Formalization and Knowledge Representation in Advanced Engineering Informatics

Mohammad Biglarbegian
Department of Natural Sciences, USAQuaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, 15320, Pakistan.
[1]biglarbegian552@gmail.com

Article Info
Journal of Computing and Natural Science (http://anapub.co.ke/journals/jcns/jcns.html)
Doi: https://doi.org/10.53759/181X/JCNS202202002
Received 12 May 2021; Revised form 18 June 2021; Accepted 25 September 2021.

Abstract – The primary goal of this article in the research area of Advanced Engineering Informatics (AEIs) is to depict and formalize engineering knowledge that is multidimensional. This paper introduces conceptual framework and rationality as implicit methodologies to regularize knowledge. The objective of professionals, as well as the circumstances in which they work, should be considered when depicting and standardizing knowledge. The constructs of epistemology, rationality, and context are used to communicate various alternative data analysis techniques and practices that expert can use to institutionalize intricate engineering expertise and to substantiate whether a specialized conceptual model can support engineers with their challenging operations. A bottom-up method of research in advanced engineering, encompassing engineers, is suggested in this article. A social scientific approach to engendering knowledge for formalization and validating it is also recommended by us for scientists.

Keywords - Advanced Engineering Informatics (AEIs), Data Analytics (DA), Knowledge Representation (KR).

I. INTRODUCTION

Engineers develop complex physical infrastructures and components to remedy society's most pressing issues, as well as to raise the standard of living for individuals by inventing new technologies that can be analyzed, built, tested and maintained. Every aspect of engineering revolves around a prototype of any magnitude, structure or operate that can be created by engineers. Almost all engineering work is now computerized, and technicians are routinely using computers to do their jobs. Only a small number of tasks are completed without the aid of technology. As a result of this, some engineering standards, such as structural engineering, are defined as “digital laggards”. There is a considerable resistance to using innovative strategies, as well as the additional benefits of using digitalization methods to enhance design engineering activities are often not interpreted, noticeable, or present. In the past, engineers' reluctance to adopt advances in computational instruments has indeed been contributed to their own cultural and professional characteristics.

When studying engineering and structural engineering, for instance, past research has placed blame for opposition on organisational factors of an economy, such as Mitropoulos and Tatum's pioneering study of general business character traits of the industry's particular network framework. In accordance with individual properties of engineers including such maturity level, gender, basic computing comprehension, and knowledge, Davis and Songer ascribe engineers' reluctance to adopt new technologies to their own personality attributes.

Although technicians use an expanding range of digital applications, it appears that designers are progressively having difficulties to provide and improve our society's complex technology systems, regardless of rigidity or its cause [1]. Our built ecosystem's systems and networks are a prime example of this. How the features of supercomputing instruments impact adoption is a subject that has received very little research in the past. There was a large gap between professions' anticipations and what the instruments could actually offer. As a result of this conundrum, the tech community has invented a different science-based field of research and investigation: Advanced Engineering Informatics (AEIs).

Advancements in AEIs are driven by a desire to help designers adapt well with growing complexity of the structures they need to provide. The discipline aims to provide professionals with advanced simulation and methodological approach that will allow them to utilize their knowledge of various processor architectures' behavior. As well, it aims to improve the engineering community's ability to work together and communicate in increasingly complex multidisciplinary teams. Instead of automating routine tasks, advanced engineering informatics develops, researches, and explores methods for improving the current work environment of designers, unlike other relevant fields. According to experts in the field, well-designed supercomputing systems have the ability to empower technicians in directions that have never been conceivable before.

Computers, according to many experts in the field, are not only capable of speeding up the engineering design process, but are also capable of causing substantial disruptions in all phases of product development from the metaphysical stage all the way through manufacturing as well as maintaining engineered infrastructures [2]. As a result, this article can only portray our existing observations and thoughts in the sector and is meant to stimulate further introspection and spirited discussion. The constructs of knowledge codification and research methodology introduced here are not meant to be final conclusions, but rather as a starting point for more in-depth theoretical investigations. This paper has been organized as follows: Section II presents the research rationale and question. Section III presents the research methodology. Section IV provides a critical analysis of the paper. Section V presents the results and discussion. Lastly, Section VI concludes the paper and proposes future research directions.

II. RESEARCH QUESTION

According to AEIs, engineers are involved in highly intellectually demanding work that requires extensive knowledge. A mathematical formalism of engineers' understanding is the first step in any investigation into how computational techniques can endorse engineering. As a subfield of Knowledge Representation (KR), AEIs addresses the question: "How can we codify complex technical knowledge to build advances in computational techniques that help professionals mitigate practical difficulties within their restrictions and expenditures?" When it comes to the above research question, AEIs is also relevant in analyzing how clear and direct conceptions and representational or mathematical modeling techniques can be used to codify intricate knowledge of engineering [3]. In addition to advanced analytical modeling based on formally constructed experience and understanding, researchers are also investigating the representation of the data in graphical interface, the stipulation of integrated knowledge bases through big datasets, or how developers and engineering organizations can be endorsed in construing remedies and transitional remedy areas today. A clear spotlight on design information is required in all of these initiatives if we are to increase our understanding in such areas.

Despite their academic and engineering significance, the variety of researchers accepted for publication in science-based engineering publications fail to overtly identify and respond to engineering knowledge formulation and recognition. This is also true for journals that fixate on the engineering and architecture of our building design. Methodologies, techniques, or data analytical results are usually depicted without a setting for how they might be used in a specific technology setting. Invariably, it's not evident how newly proposed methodologies make use of clearly codified technical knowledge as well as how the techniques help technicians with experience and understanding activities. For the most part, the scientific engineering community still has a long way to go before it has a comprehensive understanding of how advanced computational techniques can benefit professionals. A basic impression as to how innovative supercomputing methodologies can be executed across activities and engineering systems is therefore lacking. In turn, this scarcity of funds has decelerated the establishment of innovative remedies that could actually improve manufacturing methods.

This article is an attempt to reorient the contemporary science discussion and debate on the significance of practical experience. To this point, we endeavor to first include a clear understanding and synopsis of the philosophical foundation for knowledge conceptualization and knowledge discovery as the framework for all research exploration in the sector of AEIs. Several recently released publications on the field of designed engineering serve as examples for illustrating these interpretations and representations. Another objective of the paper would be to begin a discussion about the necessary research methodologies for AEIs investigation. This lack of discussion about research methodology has made it difficult for the field to become well-known among other science disciplines. In the second section of the paper, we propose various research methodologies as well as some conceptual framework in order to stimulate this conversation. It goes without saying that advances in engineering systems engineering are indeed a moving target, as are definitions, conceptual frameworks, approaches and methods affiliated to them. Various research methodologies for AEIs are identified in Section III below.

III. METHODOLOGY

After presenting theoretical foundations for work in the domain of AEIs by concentrating on epistemology, rationality, intent, and connotation, this section will provide some foundational suppositions about how to address scientific studies theoretically. There is little debate about data analysis techniques in the study up to this point, and there are no clear conventions for how to methodically address research issues. Researchers should be able to use skepticism about empirical findings because scientific methodology ought to be quantifiable in their method of acquiring understanding. The paper is organized around two primary research functions: first, establishing KRs; and second, validating, verifying, and illustrating those representations.

IV. CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Formalization and Representation of Knowledge

Experts define knowledge engineering as the implementation of epistemology and reasoning to the task of creating computer simulations for a single domain. Since knowledge engineering focuses on two main elements, the description offered as part of the introduction can help expand AEIs experiments. To begin, creating computer simulations is suggested by the definition. As a result, the definition suggests moving away from developing computational models and towards designs that can make computational prognostications about a field. As a result, the concept necessitates a spotlight on realistic solutions. These two factors are crucial for any study of AEIs. The discipline is really not involved with inventing new computational formulas, methodologies, or arithmetic systems; instead, it is indeed involved in using conventional computing techniques to create designs that quantify useful results for a particular technician. In addition, this significance must be linked to a practical engineering intent in the broader product design process of an experimental platform.

Furthermore, the definition relates to fundamental research methodologies, such as epistemology, reasoning, and data processing, which AEIs researchers should be accustomed with. The term "epistemology" refers to a formal portrayal of all the patterns and relations within a subject in information systems and KR. Engineers' knowledge of physical and conceptual artifacts, their relationships, and the occurrences that influence those artifacts is addressed by an epistemological representation of knowledge. Because of this, it is possible to make an epistemological dedication to the conceptual framework that will serve as the foundation for any theoretical calculations. Conceptual frameworks help robots and humans comprehend and use the domain knowledge by making this dedication. Domain hypotheses and remedies are a crucial component of AEIs studies, which seeks to enhance strategies for instituting computer-assisted engineering systems.

The knowledge inside a particular discursive multiverse requires to be mapped by each epistemology promoting such remedies. A designing discipline's discursive multiverse should be a tightly constrained and narrowly focused micro-world. Alternately, it may concentrate on a different engineering cooperation among two engineering fields. Computational approaches, as described above, necessitate a bottom-up strategy which relies on a specific engineering assignment. Furthermore, domain epistemology constructs must be developed continuously with the participation of all knowledge-relevant parties. Knowledge is constantly evolving and expanding, and it is held by a diverse group of experts from various fields.

T. Hellström and S. Raman in [4] provide a definition that suggests reasoning as the second study methodology. As a result of logical reasoning, a particular proposal is accepted. In order to conduct such thorough research, it is necessary to formalize a claim and establish facilities, which may or may not support the findings. AEIs scholars can codify regulations of extrapolation used by designers to reach the conclusion, make a decision, or establish ideas by using reasoning as a comprehensive examination. Formulating new conceptual designs, in particular, necessitates paying attention to reasoning. The codification of predefined rules frequently leads to reasoning that is too restrictive or that focuses on the codification of inconsequential rule base. Engineering creativity, which is essential to enhancing complex engineered infrastructures, is thwarted when this occurs.

Engineers' reasoning strategies can be better understood if logic is applied correctly. Logic allows the codification of technically challenging comprehension of the spatial and temporal actions of an integral approach with regards to particular systemic changes under different individual environmental factors. As a result of reasoning, knowledge about critical product manufacturing or system engineering maintenance procedures can be formalized. The role of reasoning in helping designers account for particular limitations imposed by systems and practices is crucial.

Epistemology and knowledge enable the user to evaluate technically challenging insights into the structure and behaviour patterns of an analytical model, as well as the processes for its construction and distribution. On the other hand, epistemology and reasoning by themselves are unable to describe a design goal. Scientists using Newton's second law of motion, which connects pressure, mass, and speed, include a perfect illustration of this problem. A conceptual framework is introduced by Newton's equation and it gives a precise and conceptual synopsis of the elements involved in function. The methodology also illustrates the relationship between pressure, mass, and velocity.

Nevertheless, the methodology does not yet recommend what a technician can use it to evaluate a scheme on intent. The law can be used by a technician in three different ways: to determine mass based on velocity and acceleration, pressure based on acceleration and mass, or velocity based on mass and force. By only trying to represent the arithmetic operations needed inside the particular context can the engineer construct which one of these reasons is critical for a given task. As a result, while portraying and standardizing knowledge of engineering, the intent must be contextualizing. While formulating engineering purpose, attention must also be paid to the construct of "setting," which is closely related to purpose. To that extent, it's impossible to pinpoint a goal without considering the surrounding circumstances. Nevertheless, the context of the knowledge legitimized with epistemology and logic must also be considered. In other words, both epistemology and reasoning are frameworks, and it is critical to be clear about when and where they are appropriate.

The study of setting is therefore a crucial component of AEIs survey. For AEIs researchers, it is indeed critical to remember that epistemology, reasoning, and simulation can only portray a very abstract representation of professional developers' logic and knowledge. Structured KRs are segmented by disposition and therefore can approach the authentic logic that technicians use to arrive at their inferences for particular tasks. Although abstractions and rationalization are factionalized and conceptual, they still allow effective communications among designers and AEIs researchers, as well. This section uses four research findings to demonstrate and verify 4 distinct computational modeling for formulating intricate knowledge of engineering in the sustainable construction field of engineering. The researchers, who are also reviewers of the publication Advanced Engineering Informatics, chose these illustrations as practice references. The aim of this paper was not to provide a systemic literature search, but rather to demonstrate the aforementioned constructs using a number of haphazardly chosen earlier researches.

Formalization of Engineering Knowledge Using Abstractions

Building abstractions from the ground up has as its goal aiding human comprehension as well as making full use of specialized domain expertise [5]. For this reason, domain metaphysics conceptual model must be constructed and regularly tested as a collective knowledge, with contributions from multiple subject matter experts. Knowledge base is constantly growing and changing. Modeling resale value peril around construction projects' vulnerabilities is a representation of the system. Both the public and private sectors are responsible for funding these initiatives. Comprehending fiscal risks, which happen during the lifecycle of delivering these projects, is fundamental. These risks must be estimated in the abstract designing phase by designers and this is critical for extensively drafting contract arrangements between parties of the contract in these kinds of developments that are involved about these risks.

For this particular discipline, scientists formally established their mechanical aptitude by suggesting an epistemology that represents the factors that can impact a proposal, such as sources of risk, possibility of loss, risk implications, and vulnerabilities, as well as response efficacy and situational responsiveness. The research also created an epistemology to formalize the actual knowledge of a demonstrative bridge project and substantiated the epistemology through a survey of subject matter experts. According to the findings, utilizing conceptual models to formalize knowledge is a good idea. The study shows how a conceptual framework can be used to visualize risk factors in KR, and how doing so assisted them in estimating the accounting project risks. The research also shows how the formal representation of the insight permits the arithmetic of automated analysis tracks, for instance, to realize the effects of architecture or ecological issues on a particular risk level.

Utilizing Reasoning to Signify Designing Knowledge

The scientists' survey that established rule-based correlations for setting out amusement parks is an illustration of how reasoning can be used to codify knowledge of engineering. The layout of amusement areas in a theme park necessitates thorough understanding. In order to satisfy guests, amusement parks must provide an extremely complex and multi-layered infrastructure and services. The study's authors discovered and codified patterns found in a variety of effective amusement parks, and then melded them into a logic and reasoning framework. The analysis revealed, for instance, that amenities like theme parks, eateries, and stores are uniformly spread around a facility's centreline. A second rational and reasonable pattern discovered and codified by scientists is that constructing access roads are situated along paths with low traffic flow. The researchers also demonstrated how well these structures could be used by programming execution for amusement park configuration and using that application to create a new amusement park in South Korea. Interrogating specialists and performing layout experimentations with four well-versed specialists substantiated the theory.

Optimization

Numerous efforts have been made in the sector of AEIs to help technicians determine the best models from among a number of approaches when it comes to design optimization. Optimisation necessitates the use of epistemology and reasoning in order to develop a mathematical model for the development issue. As a result, scientists must first features of the situation which define alternative strategies and then link these factors rationally within an optimization problem that should be optimized. The initial development factors must also be used to rationally establish many constrictions. Supercomputing optimization techniques can be used to solve design issues if they are designed appropriately. The preparation of optimum design issues is an interesting matter of AEIs investigation; whereas the introduction of innovative optimization techniques would much rather fall into the computer programming or mathematics scope. In their research about how to reform the scheduling of structural support needed for complicated piping installations, the researchers used studies to establish an optimum design issue around one complex technology assignment.

Engineers face a challenging task when deciding the right engineering set-up due to the obvious relationship between job sites and a need to establish supporting constructions. Authors created a rule-based reasoning for support beams layout to formulate the optimization model and connected such regulations with a clear and specific metaphysical characterization incorporating the duration of building work activities, the site of these activities, and the pipe symmetries [6]. The preparation would include various potential stances for employees to configure a pipe in an effort to maximise optimum working stances for constructive configuration.

The automated unconventional production was bound by multiple constraints, like the upper and lower limits suitable altitudes for workplace conditions. There is an instance of a twenty one-meter elevated industrial facility with seventy one different pipes that was used to test the preparation of the optimization process. Engineers can use sources of knowledge to try to set up optimised structures that decreases the amount of piping systems that cannot be fitted with a set reference while enhancing the capacity of installation and configuration, as illustrated in this indicative research project.

Data Analytics (DA)

In an attempt to advance techniques to assist technicians, many research findings have used Data Analytics (DA) methodologies, such as computer vision deep learning, in the last 2 decades, comparable to maximization [7]. Similarly to optimization research, it's critical for DA research findings to expressly concentrate on the portrayal of intricate engineering skills this is built into the process. Machine learning techniques, from the view of information depiction, convert accumulated data entry that technicians cannot conveniently perceive into an outcome that technicians can perceive. Applied DA methodologies from computer science and engineering are studied in depth in AEIs research. AEIs also investigate how KRs and translations like these can assist engineers in dealing with their difficult engineering tasks in the future.

Scientists who established a wind energy framework forecasting technique are an example of the sort of research. The authors introduce a solution for conveying difficult-to-interpret wind power signals using the ridgelet wavelet transform, which enables one to more appropriately mathematical model the solitary adjustments within the wind transmitter. A neurological network can learn to accurately predict wind energy using the wind messages as input data and an adapted ridgelet change. After that, the researchers use an Alberta wind turbine to show how the predicting approach works. The authors were also successful in their efforts to demonstrate how well the technique enables interpretable deliverables to predicted wind energy for distinct annual seasons or even specific days. Wind farm technicians can use these projections not only to enhance wind farm configurations, but also to effectively maintain existing wind farms.

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Development of Formalizations

Formalizing insight with epistemology and reasoning and representing it is a significant research assignment in AEIs. There are well-established methodologies for formalization, and these are widely employed. To create conceptual models, scholars often use epistemological editors like Protégé, which make it possible to create knowledge layouts that portray the concepts that have been observed. Arithmetical formulae, code generators, and sequence diagram are common ways of representing reasoning. Metamodels for portraying conceptualising frameworks of engineering, such as those listed above, are widely used in research.

Nevertheless, little consideration has been paid about how technically challenging knowledge can be methodically elicited from professionals and engineering principles. The vast majority of the insight that has been formalized comes directly from the scientists themselves. Since the scholars are often also specialist designers, this practical solution has aided in the development of the field. In scientific terms, this practice is problematic because it does not follow scientifically sound principles such as empirics and systematicity. To date, only a few particular systems have been suggested or used to elicit physician knowledge of engineering. The few methodologies that have been proposed all depend on one of two approaches: social scientific techniques or detailed study of construction records and modeling techniques. In the past, socioeconomic technology methodologies have relied on discussions with designers, trainings, focus group discussions, and other more experimentation like focus group discussions. The use of as such layout charrettes is among the most advanced techniques postulated. It is proposed that short, concentrated layout workouts with specialists can be used to capture designers' knowledge through architecture charrettes.

This observational data can then be analyzed by scientists to learn more about the technical expertise applied during the charrette for the systemic codification that followed. An additional example of a social concept is anthropological applied research. Anthropological applied research implies that the researcher becomes engrossed in design work environments by operating with practitioners. They claim that by immersing themselves in the subject matter, researchers are able to obtain the required knowledge and insight into practical technical knowledge before codification. Records as well as other artifacts have been subjected to system design by scientists as an alternative to traditional scientific research methodologies. Scholars, for instance, have formally established trends for the layout of amusement parks, as previously discussed. The trends were discovered through a systematic examination of design documentation for a variety of real-world amusement parks.

Many reports have been conducted using robotic techniques to extract data from previous design documentation and designs, thanks to advancements in text analytics and pattern recognition systems. There is a lot of activity in this area now [8]. Automatic mining techniques have been used to codify trademark knowledge of engineering, classify trends in research for developing energy efficiency, evaluate construction project fatalities, forecast building budget shortfalls, recover Cad files, or retrieve industry standards from computer simulation standards. Architecture and design layout design architecture and robotic excavation and codification of construction phase trends both benefit from graph-based layout mining techniques. Finally, dimensional machine learning technologies have been implemented to help with vehicle aerodynamics.

Because designers have amassed such a high-quality digital catalogue of design documentation, we anticipate this field of investigation to continue to accelerate in the years ahead. Practically, the findings could lead to specialized domain-specific search results that help technicians effectively locate and comprehend existing design alternatives that are flexible and adaptive to the current design assignment. Recognition of these trends can also lead to an increase in the amount of scientific proof layout tools available to cover a wide variety of engineering projects. Ultimately, test extraction and pattern correspondence may allow designers to gain a better insight into to the actions of design materials and products by combining metrics and diagnostic testing from the past.

Validation and Verification

To this end, a vital issue for scientifically sound studies in the areas of AEIs is to guarantee that a suggested expertise preparation is both valuable and suitable. A KR must be methodically tested and validated in order to be considered scientifically sound training. In this section, we shall go over certain most main techniques to validation and verification. At the core of ontology’s validation is the practice of developing certain that its basic assumptions reflect its designer's motives. The process of creating conceptual frameworks is subject to mistakes, and it is challenging to construct conceptual frameworks in such a way that they really do not enable for unintentionally assumptions, such as the emergence of syllogisms that are not satisfied. Prevalent domain knowledge toolchains like Protégé, which was previously established, have constructed reasoners that can automatically identify epistemology flaws. Such instantaneous reasoners must be used regularly while constructing conceptual frameworks to prevent the dissemination of methodological problems early on.

Fixing such methodological flaws will become even more costly and time consuming as just domain knowledge expands and develops. It is more difficult to confirm a logic-based computational model. Sound validation would necessitate mathematical equation of the arithmetic, if possible. Finding mathematical theorems, on the other hand, quickly becomes a problem even for calculations that seem simple. Another choice is a combinatorial approach, which regulates the output data of all input combinations within in the perspective of the arithmetic. Solid research settings do not allow for true combinatorial attempts, even if the framework in which a specialized arithmetic should operate is meticulously constrained.

This issue can be fixed by using selectivity analytical techniques in conjunction with strictly delineated sample selection for various input valuation configurations. Nevertheless, for the most part, research findings still rely solely on the use of illustrations in order to confirm their proposed computational modeling. When using this methodology, scientists must at least provide such a persuasive argument for how suitable the illustration is in connection to how intricate the authentic engineering problem is. A KR's suitability for a given engineering task is evaluated during validation rather than verification. Validity evaluation necessitates a greater focus on engineering analysis than confirmation itself, and is therefore harder to achieve.

However, a KR can be soundly verified by looking at only the interior structure; however, recognition can be validated by considering it in its setting and for a specific reason. As a result of this provision, validating a remedy is much more difficult, and scientists must organize and conduct confirmation activities with great care. Validation can be reached in a number of ways. One of the most popular and straightforward methods of validating the domain ontology is to implement it to a hypothetical design task. It's possible to demonstrate that a depiction serves its intended purpose in this way, and it is not always very compelling. For the confirmation, it's critical that the remarkable example depicts a real-world problem that technicians might face. Studies, on the other hand, frequently use overly simplified illustrations that fail to capture the true intricacies of the issues that designers encounter on a regular basis.

Simplifications and illustrations are great for verifying, but they're hardly enough to be deemed validating. Other methods for validating conceptual modeling structures include the development of a technology demonstrator of a computational analysis that enforces the depiction. This prototype can be used to demonstrate the system in action and then get feedback from engineers. The majority of the time, these recognition efforts falls flat on their faces. The approach's epistemological concern is it is difficult to create a suitable sample strategy to reach designers with varying levels of knowledge and orientations, which is needed to generalise the findings. It also is difficult to get technicians to participate in research even when there's a suitable sampling clear strategy. Scholars therefore have turned to even less persuasive student participants, as per some.

To validate a prototype, inform technicians or undergraduates to use it to alleviate an engineering challenge. Such methods could provide a great deal more substantiation, but they must be intended very thoroughly if they are to be effective. For starters, there was a propensity to over-structure the experimental setting by assigning the research subjects a narrow task involving the working model. Furthermore, a few researchers analyzed these initiatives with those of a regulate engineers who completed the same assignment without the aid of the technology demonstrator. While these efforts appear to provide strong affirmation for the prototype's operation, they can hardly demonstrate the effectiveness of the formal logic in enabling technicians to deal with an engineering challenge in a substantially different way than was previously possible.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

With the goal of rededicating current research efforts toward developing computational modeling in designing as a whole, we contend that explicit knowledge is the primary ongoing research necessary for the growth of techniques that also optimize mundane systems engineering but provide engineers with devices that enable them to do stuff they never had before. To interact with the ever-increasing complexities of modern system architectures, technicians will require such techniques. We first implement the philosophical ideas of representation of knowledge as well as mathematical formalism to concentrate scientific research in AEIs on representation of knowledge. We rely heavily on researchers' seminal work to achieve this goal. We then use four research findings to demonstrate these ideas. We discuss potential research methodology consistent with the theoretical constructs that researchers can use while creating and empirical evidence verifying KR. The recommended research techniques are intended to kick off a conversation about how to gather information in the subject of AEIs in the best possible way. Finally, we hope that this article will aid researchers in deeper understanding AEIs and its significance. We also expect that the study will aid researchers in developing research projects in the field that will increase our understanding of how to best employ computational approaches to define complicated knowledge of engineering. We recommended that future research do a systematic and complete literature evaluation as a follow-up to this article in order to further expand on the topic of AEIs.

References

[1]. A. Glinchenko, "Expanding the Dynamic Range of Digital Spectral Measurements", *Measurement Techniques*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 57-61, 2017. Doi: 10.1007/s11018-017-1149-8.

[2]. A. Westerberg, "Synthesis in engineering design", *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, vol. 13, no. 4-5, pp. 365-376, 1989. Doi: 10.1016/0098-1354(89)85016-1.

[3]. S. Darmoni and J. Charlet, "Knowledge Representation and Management. From Ontology to Annotation", *Yearbook of Medical Informatics*, vol. 24, no. 01, pp. 134-136, 2015. Doi: 10.15265/iy-2015-038.

[4]. T. Hellström and S. Raman, "The commodification of knowledge about knowledge: Knowledge management and the reification of epistemology", *Social Epistemology*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 139-154, 2001. Doi: 10.1080/02691720110076495.

[5]. X. Yang, "Building Simulation has set up a new goal to publish papers quickly", *Building Simulation*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1-1, 2014. Doi: 10.1007/s12273-014-0207-2.

[6]. R. Pottinger, "Fundamental Considerations In Deciding A Sampling Plan", *New Zealand Entomologist*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 27-27, 1968. Doi: 10.1080/00779962.1968.9722879.

[7]. B. Egliston, "Big playerbase, big data: On data analytics methodologies and their applicability to studying multiplayer games and culture", *First Monday*, 2016. Doi: 10.5210/fm.v21i7.6718.

[8]. A. Fred and A. Jain, "Pattern recognition in information systems", *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 2671-2672, 2002. Doi: 10.1016/s0031-3203(02)00094-8.