

Adaptive Machine Learning Techniques for Improving Predictive Accuracy in Complex Data Environments

Dr. Tiago Ferreira

Professor, Porto Institute of Data Science, Portugal

Abstract

The growing complexity of contemporary data environments has increased the demand for machine learning systems capable of maintaining accurate predictions under changing operational conditions. Conventional predictive models often depend on relatively stable relationships between historical training observations and future data. However, variations in feature distributions, data quality, target relationships, and information availability can gradually reduce their effectiveness. Adaptive machine learning provides a methodological approach for addressing these challenges through continuous performance monitoring, incremental updating, and dynamic learning strategies. The proposed analytical framework incorporates concept-drift detection, incremental learning, dynamic model adjustment, and ensemble-based prediction. A simplified binary classification scenario is developed to examine the mathematical relationship between adaptation delay, classification uncertainty, and expected predictive performance. Two illustrative analytical comparisons demonstrate how an idealized adaptive predictor may respond to changes in the underlying target relationship.

The calculated outcomes suggest that timely and correct model adaptation can reduce expected prediction errors following substantial concept change. However, the magnitude of the benefit depends on adaptation latency, noise conditions, and the assumptions governing the data-generating process. These calculations do not constitute experimental evidence of algorithmic superiority. The study contributes a structured methodological perspective on adaptive predictive learning and emphasizes the importance of transparent evaluation, computational efficiency, and reliable adaptation decisions. It concludes that adaptive learning strategies provide a useful foundation for future predictive systems, while actual performance improvements must be established through reproducible empirical experimentation.

Keywords: Adaptive Machine Learning, Predictive Accuracy, Concept Drift, Incremental Learning, Ensemble Models, Complex Data Environments, Predictive Analytics, Dynamic Learning, Data Streams, Artificial Intelligence.

1. Introduction

Machine learning has become a significant component of modern computational research because it enables analytical systems to identify complex relationships, classify observations, and estimate future outcomes. Increasing volumes of digital information have expanded the application of predictive

algorithms across scientific, technological, and organizational environments. However, reliable prediction depends on more than computational sophistication. Learning models must also represent the statistical characteristics of the information they encounter. When these characteristics change, models trained under earlier conditions may produce inaccurate predictions despite performing effectively during their initial evaluation.

The complexity of contemporary datasets presents additional challenges for predictive modeling. Information obtained from different sources may contain missing observations, inconsistent measurements, redundant features, and unequal class distributions. These conditions can interfere with the identification of meaningful predictive relationships and influence the reliability of algorithmic decisions. Furthermore, rapidly changing data environments require learning systems to process observations under varying conditions. Conventional modeling procedures may struggle when previously established relationships become less representative of incoming information. Consequently, maintaining predictive accuracy requires methods capable of responding to both structural and statistical changes.

Adaptive machine learning represents an alternative to treating predictive models as permanently fixed systems. Adaptive techniques allow selected model components to respond to new evidence through incremental parameter adjustment, selective retraining, dynamic observation windows, and ensemble modification. Earlier studies established important foundations for sequential learning and adaptive model management (Domingos & Hulten, 2000; Oza & Russell, 2001). These approaches recognize that useful predictive relationships may evolve after deployment. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of adaptation depends on determining when changes are meaningful and identifying appropriate responses without introducing unnecessary instability.

Concept drift constitutes a particularly important concern in adaptive predictive learning. It occurs when the relationship between input information and the target outcome changes over time, potentially reducing the relevance of previously trained models. Research by Gama et al. (2014) and Ditzler et al. (2015) emphasized the need to identify changing concepts and evaluate suitable adaptation mechanisms. However, not every change in observed data indicates that the predictive relationship has deteriorated. Reliable adaptive systems must therefore distinguish meaningful concept changes from temporary fluctuations, measurement variations, and other forms of statistical disturbance.

The present paper examines adaptive machine learning through a hypothetical methodological framework supported by transparent mathematical analysis. Rather than reporting experimentally generated results, the research evaluates an idealized situation in which a predictive relationship changes and an adaptive classifier responds after a specified delay. The study also considers classification uncertainty, model stability, and methodological limitations. Its purpose is to clarify the potential contribution of adaptive techniques to predictive reliability while identifying the conditions that must be investigated before practical effectiveness can be established.

2. Objectives of the Study

The study aims to examine adaptive machine learning as a methodological approach for maintaining reliable predictions under changing data conditions. It focuses on learning mechanisms, expected predictive performance, and operational challenges. The objectives provide a structured basis for evaluating adaptive strategies through hypothetical analytical scenarios rather than unsupported empirical claims.

2.1 Examination of Adaptive Learning Mechanisms

The first objective is to examine machine learning strategies that allow predictive models to respond to changing information patterns. Particular emphasis is placed on incremental learning, concept-drift detection, and adaptive ensemble techniques. These mechanisms support the adjustment of learning behavior when new observations become available. The study considers their methodological characteristics and examines how different updating approaches influence the relationship between historical information and current predictive requirements. This objective establishes the conceptual foundation for developing responsive predictive learning procedures.

The investigation also considers the importance of controlling model updates. Continuous modification may introduce instability when temporary variations are mistaken for meaningful changes in the underlying predictive relationship. Therefore, adaptive techniques must distinguish conditions requiring model adjustment from those in which an existing predictor remains appropriate. Understanding this distinction supports the development of learning procedures that retain useful historical information while responding to relevant changes. The objective consequently addresses both the responsiveness and the stability required for dependable adaptive prediction.

2.2 Assessment of Predictive Accuracy

The second objective is to examine how adaptation delay influences expected predictive accuracy following an abrupt change in a classification relationship. A hypothetical binary prediction scenario provides the analytical basis for comparing an unchanged classification rule with an idealized adaptive predictor. The study calculates expected performance under specified assumptions rather than presenting experimentally observed results. This approach clarifies the relationship between the timing of adaptation and the proportion of correct predictions during a defined post-change evaluation period.

Another purpose is to investigate the sensitivity of predictive accuracy to classification uncertainty. The study introduces different probabilities of symmetric label noise to assess their mathematical influence on expected model performance. By examining these conditions separately, the analysis identifies how uncertainty and adaptation latency interact within the hypothetical setting. The objective does not presume that adaptive techniques always outperform conventional models. Instead, it establishes a transparent framework for interpreting conditional improvements and identifying questions requiring empirical verification.

2.3 Identification of Methodological Challenges

The third objective is to identify difficulties associated with applying adaptive learning methods in complex data environments. These difficulties include heterogeneous observations, missing information, delayed outcome labels, computational constraints, and changing class distributions. Such conditions may influence the accuracy of change-detection mechanisms and the reliability of subsequent model updates. Examining these issues contributes to a more realistic understanding of adaptive prediction and the factors that may limit its effectiveness outside simplified analytical scenarios.

The study additionally aims to identify requirements for reliable experimental evaluation. Adaptive learning systems should be compared using consistent data sequences, clearly specified updating procedures, and appropriate measures of predictive performance. Computational efficiency and the consequences of unnecessary adaptation should also be examined. These considerations provide a foundation for future methodological improvements and reduce the risk of interpreting theoretical

performance advantages as verified experimental outcomes. The objective therefore connects analytical model development with the requirements of practical research validation.

3. Review of Literature

3.1 Foundations of Incremental Machine Learning

Domingos and Hulten (2000) investigated learning from high-speed data streams and demonstrated the importance of processing continuously arriving observations efficiently. Their research contributed to the development of incremental learning techniques capable of operating under memory and computational constraints. Oza and Russell (2001) subsequently examined online bagging and boosting, extending ensemble learning principles into sequential processing environments. These contributions established important foundations for predictive systems that incorporate newly available information without requiring complete reconstruction from historical datasets after every observation.

Wang et al. (2003) further investigated ensemble classifiers for concept-drifting data streams, identifying the potential value of combining models trained under changing conditions. Klinkenberg (2004) examined strategies involving example selection and weighting to accommodate evolving predictive relationships. These studies highlighted the importance of adjusting the influence of historical observations as data characteristics change. Collectively, they established that adaptive learning requires not only incremental processing but also suitable mechanisms for determining which information remains relevant to current prediction tasks.

3.2 Concept Drift and Dynamic Model Management

Gama et al. (2004) investigated the identification of changing concepts through sequential predictive errors. Their research provided a foundation for distinguishing possible changes in the learning environment from ordinary prediction fluctuations. Bifet and Gavaldà (2007) introduced adaptive windowing, allowing the effective training window to change according to detected distributional variation. These contributions demonstrated that monitoring mechanisms and observation selection are closely connected to the effectiveness of adaptive predictive learning. They also emphasized the importance of responding selectively rather than continuously replacing models.

Kolter and Maloof (2007) proposed dynamic weighted majority as an ensemble approach for changing concepts. Elwell and Polikar (2011) subsequently examined incremental learning under nonstationary conditions, emphasizing the preservation and modification of predictive knowledge. Gama et al. (2014) provided a broader synthesis of concept-drift adaptation, while Ditzler et al. (2015) discussed challenges associated with nonstationary environments. These studies collectively indicate that successful adaptation depends on the type of change, updating strategy, observation availability, and reliability of model evaluation.

3.3 Predictive Performance and Evaluation Methods

Breiman (2001) established random forests as an influential ensemble learning method, while Friedman (2001) developed gradient boosting from a statistical optimization perspective. Although conventional implementations are not inherently continuous adaptation systems, their predictive capabilities provide important foundations for model aggregation and dynamic updating strategies. Bergstra and Bengio (2012) examined efficient hyperparameter optimization, demonstrating the importance of computationally informed model selection. These contributions emphasize that predictive performance

depends on both the selected learning architecture and the procedures used for configuring and evaluating models.

Chawla et al. (2002) and He and Garcia (2009) examined classification difficulties arising from imbalanced datasets. Demšar (2006) investigated statistical comparison procedures, while Saito and Rehmsmeier (2015) emphasized the value of precision–recall analysis in imbalanced classification. Chen and Guestrin (2016) demonstrated advances in scalable predictive modeling through XGBoost. Together, these studies establish that adaptive learning should be evaluated using appropriate performance measures, reproducible comparisons, and computational considerations rather than relying exclusively on overall classification accuracy.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Design and Analytical Framework

The present study adopts a hypothetical methodological research design supported by mathematical calculations. The framework examines adaptive predictive learning through a simplified binary classification environment in which the underlying relationship between predictor and outcome variables changes. Two alternative prediction strategies are considered: a fixed classifier retaining its original decision rule and an idealized adaptive classifier capable of changing its rule after a specified delay. The design aims to illustrate adaptation-related performance differences without presenting hypothetical values as observed experimental findings.

The analytical framework also incorporates methodological principles relevant to practical adaptive systems. These include sequential observation processing, performance monitoring, identification of potential concept changes, and controlled updating decisions. The proposed process assumes that predictions are generated before corresponding outcomes become available for learning. This ordering is essential for preventing information leakage during sequential evaluation. The framework is intended to support future experimental implementation, although no actual adaptive learning algorithm or drift detector has been executed in the present study.

4.2 Hypothetical Dataset and Model Specification

The illustrative dataset consists of two conceptual phases containing 500 observation positions each. The predictor and target variables are binary, and the predictor assumes values zero and one with equal probability. During the initial phase, the dominant relationship follows the rule $Y = X$. Following an abrupt concept change, the dominant relationship becomes $Y = 1 - X$. Independent symmetric label noise is introduced through a probability parameter q , representing uncertainty in the target relationship.

The fixed model continues using the initial prediction rule throughout both phases. In contrast, the idealized adaptive model changes to the revised classification rule after d post-change observations. The post-change evaluation horizon is represented by N , fixed at 500 for the illustrative comparisons. The analysis assumes that the adaptive model adopts the correct new rule after the specified delay. It excludes false alarms, incomplete adaptation, model-estimation error, and computational overhead to isolate the mathematical influence of adaptation timing.

4.3 Analytical Procedure and Evaluation Measures

Expected predictive accuracy is calculated from the probability of correct classification before and after model adaptation. Under the hypothetical concept reversal, the fixed model achieves expected post-

change accuracy equal to q . The adaptive model initially uses the outdated relationship but subsequently applies the correct revised rule. Its expected accuracy is defined as $A = (1 - q) - [(1 - 2q)d/N]$, where d represents adaptation delay, N represents the evaluation horizon, and q represents symmetric label-noise probability.

The analysis evaluates two controlled mathematical comparisons. The first varies adaptation delay while maintaining a constant noise probability, whereas the second varies label uncertainty under a fixed adaptation delay. Expected accuracy is calculated directly from the specified equation. These calculations are not outputs from trained machine learning models or generated experiments. In subsequent empirical research, evaluation should additionally consider precision, recall, F1 score, balanced accuracy, computational requirements, and the reliability of drift-detection decisions.

5. Analysis

5.1 Expected Accuracy Under Varying Adaptation Delays

The first hypothetical analysis evaluates expected classification accuracy after an abrupt concept reversal. The evaluation horizon contains 500 post-change observation positions, while the symmetric label-noise probability is fixed at 0.10. Under these assumptions, the unchanged predictor achieves expected accuracy of 10%. An idealized adaptive predictor achieves higher accuracy when it adopts the revised classification relationship sufficiently early. The analytical values demonstrate how accumulated errors depend on the duration for which the outdated prediction rule remains active.

The calculations indicate that increasing adaptation delay reduces expected predictive accuracy within the specified environment. An immediately adapted predictor achieves expected accuracy of 90%, whereas a delay of 200 observations reduces expected accuracy to 58%. This relationship follows directly from the assumed classification probabilities and does not represent measured algorithm performance. The comparison illustrates why adaptation speed may be relevant when a predictive concept changes substantially, while recognizing that real detection and updating procedures introduce additional uncertainty.

Table 1: Hypothetical Expected Predictive Accuracy Under Different Adaptation Delays

Adaptation Delay (Observations)	Fixed Model Accuracy (%)	Adaptive Model Accuracy (%)
0	10	90
50	10	82
100	10	74
150	10	66
200	10	58

Assumptions: $N = 500$ and $q = 0.10$. All values are mathematical expectations, not empirical results.

5.2 Expected Accuracy Under Classification Uncertainty

The second hypothetical analysis considers how classification uncertainty influences expected post-change accuracy. The adaptation delay remains fixed at 100 observations, while symmetric label-noise probability varies between 0.05 and 0.25. Under the defined model, increasing noise reduces the maximum accuracy attainable through the revised classification relationship. The calculations compare the fixed and adaptive predictors using identical probability assumptions. This approach isolates the mathematical consequences of label uncertainty without introducing additional model-training or data-processing variables.

The illustrative results demonstrate a narrowing difference between fixed and adaptive predictive accuracy as label uncertainty increases. At a noise probability of 0.05, expected adaptive accuracy is 77%, compared with 5% for the fixed predictor. At a probability of 0.25, the corresponding values are 65% and 25%. These changes arise from the assumed symmetric label-generation process. They should not be interpreted as evidence that noisy data generally improve outdated classifiers or that adaptive systems always outperform static alternatives.

Table 2: Hypothetical Expected Classification Accuracy Under Different Noise Conditions

Label-Noise Probability	Fixed Model Accuracy (%)	Adaptive Model Accuracy (%)
0.05	5	77
0.10	10	74
0.15	15	71
0.20	20	68
0.25	25	65

Assumptions: $N = 500$ and $d = 100$. All results represent expected values within the defined mathematical scenario.

6. Discussion

6.1 Adaptive Learning and Predictive Reliability

The hypothetical findings indicate that correct adaptation can increase expected predictive accuracy when an earlier classification relationship becomes substantially inconsistent with new conditions. The analytical comparison demonstrates that the potential benefit depends on the delay between concept change and successful updating. This interpretation is consistent with the methodological importance of concept-drift adaptation discussed by Gama et al. (2014). However, the calculated outcomes cannot establish the performance of any specific adaptive algorithm without experimental implementation.

Predictive reliability also depends on avoiding unnecessary modifications when existing relationships remain useful. An adaptive system responding to temporary statistical fluctuations may replace a suitable model with an inferior alternative. Therefore, adaptation should be supported by reliable evidence rather than triggered automatically by every detectable change. The distinction between model responsiveness and model stability is essential for interpreting adaptive learning. The

proposed framework emphasizes this balance while recognizing that actual updating decisions require further methodological evaluation.

6.2 Dynamic Learning and Model Updating

Incremental learning and dynamic ensemble methods provide alternative approaches for maintaining predictive relevance. Incremental algorithms incorporate newly observed information into an existing model, whereas ensemble techniques may change the relative contribution of multiple predictors. Previous research by Kolter and Maloof (2007) and Elwell and Polikar (2011) demonstrates the importance of managing predictive knowledge under changing conditions. The present hypothetical framework incorporates these principles conceptually but does not compare their experimental effectiveness or establish the superiority of one approach.

The selection of an appropriate updating strategy should consider the magnitude of environmental change, available observations, computational resources, and model complexity. Complete retraining may be unnecessary when only limited parameters require adjustment. Conversely, partial updating may be insufficient following major changes in the target relationship. Adaptive systems therefore benefit from flexible model-management procedures that support different responses according to available evidence. Effective updating requires an appropriate balance between incorporating new information and preserving predictive knowledge that remains relevant.

6.3 Interpretation of Predictive Performance

The analytical comparisons emphasize the importance of evaluating predictive performance under clearly defined assumptions. In the hypothetical benchmark, adaptation delay and label uncertainty influence expected classification accuracy through a specified mathematical relationship. These conclusions cannot automatically be extended to datasets containing high-dimensional variables, imbalanced classes, or gradual changes. Such environments may produce different error patterns and require additional evaluation measures. The interpretation therefore remains restricted to the conditions established within the analytical research design.

Practical adaptive learning research should employ evaluation procedures that account for the chronological availability of observations and target labels. Aggregate accuracy may conceal poor performance on minority classes or during periods immediately following concept change. Measures such as balanced accuracy, precision, recall, and recovery time can provide additional information. The methodological guidance of Demšar (2006) and Saito and Rehmsmeier (2015) further supports appropriate comparative analysis and careful selection of performance metrics in predictive learning investigations.

7. Challenges

7.1 Heterogeneous Data and Information Quality

Adaptive learning systems frequently operate with information obtained from multiple sources containing different statistical characteristics. Missing observations, inconsistent measurement practices, redundant features, and changing class distributions can complicate predictive modeling. These conditions may also interfere with change-detection procedures because data-quality problems can resemble meaningful variation in the underlying learning environment. Research on imbalanced classification emphasizes that dataset composition substantially influences evaluation outcomes (He &

Garcia, 2009; Krawczyk, 2016). Reliable adaptation therefore requires systematic information assessment and appropriate preprocessing procedures.

Another challenge involves maintaining consistency when new observations differ from historical training information. Feature definitions, measurement scales, or data-collection practices may change without altering the fundamental predictive relationship. In such situations, unnecessary model replacement can introduce instability rather than improve accuracy. Adaptive systems must distinguish changes requiring revised predictive knowledge from those requiring data-processing adjustments. This distinction is especially important when learning procedures receive heterogeneous observations continuously and cannot assume that every incoming record follows identical measurement conditions.

7.2 Computational Complexity and Model Stability

Adaptive predictive systems may require continuous monitoring, frequent parameter adjustments, model retraining, and management of multiple candidate predictors. These activities introduce computational demands beyond those associated with a permanently fixed model. The processing burden may become significant when observations arrive rapidly or when model architectures require extensive optimization. Resource limitations can restrict the frequency and complexity of feasible adaptation procedures. Consequently, improvements in predictive performance must be considered alongside processing time, memory consumption, and operational requirements.

Model stability represents another important challenge because excessive updating can reduce predictive consistency. Frequent replacement decisions may be influenced by random fluctuations rather than meaningful changes in predictive relationships. Such behavior can produce unstable outcomes and complicate performance assessment. Sculley et al. (2015) discussed maintenance difficulties associated with machine learning systems, emphasizing the importance of managing technical dependencies. Adaptive model governance should therefore incorporate controlled updating, version management, validation procedures, and mechanisms for reversing unsuitable changes when necessary.

7.3 Concept Drift Detection and Delayed Feedback

Reliable identification of concept drift is difficult when target outcomes are unavailable immediately after predictions are generated. Many adaptive learning procedures rely on observed prediction errors to determine whether a model remains appropriate. Delayed or incomplete labels restrict this information and may postpone adaptation decisions. Statistical changes in predictor distributions can provide additional monitoring signals, but they do not necessarily establish that predictive relationships have deteriorated. Distinguishing these possibilities remains important for avoiding misleading change assessments.

The effectiveness of adaptation also depends on the accuracy of decisions made after potential drift is detected. False alarms may produce unnecessary retraining, while missed changes can prolong periods of reduced predictive reliability. Gradual drift presents additional difficulties because small changes may accumulate without producing an immediately recognizable deterioration. These circumstances require carefully designed monitoring procedures and evaluation measures. Future research should examine detector sensitivity, adaptation delays, and the consequences of incorrect updating decisions under different environmental conditions.

8. Conclusion

Adaptive machine learning provides a methodological approach for maintaining predictive relevance in data environments characterized by changing relationships and uncertain information. The present hypothetical study examined incremental learning, concept-drift detection, and dynamic model updating through a structured analytical framework. Its discussion indicates that adaptive techniques may offer advantages when existing predictive models become inconsistent with emerging conditions. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of adaptation depends on reliable change identification, appropriate updating decisions, and systematic evaluation.

The analytical comparisons demonstrated how adaptation delay and classification uncertainty influence expected predictive accuracy under a simplified binary concept-reversal scenario. Earlier successful adaptation produced higher expected accuracy, while increasing label uncertainty reduced the advantage under the specified assumptions. These outcomes are mathematical expectations rather than experimentally observed results. Accordingly, they provide illustrative support for understanding adaptation-related performance but cannot establish the practical superiority of any particular machine learning algorithm.

The study concludes that dependable adaptive predictive systems require a balance between responsiveness, computational efficiency, and model stability. Future experimental investigations should evaluate the proposed methodological principles using representative datasets, appropriate baseline models, and temporally valid assessment procedures. Particular attention should be directed toward delayed labels, heterogeneous observations, unnecessary updates, and detection reliability. Such research would help determine the operational conditions under which adaptive machine learning can deliver measurable improvements in predictive accuracy.

References

1. Arora, S., Rani, R., & Saxena, N. (2024). A systematic review on detection and adaptation of concept drift in streaming data using machine learning techniques. *WIREs Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 14(4), Article e1536. <https://doi.org/10.1002/widm.1536>
2. Bifet, A., & Gavaldà, R. (2007). Learning from time-changing data with adaptive windowing. In *Proceedings of the 2007 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining* (pp. 443–448). Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611972771.42>
3. Bifet, A., Holmes, G., Kirkby, R., & Pfahringer, B. (2010). MOA: Massive online analysis. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11, 1601–1604. <https://jmlr.org/papers/v11/bifet10a.html>
4. Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45, 5–32. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324>
5. Cawley, G. C., & Talbot, N. L. C. (2010). On over-fitting in model selection and subsequent selection bias in performance evaluation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11, 2079–2107. <https://www.jmlr.org/papers/v11/cawley10a.html>
6. Chen, T., & Guestrin, C. (2016). XGBoost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* (pp. 785–794). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939785>
7. Feurer, M., & Hutter, F. (2019). Hyperparameter optimization. In F. Hutter, L. Kotthoff, & J. Vanschoren (Eds.), *Automated machine learning: Methods, systems, challenges* (pp. 3–33). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05318-5_1

8. Friedman, J. H. (2001). Greedy function approximation: A gradient boosting machine. *The Annals of Statistics*, 29(5), 1189–1232. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1013203451>
9. Gama, J., Žliobaitė, I., Bifet, A., Pechenizkiy, M., & Bouchachia, A. (2014). A survey on concept drift adaptation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 46(4), Article 44, 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2523813>
10. Gomes, H. M., Bifet, A., Read, J., Barddal, J. P., Enembreck, F., Pfahringer, B., Holmes, G., & Abdesslem, T. (2017). Adaptive random forests for evolving data stream classification. *Machine Learning*, 106, 1469–1495. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-017-5642-8>
11. He, X., Zhao, K., & Chu, X. (2021). AutoML: A survey of the state-of-the-art. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 212, Article 106622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2020.106622>
12. Hoi, S. C. H., Sahoo, D., Lu, J., & Zhao, P. (2021). Online learning: A comprehensive survey. *Neurocomputing*, 459, 249–289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2021.04.112>
13. LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553), 436–444. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14539>
14. Lü, J., Liu, A., Dong, F., Gu, F., & Gama, J. (2019). Learning under concept drift: A review. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 31(12), 2346–2363. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2018.2876857>
15. Pan, S. J., & Yang, Q. (2010). A survey on transfer learning. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 22(10), 1345–1359. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2009.191>
16. Quiñero-Candela, J., Sugiyama, M., Schwaighofer, A., & Lawrence, N. D. (Eds.). (2009). *Dataset shift in machine learning*. MIT Press.
17. Suárez-Cetrulo, A.-L., Quintana, D., & Cervantes, A. (2023). A survey on machine learning for recurring concept drifting data streams. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 213, Article 118934. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2022.118934>
18. Sugiyama, M., Krauledat, M., & Müller, K.-R. (2007). Covariate shift adaptation by importance weighted cross validation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8, 985–1005. <https://www.jmlr.org/papers/v8/sugiyama07a.html>
19. Wilson, G., & Cook, D. J. (2020). A survey of unsupervised deep domain adaptation. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 11(5), Article 51. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3400066>
20. Xiang, Q., Zi, L., Cong, X., & Wang, Y. (2023). Concept drift adaptation methods under the deep learning framework: A literature review. *Applied Sciences*, 13(11), Article 6515. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app13116515>