

Machine Learning Approaches for Identifying Early Indicators of Equipment Failure in Automated Systems

Dr. Ethan Campbell

Lecturer, Institute of Smart Industrial Technologies

Abstract

Automated industrial systems depend on interconnected mechanical, electrical, and control components whose unexpected failure can interrupt production and reduce operational reliability. Condition-monitoring sensors generate information concerning vibration, temperature, motor current, pressure, cycle duration, and equipment load that may contain measurable changes before functional failure becomes visible. Machine learning provides a methodological approach for combining these signals and identifying multivariable patterns associated with emerging equipment degradation. This hypothetical methodological study compares machine learning approaches for identifying early indicators of equipment failure in automated systems. A fictional dataset contains 3,600 condition-monitoring windows obtained conceptually from sixty automated equipment units. Sensor features include vibration statistics, temperature trends, electrical-current variation, pressure instability, cycle-time deviation, and operating-load measures. Logistic regression, support vector machine, and random forest classifiers are compared using a common temporal evaluation framework.

The illustrative analysis evaluates accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 score for predicting whether equipment will enter a predefined failure condition within the subsequent twenty-four operating hours. Under the assigned hypothetical values, the random forest configuration records the strongest overall classification performance. A second analysis examines early-warning performance at six-, twelve-, twenty-four-, and forty-eight-hour prediction horizons and demonstrates decreasing hypothetical accuracy as the forecast interval becomes longer. The study concludes that machine learning can support early-failure identification by combining multiple condition indicators that may be difficult to interpret independently. However, predictive maintenance performance depends on reliable failure labels, representative operating conditions, temporal validation, class-imbalance management, sensor quality, and appropriate warning horizons. The numerical findings presented in this manuscript are illustrative and require real equipment data and controlled empirical validation before operational conclusions can be established.

Keywords: Machine Learning, Equipment Failure Prediction, Predictive Maintenance, Condition Monitoring, Automated Systems, Fault Detection, Random Forest, Support Vector Machine, Sensor Analytics, Industrial Reliability.

1. Introduction

Automated production systems increasingly depend on interconnected equipment operating for extended periods with limited direct human intervention. Motors, bearings, pumps, actuators, conveyors, robotic assemblies, and process-control components can experience gradual deterioration before functional failure occurs. Unexpected equipment failure may interrupt production schedules, increase maintenance expenditure, and create secondary damage to connected machinery. Early identification of changing equipment condition is therefore an important objective of industrial reliability and maintenance management.

Condition-based maintenance addresses this problem by using measurements of actual equipment condition to support maintenance decisions. Jardine et al. described condition-based maintenance as a process involving data acquisition, data processing, and maintenance decision-making, with diagnostics and prognostics forming important analytical components. Condition-monitoring systems commonly capture vibration, temperature, electrical, acoustic, pressure, and operational measurements. These signals can contain evidence of degradation before conventional threshold alarms indicate that equipment has reached a critical operating state.

Traditional condition monitoring often depends on expert-defined thresholds and signal-processing techniques. Vibration analysis is particularly important for rotating machinery because bearing and gear defects can generate recognizable frequency and amplitude characteristics. Randall and Antoni provided a detailed account of rolling-element bearing diagnostics, while Samanta investigated gear-fault detection using artificial neural networks and support vector machines. Such research demonstrates that engineered signal features can provide effective inputs for automated fault-recognition models.

Machine learning extends conventional condition monitoring by learning relationships between multiple sensor indicators and future equipment states. Jack and Nandi compared neural-network and support-vector approaches for fault detection, while Widodo and Yang reviewed the application of support vector machines to machine condition monitoring. More recently within the period considered here, Susto et al. developed a machine-learning methodology for predictive maintenance using multiple classifiers and prediction horizons. These contributions illustrate the transition from fault recognition toward earlier prediction of maintenance-relevant deterioration.

The present hypothetical study compares several machine learning approaches for identifying early indicators of equipment failure within automated systems. Logistic regression, support vector machine, and random forest models are evaluated under a common fictional sensor dataset. The methodology emphasizes prediction before failure rather than diagnosis after a component has already failed. No actual industrial equipment was monitored, and all numerical findings are constructed examples intended to demonstrate an appropriate predictive-maintenance research design.

2. Objectives of the Study

The principal objective of the study is to examine how machine learning can identify combinations of sensor and operational indicators associated with impending equipment failure in automated systems. The research emphasizes feature integration, early-warning classification, prediction-horizon sensitivity, and methodological challenges affecting predictive-maintenance reliability.

2.1 Identification of Early Condition Indicators

The first objective is to examine condition variables that may contain information before equipment reaches a functional failure state. The hypothetical feature set includes vibration root-mean-square values, vibration kurtosis, bearing-temperature trends, motor-current variation, pressure fluctuation, cycle-time deviation, and normalized operating load. These variables represent mechanical, thermal, electrical, and process dimensions of equipment condition and allow the model to evaluate multivariable degradation patterns rather than relying on one threshold.

Early indicators should not be interpreted as direct proof that failure will occur. A temporary temperature increase or vibration change can result from workload variation rather than physical deterioration. The analytical objective is therefore to identify combinations and temporal trends that statistically precede failure labels within the training information. Operational context must remain part of the prediction process so that normal high-load behavior is not incorrectly classified as impending equipment damage.

2.2 Comparison of Machine Learning Approaches

The second objective is to compare three predictive approaches under identical data and evaluation conditions. Logistic regression represents an interpretable linear baseline, support vector machine provides nonlinear classification through kernel-based decision boundaries, and random forest represents an ensemble of decision trees capable of modeling nonlinear interactions. Using a common test period allows methodological comparison without allowing one model to benefit from different sensor observations or failure prevalence.

Performance is assessed through accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 score, with the positive class representing equipment observations followed by failure within twenty-four operating hours. Recall is particularly relevant because missed early-failure events can reduce the practical value of a maintenance-warning system. Precision remains equally important because excessive false alarms may lead to unnecessary inspections and reduce operator confidence in predictive-maintenance recommendations.

2.3 Evaluation of Early-Warning Horizons

The third objective is to examine how predictive performance changes according to the amount of advance warning required. Six-hour prediction can use condition information relatively close to failure, whereas forty-eight-hour prediction requires identification of weaker and earlier degradation patterns. These horizons involve different operational benefits and levels of uncertainty. A model providing very early warnings may be useful for maintenance planning but may also generate more incorrect alerts.

The study therefore evaluates the strongest hypothetical model across four warning horizons. This analysis demonstrates that predictive-maintenance performance should always be reported together with the forecast horizon. A model cannot meaningfully be described as highly accurate without stating how early it attempts to predict failure.

3. Review of Literature

3.1 Condition Monitoring and Predictive Maintenance

Jardine et al. provided an influential review of machinery diagnostics and prognostics within condition-based maintenance and emphasized data acquisition, processing, diagnostics, prognostics, and

maintenance decision support. Their framework established that condition monitoring is not limited to fault detection but should contribute to maintenance planning. Heng et al. subsequently reviewed rotating-machinery prognostics and identified challenges involving degradation modeling, uncertainty, data quality, and prediction of remaining useful life.

Peng et al. examined condition-based maintenance through a review of condition monitoring, diagnostics, and prognostics approaches. Susto et al. later demonstrated a machine-learning predictive-maintenance framework using multiple classifiers with different prediction horizons. Their methodology is particularly relevant to early-failure identification because it recognizes that maintenance decisions may require different trade-offs between unexpected failures and premature maintenance actions depending on how far ahead predictions are made.

3.2 Machine Learning for Machinery Fault Recognition

Jack and Nandi compared support vector machines and artificial neural networks for rotating-machinery fault detection using vibration-derived statistical features. Samanta similarly investigated gear-fault classification through neural networks and support vector machines combined with genetic-algorithm-based feature selection. These studies demonstrated that machine learning can classify machinery condition effectively when appropriate signal features are available and established SVM and ANN approaches as important tools within intelligent condition monitoring.

Widodo and Yang reviewed support vector machine applications in machine condition monitoring and fault diagnosis and emphasized generalization performance as an important advantage of margin-based learning. Sugumaran et al. investigated decision-tree-based feature selection and support vector classification for roller-bearing fault diagnosis. Together, these studies illustrate how feature engineering, classifier selection, and dimensionality reduction can influence machinery-health classification, particularly when training samples are limited.

3.3 Prognostics and Degradation Prediction

Heng et al. distinguished diagnostics from prognostics by emphasizing prediction of future equipment condition rather than recognition of an already existing fault. Saxena et al. developed damage-propagation simulation for aircraft engines and produced run-to-failure datasets widely relevant to prognostic-method development. Such research demonstrates that predictive-maintenance evaluation benefits from sequential degradation information because isolated healthy and failed observations provide limited evidence regarding when measurable warning indicators first appear.

Si et al. reviewed statistical data-driven approaches for remaining useful life prediction and categorized methods according to the way degradation information and uncertainty are modeled. Although remaining-useful-life estimation differs from binary early-warning classification, both tasks require temporal validation and meaningful degradation labels. Predictive maintenance therefore encompasses a spectrum ranging from condition classification to estimation of the probability and timing of future equipment failure.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Design and Predictive Framework

The present study adopts a hypothetical methodological design based on binary early-failure prediction. Condition-monitoring observations are organized into fixed-duration sensor windows. Each window

receives a positive label when the corresponding equipment unit is assumed to experience a defined functional failure within the subsequent twenty-four operating hours. Windows without such an event are labeled negative. This formulation distinguishes impending failure from normal operating behavior rather than attempting to classify specific component fault types.

Three conceptual machine learning models are trained using identical sensor features. Logistic regression uses standardized continuous predictors and regularized parameter estimation. The support vector machine uses a radial-basis kernel, while random forest combines multiple decision trees constructed from bootstrapped training samples and randomized feature subsets. Hyperparameters are conceptually determined using the validation partition only. No actual machine-learning training was conducted for this manuscript.

4.2 Hypothetical Sensor Dataset and Features

The fictional dataset contains 3,600 condition-monitoring windows obtained conceptually from sixty automated equipment units. Two thousand four hundred windows are assigned chronologically to training, six hundred to validation, and six hundred to independent testing. The test partition contains 150 positive early-failure windows and 450 normal-condition windows. All equipment, failures, sensor values, and operating histories are invented and do not correspond to any real industrial facility.

Input features include vibration RMS, vibration kurtosis, peak-to-peak acceleration, rolling bearing temperature, motor-current variability, pressure deviation, average cycle duration, cycle-time variability, operating load, and recent sensor trend coefficients. These features are assumed to be calculated only from measurements available before each prediction time. Information recorded after the beginning of the prediction horizon is excluded to avoid leakage of future failure information into the classifier.

4.3 Evaluation Procedure and Performance Metrics

Model evaluation uses the same 600-window test set for all three classifiers. True positives represent impending failures correctly identified before the twenty-four-hour horizon, while false negatives represent impending failures that remain undetected. False positives represent normal-condition windows incorrectly classified as early-failure warnings. True negatives represent normal observations correctly classified. Accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 score are calculated directly from these hypothetical confusion-matrix outcomes.

A second analysis evaluates the random forest at six-, twelve-, twenty-four-, and forty-eight-hour prediction horizons. The feature-generation procedure is assumed unchanged, while labels are reconstructed according to the relevant future-failure interval. This design isolates the influence of warning horizon conceptually. In real predictive-maintenance research, repeated temporal cross-validation, equipment-level separation, confidence intervals, calibration analysis, and cost-sensitive evaluation would also be necessary.

5. Analysis

5.1 Comparative Early-Failure Classification

The first hypothetical analysis compares the three machine learning approaches on the independent 600-window test partition. Logistic regression identifies 108 of the 150 impending-failure windows, while the support vector machine identifies 123. Random forest identifies 132 impending failures and produces

only twenty-eight false-positive warnings. The assigned values illustrate how nonlinear feature interactions may contribute to stronger classification when deterioration is represented through multiple condition-monitoring signals.

Random forest records an illustrative accuracy of 92.33%, precision of 82.50%, recall of 88.00%, and F1 score of 85.16%. Support vector machine produces an F1 score of 77.36%, while logistic regression records 69.68%. These differences are hypothetical and do not establish that random forests are inherently superior for predictive maintenance. Actual performance depends on equipment type, sensor quality, feature engineering, training data, class prevalence, and parameter tuning.

Table 1: Hypothetical Early-Failure Prediction Performance

Machine Learning Model	TP	FP	FN	TN	Accuracy (%)	Precision (%)	Recall (%)	F1 Score (%)
Logistic Regression	108	52	42	398	84.33	67.50	72.00	69.68
Support Vector Machine	123	45	27	405	88.00	73.21	82.00	77.36
Random Forest	132	28	18	422	92.33	82.50	88.00	85.16

5.2 Prediction Performance Across Warning Horizons

The second hypothetical analysis evaluates random-forest prediction across alternative early-warning horizons. The model records the strongest assigned performance six hours before failure, with accuracy of 94.7% and F1 score of 90.2%. Performance gradually decreases as the warning interval becomes longer. At forty-eight hours, accuracy falls to 86.1% and F1 to 77.8%, illustrating the greater uncertainty associated with predicting failure from earlier and potentially weaker degradation signals.

The pattern demonstrates the practical trade-off between predictive accuracy and maintenance lead time. Very short warning horizons may provide strong detection but insufficient time to schedule maintenance without disrupting production. Longer horizons provide more planning flexibility but can reduce reliability if early degradation indicators overlap substantially with normal operating variation. The optimum horizon should therefore be selected according to maintenance logistics and the operational cost of missed failures and false alarms.

Table 2: Hypothetical Random-Forest Performance Across Early-Warning Horizons

Prediction Horizon	Accuracy (%)	Precision (%)	Recall (%)	F1 Score (%)
6 Hours Before Failure	94.7	91.0	89.4	90.2
12 Hours Before Failure	93.2	87.9	87.3	87.6
24 Hours Before Failure	92.3	82.5	88.0	85.2
48 Hours Before Failure	86.1	74.9	81.0	77.8

6. Discussion

6.1 Machine Learning and Multisensor Failure Indicators

The hypothetical comparison illustrates why machine learning may be useful when equipment degradation influences several sensor measurements simultaneously. A developing bearing or motor problem may alter vibration, temperature, current, and cycle stability before any individual measurement crosses a fixed alarm threshold. Machine learning can combine these weak indicators and estimate whether their joint pattern resembles condition sequences previously associated with failure.

This interpretation is consistent with condition-based maintenance literature emphasizing multisensor information and feature-based diagnostics. Jardine et al. discussed sensor-data fusion as an important component of machinery condition monitoring, while Widodo and Yang reviewed intelligent classifiers for fault diagnosis. The present framework extends this reasoning toward early-warning classification. Nevertheless, correlations learned from historical sensor data must be confirmed across changing operating conditions before they are treated as reliable degradation indicators.

6.2 Prediction Horizon and Maintenance Decision Value

The hypothetical horizon analysis demonstrates that early-failure prediction should be interpreted together with available lead time. A highly accurate six-hour warning may be operationally less valuable than a slightly less accurate twenty-four-hour warning when replacement parts or maintenance personnel require advance scheduling. Susto et al. explicitly considered multiple prediction horizons within predictive maintenance, demonstrating why horizon-dependent decision rules can provide more useful information than a single binary health estimate.

The optimal horizon also depends on failure consequence. Equipment whose failure immediately stops a critical production line may justify earlier warnings and a higher false-positive rate. Less critical assets may require stronger evidence before maintenance is initiated. Consequently, machine-learning evaluation should ultimately incorporate operational costs rather than maximizing F1 score independently. Predictive-maintenance models become decision-support systems only when their warning behavior is connected to practical maintenance actions.

6.3 Feature Engineering and Model Interpretation

Condition-monitoring signals often require substantial preprocessing before classification. Vibration RMS, kurtosis, spectral-energy measures, temperature slopes, and operating-load trends summarize different aspects of equipment behavior. Samanta and Jack and Nandi demonstrated the importance of engineered signal features for machinery fault classification. Feature selection can improve interpretability and reduce the risk that models learn unstable relationships from redundant sensor measurements.

Random forests provide variable-importance measures that can support exploratory interpretation, but such scores do not automatically establish causal failure mechanisms. A feature may receive high importance because it correlates with workload, equipment age, or another unmeasured factor. Maintenance specialists should therefore compare statistical feature importance with engineering knowledge and physical failure mechanisms. Machine-learning explanations are most useful when they complement rather than replace domain expertise.

7. Challenges

7.1 Failure Labels and Class Imbalance

Reliable failure labels are difficult to construct because maintenance records may not distinguish confirmed component failure from preventive replacement, inspection, or unrelated downtime. A sensor window labeled as impending failure can therefore contain uncertainty concerning the actual degradation state. Heng et al. emphasized similar challenges in machinery prognostics, where accurate degradation and failure information is essential for estimating future condition.

Failure events are also typically less frequent than normal operation, creating class imbalance. A model can achieve high accuracy by favoring the normal class while missing important failures. Precision, recall, and F1 should therefore accompany accuracy, and cost-sensitive learning or resampling may be required in real datasets. Equipment-level temporal separation is equally important so that repeated observations from the same failure episode do not inflate apparent performance.

7.2 Operating Variability and Sensor Reliability

Automated equipment does not always operate under identical load, speed, environmental temperature, or process conditions. These variations can change vibration, current, and temperature even when the equipment remains healthy. A predictive model trained under narrow operating conditions may therefore generate false alarms after production settings change. Features should incorporate operating context, and testing should include multiple loads, speeds, product types, or environmental states wherever these factors influence sensor behavior.

Sensor degradation introduces another source of uncertainty. Calibration drift, loose mounting, communication interruptions, and missing measurements can resemble equipment changes or hide genuine deterioration. Condition-monitoring systems should therefore evaluate sensor health alongside equipment health. Missing-value procedures and sensor-quality indicators should be defined before deployment. A machine-learning model cannot compensate reliably for persistent measurement errors that were not represented during training.

7.3 Generalization and Maintenance Integration

Predictive models can perform strongly on one machine population while failing on equipment with different ages, manufacturers, component tolerances, or operating histories. Transfer between nominally similar assets should therefore be demonstrated rather than assumed. Cross-equipment validation provides stronger evidence than random window splitting because it tests whether the learned condition patterns generalize beyond the individual units represented during model development.

Operational integration creates an additional challenge because a warning must lead to a practical decision. Maintenance teams need interpretable information concerning warning confidence, affected equipment, likely urgency, and recent condition trends. Excessive alerts can produce alarm fatigue, whereas missed failures reduce trust in the system. Predictive-maintenance deployment therefore requires monitoring of both model performance and the downstream maintenance actions triggered by predictions.

8. Conclusion

Machine learning provides a useful methodological framework for identifying early indicators of equipment failure from multisensor condition-monitoring data. The present hypothetical study compared

logistic regression, support vector machine, and random forest classification using vibration, temperature, electrical, pressure, cycle-time, and load-related features. The methodology focused specifically on prediction before failure rather than diagnosis after a fault had already become established.

The illustrative analysis assigned the strongest twenty-four-hour early-warning performance to the random forest model and demonstrated decreasing predictive performance as the warning horizon increased from six to forty-eight hours. Every numerical result is hypothetical and does not represent an implemented industrial system. Genuine performance claims would require verified failure records, real sensor histories, equipment-level temporal testing, repeated model evaluation, and statistical uncertainty estimates.

The study concludes that successful predictive maintenance depends on more than classifier selection. Failure-label quality, sensor reliability, class imbalance, operating variability, warning horizon, interpretability, and maintenance decision costs are equally important. Future empirical work should combine engineering knowledge with machine learning and evaluate whether early warnings actually reduce unexpected downtime and improve maintenance planning under realistic automated-system operating conditions.

References

1. Carvalho, T. P., Soares, F. A. A. M. N., Vita, R., Francisco, R. d. P., Basto, J. P., & Alcalá, S. G. S. (2019). A systematic literature review of machine learning methods applied to predictive maintenance. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 137, Article 106024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2019.106024>
2. Jardine, A. K. S., Lin, D., & Banjevic, D. (2006). A review on machinery diagnostics and prognostics implementing condition-based maintenance. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 20(7), 1483–1510. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymssp.2005.09.012>
3. Heng, A., Zhang, S., Tan, A. C. C., & Mathew, J. (2009). Rotating machinery prognostics: State of the art, challenges and opportunities. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 23(3), 724–739. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymssp.2008.06.009>
4. Lee, J., Wu, F., Zhao, W., Ghaffari, M., Liao, L., & Siegel, D. (2014). Prognostics and health management design for rotary machinery systems—Reviews, methodology and applications. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 42(1–2), 314–334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymssp.2013.06.004>
5. Susto, G. A., Schirru, A., Pampuri, S., McLoone, S., & Beghi, A. (2015). Machine learning for predictive maintenance: A multiple classifiers approach. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 11(3), 812–820. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TII.2014.2349359>
6. Si, X.-S., Wang, W., Hu, C.-H., & Zhou, D.-H. (2011). Remaining useful life estimation—A review on the statistical data driven approaches. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 213(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2010.11.018>
7. Sikorska, J. Z., Hodkiewicz, M., & Ma, L. (2011). Prognostic modelling options for remaining useful life estimation by industry. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 25(5), 1803–1836. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymssp.2010.11.018>

8. Zhao, R., Yan, R., Chen, Z., Mao, K., Wang, P., & Gao, R. X. (2019). Deep learning and its applications to machine health monitoring. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 115, 213–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymssp.2018.05.050>
9. Lei, Y., Li, N., Guo, L., Li, N., Yan, T., & Lin, J. (2018). Machinery health prognostics: A systematic review from data acquisition to RUL prediction. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 104, 799–834. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymssp.2017.11.016>
10. Zhang, S., Zhang, S., Wang, B., & Habetler, T. G. (2019). Deep learning algorithms for bearing fault diagnostics—A review. *IEEE Access*, 7, 28281–28292. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2903261>
11. Zonta, T., da Costa, C. A., da Rosa Righi, R., de Lima, M. J., da Trindade, E. S., & Li, G. P. (2020). Predictive maintenance in the Industry 4.0: A systematic literature review. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 150, Article 106889. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2020.106889>
12. Bousdekis, A., Magoutas, B., Apostolou, D., & Mentzas, G. (2020). Review, analysis and synthesis of prognostic-based decision support methods for condition based maintenance. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 31, 1303–1316.
13. Tidriri, K., Chatti, N., Verron, S., & Tiplica, T. (2016). Bridging data-driven and model-based approaches for process fault diagnosis and health monitoring: A review of research and challenges. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 42, 63–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arcontrol.2016.09.008>
14. Randall, R. B., & Antoni, J. (2011). Rolling element bearing diagnostics—A tutorial. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 25(2), 485–520. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymssp.2010.07.017>
15. Peng, Y., Dong, M., & Zuo, M. J. (2010). Current status of machine prognostics in condition-based maintenance: A review. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 50, 297–313. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-009-2482-0>
16. Kothamasu, R., Huang, S. H., & VerDuin, W. H. (2006). System health monitoring and prognostics—A review of current paradigms and practices. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 28, 1012–1024.
17. Neupane, D., Bouadjenek, M. R., Dazeley, R., & Aryal, S. (2024). Data-driven machinery fault detection: A comprehensive review. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.18843>
18. Hector, I., & Panjanathan, R. (2024). Predictive maintenance in Industry 4.0: A survey of planning models and machine learning techniques. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 10, Article e2016. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.2016>
19. Sahu, A. R., Palei, S. K., & Mishra, A. (2024). Data-driven fault diagnosis approaches for industrial equipment: A review. *Expert Systems*, 41(2), Article e13360. <https://doi.org/10.1111/exsy.13360>
20. Paradigm shift for predictive maintenance and condition monitoring from Industry 4.0 to Industry 5.0: A systematic review, challenges and case study. (2024). *Results in Engineering*, 24, Article 102935. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rineng.2024.102935>