submissions to self-evaluate against the checklist [22] before submission.

On a more granular level, software engineering metrics may be used to quantify the readability of the source code [148, 152]; readability aids in transparency by making the code easier to understand. In the earth sciences and social sciences, transparency in data processing is addressed by standardizing how data labeling is documented [217]; this is distinct from fair data processes because it examines how the methods are reported and not just which methods are implemented.

A transparency-oriented framework *FAIR* [215, 216] has been proposed to standardize data science stewardship. Importantly, the FAIR framework has been connected to evaluation metrics [216], introducing a quantitative approach to transparency that is useful for the scientific community. Finally, the Foundation Model Transparency Index [20] evaluates each model across thirteen aspects of transparency. This granularity ensures repeatable results and post-hoc analysis, and empowers materials science researchers that their work is both correct and reusable.

Reporting Stability Studies

Reporting model stability goes beyond transparency because it includes an analysis of how hyperparameters affect model performance. As shown in Figure 16, the best method of hyperparameter selection to promote stable modeling is an active area of research [89, 91, 122, 128]. For example, Bischl et al. [18] present six different algorithms for selecting hyperparameters and report that the impact of the hyperparameter on the model performance is “subtle”. Bayesian strategies for hyperparameters optimization include Gaussian process and ensemble methods [15], evolutionary methods such as covariance matrix adaptation (CMA) [65], and bandit-style pruning such as Hyperband [111] or asynchronous successive halving (ASHA) [81]. An evolutionary algorithm tuned hyperparameters encoded as a chromosome [191]. An alternative to hyperparameter analysis involves perturbing the model




Figure 15: The FAIR-AI framework for accelerating high-energy diffraction microscopy through AI model development and deployment. The workflow integrates FAIR and AI-ready datasets from the Materials Data Facility with PyTorch, TensorRT, and SambaNova models, which are trained and containerized using ThetaGPU and ALCF resources. Models are published in DLHub with DOIs, tutorials, sample test sets, uncertainty quantification metrics, and rich metadata to ensure findability, accessibility, interoperability, and reusability. Reproduced with permission [153]. Copyright 2022 Nature Publishing Group UK London.

parameters directly to see how this affects model performance [93, 213]. Frameworks like Optuna [3], Vizier [58], SMAC [74], Hyperopt [16], Katib [236], and Tune [115] combine methods for ease of use.




Figure 16: Advancing stability reporting in AI/ML methods: (a) evaluation flow for the MedSegX generalist medical-image segmenter, outlining in-distribution tests, two OOD regimes (cross-site and cross-task), and a real-world track, with both zero-shot and data-efficient (few-label fine-tuning) assessments [230]; (b) VTAB's hyperparameter-sweep summary heatmap, which visualizes, per downstream dataset, the best setting (red dot) and the full set of near-optimal settings (green background) [227]; and (c) Flexynesis violin plots showing how modest fine-tuning shifts performance distributions under matched versus shifted domains, with means and 95% bootstrap CIs overlaid for deep-learning and classical baselines [196]. Reproduced with permission [230]. Copyright 2025 Nature Publishing Group. Reproduced with permission [227]. Copyright 2019 arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.04867. Reproduced with permission [196]. Copyright 2025 Nature Publishing Group.

Reports highlight different aspects of model stability. The effect of compute budget on identifying optimal hyperparameters is addressed by the visual task adaptation benchmark (VTAB) [227]. Another study standard-

izes training and evaluation, then eliminates important components to explain performance gains [230]. One study compares hyperparameter tuning methods, then maps out Pareto fronts, runs extensive statistical tests, and reports efficiency [226]. Flexynesis performs hyperparameter tuning, then summarizes outcomes across model families with paired statistical tests and an auditable dashboard [196]. Finally, a Taylor diagram [137, 186] condenses hyperparameter effects to three statistical measures: the Pearson correlation coefficient R , the standard deviation of the set of target values σ_z , the standard deviation of the predicted values $\sigma_{\hat{z}}$ and the standard deviation of the error (SDE) so that $\text{SDE}^2 = \sigma_z^2 + \sigma_{\hat{z}}^2 - 2\sigma_z\sigma_{\hat{z}}R$. These practices clarify whether results come from the data, the architecture, or the tuning, and ensure that the method used to obtain the reported model is stable with respect to the search space, budget, selection rule, validation protocol, number of seeds, and statistical tests.

5 Future Directions and Recommendations

Progress in TAI depends on filling the gaps that benchmarking, case studies, and cross-domain research have only hinted at. Examples from multiple disciplines indicate that trust in AI is being built by researchers striving for more transparent, reliable, and explainable methods. This is important for materials science because we can now adapt proven methods to our own challenges and build trust into our models from the start. We can also go further, drawing inspiration from other fields to develop new AI/ML methods that simultaneously accelerate discovery and improve trustworthiness. We next focus on four fronts that will inspire the next wave of TAI experimental materials science and engineering research.

- **Physics-informed and knowledge-guided learning when no closed-form model exists:** Much of today’s physics-informed work assumes some governing equations are known; this is largely untrue in experimental settings. Directly encoding weak physics [42], domain regularities [67], and physics-inspired constraints [98, 117, 144] into learning systems without the need for a closed-form model is a feasible next step. Lab protocols and instrument transfer functions may be treated as AI/ML model priors, with ablation studies indicating how each prior changes calibration and error under shifting conditions. The next step is to test these ideas at the bench by planning measurements to deliberately stress physics-inspired constraints. This could lead to new trustworthiness metrics, such as the frequency with which a system violates a physical principle, or the degree of violation, and demonstrate when trust is improved through soft physics.
- **Trust for robotics AI/ML in self-driving labs:** Sophisticated closed-loop platforms exist to automate experiments; these systems may benefit from proposed requirements for trust in robotics [27, 68]. A lab autonomy readiness scale has been proposed to provide a structured path for robotic experimentation. Each stage in the scale was defined by clear criteria. These requirements include the use of verified interlocks [106], exploration guided by uncertainty [224], automatic delay when calibration drifts [38], and reproducibility across various instruments [26]. To complement this structure, task level scorecards were expected to be created [193]. These comprehensive approaches satisfy a need for auditability, and connects uncertainty with explanation in a practical approach. As a result, repeatable and verifiable processes strengthen confidence in robotic experimentation.
- **Using NLP models with explicit trust metrics:** Trustworthiness metrics used in natural language processing can be leveraged for materials discovery. Confidence metrics indicate when model outputs are insufficient for guiding experimental action and when suggestions should instead be withheld pending stronger evidence [51]. Errors should be analyzed to ensure the model meets reliability standards [32]. Human scientists use documented logical processes and contextual awareness when progressing from literature to hypotheses; model alignment with expert human methods should be examined [23] so that scientists can extend their expertise without compromising baseline reliability [54]. Moreover, text mined candidates should be paired with physics-based descriptors and other interpretable rules, so that outputs can be cross-checked against established scientific principles prior to experimental validation [9]. The result is a pathway for trusting, reproducing, and adopting NLP model predictions with confidence that accelerates materials discovery.
- **Human-in-the-loop and domain expertise as first-class safeguards:** Human-in-the-loop methods and domain expertise can be brought together in a trust framework for materials discovery that integrates confidence gating, error auditing, expert-guided control, domain-preserving adaptation, and physically meaningful interpretability into one workflow. Progress proceeds from deep domain knowledge, so uncertainty-

aware metrics enable human supervision that reduces bias and improves uncertainty estimates while still maintaining reliability [164]. In Bayesian optimization, for example, Gaussian process surrogates can offer calibrated uncertainty for acquisition decisions [19]. Next, human experts who can identify unexpected outcomes and fix malfunctions in sophisticated software systems ensure that errors missed by current AI or robotic systems are still addressed quickly [116]. From a systems design perspective, domain-adaptation is performed by data-informed scientists who adapt workflows and design spaces while preserving the trust signals that foundation models already provide; this can be achieved by combining evidence from multiple sources and levels of fidelity, including negative results. Guidelines for interpretable AI also recommend that human-alignment be planned in advance [129], and this entails establishing precise roles, plans, and deadlines that align with the expert audience’s cognitive capabilities.

6 Conclusion

To make reliable discoveries using AI/ML, the materials science community currently emphasizes elements of trustworthiness summarized by the principles of the *GIFTERS* framework. These approaches are already helping scientists predict material behavior with greater accuracy and confidence. However, most materials science work leveraging AI/ML methods falls short of comprehensive trustworthiness, and may benefit from AI/ML trustworthiness methods used in other disciplines such as healthcare and climate science. Finally, an analysis of future directions in materials science research demonstrates the need to design systems that actively involve human experts, follow physical laws, adapt to new data, and explain their reasoning. This is not just about making better predictions, it is about building AI that scientists can trust to help solve real-world problems.

Author Contributions

A.S.D, B.A., J.H.-S. conceived and designed the project. A.S.D., B.A. reviewed the literature and drafted the manuscript. J.H.-S supervised the project. A.S.D., B.A., S.K., and J.H.-S. discussed the results. A.S.D., B.A., S.K., and J.H.-S. reviewed and edited the manuscript. All authors contributed to the manuscript preparation.

Funding

A.S.D. acknowledges supports from the University of Toronto’s Eric and Wendy Schmidt AI in Science Post-doctoral Fellowship, a program of Schmidt Sciences.

Competing Interests

All authors declare no financial or non-financial competing interests.

References

- [1] Felix Adams, Austin McDannald, Ichiro Takeuchi, and A Gilad Kusne. Human-in-the-loop for bayesian autonomous materials phase mapping. *Matter*, 7(2):697–709, 2024.
- [2] Mahshid Ahmadi, Maxim Ziatdinov, Yuanyuan Zhou, Eric A Lass, and Sergei V Kalinin. Machine learning for high-throughput experimental exploration of metal halide perovskites. *Joule*, 5(11):2797–2822, 2021.
- [3] Takuya Akiba, Shotaro Sano, Toshihiko Yanase, Takeru Ohta, and Masanori Koyama. Optuna: A next-generation hyperparameter optimization framework. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 2623–2631, 2019.
- [4] Mohamed Akrouf, Amal Feriani, Faouzi Bellili, Amine Mezghani, and Ekram Hossain. Domain generalization in machine learning models for wireless communications: Concepts, state-of-the-art, and open issues. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 25(4):3014–3037, 2023.
- [5] Ahmed Shihab Albahri, Ali M. Duhaim, Mohammed A. Fadhel, Alhamzah Alnoor, Noor S. Baqer, Laith Alzubaidi, Osamah Shihab Albahri, Abdullah Hussein Alamoodi, Jinshuai Bai, Asma Salhi, Jose Santamaría, Chun Ouyang, Ashish

- Gupta, Yuantong Gu, and Muhammet Deveci. A systematic review of trustworthy and explainable artificial intelligence in healthcare: Assessment of quality, bias risk, and data fusion. *Information Fusion*, 96:156–191, 2023.
- [6] Nancy Albinson, Sam Balaji, and Yang Chu. Building digital trust: Technology can lead the way. *Deloitte Insights*, 2019.
- [7] Sarah I Allec and Maxim Ziatdinov. Active and transfer learning with partially bayesian neural networks for materials and chemicals. *Digital Discovery*, 4(5):1284–1297, 2025.
- [8] Alice EA Allen and Alexandre Tkatchenko. Machine learning of material properties: Predictive and interpretable multi-linear models. *Science Advances*, 8(18):eabm7185, 2022.
- [9] Ruilin Bai, Yu Yao, Qiaosong Lin, Lize Wu, Zhen Li, Huijuan Wang, Mingze Ma, Di Mu, Lingxiang Hu, Hai Yang, Weihan Li, Shaolong Zhu, Xiaojun Wu, Xianhong Rui, and Yan Yu. Preferable single-atom catalysts enabled by natural language processing for high energy density Na-S batteries. *Nature Communications*, 16(1):5827, 2025.
- [10] Sterling G Baird, Ramsey Issa, and Taylor D Sparks. Materials science optimization benchmark dataset for multi-objective, multi-fidelity optimization of hard-sphere packing simulations. *Data in Brief*, 50:109487, 2023.
- [11] Solon Barocas, Moritz Hardt, and Arvind Narayanan. *Fairness and machine learning: Limitations and opportunities*. MIT press, 2023.
- [12] Noman Bashir, Priya Donti, James Cuff, Sydney Sroka, Marija Ilic, Vivienne Sze, Christina Delimitrou, and Elsa Olivetti. The climate and sustainability implications of generative AI, 2024.
- [13] Bekassyl Battalgazy, Danial Khatamsaz, Zahra Ghasemi, Debjoy D Mallick, Raymundo Arroyave, and Ankit Srivastava. A bayesian-based approach for constitutive model selection and calibration using diverse material responses. *Acta Materialia*, 287:120796, 2025.
- [14] Désirée Baumann and Knut Baumann. Reliable estimation of prediction errors for QSAR models under model uncertainty using double cross-validation. *Journal of Cheminformatics*, 6(1):47, 2014.
- [15] James Bergstra, Rémi Bardenet, Yoshua Bengio, and Balázs Kégl. Algorithms for hyper-parameter optimization. In J. Shawe-Taylor, R. Zemel, P. Bartlett, F. Pereira, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 24. Curran Associates, Inc., 2011.
- [16] James Bergstra, Brent Komer, Chris Eliasmith, Dan Yamins, and David D Cox. Hyperopt: a Python library for model selection and hyperparameter optimization. *Computational Science & Discovery*, 8(1):014008, 2015.
- [17] Mickael Binois and Nathan Wycoff. A survey on high-dimensional gaussian process modeling with application to Bayesian optimization. *ACM Transactions on Evolutionary Learning and Optimization*, 2(2):1–26, 2022.
- [18] Bernd Bischl, Martin Binder, Michel Lang, Tobias Pielok, Jakob Richter, Stefan Coors, Janek Thomas, Theresa Ullmann, Marc Becker, Anne-Laure Boulesteix, Frank Hutter, and Marius Lindauer. Hyperparameter optimization: Foundations, algorithms, best practices, and open challenges. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 13(2):e1484, 2023.
- [19] Arpan Biswas, Yongtao Liu, Nicole Creange, Yu-Chen Liu, Stephen Jesse, Jan-Chi Yang, Sergei V Kalinin, Maxim A Ziatdinov, and Rama K Vasudevan. A dynamic Bayesian optimized active recommender system for curiosity-driven partially Human-in-the-loop automated experiments. *npj Computational Materials*, 10(1):29, 2024.
- [20] Rishi Bommasani, Kevin Klyman, Shayne Longpre, Sayash Kapoor, Nestor Maslej, Betty Xiong, Daniel Zhang, and Percy Liang. The foundation model transparency index. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12941*, 2023.
- [21] Tarik Boudaa, Mohamed El Marouani, and Nourddine Enneya. Using earth mover’s distance and word embeddings for recognizing textual entailment in arabic. *Computación y Sistemas*, 24(4):1499–1508, 2020.
- [22] Federico Cabitza and Andrea Campagner. The need to separate the wheat from the chaff in medical informatics: Introducing a comprehensive checklist for the (self)-assessment of medical AI studies. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 153:104510, 2021.
- [23] Jing Cai, Alex E Hadjinicolaou, Angelique C Paulk, Daniel J Soper, Tian Xia, Alexander F Wang, John D Rolston, R Mark Richardson, Ziv M Williams, and Sydney S Cash. Natural language processing models reveal neural dynamics of human conversation. *Nature Communications*, 16(1):3376, 2025.

- [24] Gustau Camps-Valls, Miguel-Ángel Fernández-Torres, Kai-Hendrik Cohrs, Adrian Höhl, Andrea Castelletti, Aytac Pacal, Claire Robin, Francesco Martinuzzi, Ioannis Papoutsis, Ioannis Prapas, Jorge Pérez-Aracil, Katja Weigel, Maria Gonzalez-Calabuig, Markus Reichstein, Martin Rabel, Matteo Giuliani, Miguel D. Mahecha, Oana-Iuliana Popescu, Oscar J. Pellicer-Valero, Said Ouala, Sancho Salcedo-Sanz, Sebastian Sippel, Spyros Kondylatos, Tamara Happé, and Tristan Williams. Artificial intelligence for modeling and understanding extreme weather and climate events. *Nature Communications*, 16(1):1919, 2025.
- [25] Helen Canton. Organisation for economic co-operation and development—OECD. In *The Europa Directory of International Organizations 2021*, pages 677–687. Routledge, 2021.
- [26] Richard B. Canty, Jeffrey A. Bennett, Keith A. Brown, Tonio Buonassisi, Sergei V. Kalinin, John R. Kitchin, Benji Maruyama, Robert G. Moore, Joshua Schrier, Martin Seifrid, Chad Risko, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, and Jay Myung. Science acceleration and accessibility with self-driving labs. *Nature Communications*, 16(1):3856, 2025.
- [27] Massimiliano L Cappuccio, Jai C Galliot, Friederike Eyssel, and Alessandro Lanteri. Autonomous systems and technology resistance: New tools for monitoring acceptance, trust, and tolerance. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 16(6):1–25, 2024.
- [28] Muhammed Cavus, Muhammed Nurullah Benli, Usume Altuntas, Mahmut Sari, Huseyin Ayan, and Yusuf Furkan Ugurluoglu. Transparent and bias-resilient AI framework for recidivism prediction using deep learning and clustering techniques in criminal justice. *Applied Soft Computing*, page 113160, 2025.
- [29] Sompriya Chatterjee and Dhiman Ray. Acceleration with interpretability: A surrogate model-based collective variable for enhanced sampling. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, 21(4):1561–1571, 2025.
- [30] Anthony K Cheetham and Ram Seshadri. Artificial intelligence driving materials discovery? perspective on the article: Scaling deep learning for materials discovery. *Chemistry of Materials*, 36(8):3490–3495, 2024.
- [31] Chi Chen, Yunxing Zuo, Weike Ye, Xiangguo Li, and Shyue Ping Ong. Learning properties of ordered and disordered materials from multi-fidelity data. *Nature Computational Science*, 1(1):46–53, 2021.
- [32] Qingyu Chen, Yan Hu, Xueqing Peng, Qianqian Xie, Qiao Jin, Aidan Gilson, Maxwell B. Singer, Xuguang Ai, Po-Ting Lai, Zhizheng Wang, Dongfang Xu, Zhiheng Li, Yifan Peng, and Zhiyong Lu. Benchmarking large language models for biomedical natural language processing applications and recommendations. *Nature Communications*, 16(1):3280, 2025.
- [33] Tianle Chen, Zhenqian Pang, Shuaiming He, Yang Li, Snehi Shrestha, Joshua M. Little, Haochen Yang, Tsai-Chun Chung, Jiayue Sun, Hayden Christopher Whitley, I-Chi Lee, Taylor J. Woehl, Teng Li, Liangbing Hu, and Po-Yen Chen. Machine intelligence-accelerated discovery of all-natural plastic substitutes. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 19(6):782–791, 2024.
- [34] Sathya R. Chitturi, Akash Ramdas, Yue Wu, Brian Rohr, Stefano Ermon, Jennifer Dionne, Felipe H. da Jornada, Mike Dunne, Christopher Tassone, Willie Neiswanger, and Daniel Ratner. Targeted materials discovery using Bayesian algorithm execution. *npj Computational Materials*, 10(1):156, 2024.
- [35] Annick De Backer, Sandra Van Aert, Christel Faes, Ece Arslan Irmak, Peter D Nellist, and Lewys Jones. Experimental reconstructions of 3D atomic structures from electron microscopy images using a Bayesian genetic algorithm. *npj Computational Materials*, 8(1):216, 2022.
- [36] Wei Deng, Lijun Liu, Xiaohang Li, Yanyu Huang, Ming Hu, Yafang Zheng, Yuan Yin, Yan Huan, Shuxun Cui, Zhaoyan Sun, Jun Jiang, Xiaoni Yang, and Dapeng Wang. Machine-learning-enhanced trial-and-error for efficient optimization of rubber composites. *Advanced Materials*, 37(16):2407763, 2025.
- [37] Sanket Diwale, Maximilian K Eisner, Corinne Carpenter, Weike Sun, Gregory C Rutledge, and Richard D Braatz. Bayesian optimization for material discovery processes with noise. *Molecular Systems Design & Engineering*, 7(6):622–636, 2022.
- [38] Sayan Doloi, Maloy Das, Yujia Li, Zen Han Cho, Xingchi Xiao, John V Hanna, Matthew Osvaldo, and Leonard Ng Wei Tat. Democratizing self-driving labs: Advances in low-cost 3D printing for laboratory automation. *Digital Discovery*, 4(7):1685–1721, 2025.
- [39] George Drakoulas, Theodore Gortsas, Efstratios Polyzos, Stephanos Tsinopoulos, Lincy Pyl, and Demosthenes Polyzos. An explainable machine learning-based probabilistic framework for the design of scaffolds in bone tissue engineering. *Biomechanics and Modeling in Mechanobiology*, 23(3):987–1012, 2024.
- [40] Khaled El Emam, William Klement, and Bradley Malin. Reporting and methodological observations on prognostic and diagnostic machine learning studies. *JMIR AI*, 2(1):e47995, 2023.

- [41] Erik Engleson and Hossein Azizpour. Generalized Jensen-Shannon divergence loss for learning with noisy labels. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 30284–30297. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- [42] Oscar Fajardo-Fontiveros, Ignasi Reichardt, Harry R De Los Ríos, Jordi Duch, Marta Sales-Pardo, and Roger Guimerà. Fundamental limits to learning closed-form mathematical models from data. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):1043, 2023.
- [43] Clyde Fare, Peter Fenner, Matthew Benatan, Alessandro Varsi, and Edward O Pyzer-Knapp. A multi-fidelity machine learning approach to high throughput materials screening. *npj Computational Materials*, 8(1):257, 2022.
- [44] Jinchao Feng, Joshua L Lansford, Markos A Katsoulakis, and Dionisios G Vlachos. Explainable and trustworthy artificial intelligence for correctable modeling in chemical sciences. *Science Advances*, 6(42):eabc3204, 2020.
- [45] Alexander Fengler, Saeid Haghighatshoar, Peter Jung, and Giuseppe Caire. Non-Bayesian activity detection, large-scale fading coefficient estimation, and unsourced random access with a massive MIMO receiver. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(5):2925–2951, 2021.
- [46] Md Meftahul Ferdaus, Mahdi Abdelguerfi, Elias Ioup, Kendall N Niles, Ken Pathak, and Steven Sloan. Towards trustworthy AI: A review of ethical and robust large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.13934*, 2024.
- [47] Maurizio Ferrari Dacrema, Simone Boglio, Paolo Cremonesi, and Dietmar Jannach. A troubling analysis of reproducibility and progress in recommender systems research. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, 39(2):1–49, 2021.
- [48] Benjamin Feuer, Jiawei Xu, Niv Cohen, Patrick Yubeaton, Govind Mittal, and Chinmay Hegde. Select: A large-scale benchmark of data curation strategies for image classification. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:136620–136645, 2024.
- [49] Luciano Floridi, Josh Cows, Monica Beltrametti, Raja Chatila, Patrice Chazerand, Virginia Dignum, Christoph Luetge, Robert Madelin, Ugo Pagallo, Francesca Rossi, Burkhard Schafer, Peggy Valcke, and Effy Vayena. AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28:689–707, 2018.
- [50] Sebastian Fritz-Morgenthal, Bernhard Hein, and Jochen Papenbrock. Financial risk management and explainable, trustworthy, responsible AI. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 5:779799, 2022.
- [51] Yichao Fu, Xuewei Wang, Yuandong Tian, and Jiawei Zhao. Deep think with confidence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.15260*, 2025.
- [52] Yarin Gal and Zoubin Ghahramani. Dropout as a Bayesian approximation: Representing model uncertainty in deep learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1050–1059. PMLR, 2016.
- [53] Lukas Galke, Yoav Ram, and Limor Raviv. Deep neural networks and humans both benefit from compositional language structure. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):10816, 2024.
- [54] Changjiang Gao, Zhengwu Ma, Jiajun Chen, Ping Li, Shujian Huang, and Jixing Li. Increasing alignment of large language models with language processing in the human brain. *Nature Computational Science*, 5, 2025. Accepted 7 August 2025.
- [55] Lei Gao and Ling Guan. Interpretability of machine learning: Recent advances and future prospects. *IEEE MultiMedia*, 30(4):105–118, 2023.
- [56] Jacob R Gardner, Geoff Pleiss, David Bindel, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. Gpytorch: Blackbox matrix-matrix gaussian process inference with gpu acceleration. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018.
- [57] Aritra Ghosh, Himanshu Kumar, and P Shanti Sastry. Robust loss functions under label noise for deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 31, 2017.
- [58] Daniel Golovin, Benjamin Solnik, Subhodeep Moitra, Greg Kochanski, John Karro, and David Sculley. Google vizier: A service for black-box optimization. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1487–1495, 2017.
- [59] Aldair E Gongora, Bowen Xu, Wyatt Perry, Chika Okoye, Patrick Riley, Kristofer G Reyes, Elise F Morgan, and Keith A Brown. A bayesian experimental autonomous researcher for mechanical design. *Science Advances*, 6(15):eaaz1708, 2020.

- [60] Federico Grasselli, Sanggyu Chong, Venkat Kapil, Silvia Bonfanti, and Kevin Rossi. Uncertainty in the era of machine learning for atomistic modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.09196*, 2025.
- [61] Lee A Griffin, Iaroslav Gaponenko, and Nazanin Bassiri-Gharb. Better, faster, and less biased machine learning: Electromechanical switching in ferroelectric thin films. *Advanced Materials*, 32(38):2002425, 2020.
- [62] Cameron J Gruich, Varun Madhavan, Yixin Wang, and Bryan R Goldsmith. Clarifying trust of materials property predictions using neural networks with distribution-specific uncertainty quantification. *Machine Learning: Science and Technology*, 4(2):025019, 2023.
- [63] Lisheng Guo, Xin Xu, Cencen Niu, Qing Wang, Junboun Park, Lu Zhou, Haomin Lei, Xinhai Wang, and Xiaoqing Yuan. Machine learning-based prediction and experimental validation of heavy metal adsorption capacity of bentonite. *Science of The Total Environment*, 926:171986, 2024.
- [64] María Gutiérrez, Ma Ángeles Moraga, and Félix García. Analysing the energy impact of different optimisations for machine learning models. In *2022 International Conference on ICT for Sustainability (ICT4S)*, pages 46–52. IEEE, 2022.
- [65] Nikolaus Hansen and Andreas Ostermeier. Completely derandomized self-adaptation in evolution strategies. *Evolutionary Computation*, 9(2):159–195, 2001.
- [66] Matthew Hart, Kelvin Idanwekhai, Vinicius M Alves, Alexander JM Miller, Jillian L Dempsey, James F Cahoon, Chun-Hsing Chen, David A Winkler, Eugene N Muratov, and Alexander Tropsha. Trust not verify? The critical need for data curation standards in materials informatics. *Chemistry of Materials*, 36(19):9046–9055, 2024.
- [67] Ramin Hasani, Mathias Lechner, Alexander Amini, Lucas Liebenwein, Aaron Ray, Max Tschaikowski, Gerald Teschl, and Daniela Rus. Closed-form continuous-time neural networks. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(11):992–1003, 2022.
- [68] Adam Haskard and Damith Herath. Secure robotics: Navigating challenges at the nexus of safety, trust, and cybersecurity in cyber-physical systems. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 57(9):1–48, 2025.
- [69] Mohammad Saif Himayat and Jameel Ahmad. Software understandability using software metrics: An exhaustive review. *International Journal Of Engineering And Management Research*, 13(2):188–191, 2023.
- [70] Lior Hirschfeld, Kyle Swanson, Kevin Yang, Regina Barzilay, and Connor W Coley. Uncertainty quantification using neural networks for molecular property prediction. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 60(8):3770–3780, 2020.
- [71] Yang Hong, Bo Hou, Hengle Jiang, and Jingchao Zhang. Machine learning and artificial neural network accelerated computational discoveries in materials science. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Molecular Science*, 10(3):e1450, 2020.
- [72] Yiyu Hong, Jinung Song, Junsu Ko, Juyong Lee, and Woong-Hee Shin. S-Pred: protein structural property prediction using MSA transformer. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):13891, 2022.
- [73] Kexin Huang, Yan Teng, Yang Chen, and Yingchun Wang. From pixels to principles: A decade of progress and landscape in trustworthy computer vision. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 30(3):26, 2024.
- [74] Frank Hutter, Holger H Hoos, and Kevin Leyton-Brown. Sequential model-based optimization for general algorithm configuration. In *International Conference on Learning and Intelligent Optimization*, pages 507–523. Springer, 2011.
- [75] Seong-Hyeon Hwang, Minsu Kim, and Steven Euijong Whang. Rc-mixup: A data augmentation strategy against noisy data for regression tasks. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1155–1165, 2024.
- [76] Filip Ilievski, Barbara Hammer, Frank van Harmelen, Benjamin Paassen, Sascha Saralajew, Ute Schmid, Michael Biehl, Marianna Bolognesi, Xin Luna Dong, Kiril Gashteovski, Pascal Hitzler, Giuseppe Marra, Pasquale Minervini, Martin Mundt, Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo, Alessandro Oltramari, Gabriella Pasi, Zeynep G. Saribatur, Luciano Serafini, John Shawe-Taylor, Vered Schwartz, Gabriella Skitalinskaya, Clemens Stachl, Gido M. van de Ven, and Thomas Villmann. Aligning generalization between humans and machines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, pages 1–12, 2025.
- [77] Pavel Izmailov, Sharad Vikram, Matthew D Hoffman, and Andrew Gordon Gordon Wilson. What are Bayesian neural network posteriors really like? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4629–4640. PMLR, 2021.
- [78] Kevin Maik Jablonka, Daniele Ongari, Seyed Mohamad Moosavi, and Berend Smit. Big-data science in porous materials: Materials genomics and machine learning. *Chemical Reviews*, 120(16):8066–8129, 2020.

- [79] Arya Jadhav, Suhila Sawesi, and Bushra Rashrash. Bias and generalizability challenges in machine learning models for leptospirosis. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (BigData)*, pages 4989–4995. IEEE, 2024.
- [80] Anjali Jain, Jasmin R Brooks, Cleothia C Alford, Christine S Chang, Nora M Mueller, Craig A Umscheid, and Arlene S Bierman. Awareness of racial and ethnic bias and potential solutions to address bias with use of health care algorithms. In *JAMA Health Forum*, volume 4, pages e231197–e231197. American Medical Association, 2023.
- [81] Kevin Jamieson and Ameet Talwalkar. Non-stochastic best arm identification and hyperparameter optimization. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 240–248. PMLR, 2016.
- [82] Jiaming Ji, Tianyi Qiu, Boyuan Chen, Borong Zhang, Hantao Lou, Kaile Wang, Yawen Duan, Zhonghao He, Lukas Vierling, Donghai Hong, Jiayi Zhou, Zhaowei Zhang, Fanzhi Zeng, Juntao Dai, Xuehai Pan, Kwan Yee Ng, Aidan O’Gara, Hua Xu, Brian Tse, Jie Fu, Stephen McAleer, Yaodong Yang, Yizhou Wang, Song-Chun Zhu, Yike Guo, and Wen Gao. AI alignment: A comprehensive survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19852*, 2023.
- [83] Zhimeng Jiang, Xiaotian Han, Chao Fan, Fan Yang, Ali Mostafavi, and Xia Hu. Generalized demographic parity for group fairness. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [84] Anna Jobin, Marcello Ienca, and Effy Vayena. The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature machine intelligence*, 1(9):389–399, 2019.
- [85] Penelope K Jones, Ulrich Stimming, and Alpha A Lee. Impedance-based forecasting of lithium-ion battery performance amid uneven usage. *Nature Communications*, 13(1):4806, 2022.
- [86] Laurent Valentin Jospin, Hamid Laga, Farid Boussaid, Wray Buntine, and Mohammed Bennamoun. Hands-on Bayesian neural networks—a tutorial for deep learning users. *IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine*, 17(2):29–48, 2022.
- [87] Dan W Joyce, Andrey Kormilitzin, Katharine A Smith, and Andrea Cipriani. Explainable artificial intelligence for mental health through transparency and interpretability for understandability. *npj Digital Medicine*, 6(1):6, 2023.
- [88] Bhavya Kailkhura, Brian Gallagher, Sookyung Kim, Anna Hiszpanski, and T Yong-Jin Han. Reliable and explainable machine-learning methods for accelerated material discovery. *npj Computational Materials*, 5(1):108, 2019.
- [89] Florian Karl, Tobias Pielok, Julia Moosbauer, Florian Pfisterer, Stefan Coors, Martin Binder, Lennart Schneider, Janek Thomas, Jakob Richter, Michel Lang, and Bernd Bischl. Multi-objective hyperparameter optimization in machine learning—An overview. *ACM Transactions on Evolutionary Learning and Optimization*, 3(4):1–50, 2023.
- [90] Dewant Katare, Nicolas Kourtellis, Souneil Park, Diego Perino, Marijn Janssen, and Aaron Yi Ding. Bias detection and generalization in AI algorithms on edge for autonomous driving. In *2022 IEEE/ACM 7th Symposium on Edge Computing (SEC)*, pages 342–348. IEEE, 2022.
- [91] Muhammad Salman Khan, Tianbo Peng, Hanzlakh Akhlaq, and Muhammad Adeel Khan. Comparative analysis of automated machine learning for hyperparameter optimization and explainable artificial intelligence models. *IEEE Access*, 2025.
- [92] Danial Khatamsaz, Raymond Neuberger, Arunabha M Roy, Sina Hossein Zadeh, Richard Otis, and Raymundo Arróyave. A physics informed bayesian optimization approach for material design: Application to NiTi shape memory alloys. *npj Computational Materials*, 9(1):221, 2023.
- [93] Chiho Kim, Rohit Batra, Lihua Chen, Huan Tran, and Rampi Ramprasad. Polymer design using genetic algorithm and machine learning. *Computational Materials Science*, 186:110067, 2021.
- [94] Dani Kiyasseh, Tingting Zhu, and David Clifton. A clinical deep learning framework for continually learning from cardiac signals across diseases, time, modalities, and institutions. *Nature Communications*, 12(1):4221, 2021.
- [95] Giona Kleinberg, Michael J Diaz, Sai Batchu, and Brandon Lucke-Wold. Racial underrepresentation in dermatological datasets leads to biased machine learning models and inequitable healthcare. *Journal of Biomed Research*, 3(1):42, 2022.
- [96] Wataru Kobayashi, Takuma Otsuka, Yuki K Wakabayashi, and Gensai Tei. Physics-informed Bayesian optimization suitable for extrapolation of materials growth. *npj Computational Materials*, 11(1):36, 2025.
- [97] Ai Koizumi, Guillaume Deffrennes, Kei Terayama, and Ryo Tamura. Performance of uncertainty-based active learning for efficient approximation of black-box functions in materials science. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):27019, 2024.

- [98] Patrick Tser Jern Kon, Jiachen Liu, Xinyi Zhu, Qiuyi Ding, Jingjia Peng, Jiarong Xing, Yibo Huang, Yiming Qiu, Jayanth Srinivasa, Myungjin Lee, Wenxuan Wang, Xingjian Zhang, Yuqing Zhang, Jiawei Li, and Yang You. EXP-bench: Can AI conduct AI research experiments? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.24785*, 2025.
- [99] Ruho Kondo, Shunsuke Yamakawa, Yumi Masuoka, Shin Tajima, and Ryoji Asahi. Microstructure recognition using convolutional neural networks for prediction of ionic conductivity in ceramics. *Acta Materialia*, 141:29–38, 2017.
- [100] Alexander Kovacs, Johann Fischbacher, Harald Oezelt, Alexander Kornell, Qais Ali, Markus Gusenbauer, Masao Yano, Noritsugu Sakuma, Akihito Kinoshita, Tetsuya Shoji, Akira Kato, Yuan Hong, Stéphane Grenier, Thibaut Devillers, Nora M. Dempsey, Tetsuya Fukushima, Hisazumi Akai, Naoki Kawashima, Takashi Miyake, and Thomas Schrefl. Physics-informed machine learning combining experiment and simulation for the design of neodymium-iron-boron permanent magnets with reduced critical-elements content. *Frontiers in Materials*, 9:1094055, 2023.
- [101] Masaya Kumagai, Yuki Ando, Atsumi Tanaka, Koji Tsuda, Yukari Katsura, and Ken Kurosaki. Effects of data bias on machine-learning-based material discovery using experimental property data. *Science and Technology of Advanced Materials: Methods*, 2(1):302–309, 2022.
- [102] A. Gilad Kusne, Heshan Yu, Changming Wu, Huairuo Zhang, Jason Hattrick-Simpers, Brian DeCost, Suchismita Sarker, Corey Oses, Cormac Toher, Stefano Curtarolo, Ichiro Takeuchi, and Apurva Mehta. On-the-fly closed-loop materials discovery via Bayesian active learning. *Nature Communications*, 11(1):5966, 2020.
- [103] Gitaek Kwon, Jaeyoung Kim, Hong-Jun Choi, Byung-Moo Yoon, Sungchul Choi, and Kyu-Hwan Jung. Improving out-of-distribution detection performance using synthetic outlier exposure generated by visual foundation models. In *BMVC*, pages 10–11, 2023.
- [104] William G La Cava, Paul C Lee, Imran Ajmal, Xiruo Ding, Priyanka Solanki, Jordana B Cohen, Jason H Moore, and Daniel S Herman. A flexible symbolic regression method for constructing interpretable clinical prediction models. *npj Digital Medicine*, 6(1):107, 2023.
- [105] Changxin Lai, Minglang Yin, Eugene G. Kholmovski, Dan M. Popescu, Dai-Yin Lu, Erica Scherer, Edem Binka, Stefan L. Zimmerman, Jonathan Chrispin, Allison G. Hays, Dermot M. Phelan, M. Roselle Abraham, and Natalia A. Trayanova. Multimodal AI to forecast arrhythmic death in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Nature Cardiovascular Research*, pages 1–13, 2025.
- [106] Shi Xuan Leong, Caleb E Griesbach, Rui Zhang, Kourosh Darvish, Yuchi Zhao, Abhijoy Mandal, Yunheng Zou, Han Hao, Varinia Bernales, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. Steering towards safe self-driving laboratories. *Nature Reviews Chemistry*, pages 1–16, 2025.
- [107] He Li, Hongbo Zheng, Tianle Yue, Zongliang Xie, ShaoPeng Yu, Ji Zhou, Topprasad Kapri, Yunfei Wang, Zhiqiang Cao, Haoyu Zhao, Aidar Kemelbay, Jinlong He, Ge Zhang, Priscilla F Pieters, Eric A. Dailing, John R. Cappiello, Miquel Salmeron, Xiaodan Gu, Ting Xu, Peng Wu, Ying Li, K. Barry Sharpless, and Yi Liu. Machine learning-accelerated discovery of heat-resistant polysulfates for electrostatic energy storage. *Nature Energy*, 10(1):90–100, 2025.
- [108] Kai Li, Jifeng Wang, Yuanyuan Song, and Ying Wang. Machine learning-guided discovery of ionic polymer electrolytes for lithium metal batteries. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):2789, 2023.
- [109] Kangming Li, Brian DeCost, Kamal Choudhary, Michael Greenwood, and Jason Hattrick-Simpers. A critical examination of robustness and generalizability of machine learning prediction of materials properties. *npj Computational Materials*, 9(1):55, 2023.
- [110] Kangming Li, Andre Niyongabo Rubungo, Xiangyun Lei, Daniel Persaud, Kamal Choudhary, Brian DeCost, Adjai Bousso Dieng, and Jason Hattrick-Simpers. Probing out-of-distribution generalization in machine learning for materials. *Communications Materials*, 6(1):9, 2025.
- [111] Lisha Li, Kevin Jamieson, Giulia DeSalvo, Afshin Rostamizadeh, and Ameet Talwalkar. Hyperband: A novel bandit-based approach to hyperparameter optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(185):1–52, 2018.
- [112] Oscar Li, Hao Liu, Chaofan Chen, and Cynthia Rudin. Deep learning for case-based reasoning through prototypes: A neural network that explains its predictions. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- [113] Qinyang Li, Nicholas Miklaucic, and Jianjun Hu. Out-of-distribution materials property prediction using adversarial learning based fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.09297*, 2024.

- [114] Qiaohao Liang, Aldair E. Gongora, Zekun Ren, Armi Tiihonen, Zhe Liu, Shijing Sun, James R. Deneault, Daniil Bash, Flore Mekki-Berrada, Saif A. Khan, and Tonio Buonassisi. Benchmarking the performance of bayesian optimization across multiple experimental materials science domains. *npj Computational Materials*, 7(1):188, 2021.
- [115] Richard Liaw, Eric Liang, Robert Nishihara, Philipp Moritz, Joseph E Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Tune: A research platform for distributed model selection and training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.05118*, 2018.
- [116] Xiaozhao Liu, Bin Ouyang, and Yan Zeng. Balancing autonomy and expertise in autonomous synthesis laboratories. *Nature Computational Science*, 5(2):92–94, 2025.
- [117] Charlotte Loh, Thomas Christensen, Rumen Dangovski, Samuel Kim, and Marin Soljačić. Surrogate-and invariance-boosted contrastive learning for data-scarce applications in science. *Nature Communications*, 13(1):4223, 2022.
- [118] Scott M Lundberg and Su-In Lee. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- [119] Tero Mäkinen, Anshul DS Parmar, Silvia Bonfanti, and Mikko J Alava. Bayesian exploration of the composition space of cuzral metallic glasses for mechanical properties. *npj Computational Materials*, 11(1):96, 2025.
- [120] Nour Makke and Sanjay Chawla. Interpretable scientific discovery with symbolic regression: A review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 57(1):2, 2024.
- [121] Farhad Maleki, Katie Ovens, Rajiv Gupta, Caroline Reinhold, Alan Spatz, and Reza Forghani. Generalizability of machine learning models: quantitative evaluation of three methodological pitfalls. *Radiology: Artificial Intelligence*, 5(1):e220028, 2022.
- [122] Nijat Mehdiyev, Maxim Majlatow, and Peter Fettke. Quantifying and explaining machine learning uncertainty in predictive process monitoring: An operations research perspective. *Annals of Operations Research*, 347(2):991–1030, 2025.
- [123] José Mena, Oriol Pujol, and Jordi Vitrià. A survey on uncertainty estimation in deep learning classification systems from a Bayesian perspective. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 54(9):1–35, 2021.
- [124] Amil Merchant, Simon Batzner, Samuel S Schoenholz, Muratahan Aykol, Gowoon Cheon, and Ekin Dogus Cubuk. Scaling deep learning for materials discovery. *Nature*, 624(7990):80–85, 2023.
- [125] Dang Minh, H Xiang Wang, Y Fen Li, and Tan N Nguyen. Explainable artificial intelligence: A comprehensive review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 55(5):3503–3568, 2022.
- [126] Marius Miron, Songül Tolan, Emilia Gómez, and Carlos Castillo. Evaluating causes of algorithmic bias in juvenile criminal recidivism. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 29(2):111–147, 2021.
- [127] Junseok Moon, Wiktor Beker, Marta Siek, Jiheon Kim, Hyeon Seok Lee, Taeghwan Hyeon, and Bartosz A Grzybowski. Active learning guides discovery of a champion four-metal perovskite oxide for oxygen evolution electrocatalysis. *Nature Materials*, 23(1):108–115, 2024.
- [128] Julia Moosbauer, Julia Herbringer, Giuseppe Casalicchio, Marius Lindauer, and Bernd Bischl. Explaining hyperparameter optimization via partial dependence plots. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 2280–2291. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- [129] Eduardo Mosqueira-Rey, Elena Hernández-Pereira, David Alonso-Ríos, José Bobes-Bascarán, and Ángel Fernández-Leal. Human-in-the-loop machine learning: A state of the art. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 56(4):3005–3054, 2023.
- [130] Seyed-Pezhman Mousavi, Reza Nakhaei-Kohani, Saeid Atashrouz, Fahimeh Hadavimoghaddam, Ali Abedi, Abdolhossein Hemmati-Sarapardeh, and Ahmad Mohaddespour. Modeling of H₂S solubility in ionic liquids: comparison of white-box machine learning, deep learning and ensemble learning approaches. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):7946, 2023.
- [131] Eric S Muckley, James E Saal, Bryce Meredig, Christopher S Roper, and John H Martin. Interpretable models for extrapolation in scientific machine learning. *Digital Discovery*, 2(5):1425–1435, 2023.
- [132] Shun Muroga, Yasuaki Miki, and Kenji Hata. A comprehensive and versatile multimodal deep-learning approach for predicting diverse properties of advanced materials. *Advanced Science*, 10(24):2302508, 2023.

- [133] Chang Woo Myung, Amir Hajibabaei, Ji-Hyun Cha, Miran Ha, Junu Kim, and Kwang S Kim. Challenges, opportunities, and prospects in metal halide perovskites from theoretical and machine learning perspectives. *Advanced Energy Materials*, 12(45):2202279, 2022.
- [134] Nikos Th Nikolinakos. Ethical principles for trustworthy AI. In *EU policy and legal framework for artificial intelligence, robotics and related technologies-the AI Act*, pages 101–166. Springer, 2023.
- [135] Curtis Northcutt, Lu Jiang, and Isaac Chuang. Confident learning: Estimating uncertainty in dataset labels. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 70:1373–1411, 2021.
- [136] Claudio Novelli, Mariarosaria Taddeo, and Luciano Floridi. Accountability in artificial intelligence: What it is and how it works. *AI & Society*, 39(4):1871–1882, 2024.
- [137] Portia Annabelle Opoku, Longcang Shu, Theophilus Ansah-Narh, Patrick Banahene, Kouassi Bienvenue Mikael Onan Yao, Albert Kwame Kwaw, and Shuyao Niu. Prediction of karst spring discharge using LSTM with Bayesian optimisation hyperparameter tuning: A laboratory physical model approach. *Modeling Earth Systems and Environment*, 10(1):1457–1482, 2024.
- [138] Felipe Oviedo, Zekun Ren, Shijing Sun, Charles Settens, Zhe Liu, Noor Titan Putri Hartono, Savitha Ramasamy, Brian L. DeCost, Siyu I. P. Tian, Giuseppe Romano, Aaron Gilad Kusne, and Tonio Buonassisi. Fast and interpretable classification of small X-ray diffraction datasets using data augmentation and deep neural networks. *npj Computational Materials*, 5(1):60, 2019.
- [139] Felipe Oviedo, Juan Lavista Ferres, Tonio Buonassisi, and Keith T Butler. Interpretable and explainable machine learning for materials science and chemistry. *Accounts of Materials Research*, 3(6):597–607, 2022.
- [140] Cameron J Owen, Yu Xie, Anders Johansson, Lixin Sun, and Boris Kozinsky. Low-index mesoscopic surface reconstructions of Au surfaces using Bayesian force fields. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):3790, 2024.
- [141] Glenn Palmer, Siqi Du, Alexander Politowicz, Joshua Paul Emory, Xiyu Yang, Anupraas Gautam, Grishma Gupta, Zhelong Li, Ryan Jacobs, and Dane Morgan. Calibration after bootstrap for accurate uncertainty quantification in regression models. *npj Computational Materials*, 8(1):115, 2022.
- [142] Noah H Paulson, Elise Jennings, and Marius Stan. Bayesian strategies for uncertainty quantification of the thermodynamic properties of materials. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 142:74–93, 2019.
- [143] Fabian Pedregosa, Gaël Varoquaux, Alexandre Gramfort, Vincent Michel, Bertrand Thirion, Olivier Grisel, Mathieu Blondel, Peter Prettenhofer, Ron Weiss, Vincent Dubourg, Jake Vanderplas, Alexandre Passos, David Cournapeau, Matthieu Brucher, Matthieu Perrot, and Édouard Duchesnay. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *the Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2825–2830, 2011.
- [144] Raphaël Pestourie, Youssef Mroueh, Chris Rackauckas, Payel Das, and Steven G Johnson. Physics-enhanced deep surrogates for partial differential equations. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(12):1458–1465, 2023.
- [145] Simon Petit-Renaud and Thierry Denoeux. Nonparametric regression analysis of uncertain and imprecise data using belief functions. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 35(1):1–28, 2004.
- [146] Nga Pham, Minh Kha Do, Tran Vu Dai, Pham Ngoc Hung, and Anh Nguyen-Duc. Fairedu: A multiple regression-based method for enhancing fairness in machine learning models for educational applications. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 269:126219, 2025.
- [147] Hai Phan and Anh Nguyen. Deepface-emd: Re-ranking using patch-wise earth mover’s distance improves out-of-distribution face identification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 20259–20269, 2022.
- [148] Daryl Posnett, Abram Hindle, and Premkumar Devanbu. A simpler model of software readability. In *Proceedings of the 8th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories*, pages 73–82, 2011.
- [149] Apostolos F Psaros, Xuhui Meng, Zongren Zou, Ling Guo, and George Em Karniadakis. Uncertainty quantification in scientific machine learning: Methods, metrics, and comparisons. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 477:111902, 2023.
- [150] Edward Raff, Michel Benaroch, Sagar Samtani, and Andrew L Farris. What do machine learning researchers mean by “reproducible”? In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 39, pages 28671–28683, 2025.

- [151] Rahul Rahaman and alexandre thiery. Uncertainty quantification and deep ensembles. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 20063–20075. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- [152] Md Masudur Rahman, Zenun Chowdhury, and Raqeebir Rab. A tool for measuring program comprehensibility using readability-driven metrics. *Software Impacts*, page 100782, 2025.
- [153] Nikil Ravi, Pranshu Chaturvedi, EA Huerta, Zhengchun Liu, Ryan Chard, Aristana Scourtas, KJ Schmidt, Kyle Chard, Ben Blaiszik, and Ian Foster. FAIR principles for AI models with a practical application for accelerated high energy diffraction microscopy. *Scientific Data*, 9(1):657, 2022.
- [154] Sandipp Krishnan Ravi, Indranil Roy, Subhrajit Roychowdhury, Bojun Feng, Sayan Ghosh, Christopher Reynolds, Rajnikant V Umretiya, Raul B Rebak, and Andrew K Hoffman. Elucidating precipitation in FeCrAl alloys through explainable AI: A case study. *Computational Materials Science*, 230:112440, 2023.
- [155] Pranoy Ray, Adam P Generale, Nikhith Vankireddy, Yuichiro Asoma, Masataka Nakauchi, Haein Lee, Katsuhisa Yoshida, Yoshishige Okuno, and Surya R Kalidindi. Refining coarse-grained molecular topologies: A Bayesian optimization approach. *npj Computational Materials*, 11(1):234, 2025.
- [156] Patrick AK Reinbold, Logan M Kageorge, Michael F Schatz, and Roman O Grigoriev. Robust learning from noisy, incomplete, high-dimensional experimental data via physically constrained symbolic regression. *Nature Communications*, 12(1):3219, 2021.
- [157] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. “Why should I trust you?” explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1135–1144, 2016.
- [158] Sebastien Röcken and Julija Zavadlav. Accurate machine learning force fields via experimental and simulation data fusion. *npj Computational Materials*, 10(1):69, 2024.
- [159] Sunčana Roksandić, Nikola Protrka, and Marc Engelhart. Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence and its use by Law Enforcement Authorities: where do we stand? In *2022 45th jubilee international convention on information, communication and electronic technology (MIPRO)*, pages 1225–1232. IEEE, 2022.
- [160] Swalpa Kumar Roy, Suvojit Manna, Tiecheng Song, and Lorenzo Bruzzone. Attention-based adaptive spectral-spatial kernel ResNet for hyperspectral image classification. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 59(9):7831–7843, 2020.
- [161] Tonmoy Roy, Pobithra Das, Ravi Jagirdar, Mousa Shhabat, Md Shahriar Abdullah, Abul Kashem, and Raiyan Rahman. Prediction of mechanical properties of eco-friendly concrete using machine learning algorithms and partial dependence plot analysis. *Smart Construction and Sustainable Cities*, 3(1):2, 2025.
- [162] Víctor Sabanza-Gil, Riccardo Barbano, Daniel Pacheco Gutiérrez, Jeremy S Luterbacher, José Miguel Hernández-Lobato, Philippe Schwaller, and Loïc Roch. Best practices for multi-fidelity Bayesian optimization in materials and molecular research. *Nature Computational Science*, pages 1–10, 2025.
- [163] Shrutidhara Sarma, Akarshit Kumar Verma, Saket Sanjay Phadkule, and Manabendra Saharia. Towards an interpretable machine learning model for electrospun polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) fiber properties. *Computational Materials Science*, 213:111661, 2022.
- [164] Christoph Scheurer and Karsten Reuter. Role of the human-in-the-loop in emerging self-driving laboratories for heterogeneous catalysis. *Nature Catalysis*, 8(1):13–19, 2025.
- [165] Ian Scott, Stacy Carter, and Enrico Coiera. Clinician checklist for assessing suitability of machine learning applications in healthcare. *BMJ Health & Care Informatics*, 28(1):e100251, 2021.
- [166] Balaranjan Selvaratnam, Anton O Oliynyk, and Arthur Mar. Interpretable machine learning in solid-state chemistry, with applications to perovskites, spinels, and rare-earth intermetallics: Finding descriptors using decision trees. *Inorganic Chemistry*, 62(28):10865–10875, 2023.
- [167] Harald Semmelrock, Tony Ross-Hellauer, Simone Kopeinik, Dieter Theiler, Armin Haberl, Stefan Thalmann, and Dominik Kowald. Reproducibility in machine-learning-based research: Overview, barriers, and drivers. *AI Magazine*, 46(2):e70002, 2025.

- [168] Poonam Sharma, Mitesh B Solanki, Sanketsinh Thakor, Prince Jain, Ajay Zapadiya, Dimple V Shah, and Chandan Vaja. Comprehensive study of spinel nanoparticles using experimental, theoretical and machine learning methods. *Physica B: Condensed Matter*, 699:416820, 2025.
- [169] Chen Shen. The synergy of machine learning and calphad: Revitalizing traditional approaches. *Computational Materials Science*, 258:113970, 2025.
- [170] Hua Shen, Tiffany Kneare, Reshmi Ghosh, Kenan Alkiek, Kundan Krishna, Yachuan Liu, Ziqiao Ma, Savvas Petridis, Yi-Hao Peng, Qiwei Li, Sushrita Rakshit, Chenglei Si, Yutong Xie, Jeffrey P. Bigham, Frank Bentley, Joyce Chai, Zachary Lipton, Qiaozhu Mei, Rada Mihalcea, Michael Terry, Diyi Yang, Meredith Ringel Morris, and David Jurgens. Towards bidirectional human-AI alignment: A systematic review for clarifications, framework, and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09264*, 2024.
- [171] Yan Shi, Pengfei Wei, Ke Feng, De-Cheng Feng, and Michael Beer. A survey on machine learning approaches for uncertainty quantification of engineering systems. *Machine Learning for Computational Science and Engineering*, 1(1):11, 2025.
- [172] Aubrey A Shick, Christina M Webber, Nooshin Kiarashi, Jessica P Weinberg, Aneesh Deoras, Nicholas Petrick, Anindita Saha, and Matthew C Diamond. Transparency of artificial intelligence/machine learning-enabled medical devices. *npj Digital Medicine*, 7(1):21, 2024.
- [173] Benjamin J Shields, Jason Stevens, Jun Li, Marvin Parasram, Farhan Damani, Jesus I Martinez Alvarado, Jacob M Janey, Ryan P Adams, and Abigail G Doyle. Bayesian reaction optimization as a tool for chemical synthesis. *Nature*, 590(7844): 89–96, 2021.
- [174] Snehi Shrestha, Kieran James Barvenik, Tianle Chen, Haochen Yang, Yang Li, Meera Muthachi Kesavan, Joshua M. Little, Hayden C. Whitley, Zi Teng, Yaguang Luo, Eleonora Tubaldi, and Po-Yen Chen. Machine intelligence accelerated design of conductive mxene aerogels with programmable properties. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):4685, 2024.
- [175] Samira Silva, Adiel Tuyishime, Tiziano Santilli, Patrizio Pelliccione, and Ludovico Iovino. Quality metrics in software architecture. In *2023 IEEE 20th International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA)*, pages 58–69. IEEE, 2023.
- [176] Chandan Singh, Armin Askari, Rich Caruana, and Jianfeng Gao. Augmenting interpretable models with large language models during training. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):7913, 2023.
- [177] Swati Singh, Nirmal Kumar Katiyar, Saurav Goel, and Shrikrishna N Joshi. Phase prediction and experimental realisation of a new high entropy alloy using machine learning. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):4811, 2023.
- [178] Boris N Slautin, Yu Liu, Jan Dec, Vladimir V Shvartsman, Doru C Lupascu, Maxim A Ziatdinov, and Sergei V Kalinin. Measurements with noise: Bayesian optimization for co-optimizing noise and property discovery in automated experiments. *Digital Discovery*, 4(4):1066–1074, 2025.
- [179] Zeinab Sodaee, Saeid Ekrami, and Seyed Majid Hashemianzadeh. Machine learning analysis of molecular dynamics properties influencing drug solubility. *Scientific Reports*, 15(1):26955, 2025.
- [180] Martim Sousa, Ana Maria Tome, and Jose Moreira. Improving conformalized quantile regression through cluster-based feature relevance. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 238:122322, 2024.
- [181] Jacob Startt, Megan J McCarthy, Mitchell A Wood, Sean Donegan, and Rémi Dingreville. Bayesian blacksmithing: discovering thermomechanical properties and deformation mechanisms in high-entropy refractory alloys. *npj Computational Materials*, 10(1):164, 2024.
- [182] Yiyu Sun and Yixuan Li. Dice: Leveraging sparsification for out-of-distribution detection. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 691–708. Springer, 2022.
- [183] Piyush M Tagade, Shashishekar P Adiga, Shanthi Pandian, Min Sik Park, Krishnan S Hariharan, and Subramanya Mayya Kolake. Attribute driven inverse materials design using deep learning bayesian framework. *npj Computational Materials*, 5(1):127, 2019.
- [184] Anjana Talapatra, Shahin Boluki, Thien Duong, Xiaoning Qian, Edward Dougherty, and Raymundo Arróyave. Autonomous efficient experiment design for materials discovery with Bayesian model averaging. *Physical Review Materials*, 2(11):113803, 2018.

- [185] Zeyu Tang and Kun Zhang. Attainability and optimality: The equalized odds fairness revisited. In *Conference on Causal Learning and Reasoning*, pages 754–786. PMLR, 2022.
- [186] Karl E Taylor. Summarizing multiple aspects of model performance in a single diagram. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 106(D7):7183–7192, 2001.
- [187] Kensei Terashima, Pedro Baptista de Castro, Akiko Takahashi Saito, Takafumi D Yamamoto, Ryo Matsumoto, Hiroyuki Takeya, and Yoshihiko Takano. Experimental exploration of Erb2 and SHAP analysis on a machine-learned model of magnetocaloric materials for materials design. *Science and Technology of Advanced Materials: Methods*, 3(1):2217474, 2023.
- [188] Jonas Teufel, Luca Torresi, Patrick Reiser, and Pascal Friederich. MEGAN: multi-explanation graph attention network. In *World Conference on Explainable Artificial Intelligence*, pages 338–360. Springer, 2023.
- [189] Shun Tian, Ke Zhou, Wanjian Yin, and Yilun Liu. Machine learning enables the discovery of 2D Invar and anti-Invar monolayers. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):6977, 2024.
- [190] Yuan Tian, Tongtong Li, Jianbo Pang, Yumei Zhou, Dezhen Xue, Xiangdong Ding, and Turab Lookman. Materials design with target-oriented Bayesian optimization. *npj Computational Materials*, 11(1):209, 2025.
- [191] Liana Todorean, Mihai Daian, Tudor Cioara, Ionut Anghel, Vasilis Michalakopoulos, Efstathios Sarantinopoulos, and Elisaios Sarmas. Heuristic based federated learning with adaptive hyperparameter tuning for households energy prediction. *Scientific Reports*, 15(1):12564, 2025.
- [192] Milica Todorović, Michael U Gutmann, Jukka Corander, and Patrick Rinke. Bayesian inference of atomistic structure in functional materials. *npj Computational Materials*, 5(1):35, 2019.
- [193] Gary Tom, Stefan P Schmid, Sterling G. Baird, Yang Cao, Kourosh Darvish, Han Hao, Stanley Lo, Sergio Pablo-García, Ella M. Rajaonson, Marta Skreta, Nikolas P. A. Smith, Wenhao Sun, Chaochao Dun, Mahshad Koochy, Arne-Christian Laakmann, Tony C. Yu, Caleb Johnson, Susan M. Zurbuchen, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, and Lee Cronin. Self-driving laboratories for chemistry and materials science. *Chemical Reviews*, 124(16):9633–9732, 2024.
- [194] Cuong Tran, Ferdinando Fioretto, Jung-Eun Kim, and Rakshit Naidu. Pruning has a disparate impact on model accuracy. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17652–17664, 2022.
- [195] Kevin Tran, Willie Neiswanger, Junwoong Yoon, Qingyang Zhang, Eric Xing, and Zachary W Ulissi. Methods for comparing uncertainty quantifications for material property predictions. *Machine Learning: Science and Technology*, 1(2):025006, 2020.
- [196] Bora Uyar, Taras Savchyn, Amirhossein Naghsh Nilchi, Ahmet Sarigun, Ricardo Wurmus, Mohammed Maqsood Shaik, Björn Grüning, Vedran Franke, and Altuna Akalin. Flexynesis: A deep learning toolkit for bulk multi-omics data integration for precision oncology and beyond. *Nature Communications*, 16(1):8261, 2025.
- [197] Rens van de Schoot, Jonathan de Bruin, Raoul Schram, Parisa Zahedi, Jan de Boer, Felix Weijdem, Bianca Kramer, Martijn Huijts, Maarten Hoogerwerf, Gerbrich Ferdinands, Chris H. van der Mierden, Roy M. N. van Noorden, Bart M. Borgers, Qian Li, Johanna A. H. Hooijmans, and Maurice P. A. Zeegers. An open source machine learning framework for efficient and transparent systematic reviews. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 3(2):125–133, 2021.
- [198] Jasper Van Der Waa, Elisabeth Nieuwburg, Anita Cremers, and Mark Neerincx. Evaluating XAI: A comparison of rule-based and example-based explanations. *Artificial Intelligence*, 291:103404, 2021.
- [199] Jonathan Vandermause, Yu Xie, Jin Soo Lim, Cameron J Owen, and Boris Kozinsky. Active learning of reactive Bayesian force fields applied to heterogeneous catalysis dynamics of H/Pt. *Nature Communications*, 13(1):5183, 2022.
- [200] Sahil Verma, Varich Boonsanong, Minh Hoang, Keegan Hines, John Dickerson, and Chirag Shah. Counterfactual explanations and algorithmic recourses for machine learning: A review. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(12):1–42, 2024.
- [201] Svetlana Volkova. An overview on data augmentation for machine learning. In *International Scientific and Practical Conference Digital and Information Technologies in Economics and Management*, pages 143–154. Springer, 2023.
- [202] Yuki K Wakabayashi, Takuma Otsuka, Yoshiharu Krockenberger, Hiroshi Sawada, Yoshitaka Taniyasu, and Hideki Yamamoto. Bayesian optimization with experimental failure for high-throughput materials growth. *npj Computational Materials*, 8(1):180, 2022.

- [203] Bo Wang, Jianlong Zhou, Yiqiao Li, and Fang Chen. Impact of fidelity and robustness of machine learning explanations on user trust. In *Australasian Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 209–220. Springer, 2023.
- [204] Fangxi Wang, Allana G Iwanicki, Abhishek T Sose, Lucas A Pressley, Tyrel M McQueen, and Sanket A Deshmukh. Experimentally validated inverse design of FeNiCrCoCu MPEAs and unlocking key insights with explainable AI. *npj Computational Materials*, 11(1):1–18, 2025.
- [205] Hongshuai Wang, Jie Feng, Zhihao Dong, Lujie Jin, Miaomiao Li, Jianyu Yuan, and Youyong Li. Efficient screening framework for organic solar cells with deep learning and ensemble learning. *npj Computational Materials*, 9(1):200, 2023.
- [206] Jindong Wang, Cuiling Lan, Chang Liu, Yidong Ouyang, Tao Qin, Wang Lu, Yiqiang Chen, Wenjun Zeng, and Philip S Yu. Generalizing to unseen domains: A survey on domain generalization. *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 35(8):8052–8072, 2022.
- [207] Shaojun Wang, Yiru Huang, Wenguang Hu, and Lei Zhang. Data-driven optimization and machine learning analysis of compatible molecules for halide perovskite material. *npj Computational Materials*, 10(1):114, 2024.
- [208] Xiaoqian Wang, Yang Huang, Xiaoyu Xie, Yan Liu, Ziyu Huo, Maverick Lin, Hongliang Xin, and Rong Tong. Bayesian-optimization-assisted discovery of stereoselective aluminum complexes for ring-opening polymerization of racemic lactide. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):3647, 2023.
- [209] Yiming Wang, Pei Zhang, Baosong Yang, Derek Wong, Zhuosheng Zhang, and Rui Wang. Embedding trajectory for out-of-distribution detection in mathematical reasoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:42965–42999, 2024.
- [210] Yinan Wang, Wenbo Sun, Jionghua Jin, Zhenyu Kong, and Xiaowei Yue. Wood: Wasserstein-based out-of-distribution detection. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 46(2):944–956, 2023.
- [211] Yuxuan Wang and Ross D King. Extrapolation is not the same as interpolation. *Machine Learning*, 113(10):8205–8232, 2024.
- [212] Geemi P Wellawatte, Aditi Seshadri, and Andrew D White. Model agnostic generation of counterfactual explanations for molecules. *Chemical Science*, 13(13):3697–3705, 2022.
- [213] Mingjian Wen and Ellad B Tadmor. Uncertainty quantification in molecular simulations with dropout neural network potentials. *npj Computational Materials*, 6(1):124, 2020.
- [214] Alexander Wiczorek, Austin G Kuba, Jan Sommerhäuser, Luis Nicklaus Caceres, Christian M Wolff, and Sebastian Siol. Advancing high-throughput combinatorial aging studies of hybrid perovskite thin films via precise automated characterization methods and machine learning assisted analysis. *Journal of Materials Chemistry A*, 12(12):7025–7035, 2024.
- [215] Mark D. Wilkinson, Michel Dumontier, IJsbrand Jan Aalbersberg, Gabrielle Appleton, Myles Axton, Arie Baak, Niklas Blomberg, Jan-Willem Boiten, Luiz Bonino da Silva Santos, Philip E. Bourne, Jildau Bouwman, Anthony J. Brookes, Tim Clark, Mercè Crosas, Ingrid Dillo, Olivier Dumon, Scott Edmunds, Chris T. Evelo, Richard Finkers, Alejandra Gonzalez-Beltran, Alasdair J.G. Gray, Paul Groth, Carole Goble, Jeffrey S. Grethe, Jaap Heringa, Peter A.C. 't Hoen, Rob Hooft, Tobias Kuhn, Ruben Kok, Joost Kok, Scott J. Lusher, Maryann E. Martone, Albert Mons, Abel L. Packer, Bengt Persson, Philippe Rocca-Serra, Marco Roos, Rene van Schaik, Susanna-Assunta Sansone, Erik Schultes, Thierry Sengstag, Ted Slater, George Strawn, Morris A. Swertz, Mark Thompson, Johan van der Lei, Erik van Mulligen, Jan Velterop, Andra Waagmeester, Peter Wittenburg, Katherine Wolstencroft, Jun Zhao, and Barend Mons. The FAIR guiding principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific Data*, 3(1):1–9, 2016.
- [216] Mark D Wilkinson, Susanna-Assunta Sansone, Erik Schultes, Peter Doorn, Luiz Olavo Bonino da Silva Santos, and Michel Dumontier. A design framework and exemplar metrics for fairness. *Scientific Data*, 5(1):1–4, 2018.
- [217] Christopher D. Wirz, Carly Sutter, Julie L. Demuth, Kirsten J. Mayer, William E. Chapman, Mariana Goodall Cains, Jacob Radford, Vanessa Przybylo, Aaron Evans, Thomas Martin, Lauriana C. Gaudet, Kara Sulia, Ann Bostrom, David John II Gagne, Nick Bassill, Andrea Schumacher, and Christopher Thorncroft. Increasing the reproducibility and replicability of supervised AI/ML in the Earth systems science by leveraging social science methods. *Earth and Space Science*, 11(7):e2023EA003364, 2024.
- [218] David A Wood. More transparent and explainable machine learning algorithms are required to provide enhanced and sustainable dataset understanding. *Ecological Modelling*, 498:110898, 2024.

- [219] Mengfan Wu, Evgenii Tikhonov, Abudukadi Tudi, Ivan Kruglov, Xueling Hou, Congwei Xie, Shilie Pan, and Zhihua Yang. Target-driven design of deep-UV nonlinear optical materials via interpretable machine learning. *Advanced Materials*, 35(23):2300848, 2023.
- [220] Boming Xia, Qinghua Lu, Liming Zhu, Sung Une Lee, Yue Liu, and Zhenchang Xing. Towards a responsible AI metrics catalogue: A collection of metrics for AI accountability. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 3rd International Conference on AI Engineering-Software Engineering for AI*, pages 100–111, 2024.
- [221] Ziyu Xiang, Mingzhou Fan, Guillermo Vázquez Tovar, William Trehern, Byung-Jun Yoon, Xiaofeng Qian, Raymundo Arroyave, and Xiaoning Qian. Physics-constrained automatic feature engineering for predictive modeling in materials science. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 10414–10421, 2021.
- [222] Tian Xie and Jeffrey C Grossman. Crystal graph convolutional neural networks for an accurate and interpretable prediction of material properties. *Physical Review Letters*, 120(14):145301, 2018.
- [223] Pengcheng Xu, Xiaobo Ji, Minjie Li, and Wencong Lu. Small data machine learning in materials science. *npj Computational Materials*, 9(1):42, 2023.
- [224] Yang Xu, Ronghao Zheng, Senlin Zhang, Meiqin Liu, and Junzhi Yu. Uncertainty-aware autonomous robot exploration using confidence-rich localization and mapping. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2024.
- [225] Chih-Hsuan Yang, Balaji Sessa Sarath Pokuri, Xian Yeow Lee, Sangeeth Balakrishnan, Chinmay Hegde, Soumik Sarkar, and Baskar Ganapathysubramanian. Multi-fidelity machine learning models for structure–property mapping of organic electronics. *Computational Materials Science*, 213:111599, 2022.
- [226] Huarong Yu, Yue Wang, Tan Li, Qibo Gan, Dan Qu, and Fangshu Qu. Calibrating activated sludge models through hyperparameter optimization: A new framework for wastewater treatment plant simulation. *npj Clean Water*, 8(1):80, 2025.
- [227] Xiaohua Zhai, Joan Puigcerver, Alexander Kolesnikov, Pierre Ruysen, Carlos Riquelme, Mario Lucic, Josip Djolonga, André Susano Pinto, Maxim Neumann, Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Olivier Bachem, Michael Tschannen, Marcin Michalski, Olivier Bousquet, Sylvain Gelly, and Neil Houlsby. A large-scale study of representation learning with the visual task adaptation benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.04867*, 2019.
- [228] Changwei Zhang, Yang Zhong, Zhi-Guo Tao, Xinming Qin, Honghui Shang, Zhenggang Lan, Oleg V Prezhdo, Xin-Gao Gong, Weibin Chu, and Hongjun Xiang. Advancing nonadiabatic molecular dynamics simulations in solids with E(3) equivariant deep neural hamiltonians. *Nature Communications*, 16(1):2033, 2025.
- [229] Jize Zhang, Bhavya Kailkhura, and T Yong-Jin Han. Leveraging uncertainty from deep learning for trustworthy material discovery workflows. *ACS Omega*, 6(19):12711–12721, 2021.
- [230] Siqi Zhang, Qizhe Zhang, Shanghang Zhang, Xiaohong Liu, Jingkun Yue, Ming Lu, Huihuan Xu, Jiaxin Yao, Xiaobao Wei, Jiajun Cao, Xiang Zhang, Ming Gao, Jun Shen, Yichang Hao, Yinkui Wang, Xingcai Zhang, Song Wu, Ping Zhang, Shuguang Cui, and Guangyu Wang. A generalist foundation model and database for open-world medical image segmentation. *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, pages 1–16, 2025.
- [231] Xingyu Zhao, Simos Gerasimou, Radu Calinescu, Calum Imrie, Valentin Robu, and David Flynn. Bayesian learning for the robust verification of autonomous robots. *Communications Engineering*, 3(1):18, 2024.
- [232] Shisheng Zheng, Xi-Ming Zhang, Heng-Su Liu, Ge-Hao Liang, Si-Wang Zhang, Wentao Zhang, Bingxu Wang, Jingling Yang, Xian’an Jin, Feng Pan, and Jian-Feng Li. Active phase discovery in heterogeneous catalysis via topology-guided sampling and machine learning. *Nature Communications*, 16(1):1–13, 2025.
- [233] Haowen Zhong, Yilan Liu, Haibin Sun, Yuru Liu, Rentao Zhang, Baochen Li, Yi Yang, Yuqing Huang, Fei Yang, Frankie S. Mak, Klement Foo, Sen Lin, Tianshu Yu, Peng Wang, and Xiaoxue Wang. Towards global reaction feasibility and robustness prediction with high throughput data and Bayesian deep learning. *Nature Communications*, 16(1):4522, 2025.
- [234] Xiaoting Zhong, Brian Gallagher, Shusen Liu, Bhavya Kailkhura, Anna Hiszpanski, and T Yong-Jin Han. Explainable machine learning in materials science. *npj Computational Materials*, 8(1):204, 2022.
- [235] Jianlong Zhou, Sunny Verma, Mudit Mittal, and Fang Chen. Understanding relations between perception of fairness and trust in algorithmic decision making. In *2021 8th International Conference on Behavioral and Social Computing (BESC)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2021.

- [236] Jinan Zhou, Andrey Velichkevich, Kirill Prosvirov, Anubhav Garg, Yuji Oshima, and Debo Dutta. Katib: A distributed general {AutoML} platform on kubernetes. In *2019 USENIX Conference on Operational Machine Learning (OpML 19)*, pages 55–57, 2019.
- [237] Ziyue Zou and Pratyush Tiwary. Enhanced sampling of crystal nucleation with graph representation learnt variables. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 128(12):3037–3045, 2024.