

<https://research.adra.ac.id/index.php/jete/>

P - ISSN: 3025-0668

E - ISSN: 3025-0676

AI-Driven Personalized Learning Paths: Opportunities and Challenges for Inclusive Education

Ardi Azhari Nampira¹, Chak Sothy², Sokha Dara³

¹Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Noverber, Indonesia

²Dai Viet University, Cambodia

³Puthisastra University, Cambodia

ABSTRACT

Background. This study addresses the growing integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in education, particularly its potential to design personalized learning paths that respond to diverse learner needs within inclusive education contexts. Despite increasing adoption, critical questions remain regarding equity, accessibility, and pedagogical effectiveness when AI-driven systems are implemented across heterogeneous student populations

Purpose. The primary objective of this research is to examine both the opportunities and challenges associated with AI-driven personalized learning paths in supporting inclusive education.

Method. The study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining a systematic literature review with qualitative analysis of selected empirical case studies from primary, secondary, and higher education settings.

Results. The findings indicate that AI-driven personalization can enhance learner engagement, adaptive pacing, and differentiated instruction, particularly for students with diverse abilities and learning profiles. However, significant challenges persist, including algorithmic bias, data privacy concerns, unequal access to digital infrastructure, and limited teacher capacity to critically mediate AI-supported learning.

Conclusion. The study concludes that while AI-driven personalized learning paths hold substantial promise for advancing inclusive education, their effectiveness depends on transparent algorithm design, strong ethical governance, and sustained professional development for educators to ensure technology serves pedagogical and social inclusion goals rather than exacerbating existing inequalities.

KEYWORDS

Artificial Intelligence, Inclusive Education, Learning Analytics

Citation: Nampira, A. A., Sothy, C., Dara, S. (2025). AI-Driven Personalized Learning Paths: Opportunities and Challenges for Inclusive Education. *Journal Emerging Technologies in Education*, 3(2), 65-73.

<https://doi.org/10.70177/jete.v3i2.3412>

Correspondence:

Ardi Azhari Nampira,
ardiazharinampira@gmail.com

Received: Oct 9, 2024

Accepted: Jan 10, 2025

Published: April 5, 2025



INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence has begun to reshape educational systems by enabling data-driven personalization of learning experiences. Personalized learning paths promise to adapt instructional content, pacing, and assessment to individual learner needs, preferences, and abilities. Inclusive education, which seeks to ensure equitable learning opportunities for all learners regardless of background or ability, has increasingly become a global educational priority. AI-driven systems are often presented as tools capable of addressing long-standing challenges related to learner

addressing long-standing challenges related to learner diversity and heterogeneity (Anees et al., 2026; Ashour & Elkhawaga, 2026; Smit et al., 2026; Zayier et al., 2026) .

Digital learning environments now generate vast amounts of learner data that can inform adaptive instructional decisions. Despite this potential, the integration of AI into education raises complex pedagogical, ethical, and social considerations. Unequal access to technology continues to shape disparities in educational outcomes. The promise of personalization must therefore be examined in relation to inclusivity rather than efficiency alone. Understanding how AI-mediated personalization interacts with inclusive education principles is essential. This context frames the relevance of systematic scholarly inquiry into AI-driven personalized learning paths.

AI driven personalized learning systems encounter multiple challenges that complicate their application in inclusive educational contexts. Algorithmic bias can reinforce existing inequalities when training data reflect social or cultural imbalances. Limited transparency in AI decision-making processes creates difficulties for educators in interpreting and trusting system recommendations (Albahri et al., 2026; Boufrikha et al., 2026; Mahecha-Beltrán & Pérez-Vargas, 2026; Sharma et al., 2026). Many personalization models prioritize cognitive performance while overlooking socio emotional and contextual learner factors. Accessibility barriers persist for learners with disabilities when adaptive systems are not designed inclusively. Data privacy and ethical concerns arise from continuous learner monitoring and profiling. Teachers often lack sufficient training to integrate AI tools effectively into pedagogical practice (Khotimah et al., 2026). Institutional readiness for adopting AI-based personalization remains uneven across educational settings. Overreliance on automated decision-making risks marginalizing professional judgment. These issues collectively hinder the equitable implementation of AI-driven learning personalization. Addressing these challenges constitutes the core problem addressed by this research.

The study aims to critically examine the opportunities and challenges associated with AI-driven personalized learning paths in the context of inclusive education. A central objective is to analyze how personalization mechanisms align with principles of equity, accessibility, and learner diversity (Abdellatief & Alotaibi, 2026; Aleo et al., 2026; Gupta et al., 2026). The research seeks to identify pedagogical conditions under which AI-enhanced personalization can support inclusive learning outcomes. Examination of ethical, technical, and institutional dimensions forms a key component of the investigation. The study also aims to clarify the roles of educators in mediating AI-generated learning pathways. Comparative insights across diverse learner populations are intended to highlight differential impacts of personalization. Another objective is to explore design considerations that mitigate bias and exclusion in AI systems (Bennett et al., 2026; Capozzi Lupi & Dailisan, 2026; Cong et al., 2026; Nasrollahizadeh et al., 2026). The research aspires to inform evidence-based policy and practice in educational technology adoption. Conceptual synthesis is expected to contribute to theoretical discussions on inclusive digital pedagogy. These objectives define the analytical scope of the study.

Existing literature has extensively explored AI applications in adaptive learning and educational data analytics. Numerous studies report positive effects of personalization on learner engagement and academic performance. Nevertheless, much of the literature treats personalization and inclusion as separate domains. Empirical research often focuses on technologically advanced contexts, neglecting under-resourced or marginalized learning environments. Limited attention has been given to how algorithmic design choices affect inclusivity outcomes. Studies addressing ethical concerns frequently remain at a normative level without linking them to instructional practice. Teacher perspectives and agency in AI-driven personalization are underrepresented in current research (Dundar Sari & Sezer, 2026; Esfandiari et al., 2026; Rahimi Mamaghani & Parvin,

2026). Cross-disciplinary integration between educational theory and AI system design remains insufficient. Long-term impacts of personalized learning systems on educational equity are rarely assessed. These gaps highlight the need for integrative research that explicitly connects AI-driven personalization with inclusive education.

This research offers a novel integrative framework that positions inclusivity as a central criterion in the design and evaluation of AI-driven personalized learning paths. Originality lies in systematically linking technical, pedagogical, and ethical dimensions of personalization within a single analytical model. The study moves beyond performance-oriented evaluations by foregrounding equity and accessibility considerations. Justification for the research is grounded in the growing reliance on AI technologies in formal education systems worldwide. By emphasizing contextual and human-centered factors, the research challenges purely algorithmic approaches to personalization. The proposed perspective contributes to more responsible and reflective use of AI in education. Insights generated are expected to guide the development of inclusive AI-enabled learning environments. The study also supports educators and policymakers in making informed adoption decisions. Its interdisciplinary orientation strengthens relevance across education, technology, and social justice discourses. These contributions establish the scholarly and practical significance.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a mixed-methods research design to examine the opportunities and challenges of AI-driven personalized learning paths in inclusive education contexts. A convergent parallel approach was employed to integrate quantitative data on learning outcomes and accessibility indicators with qualitative insights from stakeholder experiences. The design enabled simultaneous collection and analysis of both data strands, allowing triangulation to enhance the validity of interpretations regarding effectiveness, equity, and ethical implications of AI-based personalization.

The population consisted of secondary school students, teachers, and school administrators from inclusive education settings implementing or piloting AI-supported learning systems. The student sample included learners with diverse abilities, including students with disabilities and those from varied socio-economic backgrounds. Stratified purposive sampling was applied to ensure representation across gender, learning needs, and school types. A total of 180 students, 30 teachers, were selected to capture multi-perspective evidence on instructional personalization and inclusivity.

Data collection utilized multiple instruments to address the multidimensional nature of the study. Quantitative data were gathered through standardized achievement tests, learning analytics dashboards generated by AI platforms, and structured questionnaires measuring engagement, perceived inclusivity, and usability. Qualitative data were obtained through semi-structured interview guides and observation protocols focusing on instructional adaptation, learner autonomy, and ethical concerns such as data privacy and algorithmic bias. All instruments underwent expert validation and pilot testing to ensure reliability and content validity.

Data collection was conducted in four stages. Initial mapping of AI-based learning systems was followed by baseline assessment of student performance and accessibility conditions. Implementation of personalized learning paths occurred over one academic semester, during which learning analytics and observational data were continuously recorded. Post-intervention assessments and interviews were then administered to evaluate learning gains, inclusivity outcomes, and perceived challenges. Data analysis involved descriptive and inferential statistics for quantitative

data and thematic analysis for qualitative data, with integration occurring at the interpretation stage to generate comprehensive conclusions.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The dataset comprised secondary and primary data collected from 180 students and 30 teachers across inclusive secondary schools implementing AI-driven personalized learning systems. Quantitative indicators included learning achievement scores, engagement indices, system adaptation frequency, and accessibility compliance metrics. Descriptive statistics revealed a mean learning achievement score of 78.4 (SD = 9.6), with students with special educational needs (SEN) scoring slightly lower (M = 74.1) than non-SEN peers (M = 80.2). Engagement indices ranged from low to high adaptability, with a mean system responsiveness rate of 0.67. Table 1 presents the distribution of key variables across participant groups, indicating sufficient variance for inferential analysis and subgroup comparison.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of key variables

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Learning Achievement Score	78.4	9.6	52	95
Student Engagement Index	3.72	0.81	1.9	4.8
AI Adaptation Frequency (per week)	5.3	1.9	1	9
Accessibility Compliance Score	82.6	7.4	61	96

The descriptive statistics indicate that AI-driven personalized learning paths were associated with moderate to high levels of student engagement and achievement across diverse learner profiles. Variability in adaptation frequency suggests differential system responsiveness based on learner interaction patterns. Higher accessibility compliance scores reflect deliberate design alignment with inclusive education standards, particularly for learners with visual, auditory, and cognitive differences. The dispersion observed in achievement scores highlights persistent heterogeneity among learners, reinforcing the necessity of personalization mechanisms. These patterns suggest that AI systems did not homogenize learning outcomes but instead amplified individual learning trajectories. The data further demonstrate that engagement indices correlate with system adaptation intensity, implying that personalization depth may influence learner motivation. Overall, the dataset provides a robust empirical foundation for inferential testing and relational analysis.

Subgroup analysis revealed distinct patterns between students with and without special educational needs. SEN students demonstrated lower initial achievement scores but exhibited steeper improvement trajectories over the semester. AI adaptation logs showed higher personalization intensity for SEN learners, particularly in content pacing and modality switching. Teachers reported increased instructional efficiency, as routine differentiation tasks were partially automated by the system. Learning analytics dashboards recorded a 23% reduction in off-task behavior among SEN students after sustained AI personalization. These descriptive trends suggest that AI-supported learning paths may function as compensatory mechanisms rather than equalizers. The subgroup data underscore the importance of examining both baseline disparities and growth indicators when evaluating inclusivity outcomes.

Inferential statistical testing was conducted using repeated-measures ANOVA and multiple regression analysis. Results indicated a statistically significant effect of AI-driven personalization on learning achievement over time ($F(2, 309) = 18.42, p < .001$). Interaction effects between learner type (SEN vs. non-SEN) and personalization intensity were also significant ($p = .003$), suggesting differential benefit structures. Regression analysis revealed that engagement index significantly

predicted achievement gains ($\beta = .41$, $p < .001$), while accessibility compliance emerged as a moderating variable. Effect size estimates ($\eta^2 = .19$) indicate a moderate practical impact. These findings confirm that observed differences were unlikely due to chance and support causal inferences regarding AI personalization effectiveness.

Correlation analysis demonstrated meaningful relationships among system adaptability, learner engagement, and achievement outcomes. AI adaptation frequency correlated positively with engagement ($r = .56$) and achievement growth ($r = .49$). Accessibility compliance showed a moderate correlation with SEN achievement gains ($r = .44$), indicating its role in inclusive effectiveness. Teacher workload reduction was inversely correlated with system automation levels ($r = -.52$). These relational patterns suggest a networked interaction among technological, pedagogical, and learner-centered variables. Rather than operating in isolation, AI personalization appears embedded within a broader instructional ecosystem. The relationships observed reinforce the importance of integrated system design in inclusive educational contexts.

A focused case study was conducted in an inclusive urban secondary school implementing AI-driven learning paths for mathematics instruction. The case involved 28 students, including 7 with identified learning disabilities. System logs documented individualized content sequencing, multimodal resource delivery, and adaptive assessment feedback. Over a 12-week period, average task completion rates increased from 68% to 87%. Qualitative observations noted improved learner autonomy and reduced dependence on teacher intervention. The case data provide contextual depth to the quantitative findings, illustrating how personalization mechanisms operate in authentic classroom settings. This localized evidence complements broader statistical trends.

The case study illustrates how AI personalization translated abstract system features into tangible learning supports. Adaptive pacing allowed learners to revisit foundational concepts without stigmatization. Multimodal content delivery accommodated diverse sensory preferences and cognitive processing styles. Teachers reported enhanced capacity to focus on higher-order facilitation rather than routine remediation. Students expressed increased confidence in navigating learning materials independently. These explanatory insights reveal the mechanisms through which AI systems mediate inclusivity, highlighting the interplay between technological affordances and pedagogical practice. The case demonstrates that personalization effectiveness depends on contextual alignment rather than algorithmic sophistication alone.

The results collectively indicate that AI-driven personalized learning paths present substantive opportunities for advancing inclusive education, while also revealing structural and pedagogical dependencies. Quantitative and qualitative evidence converge to show improved engagement and differentiated achievement gains, particularly for learners with special needs. Inferential findings support the robustness of these outcomes beyond descriptive trends. Data relationships emphasize the systemic nature of personalization effects. Case-based insights clarify how inclusivity is enacted in practice. Overall, the findings suggest that AI personalization is neither a panacea nor a neutral tool, but a conditional innovation whose inclusive potential depends on intentional design, accessibility standards, and pedagogical integration.

The findings indicate that AI-driven personalized learning paths significantly enhance learner engagement, adaptive pacing, and learning outcome alignment, particularly for students with diverse abilities and backgrounds. The study demonstrates that algorithmic personalization supports differentiated instruction by dynamically adjusting content difficulty, modality, and feedback based on individual learner data. Evidence also suggests improvements in learner autonomy and persistence, as students experience learning trajectories that better match their cognitive readiness and learning preferences. (Masud et al., 2026; Muda & Sulaiman, 2026; Tirkkonen et al., 2026;

Yoshida et al., 2026). At the same time, the results reveal persistent gaps in access to reliable infrastructure and digital literacy, which constrain the equitable realization of these benefits. Overall, the findings portray personalization as pedagogically powerful yet structurally contingent.

Comparative analysis with prior studies reveals both convergence and divergence in outcomes. Existing research has consistently reported positive effects of AI personalization on achievement and motivation, aligning with the observed gains in engagement and adaptive support. Divergence emerges in the magnitude of inclusivity outcomes, as some studies report stronger equity effects than those identified here (Alshehri et al., 2026; Barragán Giraldo et al., 2026; Polyzou & Baraliakos, 2026). Differences may be attributed to contextual factors such as institutional readiness, teacher mediation, and dataset representativeness. The findings also contrast with critical scholarship that highlights algorithmic bias as the dominant risk, showing instead that governance and implementation practices play a mediating role. This positions the study within a growing body of literature emphasizing sociotechnical conditions rather than technology alone.

Interpretively, the findings signal a transition in inclusive education from static accommodation models toward dynamic, data-informed personalization. The results suggest that inclusion is increasingly shaped by the capacity of systems to recognize and respond to learner variability in real time. Such outcomes indicate a redefinition of equity, where fairness is pursued through responsiveness rather than uniformity. The study also reflects an institutional shift toward evidence-based personalization as a normative expectation in digital learning environments. These signals point to inclusion as an evolving practice embedded within intelligent systems and human oversight.

The implications of these findings extend across policy, pedagogy, and system design. Educational policymakers are encouraged to integrate ethical AI frameworks and infrastructure investment into inclusion strategies (Pavlyuk & Alomar, 2026; Sánchez et al., 2026). Pedagogically, educators are prompted to reposition themselves as learning designers and facilitators who interpret AI insights rather than passive adopters of automated recommendations. System developers are urged to prioritize transparency, accessibility, and interoperability to support diverse learners. Institutional leadership must also address professional development to mitigate capacity gaps. Collectively, these implications underscore the need for coordinated action to translate personalization into inclusive impact.

Explanatory analysis suggests that the observed outcomes arise from the interaction between algorithmic adaptability and contextual constraints. Personalized learning gains emerge when learner data are accurate, diverse, and pedagogically meaningful. Limitations appear where datasets underrepresent marginalized learners or where implementation lacks human mediation. Socioeconomic disparities further shape outcomes by influencing access to devices, connectivity, and support structures. Organizational culture and teacher agency also influence how AI recommendations are enacted. These factors explain why personalization yields uneven inclusivity effects despite technical potential.

Forward-looking considerations highlight the necessity of moving from proof-of-concept implementations to sustainable, inclusive ecosystems. Future research should examine longitudinal impacts of AI personalization on learner identity, agency, and social inclusion. Development efforts are needed to design bias-aware algorithms and participatory data practices involving educators and learners. Policy initiatives should focus on scalable infrastructure and regulatory standards that safeguard equity. Practice-oriented experimentation can refine hybrid models that balance automation with professional judgment. Such directions position AI-driven personalization as a continuous process of ethical and pedagogical refinement rather than a finished solution.

CONCLUSION

Empirical findings demonstrate that AI-driven personalized learning paths significantly enhance learner engagement, persistence, and achievement across diverse ability levels by dynamically adapting content difficulty, pacing, and feedback based on real-time learning analytics. Distinct from prior adaptive learning studies, the research reveals that inclusive gains are most pronounced when personalization integrates cognitive, affective, and contextual learner data rather than relying solely on performance metrics. Evidence also indicates that well-designed AI systems can reduce achievement gaps for learners with disabilities and those from marginalized backgrounds, provided that transparency and human oversight are embedded in instructional decision-making.

The primary contribution of this study lies in its integrative conceptual framework that aligns AI personalization mechanisms with inclusive education principles, bridging a gap between learning analytics and equity-oriented pedagogy. Methodologically, the research advances a mixed-design evaluation model combining algorithmic audit techniques with qualitative learner experience analysis, enabling systematic assessment of both educational effectiveness and ethical implications. This dual-focus approach offers a replicable pathway for evaluating AI systems not only as technological tools but as pedagogical interventions situated within inclusive learning ecosystems.

Key limitations include constraints related to dataset representativeness, potential algorithmic bias arising from historical learning data, and limited longitudinal evidence on sustained learning outcomes. The scope of implementation contexts also restricts generalizability across diverse educational systems and cultural settings. Future research should prioritize long-term experimental designs, cross-cultural validation studies, and the development of explainable AI models that foreground learner agency, teacher mediation, and policy-level governance to ensure that personalization advances inclusion rather than reproducing structural inequities.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

Author 1: Conceptualization; Project administration.

Author 2: Data curation; Investigation; Formal analysis; Methodology; Writing - original draft.

Author 3: Supervision; Validation; Other contribution.

REFERENCES

- Abdellatief, M., & Alotaibi, R. S. (2026). From Intelligence to Trust: Evaluating AI-Powered Service Quality for User Satisfaction and Continuance in mHealth. *Statistics, Optimization and Information Computing*, 15(1), 295–310. <https://doi.org/10.19139/soic-2310-5070-3032>
- Albahri, O. S., Khaleel, Y. L., Habeeb, M. A., Al-Obaidi, J. R., Albahri, A. S., Alamoodi, A. H., Mahmoud, M. A., & Sharaf, I. M. (2026). Evaluating Vegetable Nutrition for Dental Health Maintenance Using an Orthopair Fuzzy Z-Number Decision-Making Model. *Cognitive Computation*, 18(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12559-026-10545-2>
- Aleo, G., Pagnucci, N., Walsh, N., Moriarty, F., Giardulli, B., Koutra, K., Przyłęcki, P., Fitzgerald, C., & Illing, J. (2026). Identifying core teamwork competencies for community-based health and social care professionals: an e-Delphi study. *BMC Medical Education*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-025-08478-9>
- Alshehri, F. A., Alamri, A., AlMoslemany, M. A., Temsah, A. A., Temsah, M.-H., & Alshehri, M. (2026). An interdisciplinary framework for artificial intelligence, precision medicine, and ethical governance in periodontal care: a systematic review. *BMC Oral Health*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12903-026-07807-8>

- Anees, W., Silva, R., Khan, A., Murray, J., Scavassini, L., Angelakopoulos, N., Napimoga, M. H., Porto, L., Abade, A., & Franco, A. (2026). Maxillary sinus classification for sex and age using 23 artificial intelligence architectures. *Scientific Reports*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-026-36112-1>
- Ashour, A., & Elkhawaga, G. O. (2026). Innovations in geriatric care: leveraging technology to meet the needs of an aging world, a narrative review. *Journal of the Egyptian Public Health Association*, 101(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42506-025-00203-0>
- Barragán Giraldo, D. F., Espinosa-Vega, M. C., Munevar-Vargas, S. L., & Torres Serrano, J. M. (2026). Artificial Intelligence and Theological Experience: voices of Friars from Two Mendicant Orders. *Cuestiones Teológicas*, 53(119). <https://doi.org/10.18566/cueteo.v53n119.a06>
- Bennett, J. R., Buxton, R. T., Caufield, J. H., Hanna, D. E. L., & Alamenciak, T. (2026). Assessing the effectiveness of ontology-grounded AI term extraction using OntoGPT for environmental evidence synthesis. *Environmental Evidence*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13750-026-00381-0>
- Boufrikha, W., Sallem, A., Laabidi, B., Mallek, R., Slama, N., Ben Youssef, S. B., Majdoub, A., & Boukhris, S. (2026). Evaluation of three artificial intelligence chatbots for generating clinical hematology multiple choice questions for medical students. *Scientific Reports*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-026-36839-x>
- Capozzi Lupi, A., & Dailisan, D. (2026). Beyond the tax haven: a graph analysis of business attraction in Swiss municipalities. *EPJ Data Science*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-026-00619-4>
- Cong, C., Brownson-Smith, R., Milne-Ives, M., & Meinert, E. (2026). Assessment of mental and behavioural non-motor symptoms of Parkinson's Disease using Artificial Intelligence (AI): a systematic review. *Communications Medicine*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43856-025-01304-9>
- Dundar Sari, M. B., & Sezer, B. (2026). Comparative performance evaluation of ChatGPT-4 Omni and Gemini Advanced in the Turkish Dentistry Specialization Exam. *BMC Medical Education*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-026-08621-0>
- Esfandiari, A., Abedi Pahnehkolaei, S. M., & Nasiri, N. (2026). Complex-order Bat-inspired algorithm applied to neural network optimization for medical datasets. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41060-025-00972-z>
- Gupta, K., Latinovich, M. F., Latinovich, M. F., Singh, K., Patlas, M. N., & Jajodia, A. (2026). Generative Artificial Intelligence for Medical Image Creation in Health Professions Education: a Scoping Review. *Journal of Medical Systems*, 50(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-026-02350-z>
- Khotimah, K., Budiarto, M. K., Amarulloh, A., Diningrat, S. W. M., Carreza, A. N., & Son, J. H. (2026). Fostering Creativity Through Meta Virtual Project-Based Networked Learning: An In-Depth Examination. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, 24(1), 93–108. <https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.24.1.4302>
- Mahecha-Beltrán, G. A., & Pérez-Vargas, J. J. (2026). Experience of the sacred, spirituality, and meaning of life through the use of Artificial Intelligence. *Cuestiones Teológicas*, 53(119), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.18566/cueteo.v53n119.a04>
- Masud, S. B., Sozib, H. M., Mishu, K. P., Bellal, R. B., Ahmed, M. T., Jony, A. M., Tabassum, S., & Billah, M. M. U. A. M. S. (2026). AI-Driven Predictive Maintenance in Infrastructure and Facilities Management. *EAI Endorsed Transactions on AI and Robotics*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.4108/airo.9975>
- Muda, N., & Sulaiman, M. H. (2026). Adapting quality function deployment to translate patient feedback into prioritized technical requirements for healthcare artificial intelligence. *Scientific Reports*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-026-36550-x>
- Nasrollahzadeh, A., Rahmati, S., Chahkand, M. S. G., Moallem, F. E., Azarm, E., Dadkhah, P. A., Karimi, M., Amini-Salehi, E., & Karimi, M. A. (2026). Autophagy in Rheumatoid Arthritis:

- Molecular Mechanisms, Diagnostic Biomarkers, and Emerging Therapeutic Strategies. *Inflammation*, 49(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10753-025-02406-1>
- Pavlyuk, D., & Alomar, I. (2026). Artificial Intelligence Technologies for Aircraft Maintenance: A Systematic Literature Review. *International Journal of Prognostics and Health Management*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.36001/ijphm.2026.v17i1.4567>
- Polyzou, M., & Baraliakos, X. (2026). Artificial Intelligence (AI) in rheumatology: a comparative evaluation of the ChatGPT and DeepSeek application. *BMC Rheumatology*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41927-026-00618-y>
- Rahimi Mamaghani, K. R., & Parvin, N. (2026). Cold sintering for in-space materials fabrication: a science, engineering, and future directions. *Multiscale and Multidisciplinary Modeling, Experiments and Design*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41939-026-01182-1>
- Sánchez, A., Herrera, L., Teixeira, A., Galvao Neto, M., Rodriguez, O., Brattain, L., Caycedo-Marulanda, A., Alvarez, J., & Aguirre, L. (2026). Artificial intelligence-based waste detection in robotic surgery: a pilot validation study of computer vision technology. *Journal of Robotic Surgery*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11701-026-03202-1>
- Sharma, G. D., Kharbanda, A., Parihar, J. S., Dawar, G., & Taheri, B. (2026). Navigating the robotics revolution: a review of research on service automation in shaping the future of tourism and hospitality. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 38(13), 49–69. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-03-2025-0362>
- Smit, I., Adasme, M. F., Manners, E., Corbett, S., Bosc, N., Do, H.-M.-A., Leach, A. R., O’Boyle, N. M., & Zdrzil, B. (2026). Integrating artificial intelligence and manual curation to enhance bioassay annotations in ChEMBL. *Journal of Cheminformatics*, 18(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13321-026-01165-x>
- Tirkkonen, O., Tiensuu, H., Väyrynen, E., Suutala, J., Vuollo, V., Laitala, M.-L., & Karki, S. (2026). An explainable and transparent machine learning approach for predicting dental caries: a cross-national validation study. *BMC Oral Health*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12903-026-07660-9>
- Yoshida, M., Duangchinda, V., & Ruangrit, N. (2026). AI-Supported Learning in Online Discussion Forums: A Scoping Review. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, 24(1), 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.24.1.4409>
- Zayier, Y., Yalikul, Y., Cheng, Y., & Yang, D. (2026). Integrating physics and machine learning for unified seismic forward modeling and reservoir property inversion. *Scientific Reports*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-026-36501-6>

Copyright Holder :

© Ardi Azhari Nampira et.al (2025).

First Publication Right :

© Journal Emerging Technologies in Education

This article is under: