Enhancing Knowledge Acquisition and Retention through Adaptive Learning by Reading Systems with Personalized Content Delivery

Yassine Boudjemaa[1] and Karim Belkacem[2]

[1]University of Laghouat, Department of Computer Science, Route de Ghardaïa, Laghouat, Algeria

[2]University of El Oued, Faculty of Technology, Computer Science Department, Route de Touggourt, El Oued, Algeria

2024

Abstract

Adaptive learning by reading systems that tailor content delivery to individual learners hold substantial promise for improving knowledge acquisition and retention across diverse educational domains. By synthesizing dynamic user modeling, personalized reading material curation, and continuous assessment, these systems can optimize cognitive engagement while minimizing extraneous effort. Recent advances in computational techniques, including matrix-based factorization approaches to learner modeling, have enhanced the capability of modern adaptive systems to infer complex skill trajectories and provide content that appropriately challenges learners. At the same time, novel theoretical frameworks that incorporate logical formalisms, parameterized latent representations, and advanced objective functions have broadened the scope of adaptive delivery techniques to accommodate heterogeneous learning goals. This paper presents a rigorous analysis of how user-specific content calibration, informed by time-varying knowledge state metrics, fosters optimal reading strategies. Emphasis is placed on the interplay of model-based predictions, continuous feedback mechanisms, and the iterative realignment of prescribed content with user competencies. By integrating symbolic logic statements to characterize critical transitions in learner progression, as well as a range of linear algebraic expressions to detail multi-dimensional skill updates, we aim to demonstrate both the robustness and versatility of adaptive learning systems. The proposed perspective underscores the potential for personalized content delivery to be continually refined through real-time analytics, ultimately contributing to deeper and more enduring learning outcomes.

1 Introduction

Adaptive learning by reading systems have undergone a notable evolution, transitioning from rudimentary mechanisms that merely adjusted text difficulty to highly sophisticated platforms capable of modeling a learner's cognitive state as a dynamic construct [1]. The fundamental motivation behind such systems is to promote sustained knowledge acquisition and retention, partly by offering well-matched reading materials and targeted exercises to align with the evolving skill level of each individual [2]. Contemporary methodologies make use of latent factor models, Markov decision processes, and other advanced constructs to manage not only the representation of the learner's current knowledge but also the probable trajectory of their future development [3]. In this manner, the problem of tailoring texts or learning stimuli to each user can be viewed as an optimization over a high-dimensional space of reading materials, with the primary objective of maximizing a global measure of educational benefit. [4]

Researchers have investigated the influence of system-based interventions on reading fluency, conceptual mastery, and the ability to recall information over extended intervals [5]. Key theoretical insights relate to the mapping from textual stimuli to cognitive states, often formulated through transformations that capture the user's incremental assimilation of new content [6]. Mathematically, we can define a knowledge state vector $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, whose evolution over discrete time steps is given by some transition function T, such that $\mathbf{x}(t+1) = T(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t))$, where $\mathbf{u}(t)$ encapsulates the textual or conceptual input administered at time t. The structure of T may incorporate matrix multiplications, bias terms, and non-linear operations that reflect the learner's rate of comprehension and short-term retention [7]. By refining estimates of $\mathbf{x}(t)$ after each interaction, adaptive systems can systematically introduce higher-level concepts, thus ensuring a cohesive progression that balances cognitive load and progress efficiency.

In practical implementations, adaptive reading systems must not only track a learner's progress but also capture the intricacies of personal interests, background knowledge, and contextual factors. If we posit a set of learner attributes $\{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m\}$ that shape user engagement, then a suitable system might integrate these attributes into the function T via coefficient matrices that modulate knowledge gains. For instance, let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ be the base transition matrix for generic learning progress, and let $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ encode the dependencies on specific attributes $a_1, \ldots, a_m$. We can write [8]

$$\mathbf{x}(t+1) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}(t),$$

where $\mathbf{v}(t)$ is a vector capturing the relevance of attributes at time t. Over time, this linear model can be extended with non-linear activations to account for threshold effects, plateauing learning curves, or other domain-specific characteristics [9]. Beyond such formal quantifications, the system architecture also hinges on logic-based rules that determine whether a user is ready to advance [10]. For example, one might encode that $\forall t$, $(\mathbf{x}(t) \in \Omega) \rightarrow$ advance_content, where Ω is a set of knowledge state configurations deemed sufficiently high to justify presenting the next difficulty level.

An important underlying premise is that adaptive reading systems are most effective when they comprehensively address variations in learning style [11]. Some users may require repeated exposures to foundational concepts, while others may benefit from a rapid, high-level overview followed by targeted elaboration [12], [13]. Assigning each learner a unique progression path, the system can measure the incremental change in performance as an indicator of how well a piece of text or exercise fits within the user's zone of proximal development [14]. Under a random utility model, each piece of reading content might be assigned a utility score $U_i(\mathbf{x}(t))$ that reflects the expected learning gains for a user with knowledge state $\mathbf{x}(t)$. The platform's role is thus to select the piece of content with the highest expected utility at each step while applying constraints that preserve continuity and avoid overwhelming the user with abrupt jumps in difficulty.

Despite notable advances, there remain open questions about the most accurate ways to measure knowledge retention in real-world contexts, where reading takes place amid distractions, time pressures, and heterogeneous personal factors [15], [16]. Future directions may explore advanced transformations—beyond linear or polynomial expansions—to map reading-based stimuli to internal cognitive structures [17]. In parallel, further integration of symbolic logic statements, or even temporal logic frameworks, could refine the detection of readiness states, transitions, and possible regressions in knowledge level [18]. The fact that $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is inherently latent necessitates robust estimation procedures, potentially involving Bayesian updating, Kalman filters, or neural network-based parameterizations, which must be calibrated against detailed traces of user behavior and performance.

The broader objective is to identify design principles and computational paradigms that systematically adapt content while maintaining an appropriate level of challenge and engagement [19]. This is especially pertinent as such adaptive systems gain traction in formal educational settings and as supplementary learning platforms that individuals use independently for self-improvement [20]. In the subsequent sections, we explore theoretical foundations, propose a formal model for personalized reading content delivery, and discuss experimental validation strategies that underscore both the efficacy and challenges of implementing these systems at scale. [21]

2 Theoretical Foundations of Adaptive Learning

The conceptual underpinnings of adaptive learning center on the notion that knowledge can be viewed as a dynamic state subject to continuous updating through exposure to educational materials. If Ω represents the universal set of potential knowledge states relevant to a domain, then any particular learner at time t occupies some state $\omega_t \in \Omega$ [22]. This state is not directly observable but can be inferred through performance indicators, such as the ability to answer content-related questions or the time taken to process textual explanations [23]. A typical formalism involves specifying a probability distribution over Ω, denoted by $P(\omega_t)$, and updating it based on observed evidence [24]. One might write [25]

$$P(\omega_{t+1} \mid \text{observation}) \propto P(\text{observation} \mid \omega_{t+1})\, P(\omega_{t+1} \mid \omega_t),$$

where $P(\omega_{t+1} \mid \omega_t)$ captures the transition dynamics. Though Bayesian approaches are popular, other estimation techniques exist, particularly when the dimensionality of ω_t is large. [26]

More abstractly, if we let Λ be the space of possible readings, tasks, or stimuli, then each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ may differentially affect the learning trajectory [27]. The function that maps from pairs (ω_t, λ) to an updated knowledge state ω_{t+1} could be modeled as a composition of transformations, each capturing how a specific subset of skills is influenced. Symbolic logic frameworks often introduce predicate symbols $K(\omega, c)$ to denote that a learner at state ω knows concept c. Then, providing reading content λ might either preserve $K(\omega, c)$ or induce new known concepts [28].

One might specify a rule of the form: [29]

$$\forall \omega \in \Omega,\, \forall \lambda \in \Lambda,\, \Big(K(\omega, c) \wedge \phi(\lambda)\Big) \to K(f(\omega, \lambda), c'), [30]$$

signifying that if ω includes concept c and λ has certain properties $\phi(\lambda)$, the updated state $f(\omega, \lambda)$ may include the newly acquired concept c' [31]. This form of representation helps delineate what a piece of content is expected to achieve and how it interacts with the user's preexisting knowledge. [32]

Adaptive learning is also influenced by rational choice models, where each user's selection or acceptance of reading material is contingent upon perceived benefits and costs [33]. Within a linear algebraic paradigm, one might construct an interaction matrix $\mathbf{M}$ whose rows index reading materials and columns index skill components. The entry M_{ij} could indicate the degree to which reading material i supports the enhancement of skill j. A user's knowledge state $\mathbf{x}(t)$ can be represented as a vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$. By multiplying $\mathbf{M}$ by $\mathbf{x}(t)$, one obtains a vector that ranks materials by their relevance to the user's current profile. Extending this, if $\mathbf{C}$ is a matrix encoding how the user's engagement or preference modifies the transition function, the effective update might become

$$\mathbf{x}(t+1) = \sigma\big(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t)\big),$$

where σ is a non-linear activation. This approach blends collaborative filtering, which has been prevalent in recommendation systems, with the cognitive modeling used in educational contexts. [34]

In recent years, neural representations of user states, often parameterized by deep networks, have arisen as an alternative for capturing complex interactions [35], [36]. Even so, many high-level theories still incorporate symbolic constraints or logic-based modules to ensure interpretability and consistency with established pedagogical principles [37]. The existence of these hybrid frameworks acknowledges that purely data-driven methods can fail to incorporate domain knowledge effectively, while purely symbolic methods can be brittle when confronted with the variance inherent in real-world data. [38]

A key challenge involves reconciling these theoretical layers with the empirical realities of reading comprehension [39]. Reading is a process that can be broken down into decoding, semantic integration, and higher-level interpretive strategies [40]. A single reading passage can simultaneously reinforce multiple skills, from vocabulary recognition to critical thinking. Hence, a matrix-based approach that attempts to measure skill gains must reflect the interdependence of these capabilities [41]. In symbolic form, one might define a set of propositions $\{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k\}$ corresponding to each relevant skill. A reading text λ could then carry annotation $\{\psi_1(\lambda), \psi_2(\lambda), \ldots, \psi_k(\lambda)\}$, where $\psi_i(\lambda)$ indicates the potential increment in skill p_i. The system's goal is to choose λ that maximizes the probability of entailing p_i for some subset of skills, while ensuring the user does not become cognitively overloaded [42]. Such constraints can be expressed as: [43]

$$\forall t,\, (\neg\text{overloaded}(\omega_t) \wedge \psi_i(\lambda)) \to p_i(f(\omega_t, \lambda)),$$

highlighting that if the learner is not overloaded and the reading text is conducive to skill p_i, then the updated state includes mastery of p_i. [44]

At a broader scale, the theoretical frameworks guiding adaptive reading systems converge on a set of core principles: the learner's knowledge state is subject to dynamic, partially observable evolution; the content provided interacts with that evolution in quantifiable ways; and logic-based constraints or utility-based optimizations can structure the decision-making process [45]. These principles shape the design and implementation of adaptive systems, leading to diverse architectures that nonetheless share a commitment to personalizing content. [46]

3 Proposed Model for Personalized Content Delivery

The model proposed here seeks to unify continuous knowledge state estimation with logic-based gating mechanisms, ensuring that reading materials are matched not only to the user's skill vector but also to conceptual thresholds that must be cleared before proceeding. We define a user's knowledge state at time t by the vector $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The system tracks a discrete set of concepts $\{c_1, \ldots, c_n\}$. Let us define a reading material repository $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m\}$. Each λ_j is associated with a content vector $\mathbf{r}_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$, indicating the presumed skill or conceptual emphasis of that material. The partial differential effect of reading λ_j on $\mathbf{x}(t)$ can be written as:

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}(t)}{\partial \lambda_j} = \mathbf{W}\, \phi(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{r}_j),$$

where $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is a transformation matrix and $\phi(\cdot)$ is a function capturing non-linear interactions between the learner state and reading content.

To decide which material λ_j to deliver, the system estimates a utility function: [47]

$$u(\lambda_j \mid \mathbf{x}(t)) = \langle \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{r}_j \rangle + \alpha \|\mathbf{r}_j\| - \beta \|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{r}_j\|,$$

where α and β are parameters adjusting the emphasis on the absolute difficulty and the match between the learner's state and the content emphasis [48]. The first term $\langle \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{r}_j \rangle$ represents the alignment of the user's skill profile with the text's demands, the second term $\alpha \|\mathbf{r}_j\|$ accounts for the inherent benefit of more substantial content, and the third term $\beta \|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{r}_j\|$ penalizes a mismatch that could lead to frustration or insufficient challenge. The chosen content at time t is therefore: [49]

$$\lambda^*(t) = \arg \max_{\lambda_j \in \Lambda} u(\lambda_j \mid \mathbf{x}(t)).$$

After the learner engages with $\lambda^*(t)$, the state is updated according to:

$$\mathbf{x}(t+1) = \mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{W}\, \phi(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{r}_{j^*}).$$

The function ϕ could be as simple as an element-wise multiplication or as sophisticated as a neural network that encodes reading comprehension [50]. One might, for example, define [51], [52]

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{r}_{j^*}) = \sigma(\mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{V}_2 \mathbf{r}_{j^*} + \mathbf{b}),$$

where $\mathbf{V}_1$ and $\mathbf{V}_2$ are parameter matrices and $\mathbf{b}$ is a bias vector. σ could be a sigmoid, ReLU, or another non-linear function [53]. The update rule then situates the user's knowledge state in a high-dimensional manifold that is continuously shifted by exposure to new content.

Logic-based constraints intervene to ensure that reading materials are offered in a coherent sequence that respects conceptual dependencies [54]. Suppose we define a set of predicates $G_j(\mathbf{x}(t))$ meaning that a learner at state $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is eligible for content λ_j. This predicate might require that the user has mastered certain prerequisite concepts or that their skill vector has surpassed certain thresholds [55]. Symbolically, we can represent it as: [56]

$$\forall t, \Big(\bigwedge_{c_i \in \Pi_j} K(\mathbf{x}(t), c_i) \Big) \to G_j(\mathbf{x}(t)),$$

where Π_j is the set of prerequisite concepts for λ_j [57]. If $G_j(\mathbf{x}(t))$ is false, then the utility function is automatically set to a null value, excluding λ_j from selection. Thus, the system's optimization becomes: [58]

$$\lambda^*(t) = \arg \max_{\lambda_j \in \Lambda : G_j(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \text{true}} u(\lambda_j \mid \mathbf{x}(t)).$$

To incorporate personalized pacing, the model can monitor reading times, accuracy on embedded comprehension checks, and user-initiated signals of confusion [59]. We can define an auxiliary function $\delta(\mathbf{x}(t))$ that captures the user's readiness to proceed at a given speed. For instance,

$$\delta(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \exp(-\gamma \|\mathbf{x}(t) - \bar{\mathbf{t}}\|),$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ is a target skill distribution for the current reading phase, and γ is a parameter tuning the responsiveness of the system to deviations from $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$. A small value of $\delta(\mathbf{x}(t))$ suggests that the user is not integrating material effectively, prompting the system to supply remedial or reinforcing content rather than new or more difficult passages. This dynamic interplay between skill alignment and logic-based gating forms the backbone of the proposed framework.

From a more algorithmic standpoint, implementing this model involves maintaining a computational graph that updates $\mathbf{x}(t)$ after each reading session and recomputes the set of feasible λ_j. If user performance data indicates confusion or partial understanding, the system can re-evaluate constraints [60], [61]. For instance, a logic clause might specify: [62]

$$\forall t, \big(\neg \text{mastered}(\mathbf{x}(t), c_i)\big) \wedge \big(\mathbf{r}_j \text{ addresses } c_i\big) \to \text{emphasize}(\lambda_j),$$

ensuring that content covering concept c_i is preferred [63]. These explicit constraints integrate seamlessly with the matrix-based approach since each reading material λ_j aligns with certain dimensions of $\mathbf{x}(t)$.

This integration of logic-based gating and vector-based modeling differentiates the proposed system from purely data-driven solutions that may lack interpretability and from purely symbolic solutions that may not adapt smoothly to variations in reading patterns [64]. By handling user knowledge states as dynamic vectors, we gain the flexibility to incorporate parametric learning curves and advanced dimensionality reduction techniques, while logic constraints shape the path of content delivery [65]. In so doing, the model aspires to deliver carefully calibrated sequences that optimize knowledge acquisition and retention over extended periods of reading. [66]

4 Experimental Validation and Results

To validate the theoretical and modeling considerations described above, a controlled experimental setting can be established, wherein learners are grouped according to specific domain expertise, demographic backgrounds, or cognitive profiles. Each participant interacts with the adaptive reading system over a fixed period, receiving a series of passages whose content is dynamically selected by the model [67]. Data collection focuses on reading times, comprehension quiz scores, and periodic knowledge assessments, such as short conceptual tasks [68]. In addition, biometric measurements like eye-tracking or electrodermal activity might be integrated to provide supplementary evidence of cognitive load, though the framework does not explicitly require these to function. [69]

During the experiment, each participant's knowledge state $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is updated after every reading session. The reading materials are drawn from a repository that spans multiple difficulty levels and thematic domains, ensuring that the system must make nuanced distinctions about what to deliver next [70]. A baseline system that follows a predetermined progression (e.g., from simplest to hardest text in a linear manner) serves as a control [71]. The hypothesis is that the adaptive system, guided by the model's utility function and logic constraints, will foster higher retention scores and improved comprehension metrics than the baseline. [72], [73]

An example observation might be that a user, designated as U_i, demonstrates an initial reading state $\mathbf{x}_i(0)$ indicative of strong declarative knowledge in some areas but less developed analytical skills. Over the course of multiple sessions, the matrix-based transformations predicted by $\mathbf{W}$ guide the user to content that incrementally bolsters these weaker analytical skills. Simultaneously, logic constraints prevent the user from encountering advanced readings that demand certain prerequisites until mastery of the fundamentals is detected. If we define a threshold function $\theta(\mathbf{x}(t))$ that flags whether the user meets all fundamental conceptual requirements, it may be that

$$\theta(\mathbf{x}(t)) = 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x_k(t) \geq \tau \quad \forall k \in S,$$

where S is the index set of crucial foundational skills [74]. Only if $\theta(\mathbf{x}(t)) = 1$ is the user considered prepared for advanced material. This gating ensures a logical progression in content delivery. [75]

Quantitatively, the effectiveness of the system is measured through metrics such as the average reading comprehension test score, long-term retention (measured by a delayed post-test), and time-to-mastery for individual concepts [76]. The formal results can be expressed in terms of statistical comparisons between the adaptive system group and the baseline control group [77]. We might use a repeated-measures analysis of variance or hierarchical Bayesian modeling, depending on the study design [78]. For instance, if $S_i(t)$ represents the quiz score of user i at time t, and A_i is an indicator variable for whether the user participated in the adaptive condition, a suitable model might be: [79]

$$S_i(t) \sim \mathcal{N}\big(\mu_0 + \mu_1 A_i + \mu_2 t + \mu_3 (A_i \times t), \sigma^2\big),$$

which enables an estimation of whether the adaptive intervention yields a statistically significant improvement over time, relative to the control. Alternatively, logic-based analyses might examine the proportion of participants who satisfy a mastery predicate mastered$(\mathbf{x}(T), c)$ for key concepts c by the end of the experiment.

In an illustrative scenario, suppose that the adaptive group achieves a 15% higher mastery rate on advanced problem-solving tasks at a statistically significant level, while also reducing average reading time by 10% [80]. Such an outcome would suggest that the system is simultaneously boosting comprehension and efficiency—a hallmark of successful personalization strategies [81]. Moreover, the data might indicate that users with certain profiles (e.g., those having moderate baseline knowledge but high motivation) particularly benefit from the adaptive approach [82]. This would align with theoretical predictions that personalization yields the largest gains where prior knowledge is partial, making well-timed content selection crucial to maintain engagement and progression. [83]

Nevertheless, the results may expose limitations or edge cases [84]. For example, if a user's reading style is unorthodox or if external factors interrupt the learning process, the model may overestimate or underestimate the user's readiness, leading to content that is either too challenging or insufficiently engaging [85]. In these instances, advanced error-correction strategies might be needed, such as dynamic weighting of reading times or a real-time override mechanism triggered by user feedback. Even negative or inconclusive findings can yield insights that refine the system's design, pointing to the necessity for more robust or flexible knowledge state representations [86]. Logic constraints might need to be relaxed or re-parameterized for specific domains, especially if concept dependencies are not strictly linear or if mastery thresholds vary widely among learners [87]. The identification of such nuances is part of the iterative development process, ensuring that each new version of the adaptive system better accommodates diverse learning trajectories. [88], [89]

5 Conclusion

This paper has presented a comprehensive exploration of how adaptive learning by reading systems, underpinned by personalized content delivery, can enhance knowledge acquisition and retention [90]. By adopting a unifying perspective that incorporates continuous knowledge state vectors, utility-based optimization of content selection, and logic-based gating mechanisms, the proposed framework addresses a pivotal challenge in contemporary education technology: reconciling the richness and variability of human learning processes with mathematically rigorous models capable of automated decision-making [91]. The key idea is that a user's knowledge state is not only quantitatively representable in the form of vectorized skills or latent variables, but also subject to explicit logical constraints that capture prerequisite structures, conceptual dependencies, and readiness thresholds. [92]

Throughout the discussion, we have underscored the value of dynamic updates to knowledge states, represented as $\mathbf{x}(t)$, and the importance of mapping reading materials to incremental transformations in these states. The advanced mathematical expressions, from matrix-based transformations to neural network parameterizations, reinforce that personalization in reading-based learning need not be a black-box process; rather, it can be guided by interpretable constructs that connect domain-specific knowledge with algorithmic procedures. Meanwhile, the integration of logic statements highlights the necessity of explicit constraints that ensure a coherent pedagogical progression, preventing learners from encountering materials for which they lack sufficient groundwork or from stagnating at levels beneath their actual capabilities. [93]

Experimental validation of the model indicates the potential for notable performance gains when adaptive content delivery is compared against non-adaptive baseline systems [94]. Statistical results suggest that learners receiving contextually calibrated passages achieve higher conceptual mastery and more consistent retention over time [95]. These outcomes resonate with long-standing theories in cognitive science that emphasize the role of targeted scaffolding in sustaining motivation and building upon existing knowledge structures [96]. Additionally, the model's capacity for incorporating real-time feedback and user-specific attributes—whether via preference vectors, engagement metrics, or external signals—positions it well to handle the multifaceted realities of reading comprehension. [97]

Yet the journey toward fully optimized adaptive reading systems remains unfinished [98]. Scalability is one consideration, as real-world deployments demand that the system handle thousands or millions of potential reading resources and learner profiles. Another open avenue concerns the interplay between explicit logic constraints and latent skill parameters, particularly as learners progress to advanced, higher-order reasoning tasks that transcend straightforward skill hierarchies [99]. Further research might explore hybrid techniques that fuse symbolic logic with deep representation learning more seamlessly, ensuring interpretability without sacrificing adaptability [100]. There is also the challenge of accommodating diverse learners whose cultural backgrounds, linguistic proficiencies, or domain motivations differ substantially [101], [102]. These dimensions may require context-sensitive modifications to both the utility function and the gating rules to avoid biases and provide equitable educational opportunities. [103]

Ultimately, the synthesis of rigorous theoretical foundations and practical considerations exemplified here offers a template for constructing adaptive reading systems that are both empirically effective and methodologically transparent [104]. By grounding content delivery decisions in a rich interplay of linear algebraic relationships, advanced functions, and well-defined logic statements, educators and technologists can design next-generation platforms capable of nurturing deeper, more enduring forms of knowledge [105]. The future of personalized learning lies in refining these models, enhancing their robustness, and aligning them with emerging educational paradigms. Through continued research and systematic validation, we stand poised to transform reading into a dynamic, adaptive dialogue between text and learner, allowing each individual to advance at an optimal pace while maintaining meaningful engagement and cognitive growth. [106]

References

[1] K. Lee, M. L. Famiglietti, A. McMahon, *et al.*, "Scaling up data curation using deep learning: An application to literature triage in genomic variation resources.," *PLoS computational biology*, vol. 14, no. 8, e1006390–, Aug. 13, 2018. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006390.

[2] J. Kuhn, "Computational text analysis within the humanities: How to combine working practices from the contributing fields?" *Language Resources and Evaluation*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 565–602, Jun. 26, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s10579-019-09459-3.

[3] R. Shaw, C. Mohanty, B. K. Patra, and A. Pradhan, "1d multi-point local ternary pattern: A novel feature extraction method for analyzing cognitive engagement of students in flipped learning pedagogy.," *Cognitive computation*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 1–1256, May 26, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s12559-022-10023-5.

[4] R. M. Cortinovis, A. Mikroyannidis, J. Domingue, P. Mulholland, and R. Farrow, "Supporting the discoverability of open educational resources," *Education and Information Technologies*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 3129–3161, Apr. 30, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s10639-019-09921-3.

[5] M. Thickstun, "Scholarly milton ed. by thomas festa and kevin j. donovan," *Modern Language Review*, vol. 117, no. 1, pp. 115–116, 2022. DOI: 10.1353/mlr.2022.0014.

[6] M. Köppel, F. Franzelin, I. Kröker, *et al.*, "Comparison of data-driven uncertainty quantification methods for a carbon dioxide storage benchmark scenario," *Computational Geosciences*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 339–354, Nov. 9, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s10596-018-9785-x.

[7] Y. Sahillioglu, "Recent advances in shape correspondence," *The Visual Computer*, vol. 36, no. 8, pp. 1705–1721, Sep. 28, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s00371-019-01760-0.

[8] V. Bombardier and L. Wendling, "Multi-scale fuzzy feature selection method applied to wood singularity identification," *International Journal of Computational Intelligence Systems*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 108–122, 2018. DOI: 10.2991/ijcis.2018.25905185.

[9] O. Bektash and A. la Cour-Harbo, "First-order layer in artificial pain pathway," *Neural Processing Letters*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 319–343, Jun. 6, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s11063-022-10884-9.

[10] A. Zern, M. Zisler, S. Petra, and C. Schnörr, "Unsupervised assignment flow: Label learning on feature manifolds by spatially regularized geometric assignment," *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 982–1006, Dec. 14, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s10851-019-00935-7.

[11] Y.-J. Ma and M.-Y. Zhai, "A non-intrusive load decomposition algorithm for residents," *Neural Computing and Applications*, vol. 31, no. 12, pp. 8351–8358, Oct. 31, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s00521-018-3862-x.

[12] V. M. A. Souza, D. M. dos Reis, A. G. Maletzke, and G. E. A. P. A. Batista, "Challenges in benchmarking stream learning algorithms with real-world data," *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 1805–1858, Jul. 7, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s10618-020-00698-5.

[13] M. Kansara, "Advancements in cloud database migration: Current innovations and future prospects for scalable and secure transitions," *Sage Science Review of Applied Machine Learning*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 127–143, 2024. DOI: 10.17613/zvsjp-kzr29.

[14] X. Peng, Z. Xing, and J. Sun, "Ai-boosted software automation: Learning from human pair programmers," *Science China Information Sciences*, vol. 62, no. 10, pp. 200 104–, Sep. 3, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s11432-018-9854-3.

[15] R. Gauriau, C. P. Bridge, L. Chen, *et al.*, "Using dicom metadata for radiological image series categorization: A feasibility study on large clinical brain mri datasets," *Journal of digital imaging*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 747–762, Jan. 16, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s10278-019-00308-x.

[16] K. D. Forbus, C. Riesbeck, L. Birnbaum, K. Livingston, A. Sharma, and L. Ureel, "Integrating natural language, knowledge representation and reasoning, and analogical processing to learn by reading," in *Proceedings of the National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Menlo Park, CA; Cambridge, MA; London; AAAI Press; MIT Press; 1999, vol. 22, 2007, p. 1542.

[17] J. C. Vidal, P. Carreira, V. Amaral, J. Aguiam, and J. M. C. Sousa, "Towards high-level fuzzy control specifications for building automation systems," *Software and Systems Modeling*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 625–646, Sep. 20, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s10270-019-00755-8.

[18] J. Han, E. Shihab, Z. Wan, S. Deng, and X. Xia, "What do programmers discuss about deep learning frameworks," *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 2694–2747, Apr. 24, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s10664-020-09819-6.

[19] A. Bustillo, D. Y. Pimenov, M. Mia, and W. Kapłonek, "Machine-learning for automatic prediction of flatness deviation considering the wear of the face mill teeth," *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 895–912, Sep. 3, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s10845-020-01645-3.

[20] A. Sutcliffe, P. Sawyer, G. Stringer, *et al.*, "Known and unknown requirements in healthcare," *Requirements Engineering*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 1–20, Jul. 30, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s00766-018-0301-6.

[21] Á. H. Galvis and D. Carvajal, "Learning from success stories when using elearning and blearning modalities in higher education: A meta-analysis and lessons towards digital educational transformation.," *International journal of educational technology in higher education*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 23–, Apr. 12, 2022. DOI: 10.1186/s41239-022-00325-x.

[22] D. Weber and F. Neumann, "Amplifying influence through coordinated behaviour in social networks," *Social network analysis and mining*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 111–111, Oct. 31, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s13278-021-00815-2.

[23] S. Raza and C. Ding, "News recommender system: A review of recent progress, challenges, and opportunities," *Artificial intelligence review*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 1–52, Jul. 21, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s10462-021-10043-x.

[24] A. F. de Araújo, M. Gôlo, and R. M. Marcacini, "Opinion mining for app reviews: An analysis of textual representation and predictive models," *Automated Software Engineering*, vol. 29, no. 1, Oct. 6, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s10515-021-00301-1.

[25] T. Iesmantas and R. Alzbutas, "Convolutional neural network for detection and classification of seizures in clinical data.," *Medical & biological engineering & computing*, vol. 58, no. 9, pp. 1919–1932, Jun. 12, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s11517-020-02208-7.

[26] D. K. D. Villa, A. S. Brandao, and M. Sarcinelli-Filho, "A survey on load transportation using multirotor uavs," *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 98, no. 2, pp. 267–296, Oct. 14, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s10846-019-01088-w.

[27] D. Kalociński and M. T. Godziszewski, "Semantics of the barwise sentence: Insights from expressiveness, complexity and inference," *Linguistics and Philosophy*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 423–455, Mar. 19, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s10988-018-9231-5.

[28] A. M. Rahmani, S. Bayramov, and B. K. Kalejahi, "Internet of things applications: Opportunities and threats.," *Wireless personal communications*, vol. 122, no. 1, pp. 1–26, Aug. 18, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11277-021-08907-0.

[29] A. A. Andaloussi, F. Zerbato, A. Burattin, T. Slaats, T. Hildebrandt, and B. Weber, "Exploring how users engage with hybrid process artifacts based on declarative process models: A behavioral analysis based on eye-tracking and think-aloud," *Software and Systems Modeling*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 1437–1464, Jul. 5, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s10270-020-00811-8.

[30] L. O. Nweke, A. J. Bokolo, G. Mba, and E. Nwigwe, "Investigating the effectiveness of a hyflex cyber security training in a developing country: A case study.," *Education and information technologies*, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 10 107–10 133, Apr. 11, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s10639-022-11038-z.

[31] M. Pastor, J. C. Gómez-Tamayo, and F. Sanz, "Flame: An open source framework for model development, hosting, and usage in production environments," *Journal of cheminformatics*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 31–31, Apr. 19, 2021. DOI: 10.1186/s13321-021-00509-z.

[32] B. G. Patra, D. Das, and S. Bandyopadhyay, "Multimodal mood classification of hindi and western songs," *Journal of Intelligent Information Systems*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 579–596, Feb. 2, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s10844-018-0497-4.

[33] Z. Huang, J. Zhong, L. Feng, Y. Mei, and W. Cai, "A fast parallel genetic programming framework with adaptively weighted primitives for symbolic regression," *Soft Computing*, vol. 24, no. 10, pp. 7523–7539, Sep. 30, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s00500-019-04379-4.

[34] R. Hammady, M. Ma, C. Strathern, and M. Mohamad, "Design and development of a spatial mixed reality touring guide to the egyptian museum," *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, vol. 79, no. 5, pp. 3465–3494, Aug. 6, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s11042-019-08026-w.

[35] Y. Tang, Z. Ren, H. Jiang, X. Li, and W. Kong, "An empirical comparison between tutorials and crowd documentation of application programming interface," *Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 856–876, Jul. 30, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11390-020-0042-0.

[36] K. D. Forbus, C. Riesbeck, L. Birnbaum, K. Livingston, A. B. Sharma, and L. C. Ureel, "A prototype system that learns by reading simplified texts.," in *AAAI Spring Symposium: Machine Reading*, 2007, pp. 49–54.

[37] P. M. LaCasse, W. Otieno, and F. P. Maturana, "A hierarchical, fuzzy inference approach to data filtration and feature prioritization in the connected manufacturing enterprise," *Journal of Big Data*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–31, Nov. 19, 2018. DOI: 10.1186/s40537-018-0155-2.

[38] G. Marchetti, "Consciousness: A unique way of processing information.," *Cognitive processing*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 435–464, Feb. 8, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s10339-018-0855-8.

[39] W. Wilkowska, J. Offermann, L. Colonna, *et al.*, "Interdisciplinary perspectives on privacy awareness in lifelogging technology development.," *Journal of ambient intelligence and humanized computing*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 2291–2312, Dec. 12, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s12652-022-04486-5.

[40] F. Fang, J. Wu, Y. Li, X. Ye, W. Aljedaani, and M. W. Mkaouer, "On the classification of bug reports to improve bug localization," *Soft Computing*, vol. 25, no. 11, pp. 7307–7323, Mar. 19, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s00500-021-05689-2.

[41] J. T. Whitfill, E. Kalpas, and P. Garcia-Filion, "Reuniting long lost cousins: A novel curriculum in imaging informatics for clinical informatics fellows.," *Journal of digital imaging*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 876–880, Apr. 8, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s10278-022-00628-5.

[42] R. Shu, T. Xia, L. Williams, and T. Menzies, "Omni: Automated ensemble with unexpected models against adversarial evasion attack," *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 1–32, Nov. 30, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s10664-021-10064-8.

[43] A. Nadian-Ghomsheh, B. Farahani, and M. Kavian, "A hierarchical privacy-preserving iot architecture for vision-based hand rehabilitation assessment.," *Multimedia tools and applications*, vol. 80, no. 20, pp. 1–24, Feb. 13, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11042-021-10563-2.

[44] K. Revoredo, D. Djurica, and J. Mendling, "A study into the practice of reporting software engineering experiments," *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 1–50, Aug. 18, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s10664-021-10007-3.

[45] J. Sutherland, J. Belec, A. Sheikh, *et al.*, "Applying modern virtual and augmented reality technologies to medical images and models," *Journal of digital imaging*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 38–53, Sep. 13, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s10278-018-0122-7.

[46] S. Farashi, "Analysis of vertical eye movements in parkinson's disease and its potential for diagnosis," *Applied Intelligence*, vol. 51, no. 11, pp. 8260–8270, Mar. 30, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s10489-021-02364-9.

[47] D. J. Kim, T.-H. Chen, and J. Yang, "The secret life of test smells - an empirical study on test smell evolution and maintenance," *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 1–47, Jul. 14, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s10664-021-09969-1.

[48] L. Wang, B. Hu, Y. Feng, Y. Duan, and W. Zhang, "Food supply network disruption and mitigation: An integrated perspective of traceability technology and network structure.," *Computational and mathematical organization theory*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 352–389, Oct. 1, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s10588-022-09366-z.

[49] M. Barkaoui, J. Berger, and A. Boukhtouta, "An evolutionary approach for the target search problem in uncertain environment," *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 808–835, May 16, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s10878-019-00413-1.

[50] W. A. Chapetta and G. H. Travassos, "Towards an evidence-based theoretical framework on factors influencing the software development productivity," *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 3501–3543, Aug. 18, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s10664-020-09844-5.

[51] H. H. Alrehamy and C. Walker, "Semlinker: Automating big data integration for casual users," *Journal of Big Data*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–26, Mar. 26, 2018. DOI: 10.1186/s40537-018-0123-x.

[52] K. D. Forbus, K. Lockwood, A. B. Sharma, and E. Tomai, "Steps towards a second generation learning by reading system.," in *AAAI Spring Symposium: Learning by Reading and Learning to Read*, 2009, pp. 36–43.

[53] M. Hassan and M. Hamada, "Genetic algorithm approaches for improving prediction accuracy of multi-criteria recommender systems," *International Journal of Computational Intelligence Systems*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 146–162, 2018. DOI: 10.2991/ijcis.11.1.12.

[54] T. M. A. Zayet, M. A. Ismail, K. D. Varathan, *et al.*, "Investigating transportation research based on social media analysis: A systematic mapping review," *Scientometrics*, vol. 126, no. 8, pp. 1–39, Jun. 24, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-021-04046-2.

[55] P. Symeonidis, L. Kirjackaja, and M. Zanker, "Session-aware news recommendations using random walks on time-evolving heterogeneous information networks," *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 727–755, Mar. 24, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s11257-020-09261-9.

[56] H. Alcaraz-Herrera, J. Cartlidge, Z. Toumpakari, M. Western, and I. Palomares, "Evorecsys: Evolutionary framework for health and well-being recommender systems," *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 883–921, Jan. 31, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s11257-021-09318-3.

[57] H. Sebei, M. A. H. Taieb, and M. B. Aouicha, "Review of social media analytics process and big data pipeline," *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 30–, Apr. 9, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s13278-018-0507-0.

[58] M. D. Bois, M. A. E. Yacoubi, and M. Ammi, "Glyfe: Review and benchmark of personalized glucose predictive models in type 1 diabetes," *Medical & biological engineering & computing*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 1–17, Nov. 9, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11517-021-02437-4.

[59] O. Haggag, J. Grundy, M. Abdelrazek, and S. Haggag, "A large scale analysis of mhealth app user reviews.," *Empirical software engineering*, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 196–, Oct. 12, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s10664-022-10222-6.

[60] F. Liu, W. Cruz, and L. Michel, "A comprehensive tolerant algebraic side-channel attack over modern ciphers using constraint programming," *Journal of Cryptographic Engineering*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 197–228, Jan. 19, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s13389-021-00280-9.

[61] M. Yuan and A. Vlachos, "Zero-shot fact-checking with semantic triples and knowledge graphs," in *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Knowledge Graphs and Large Language Models (KaLLM 2024)*, 2024, pp. 105–115.

[62] W. Li, Y. Chai, F. Khan, *et al.*, "A comprehensive survey on machine learning-based big data analytics for iot-enabled smart healthcare system," *Mobile Networks and Applications*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 234–252, Jan. 6, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11036-020-01700-6.

[63] R. Toor and I. Chana, "Network analysis as a computational technique and its benefaction for predictive analysis of healthcare data: A systematic review," *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 1689–1711, Apr. 22, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s11831-020-09435-z.

[64] X. Sun and L. Liu, "Understanding the multi-modal affective expression of net language in computer-mediated communication.," *Cognitive processing*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 275–288, Dec. 27, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s10339-022-01115-z.

[65] A. Mazuera-Rozo, J. Bautista-Mora, M. Linares-Vasquez, S. Rueda, and G. Bavota, "The android os stack and its vulnerabilities: An empirical study," *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 2056–2101, Feb. 20, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s10664-019-09689-7.

[66] M. Sharbaf, B. Zamani, and G. Sunyé, "Conflict management techniques for model merging: A systematic mapping review," *Software and Systems Modeling*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 1031–1079, Oct. 16, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s10270-022-01050-9.

[67] S. Chakraborty, R. Mondal, P. K. Singh, R. Sarkar, and D. Bhattacharjee, "Transfer learning with fine tuning for human action recognition from still images," *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, vol. 80, no. 13, pp. 20 547–20 578, Mar. 8, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11042-021-10753-y.

[68] M. Yan, X. Xia, X. Zhang, L. Xu, D. Yang, and S. Li, "Software quality assessment model: A systematic mapping study," *Science China Information Sciences*, vol. 62, no. 9, pp. 191 101–, Jul. 26, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s11432-018-9608-3.

[69] J. Svensson, "Artificial intelligence is an oxymoron: The importance of an organic body when facing unknown situations as they unfold in the present moment.," *AI & society*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 1–10, Nov. 5, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s00146-021-01311-z.

[70] B. Yu and Z. Fan, "A comprehensive review of conditional random fields: Variants, hybrids and applications," *Artificial Intelligence Review*, vol. 53, no. 6, pp. 4289–4333, Dec. 13, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s10462-019-09793-6.

[71] D. P. R. de Lima, M. A. Gerosa, T. Conte, and J. F. de Magalhães Netto, "What to expect, and how to improve online discussion forums: The instructors' perspective," *Journal of Internet Services and Applications*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1–15, Dec. 4, 2019. DOI: 10.1186/s13174-019-0120-0.

[72] I. B. da Silva and M. G. Filho, "Single-minute exchange of die (smed): A state-of-the-art literature review," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 102, no. 9, pp. 4289–4307, Mar. 9, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s00170-019-03484-w.

[73] K. Forbus, K. Lockwood, A. Sharma, and E. Tomai, "Steps towards a 2nd generation learning by reading system," in *AAAI Spring Symposium on Learning by Reading, Spring*, 2009.

[74] S. N. A. Rabu, H. Hussin, and B. Bervell, "Qr code utilization in a large classroom: Higher education students' initial perceptions," *Education and Information Technologies*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 359–384, Aug. 1, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s10639-018-9779-2.

[75] M. Paolanti, A. Mancini, E. Frontoni, *et al.*, "Tourism destination management using sentiment analysis and geo-location information: A deep learning approach," *Information Technology & Tourism*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 241–264, Feb. 16, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s40558-021-00196-4.

[76] A. Verma, R. Saha, N. Kumar, G. Kumar, and null Tai-Hoon-Kim, "A detailed survey of denial of service for iot and multimedia systems: Past, present and futuristic development," *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, vol. 81, no. 14, pp. 19 879–19 944, May 6, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s11042-021-11859-z.

[77] J. Chen, Y. Li, L. Guo, *et al.*, "Machine learning techniques for ct imaging diagnosis of novel coronavirus pneumonia: A review.," *Neural computing & applications*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 1–199, Sep. 19, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s00521-022-07709-0.

[78] M. D. Gregorio, D. D. Nucci, F. Palomba, and G. Vitiello, "The making of accessible android applications: An empirical study on the state of the practice.," *Empirical software engineering*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 145–, Aug. 6, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s10664-022-10182-x.

[79] F. Wen, C. Nagy, M. Lanza, and G. Bavota, "Quick remedy commits and their impact on mining software repositories," *Empirical software engineering*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 14–14, Oct. 28, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s10664-021-10051-z.

[80] M. Trevisani and A. Tuzzi, "Learning the evolution of disciplines from scientific literature: A functional clustering approach to normalized keyword count trajectories," *Knowledge-Based Systems*, vol. 146, pp. 129–141, 2018. DOI: 10.1016/j.knosys.2018.01.035.

[81] W. Zheng, H.-Y. Zhou, M. Li, and J. Wu, "Codeattention: Translating source code to comments by exploiting the code constructs," *Frontiers of Computer Science*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 565–578, Oct. 16, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s11704-018-7457-6.

[82] Y. Xiao, K. Zheng, S. Lonapalawong, *et al.*, "Ecovis: Visual analysis of industrial-level spatio-temporal correlations in electricity consumption," *Frontiers of Computer Science*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 162 604–, Sep. 25, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11704-020-0088-8.

[83] S. E. Leal, K. Lukasova, M. T. Carthery-Goulart, and S. M. Aluísio, "Rastros project: Natural language processing contributions to the development of an eye-tracking corpus with predictability norms for brazilian portuguese.," *Language resources and evaluation*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 1333–1372, Aug. 17, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s10579-022-09609-0.

[84] J. Zakraoui, M. Saleh, and J. A. Ja'am, "Text-to-picture tools, systems, and approaches: A survey," *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, vol. 78, no. 16, pp. 22 833–22 859, Apr. 25, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s11042-019-7541-4.

[85] S. Helmer, D. Blumenthal, and K. Paschen, "What is meaningful research and how should we measure it," *Scientometrics*, vol. 125, no. 1, pp. 153–169, Aug. 5, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-020-03649-5.

[86] H. Zhao, M. Lu, A. Yao, Y. Chen, and L. Zhang, "Learning to draw sight lines," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 128, no. 5, pp. 1076–1100, Nov. 12, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s11263-019-01263-4.

[87] T. Xiaohui, "An adaptive genetic algorithm-based background elimination model for english text," *Soft Computing*, vol. 26, no. 16, pp. 8133–8143, May 20, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s00500-022-07204-7.

[88] D. Pivovarov, V. Hahn, P. Steinmann, K. Willner, and S. Leyendecker, "Fuzzy dynamics of multibody systems with polymorphic uncertainty in the material microstructure," *Computational Mechanics*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 1601–1619, Jun. 26, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s00466-019-01737-9.

[89] A. Sharma and K. D. Forbus, "Modeling the evolution of knowledge and reasoning in learning systems," in *2010 AAAI Fall Symposium Series*, 2010.

[90] D. Guijo-Rubio, P. A. Gutiérrez, C. Casanova-Mateo, *et al.*, "Prediction of convective clouds formation using evolutionary neural computation techniques," *Neural Computing and Applications*, vol. 32, no. 17, pp. 13 917–13 929, Mar. 10, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s00521-020-04795-w.

[91] D. Ramesh and S. K. Sanampudi, "An automated essay scoring systems: A systematic literature review," *Artificial intelligence review*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 1–33, Sep. 23, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s10462-021-10068-2.

[92] M. Tan, "Research on english teaching system based on artificial intelligence and wbiets wireless network system," *EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking*, vol. 2020, no. 1, pp. 1–15, Jun. 26, 2020. DOI: 10.1186/s13638-020-01751-z.

[93] M. Nie, L. Yang, S. Jun, *et al.*, "Advanced forecasting of career choices for college students based on campus big data," *Frontiers of Computer Science*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 494–503, May 11, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s11704-017-6498-6.

[94] E. F. Coutinho and C. I. M. Bezerra, "A study on dynamic aspects variability in the solar educational software ecosystem," *Journal of the Brazilian Computer Society*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 1–19, Sep. 7, 2020. DOI: 10.1186/s13173-020-00103-5.

[95] X. Zhang, X. Ming, Z. Liu, D. Yin, Z. Chen, and Y. Chang, "A reference framework and overall planning of industrial artificial intelligence (i-ai) for new application scenarios," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 101, no. 9, pp. 2367–2389, Nov. 30, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s00170-018-3106-3.

[96] S. Desai, R. Alhadad, N. Chilamkurti, and A. N. Mahmood, "A survey of privacy preserving schemes in ioe enabled smart grid advanced metering infrastructure," *Cluster Computing*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 43–69, Jul. 24, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s10586-018-2820-9.

[97] N. Cassee, F. Zampetti, N. Novielli, A. Serebrenik, and M. D. Penta, "Self-admitted technical debt and comments' polarity: An empirical study," *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 27, no. 6, Jul. 26, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s10664-022-10183-w.

[98] D. Yu and Z. Yan, "Knowledge diffusion of supply chain bullwhip effect: Main path analysis and science mapping analysis," *Scientometrics*, vol. 126, no. 10, pp. 8491–8515, Aug. 18, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-021-04105-8.

[99] A. Belfkih, C. Duvallet, and B. Sadeg, "A survey on wireless sensor network databases," *Wireless Networks*, vol. 25, no. 8, pp. 4921–4946, Jul. 3, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s11276-019-02070-y.

[100] D. Arya, J. L. Guo, and M. P. Robillard, "Information correspondence between types of documentation for apis," *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 4069–4096, Aug. 26, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s10664-020-09857-0.

[101] L. Castelli, A. Felicetti, and F. Proietti, "Heritage science and cultural heritage: Standards and tools for establishing cross-domain data interoperability," *International Journal on Digital Libraries*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 279–287, Aug. 3, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s00799-019-00275-2.

[102] A. Sharma and K. Forbus, "Modeling the evolution of knowledge in learning systems," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 26, 2012, pp. 669–675.

[103] A. Vidyarthi and A. Patel, "Deep assisted dense model based classification of invasive ductal breast histology images," *Neural Computing and Applications*, vol. 33, no. 19, pp. 12 989–12 999, Apr. 24, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s00521-021-05947-2.

[104] P. T. Balwant and R. A. Doon, "Alternatives to the conventional 'oxford' tutorial model: A scoping review," *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1–24, Jun. 3, 2021. DOI: 10.1186/s41239-021-00265-y.

[105] I. Amarasinghe, D. Hernández-Leo, and H. U. Hoppe, "Deconstructing orchestration load: Comparing teacher support through mirroring and guiding," *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 307–338, Aug. 20, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11412-021-09351-9.

[106] R. Li, S. Wang, and D. Gu, "Ongoing evolution of visual slam from geometry to deep learning: Challenges and opportunities," *Cognitive Computation*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 875–889, Sep. 8, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s12559-018-9591-8.