

Incorporating Privacy by Design principles in the modification of AI systems in preventing breaches across multiple environments including public cloud, private cloud, and on-prem

Abstract:

This study examines the integration of Privacy by Design (PbD) principles in AI systems to prevent privacy breaches across public, private, and on-prem environments. The research employs a mixed-method approach, including logistic regression analysis to identify significant predictors of privacy breaches, with environment ($B = -1.142$, $p < .001$) and severity of vulnerabilities ($B = 0.932$, $p < .01$) emerging as key factors. A Pearson correlation analysis reveals a strong positive correlation ($r = 0.791$) between breach detection rates and PbD effectiveness, emphasizing the importance of robust detection mechanisms. Additionally, the study includes a comprehensive review of case studies and thematic analysis to provide insights into practical challenges and solutions in PbD implementation, particularly in healthcare and smart city applications. The study concludes that integrating Privacy by Design (PbD) principles is essential for mitigating privacy risks, particularly in high-risk environments such as public clouds. It recommends prioritizing the development of advanced breach detection mechanisms, implementing comprehensive privacy impact assessments, maintaining continuous stakeholder engagement throughout AI development, and investing in privacy-enhancing technologies. These measures are vital to achieving robust privacy protection in AI systems across diverse environments.

Keywords: Privacy by Design, AI systems, privacy breaches, breach detection, privacy-enhancing technologies.

1. Introduction

The advent of artificial intelligence (AI) has ushered in a new era of technological advancement, revolutionizing industries and transforming societies. The increasing reliance on digital technologies and the exponential growth of data have created an avenue for significant implications for privacy, and the convergence of AI and data-

driven systems has worsened privacy concerns, demanding innovative approaches to safeguard sensitive information. Cloud computing, which has emerged as a cornerstone of modern digital infrastructure, offers scalable, flexible, and cost-effective computing resources; with this offering, the share of corporate data stored in the cloud has surged from 30% in 2015 to 60% in 2022 [1]. This surge in growth reflects the trust organizations place in cloud technologies to securely store critical information while ensuring accessibility.

Despite cloud storage solutions being advantageous in providing solid data backup and recovery capabilities, which controls the risk of data loss due to hardware failures or other unforeseen events, security remains a top concern for 83% of organizations, and with 92% of organizations hosting some portion of their IT environment in the cloud, robust security measures are critical to protect sensitive information [1]. According to Netgate [1], it was observed that untrained workers are responsible for 88% of cloud breaches as their actions leave the organization susceptible to vulnerable attacks from hackers, and comprehensive training and awareness programs will help to mitigate these risks. Phishing attacks account for approximately 25% of all data breaches in the cloud environment, and compromised privileged accounts contribute to 34% of identity-related breaches, emphasizing the need for solid access management practices. Despite the growing importance of encryption, only 21% of organizations have encrypted more than 60% of their data in the cloud, indicating substantial room for improvement in securing sensitive information.

Zero trust security models are gaining popularity as 80% of enterprises are considering or deploying these models into their operation; zero trust security models emphasize continuous verification and authorization, thereby improving these companies security. Financial investments in cloud security are substantial, with audits starting at USD 10,000 per year, highlighting the commitment organizations must make to ensure compliance and risk mitigation. The global zero-trust cloud security market is projected to reach USD 60 billion by 2027, indicating the growing demand for advanced security solutions [1].

According to Confessore [2], the need for more strict privacy measures is underlined by high-profile data breaches such as the Cambridge Analytica scandal. In 2018, it was revealed that Cambridge Analytica had harvested the personal data of millions of Facebook users without their consent, using it for political advertising purposes. This incident highlighted the potential for misuse of personal data and led to widespread public outcry and regulatory supervision, the fallout from this scandal emphasized the need for solid data protection frameworks and the implementation of Privacy by Design (PbD) principles to prevent similar breaches. Incorporating PbD principles into AI systems involves several key strategies, including data minimization, anonymization,

pseudonymization, and the use of privacy-enhancing technologies; data minimization ensures that only necessary data is collected and retained, reducing the risk of exposure in the event of a breach [3]. Anonymization and pseudonymization techniques protect individual identities by removing or obfuscating personally identifiable information [4]. Privacy-enhancing technologies, such as homomorphic encryption and differential privacy, provide additional layers of security, enabling the analysis of data without compromising privacy [5].

This study aims to develop a model that will be instrumental in integrating risk assessment and privacy impact assessment into the AI development lifecycle; evaluating potential threats and vulnerabilities at each stage of development and implementing measures to address them, and also measure the effectiveness of PbD implementations, key performance indicators and metrics to ensure that privacy measures achieve their intended outcomes.

2. Literature Review

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has significantly progressed since its inception, allowing usage by various sectors such as healthcare, finance, and transportation. Initially constrained by rule-based operations, advancements in machine learning and deep learning have enabled AI to perform complex tasks like natural language processing, image recognition, and predictive analytics with high accuracy. According to Amajuoyi et al. [6], the integration of AI with cloud computing has further expanded its usage, allowing for scalable and flexible deployment of AI applications. Public cloud services, such as those provided by Amazon Web Services (AWS) and Microsoft Azure, offer scalable resources accessible to multiple clients, while private clouds, though more costly, provide greater control over data and security, for instance On-premises solutions offer the highest level of control, requiring significant capital investment and maintenance efforts [7][8][9]. This convergence of AI and cloud computing introduces significant privacy challenges due to extensive data collection and processing, as AI systems require large datasets for training, and storing and processing this data in cloud environments heightens the risk of unauthorized access and breaches [10][11]. Incidents like the Cambridge Analytica scandal, show how data breaches in AI and cloud environments can lead to severe consequences, including financial losses, reputational damage, and regulatory penalties, prompting increased scrutiny and demand for robust privacy measures [2][12].

In order to manage these challenges, regulatory frameworks such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) were established. GDPR mandates organizations to implement measures to protect personal

data and ensure its lawful processing, by imposing severe penalties for non-compliance. Similarly, the CCPA provides California residents with rights over their personal data, including knowledge of what is collected and the ability to request its deletion [13][14][15]. These regulations ensure that AI and cloud service providers adopt comprehensive privacy strategies, including data minimization and encryption, to comply with legal requirements and protect user privacy [14]. According to Wischmeyer [16], the ethical implications of AI and data usage further complicate the privacy issue, as AI systems often operate as "black boxes," where their decision-making processes are not fully transparent, and this raises concerns about accountability and fairness, particularly in decisions impacting individuals, such as hiring or credit scoring. Ethical considerations extend to data usage, where a careful balance between innovation and privacy must be maintained, and the misuse of personal data, as seen in the Cambridge Analytica case, highlights the potential for AI to infringe on individual privacy and autonomy [17][18].

Arif [19] proposes that addressing privacy challenges in AI and cloud environments requires a mixed approach; the implementation of Privacy by Design (PbD) principles requires embedding privacy considerations throughout the AI development lifecycle, and techniques such as data anonymization and pseudonymization are essential for protecting individual identities while enabling data utility for AI applications [20][21]. Additionally, privacy-enhancing technologies like homomorphic encryption and differential privacy offer further protection, allowing data to be analyzed without exposing sensitive information [22][23]. Continuous risk assessment and privacy impact assessments (PIAs) are vital for proactively identifying and mitigating privacy risks in AI systems, by integrating these assessments into the development processes, it ensures that potential vulnerabilities are addressed before deployment. A strong model framework for measuring the effectiveness of privacy measures is necessary to adapt to emerging threats and ensure that implemented strategies achieve their intended outcomes [24][25].

Privacy by Design (PbD)

Privacy by Design (PbD), argues that privacy should be an intrinsic component of systems and processes from the beginning, rather than an afterthought, Pagallo [26], highlights that this proactive approach contrasts with the traditional reactive method that is often adopted toward data protection. At its core, PbD promotes principles such as proactive measures, privacy as the default setting, and end-to-end security, forming a framework aimed at preventing data breaches and ensuring user trust [27][28]. In information systems and data management, PbD emphasizes integrating privacy

controls at every stage of the data lifecycle, as embedding privacy into system architectures and workflows, ensures that data collection, storage, processing, and dissemination adhere to strict privacy standards [20]. As a result, Semantha et al. [27] proposes that effective implementation of PbD can mitigate risks associated with data breaches and enhance overall data governance, however, translating these principles into practical applications remains challenging, especially in complex and dynamic data environments [29][30]

Saeed et al. [31] affirms that applying PbD to AI systems isn't without unique challenges and opportunities, and this is because AI systems require vast amounts of data to function effectively, raising concerns about data privacy and user consent. Studies argue that PbD in AI necessitates incorporating privacy safeguards into algorithms and models, ensuring data privacy throughout the AI lifecycle [31][32][33]. Techniques such as data minimization, anonymization, and pseudonymization are essential to this incorporation; data minimization involves collecting only the necessary data and retaining it only as long as required, reducing exposure risk, while anonymization removes personally identifiable information from datasets, making it difficult to trace data back to individual users, and pseudonymization replaces private identifiers with fictitious names or keys, adding an extra layer of privacy[4][35]. Privacy-enhancing technologies (PETs) like homomorphic encryption and differential privacy are powerful tools for implementing PbD in AI systems. Homomorphic encryption allows computations on encrypted data without decrypting it, maintaining data confidentiality, while differential privacy ensures that the inclusion or exclusion of a single data point does not significantly impact the outcome of an analysis, thereby protecting individual privacy [34]. It should be noted that though these technologies are promising, they are still growing and so their implementation in large-scale AI systems remains a subject of active research [36][37].

Risk assessment and privacy impact assessments (PIAs) are critical components of the PbD framework; they offer systematic approaches to identify and mitigate privacy risks, and their integration into AI development allows organizations to address potential privacy issues before they escalate proactively. These issues involve evaluating the threats, vulnerabilities, and impacts of privacy issues on user privacy at each stage of AI development, from data collection to deployment [27][39]. Although Raab [38] argues that PIAs should be mandatory for all AI projects to ensure compliance with privacy regulations and to build user trust, Georgiadis and Poels [25] suggests that a standardized framework for conducting PIAs in AI contexts is essential for consistency and effectiveness.

AI and Cloud Security

The widespread adoption of cloud computing has transformed information technology space providing unmatched capacity, flexibility, and cost-efficiency, however, this shift has also introduced significant security challenges. Cloud environments are inherently complex and dynamic, fraught with vulnerabilities that require sophisticated security measures. Scholars argue that the shared responsibility model of cloud security, where providers and clients share duties, often results in security gaps, especially due to the multi-tenant nature of cloud services, which increases risks of data breaches and unauthorized access [40][41][42]. Cloud vulnerabilities, such as data breaches resulting from misconfigured settings or inadequate access controls, can lead to severe financial losses, reputational damage, and regulatory penalties. Aslan et al. [43] observes that human error, particularly in managing cloud configurations, is a primary contributor to these vulnerabilities experienced by companies, and most importantly, phishing attacks and compromised credentials are significant threats, as they allow attackers to access sensitive data. The distributed nature of cloud environments further complicates the prompt detection and response to security incidents [44], and to curb these risks, frameworks like ISO/IEC 27001, Cloud Security Alliance's (CSA), and the Cloud Controls Matrix (CCM) have been developed [45][46]. These frameworks offer guidelines for robust security practices, covering data protection, access control, and incident response; studies contend that adherence to these standards can enhance an organization's security posture, although continuous updates are necessary to address emerging threats and technological advancements [47][48][49]

Rizvi [50] affirms that Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become a vital tool in cybersecurity due to its advanced capabilities for threat detection and prevention; AI-driven solutions utilize machine learning algorithms to analyze large datasets, identify patterns, and detect anomalies indicative of potential threats. This proactive approach allows organizations to respond to security incidents in real-time, reducing vulnerability [51], and AI's adaptability to new threats makes it particularly effective against sophisticated attacks such as zero-day exploits [52][53]. Studies indicate that AI-driven threat detection systems will significantly improve the accuracy and efficiency of identifying security incidents [51][54][55]. These systems employ techniques like behavioral analysis and anomaly detection to recognize deviations from normal activity that may signal malicious behavior, and moreover, AI can automate aspects of threat response, such as isolating affected systems and initiating remediation, thus reducing the burden on security teams and enhancing response times [56][57]. As highlighted by Kaur et al. [58], AI is also crucial in vulnerability assessment, providing continuous evaluation of an organization's security posture; traditional assessments rely on periodic scans, which can leave gaps in coverage, while AI-driven solutions offer real-time monitoring and

assessment, identifying vulnerabilities as they emerge and providing actionable insights for mitigation.

Despite the numerous opportunities that AI provides, challenges still persist, one major concern is the potential for AI systems to produce false positives, which can overwhelm security teams and lead to alert fatigue. The effectiveness of AI-driven solutions also depends on the quality and diversity of the data they are trained on, as biases in training data can result in overlooking certain threats [59]. Moreover, the deployment of AI in cybersecurity raises ethical and privacy concerns, particularly regarding the extent to which automated systems should be trusted with decision-making processes [60]. Therefore, emerging trends highlight the integration of AI with other advanced technologies, such as blockchain and quantum computing, to enhance security capabilities [61][62][63]. Researchers are exploring blockchain for secure data sharing and authentication, while quantum computing promises new cryptographic techniques that could transform cloud security [61][62].

These advancements highlight the need for ongoing research to address evolving security challenges in cloud environments, and to effectively help curb the complexity of cyberattacks, the combination of human expertise, solid security frameworks, and advanced technologies is required to protect cloud environments from the growing spectrum of threats [47][65], and also the incorporation of PbD principles into AI systems.

PbD in Cloud Environments

The implementation of Privacy by Design (PbD) in cloud environments varies significantly across public, private, and on-premises models, each presenting distinct challenges and opportunities. According to Han et al. [64], Public clouds, operated by providers such as Amazon Web Services (AWS) and Google Cloud, offer scalable resources shared among multiple clients; this multi-tenancy model requires strict data segregation measures to prevent unauthorized access, making PbD principles essential. However, these measures can introduce latency and complexity, potentially affecting performance and user experience [66]. Private clouds, though dedicated to a single organization, allow for greater control over data and security configurations; this environment is conducive to implementing comprehensive PbD strategies, as organizations can tailor privacy measures to their specific needs without compromising performance. However, Abdulsalam and Hedabou [67] states that private clouds are typically more expensive to maintain and require significant expertise to manage effectively, and the trade-off between enhanced privacy control and higher operational costs is also a key consideration. On-premises cloud environments offer the highest

level of control, with infrastructure hosted within the organization's own facilities, on-premises setup allows for the implementation of PbD principles at a granular level, from physical security measures to data encryption and access controls [68], however, on-premises solutions can be resource-intensive and may lack the capacity and flexibility offered by public and private clouds [69][70]. Studies indicate that while on-premises environments provide superior privacy protection, they may struggle to keep pace with rapid technological advancements [71][72][73].

After critical evaluation of these cloud models, Adeusi et al. [74] revealed that public clouds offer cost-efficiency and scalability but pose significant challenges in ensuring data privacy due to their shared nature, private clouds provide a middle ground with greater control and security but at higher costs, and On-premises environments, offering the most control, are often the most resource-intensive. This analysis highlights the importance of selecting a cloud model that aligns with an organization's privacy requirements and operational capabilities. Case studies of successful PbD implementations in cloud environments provide valuable insights. For example, the deployment of differential privacy techniques by Apple in its iOS operating system illustrate how PbD can be effectively integrated into a public cloud setting to enhance user privacy while maintaining data utility. Similarly, Microsoft's Azure platform has incorporated PbD principles through robust encryption practices and compliance with strict data protection regulations, demonstrating successful implementation in a private cloud environment [75][76].

According to Abdulsalam and Hedabou [67], Cloud service providers (CSPs) also play a crucial role in facilitating PbD through their privacy practices and compliance efforts, major CSPs like AWS, Google Cloud, and Microsoft Azure have developed comprehensive privacy frameworks to protect their user data, including encryption, access controls, and compliance with regulations such as GDPR and CCPA. Research indicates that CSPs' commitment to privacy is a significant factor in their clients' ability to implement PbD principles effectively [67][75]. After extensive research, Akremi and Rouached [77] states that CSPs' privacy policies reveal a strong emphasis on compliance and transparency, for example, AWS's privacy policy outlines its commitment to data protection, detailing measures such as encryption, access management, and incident response protocols [47]. Google Cloud's privacy policy similarly emphasizes compliance with global data protection laws, providing detailed information on data processing practices. These policies help ensure compliance and build trust with users by demonstrating a commitment to protecting their privacy.

However, Dias Canedo et al. [78] observes that there are controversies regarding the sufficiency and effectiveness of these privacy practices. Some scholars argue that while CSPs' privacy policies are comprehensive, they may not fully address all potential

privacy risks, particularly those arising from complex and evolving threat landscapes [79][80], while some studies are more concerned about the balance between privacy and usability [81][82], with some contending that extremely strict privacy measures can impede functionality and user experience [83][84]. Emerging trends in PbD in cloud environments include the integration of advanced privacy-enhancing technologies (PETs) such as homomorphic encryption and federated learning. These technologies offer promising solutions for enhancing privacy without compromising data utility. For instance, federated learning enables AI models to be trained on decentralized data, reducing the need for data aggregation and enhancing privacy [85]. According to Abdulsalam and Hedabou [47], the successful implementation of PbD in cloud environments requires the pulling of resources from technological, organizational, and legal dimensions, and while challenges may persist, the growing awareness of privacy risks and increasing regulatory scrutiny are driving positive change. By adopting a proactive, risk-based approach, organizations can mitigate risks, build trust, and achieve long-term sustainability.

Privacy-Enhancing Technologies (PETs) in AI

Privacy-Enhancing Technologies (PETs) are increasingly vital in safeguarding data privacy within AI systems, technologies such as homomorphic encryption, differential privacy, secure multi-party computation, and federated learning, each offers distinct capabilities for protecting sensitive information while enabling data processing and analysis. Homomorphic encryption, for instance, allows computations on encrypted data without decryption, thereby maintaining privacy throughout the computational process. Differential privacy adds noise to data queries to prevent the identification of individual data points, ensuring that the inclusion or exclusion of a single data point does not significantly alter the output [86]. According to Mestari et al. [87], the application of PETs in AI systems addresses the critical need to balance data utility with privacy, and AI systems require vast amounts of data to train models effectively, which often involves sensitive personal information. PETs curbs privacy risks by allowing data to be used without compromising individual privacy, for example, homomorphic encryption enables machine learning tasks to be performed on encrypted data, ensuring that raw data remains inaccessible even during analysis. Similarly, differential privacy techniques can be applied to AI algorithms to ensure that outputs are privacy-preserving, thus enhancing user trust and regulatory compliance [60][67].

However, Williamson and Prybutok [88] states that implementing PETs in AI systems is fraught with challenges and limitations, and one significant challenge is the computational overhead that is associated with these technologies. Homomorphic

encryption, while highly secure, is computationally intensive and can significantly slow down processing times, making it less practical for real-time applications, while differential privacy, though effective in protecting individual data points, can reduce the accuracy of AI models due to the added noise, posing a trade-off between privacy and utility [89]. Secure multi-party computation and federated learning also face scalability issues, requiring significant coordination and communication, which can be cumbersome in large-scale AI deployments. Despite these challenges, ongoing research is continually enhancing the efficiency and applicability of PETs, and emerging PETs, such as hybrid approaches that combine multiple techniques, show promise in overcoming some of the limitations of existing technologies [88][89]. For instance, hybrid models that integrate homomorphic encryption with secure hardware solutions like trusted execution environments (TEEs) can provide enhanced security with reduced computational costs. Recent studies suggest that these emerging PETs could offer more practical and scalable solutions for privacy-preserving AI [5][88][90]

Federated learning, another emerging PET, has garnered significant attention for its potential to revolutionize privacy-preserving AI; this technique involves training AI models across multiple decentralized devices or servers while keeping data localized. Rodriguez-Barroso et al. [89] highlight that only model updates, not raw data, are shared among participating nodes, significantly enhancing privacy. Federated learning is particularly relevant in sensitive sectors like healthcare, where patient data privacy is paramount. By enabling collaborative learning without centralizing data, federated learning offers a solid solution for leveraging large datasets while adhering to strict privacy regulations [89].

Risk Assessment and Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA)

Risk Assessment and Privacy Impact Assessments (PIAs) are critical components in ensuring the privacy and security of data within AI systems. According to Georgiadis and Poels [25], PIAs involve systematic evaluations of how data collection, processing, and storage practices impact privacy, particularly in environments where sensitive personal information is at stake. PIAs are particularly relevant in AI systems due to the vast amounts of data required to train models effectively, and they are often used to process sensitive personal information, raising significant privacy concerns. PETs, such as homomorphic encryption, differential privacy, secure multi-party computation, and federated learning, are essential in addressing these concerns by enabling data processing without compromising individual privacy [89]. However, there are challenges with the implementation of PETs in AI systems, but despite these challenges, recent research continues to enhance the efficiency and applicability of PETs, and emerging

hybrid approaches that combine multiple PET techniques show promise in overcoming some limitations[5][94]. For instance, integrating homomorphic encryption with secure hardware solutions like Trusted Execution Environments (TEEs) can enhance security while reducing computational costs [89].

In the context of risk assessment, PIAs are essential for balancing privacy and utility; studies suggest that the successful implementation of PETs requires careful consideration of trade-offs, ensuring that protective measures do not undermine the effectiveness of AI models [91][92]. This balance is particularly challenging in dynamic environments where both data privacy and real-time performance are critical, so an interdisciplinary approach is needed, as drawing insights from fields such as cryptography, data science, and regulatory compliance will be instrumental in developing effective privacy solutions that are tailored to the specific needs of AI systems and their application contexts [88]. As AI and data privacy continue to grow, so will the role of PETs and PIAs in shaping the future of this technological frontier [93].

3. Methodology

This study utilized a mixed-method approach (incorporating both qualitative and quantitative methods) to assess the effectiveness of Privacy by Design (PbD) principles in AI systems. Data from two key sources, the OWASP Top 10 AI Vulnerabilities Dataset and the NIST Privacy Framework were analyzed to provide detailed information on vulnerabilities in AI systems and key performance indicators relevant to PbD implementations.

A logistic regression analysis was conducted using the OWASP dataset to model the relationship between factors such as vulnerability type, environment, and severity score, and the likelihood of privacy breaches in AI systems. The logistic regression model was expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Logit}(p) &= \ln\left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right) \\ &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \text{Vulnerability Type} + \beta_2 * \text{Environment} + \beta_3 \\ &\quad * \text{Severity Score} \end{aligned}$$

The probability P of a breach occurring was derived using the logit function:

$$P = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\text{Logit}(p)}}$$

To evaluate the effectiveness of PbD implementations, a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted using

$$r = \frac{n \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[n \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][n \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

Additionally, the analysis included calculations of the mean and standard deviation to summarize the central tendency and dispersion of the key performance indicators across different PbD implementations.

The mean (μ) was calculated using:

$$\mu = \frac{\sum X}{n}$$

The standard deviation (σ) was calculated to measure the variability of the data:

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\sum(X - \mu)^2}{n}}$$

To further assess the variability in PbD effectiveness across different levels of breach detection rates, the Interquartile Range (IQR) was calculated as:

$$IQR = Q3 - Q1$$

The qualitative component of the analysis involved a comprehensive review of academic literature and conference papers specifically selected for their relevance to the implementation of PbD principles in AI systems. A case study analysis was first conducted to explore in-depth challenges, solutions, and outcomes associated with PbD across various domains, including healthcare, smart cities, and Internet of Things applications. Subsequently, a thematic analysis was performed to systematically identify and categorize recurring themes related to privacy challenges and successes, reflecting critical issues faced during the implementation of PbD, the strategies applied, and the resulting outcomes or lessons learned.

Thematic Map for Privacy by Design (PbD) in AI Systems




Figure 1: Summary of the Qualitative analysis

UNDER

4. Results and Discussion

The logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict the likelihood of privacy breaches in AI systems based on vulnerability type, environment, and severity score. The results, presented in Table 1, reveal that both environment and severity score are statistically significant predictors of breaches.

Variable	B	SE B	Wald z	p-value	95% CI for B
Constant	-4.991	1.936	-2.578	.0099	[-8.786, -1.197]
Vulnerability Type	0.348	0.217	1.603	.1090	[-0.078, 0.774]
Environment	-1.142	0.313	-3.653	.0003	[-1.755, -0.529]
Severity Score	0.932	0.289	3.231	.0012	[0.367, 1.498]

Table 1: Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting the Likelihood of Privacy Breaches in AI Systems

The environment was found to be a significant factor ($B = -1.142$, $p < .001$), with AI systems in more controlled environments less likely to experience breaches. Severity score also significantly predicted breaches ($B = 0.932$, $p < .01$), indicating that higher severity vulnerabilities increase breach likelihood. Although vulnerability type showed a positive trend ($B = 0.348$, $p = .109$), it was not statistically significant in this analysis. These findings support the study's objective of identifying key factors in preventing privacy breaches in AI systems.




Figure 2: Predicted Probability of breach by severity score

Figure 2 illustrates the relationship between the Severity Score and the predicted probability of a privacy breach. The regression line shows a positive correlation, indicating that as the severity of vulnerabilities increases, the likelihood of a breach occurring also rises.




Figure 3: Predicted Probability of breach by Environment

Figure 3 displays the predicted probability of privacy breaches across different environments, with error bars indicating confidence intervals. The chart reveals that Public Cloud environments have a higher likelihood of breaches compared to Private Cloud and On-Prem settings, consistent with the study's aim to assess environmental factors in mitigating privacy risks. The differences in breach probabilities highlights the importance of controlled environments in reducing privacy vulnerabilities.

Implementation Effectiveness Measurement

To evaluate the effectiveness of Privacy by Design (PbD) implementations using key performance indicators (KPIs—breach detection rate, compliance score, and response time) from the NIST Privacy Framework, a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine their relationship with the overall effectiveness of PbD strategies in mitigating privacy risks in AI systems, as shown in Table 2 and Table 3.

KPI	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	25th Percentile	50th Percentile	75th Percentile	Max
Breach Detection Rate	84.11	8.92	70.17	75.80	83.92	91.91	99.61
Compliance Score	79.91	11.72	60.28	69.68	80.22	90.65	99.43
Response Time (hours)	12.90	6.75	1.12	7.37	13.94	18.30	23.77
PbD Effectiveness Score	68.34	6.22	54.23	65.00	67.56	72.73	82.41

Table 2: Summary of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

KPI	Breach Detection Rate	Compliance Score	Response Time	PbD Effectiveness
Breach Detection Rate	1.000	-0.034	-0.038	0.791
Compliance Score	-0.034	1.000	-0.146	-0.019
Response Time	-0.038	-0.146	1.000	-0.370
PbD Effectiveness Score	0.791	-0.019	-0.370	1.000

Table 3: Correlation Matrix for Key Performance Indicators

The results indicate that Breach Detection Rate and PbD Effectiveness are strongly positively correlated ($r = 0.791$), suggesting that systems with higher detection rates are associated with more effective PbD implementations. Conversely, Response Time and PbD Effectiveness show a moderate negative correlation ($r = -0.370$), indicating that faster response times are linked to higher effectiveness in PbD strategies. The Compliance Score, however, exhibited no significant correlation with PbD Effectiveness ($r = -0.019$), implying that compliance, while necessary, may not be a direct predictor of PbD success.




Figure 4: Correlation Matrix of KPIs

The heatmap in Figure 4 shows the Pearson correlation coefficients between key performance indicators (KPIs) and PbD effectiveness. The strong positive correlation between Breach Detection Rate and PbD Effectiveness ($r = 0.791$) is highlighted, while the negative correlation between Response Time and PbD Effectiveness ($r = -0.370$) indicates that faster response times are associated with higher PbD effectiveness.




Figure 5: Effectiveness by Breach Detection Rates

Figure 5 presents a box plot showing the distribution of PbD effectiveness scores across different levels of breach detection rates. The plot demonstrates that higher breach detection rates are associated with higher median PbD effectiveness, emphasizing the importance of effective breach detection in enhancing privacy outcomes.

Case Study Analysis

A thorough analysis of Privacy by Design (PbD) implementations in AI systems was conducted by systematically selecting and examining targeted case studies from relevant literature. These case studies specifically illustrate the critical challenges faced, the solutions implemented, and the outcomes achieved in the practical integration of PbD principles within AI systems (see Table 4).

Case Study	Challenges	Solutions Implemented	Outcomes/Lessons Learned

<p>PbD in Healthcare AI Systems</p>	<p>Integrating PbD principles in AI-driven healthcare applications, particularly in maintaining data privacy across decentralized networks (Kaissis et al., [95]).</p>	<p>Implemented federated learning techniques to ensure data privacy without compromising AI model accuracy. PbD principles were embedded throughout the AI system development process.</p>	<p>Effective implementation of PbD led to enhanced data privacy while maintaining AI model performance. Federated learning emerged as a viable solution for privacy preservation in healthcare AI applications, necessitating continuous monitoring.</p>
<p>AI in Smart Cities and Privacy Challenges</p>	<p>Addressing privacy concerns in smart city applications where large volumes of personal data are collected and processed Eckhoff & Wagner, [96].</p>	<p>Applied anonymization techniques and real-time data encryption to protect personal data. Engaged stakeholders to ensure privacy considerations were integrated into every aspect of AI deployment.</p>	<p>Anonymization and encryption techniques helped mitigate privacy risks, though challenges remained in balancing data utility with privacy. Stakeholder engagement was critical for addressing privacy concerns and building public trust in smart city initiatives.</p>
<p>Privacy Impact Assessment in AI Development</p>	<p>Conducting effective Privacy Impact Assessments (PIAs) in AI systems, particularly in understanding and mitigating ethical</p>	<p>Developed a comprehensive PIA framework that included ethical considerations, stakeholder input, and continuous feedback loops. This framework was</p>	<p>The PIA framework offered a structured approach to identifying and mitigating privacy risks early in the AI development process. Ethical considerations and stakeholder input enhanced the robustness and acceptability of AI</p>

	implications Raab, [38]; Wairimu et al., [97].	integrated into the AI system lifecycle.	systems.
PbD in IoT and Healthcare Applications	Ensuring transparency and explainability of AI systems in IoT-based healthcare applications, where privacy risks are amplified by interconnected devices Alkhariji et al., [98].	Synthesized existing PbD knowledge into a framework prioritizing transparency and explainability. This framework was applied to design AI systems that met privacy requirements in healthcare.	The framework successfully guided the design of transparent and explainable AI systems, improving user trust and compliance with privacy regulations. However, challenges persisted in fully automating the PbD process in complex IoT environments.

Table 4: Case Study Analysis on Privacy by Design (PbD) in AI Systems

The analysis demonstrates that integrating Privacy by Design principles into AI systems requires addressing complex challenges, implementing robust solutions, and deriving valuable lessons from real-world applications. The case studies the importance of federated learning, anonymization, encryption, stakeholder engagement, and structured Privacy Impact Assessments in mitigating privacy risks within AI systems. These outcomes highlight the need for continuous monitoring, ethical considerations, and transparency to ensure the effectiveness of PbD implementations in diverse AI-driven environments.

Thematic Analysis

To systematically identify and categorize recurring challenges and successes from relevant literature, a thematic analysis of Privacy by Design (PbD) implementations in AI systems was conducted (see Table 5).

Theme	Challenges	Successes
Integration of PbD in AI Development	Difficulty in seamlessly integrating PbD principles into AI systems due to complexities like large datasets and complex algorithms Danezis et al., [99].	Effective integration using federated learning and privacy-preserving techniques, particularly in healthcare and smart cities Kaissis et al., [94]; Alkhariji et al., [98].
Ethical and Privacy Impact Assessments	Conducting effective Privacy Impact Assessments (PIAs) in AI systems, especially regarding ethical implications and data usage Raab, [38]; Wairimu et al.,[97].	Development of comprehensive PIA frameworks with continuous feedback loops and stakeholder engagement to proactively manage privacy risks Raab, [38]; Wairimu et al., [97].
Transparency and Explainability in AI	Ensuring transparency and explainability in AI systems, particularly in IoT and smart city applications Alkhariji et al., [98].	The successful design of transparent and explainable AI systems through structured PbD frameworks improves user trust and compliance Alkhariji et al., [98].
Stakeholder Engagement and Public Trust	Building and maintaining public trust through effective stakeholder engagement, especially in privacy-sensitive applications Eckhoff & Wagner, [96]; Mehr, [100].	Early and ongoing stakeholder engagement leads to AI systems that meet user needs and expectations and build public trust,Eckhoff & Wagner, [96].

Table 5: Thematic Analysis of Privacy by Design (PbD) in AI Systems

The thematic analysis presented shows the critical challenges and successful strategies involved in implementing PbD in AI systems. The findings reveal that while integrating PbD principles into AI development poses significant difficulties, particularly in managing complex data and algorithms Danezis et al., [99], effective solutions such as federated learning have proven successful Kaissis et al., [95]; Alkhariji et al., [98]. Additionally, the importance of ethical and privacy impact assessments, transparency, and stakeholder engagement is highlighted by Raab [38], Wairimu et al. [97], Eckhoff & Wagner [96], Mehr [100], with comprehensive frameworks and proactive engagement strategies emerging as key factors in building public trust and ensuring the success of AI systems.




Figure 6 : Effectiveness of Solutions in Addressing PbD Challenges

Figure 6 illustrates the effectiveness of various solutions in addressing key challenges associated with Privacy by Design (PbD) in AI systems. Federated Learning shows high effectiveness in managing complex AI systems but is less impactful in addressing other challenges. Comprehensive PIA Frameworks are particularly effective in handling Privacy Impact Assessments and ensuring transparency but are less effective in dealing with complex AI systems. Structured PbD Frameworks demonstrate strong performance across multiple challenges, especially in transparency and regulatory compliance. Stakeholder Engagement is most effective in building trust and ensuring transparency but is less effective in addressing complex AI system challenges.




Figure 7: Effectiveness of different solutions in addressing the key challenges of Privacy by Design (PbD) in AI systems

Figure 7 provides a visual representation of the effectiveness of various solutions in addressing key challenges associated with Privacy by Design (PbD) in AI systems. Federated Learning demonstrates high effectiveness in managing complex AI systems, while Comprehensive PIA Frameworks are particularly effective in addressing Privacy

Impact Assessments and transparency. Structured PbD Frameworks show strong effectiveness across multiple challenges, including transparency and regulatory compliance. Stakeholder Engagement is most effective in building trust and ensuring transparency, though less so in addressing the complexities of AI systems.

Discussion

The findings of this study provide significant insights into the effectiveness of incorporating Privacy by Design (PbD) principles within AI systems across various environments, aligning with the study's aim of developing a model for integrating risk assessment and privacy impact assessment into the AI development lifecycle. The logistic regression analysis reveals that the environment in which AI systems operate is a crucial determinant of privacy breaches, with public cloud environments exhibiting a higher likelihood of breaches compared to private cloud and on-premises settings. This result is consistent with the literature, which highlights the inherent vulnerabilities of public cloud environments due to their multi-tenant nature and the complexities associated with maintaining stringent privacy controls in such dynamic settings [43][67]. The statistical significance of the severity score as a predictor of breaches further explains the importance of addressing high-severity vulnerabilities, corroborating the view that robust privacy measures are essential in environments where the severity of potential threats is high [50][58].

Moreover, the positive correlation between breach detection rate and PbD effectiveness ($r = 0.791$) suggests that systems with more effective detection mechanisms are better equipped to mitigate privacy risks, supporting the argument that continuous monitoring and proactive threat detection are critical components of a successful PbD implementation [94][96]. Conversely, the negative correlation between response time and PbD effectiveness ($r = -0.370$) indicates that faster response times are associated with higher PbD effectiveness, highlighting the necessity of prompt action in mitigating the impact of privacy breaches. This finding aligns with the broader literature on AI and cloud security, which emphasizes the role of AI-driven solutions in reducing vulnerability and enhancing response times [50][58].

However, the lack of a significant correlation between compliance scores and PbD effectiveness ($r = -0.019$) challenges the assumption that regulatory compliance alone is sufficient to ensure effective privacy protection. While compliance with frameworks such as GDPR and CCPA is undoubtedly important, this study suggests that compliance measures must be complemented by robust, context-specific privacy strategies that address the unique challenges posed by AI systems [16][19]. The case study analysis further reinforces this point by demonstrating the effectiveness of federated learning, anonymization, and encryption techniques in mitigating privacy risks in specific

contexts, such as healthcare AI systems and smart city applications. These real-world examples illustrate how tailored PbD implementations can enhance privacy outcomes, even in environments where traditional compliance measures might fall short [94][97].

In terms of practical applications, the thematic analysis reveals recurring challenges and successful strategies associated with PbD implementation. The difficulty of integrating PbD principles into complex AI systems, particularly those involving large datasets and sophisticated algorithms, echoes the challenges highlighted in the literature [98]. Nevertheless, the successful use of federated learning and other privacy-preserving techniques in specific domains demonstrates that these challenges can be overcome with the right approach [94][97]. Similarly, the importance of comprehensive privacy impact assessments and ethical considerations in AI development is reaffirmed, aligning with existing research that advocates for a proactive, risk-based approach to privacy management [38][100].

The study's results also emphasize the critical role of stakeholder engagement and transparency in building public trust, particularly in privacy-sensitive applications such as healthcare and smart cities. This finding supports the literature's assertion that effective communication and stakeholder involvement are key to the successful implementation of PbD principles, as they help address public concerns and foster trust in AI systems [95][99]. By comparing the effectiveness of various solutions, including federated learning, structured PbD frameworks, and stakeholder engagement strategies, this study provides valuable insights into the practicalities of implementing PbD in diverse AI-driven environments. These insights highlight the need for continuous monitoring, ongoing research, and adaptive strategies to ensure that privacy measures remain effective in the face of evolving technological and regulatory challenges [67][89].

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

This study demonstrates that the effective incorporation of Privacy by Design (PbD) principles in AI systems is critical for mitigating privacy breaches across various environments, particularly in public cloud settings where the risk is heightened. The logistic regression analysis confirms that environmental factors and the severity of vulnerabilities are significant predictors of privacy breaches, highlighting the need for targeted privacy strategies. The positive correlation between breach detection rates and PbD effectiveness shows the importance of robust detection mechanisms, while the findings also suggest that compliance alone is insufficient for achieving comprehensive privacy protection. The case studies and thematic analysis further illustrate the value of tailored PbD implementations, especially in domains like healthcare and smart cities, where privacy risks are pronounced.

The following specific recommendations are proposed to enhance the implementation of PbD principles in AI systems:

1. Prioritize the development and integration of advanced breach detection mechanisms, particularly in public cloud environments, to ensure timely identification and mitigation of privacy risks.
2. Implement a comprehensive and context-specific privacy impact assessment framework that goes beyond regulatory compliance to address the unique challenges posed by AI systems and environments.
3. Foster continuous stakeholder engagement throughout the AI development lifecycle, with a focus on transparency and ethical considerations, to build public trust and enhance the acceptability of AI systems.
4. Invest in research and development of privacy-enhancing technologies, such as federated learning and homomorphic encryption, to ensure that AI systems can effectively balance data utility with robust privacy protection.

References

- [1] Netgate, "Cloud Security Statistics in 2024," *Netgate.com*, 2024. <https://www.netgate.com/blog/cloud-security-statistics#:~:text=Cloud%20Security%20Challenges%20and%20Trends&However%2C%20with%20the%20growing%20reliance> (accessed Aug. 14, 2024).
- [2] N. Confessore, "Cambridge Analytica and Facebook: The Scandal and the Fallout So Far," *The New York Times*, Apr. 04, 2018. Accessed: Aug. 14, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/04/us/politics/cambridge-analytica-scandal-fallout.html>
- [3] N. Lichtenauer, L. Schmidbauer, S. Wilhelm, and F. Wahl, "A Scoping Review on Analysis of the Barriers and Support Factors of Open Data," *Information*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 5, Jan. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/info15010005>.
- [4] S. Sampaio, P. Sousa, C. Martins, A. Ferreira, L. Antunes, and R. Cruz-Correia, "Collecting, Processing and Secondary Using Personal and (Pseudo)Anonymized Data in Smart Cities," *Applied sciences*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 3830–3830, Mar. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/app13063830>.
- [5] J. Scheibner *et al.*, "Revolutionizing Medical Data Sharing Using Advanced Privacy-Enhancing Technologies: Technical, Legal, and Ethical Synthesis," *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, vol. 23, no. 2, p. e25120, Feb. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2196/25120>.
- [6] C. P. Amajuoyi, L. K. Nwobodo, and M. D. Adegbola, "Transforming business scalability and operational flexibility with advanced cloud computing technologies," *Computer Science & IT Research Journal*, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 1469–1487, Jun. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.51594/csitrj.v5i6.1248>.
- [7] M. K. D. M. Laxmaiah, and D. Y. K. Sharma, "A Comparative Study on Google App Engine Amazon Web Services and Microsoft Windows Azure," *papers.ssrn.com*, 2019. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3537564 (accessed Aug. 11, 2024).
- [8] P. Trakadas *et al.*, "Hybrid Clouds for Data-Intensive, 5G-Enabled IoT Applications: An Overview, Key Issues and Relevant Architecture," *Sensors*, vol. 19, no. 16, p. 3591, Aug. 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/s19163591>.
- [9] C. S. Adigwe, A. I. Abalaka, O. O. Olaniyi, O. O. Adebisi, and T. O. Oladoyinbo, "Critical Analysis of Innovative Leadership through Effective Data Analytics: Exploring Trends in Business Analysis, Finance, Marketing, and Information Technology," *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*, vol. 23, no. 22, pp. 460–479, Nov. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajeba/2023/v23i221165>.
- [10] D. Dai and S. Boroomand, "A Review of Artificial Intelligence to Enhance the Security of Big Data Systems: State-of-Art, Methodologies, Applications, and

Challenges,” *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, vol. 29, Jul. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11831-021-09628-0>.

[11] C. S. Adigwe, O. O. Olaniyi, S. O. Olabanji, O. J. Okunleye, N. R. Mayeke, and S. A. Ajayi, “Forecasting the Future: The Interplay of Artificial Intelligence, Innovation, and Competitiveness and its Effect on the Global Economy,” *Asian journal of economics, business and accounting*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 126–146, Feb. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajeba/2024/v24i41269>.

[12] A. T. Arigbabu, O. O. Olaniyi, C. S. Adigwe, O. O. Adebisi, and S. A. Ajayi, “Data Governance in AI - Enabled Healthcare Systems: A Case of the Project Nightingale,” *Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 85–107, Mar. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajrcos/2024/v17i5441>.

[13] H. Li, L. Yu, and W. He, “The impact of GDPR on global technology development,” *Journal of Global Information Technology Management*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–6, Jan. 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1097198X.2019.1569186>.

[14] E. (Liz) Harding, J. J. Vanto, R. Clark, L. Hannah Ji, and S. C. Ainsworth, “Understanding the scope and impact of the California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018,” *Journal of Data Protection & Privacy*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 234–253, Jan. 2019, Accessed: Aug. 11, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/hsp/jdpp/2019/00000002/00000003/art00007>

[15] Y. A. Marquis, T. O. Oladoyinbo, S. O. Olabanji, O. O. Olaniyi, and S. S. Ajayi, “Proliferation of AI Tools: A Multifaceted Evaluation of User Perceptions and Emerging Trend,” *Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 30–35, Jan. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajarr/2024/v18i1596>.

[16] T. Wischmeyer, “Artificial Intelligence and Transparency: Opening the Black Box,” *Regulating Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 75–101, Nov. 2019, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32361-5_4.

[17] R. Reed-Berendt, E. S. Dove, and M. Pareek, “The Ethical Implications of Big Data Research in Public Health: ‘Big Data Ethics by Design’ in the UK-REACH Study,” *Ethics & Human Research*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 2–17, Dec. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/eahr.500111>.

[18] S. O. Olabanji, “AI for Identity and Access Management (IAM) in the Cloud: Exploring the Potential of Artificial Intelligence to Improve User Authentication, Authorization, and Access Control within Cloud-Based Systems,” *Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 38–56, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajrcos/2024/v17i3423>.

[19] H. Arif, A. Kumar, M. Fahad, and H. K. Hussain, “Future Horizons: AI-Enhanced Threat Detection in Cloud Environments: Unveiling Opportunities for Research,” *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Arts*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 242–251, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.47709/ijmdsa.v2i2.3452>.

- [20] F. H. Semantha, S. Azam, B. Shanmugam, and K. C. Yeo, "PbDinEHR: A Novel Privacy by Design Developed Framework Using Distributed Data Storage and Sharing for Secure and Scalable Electronic Health Records Management," *Journal of Sensor and Actuator Networks*, vol. 12, no. 2, p. 36, Apr. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/jsan12020036>.
- [21] S. O. Olabanji, Y. A. Marquis, C. S. Adigwe, A. S. Abidemi, T. O. Oladoyinbo, and O. O. Olaniyi, "AI-Driven Cloud Security: Examining the Impact of User Behavior Analysis on Threat Detection," *Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 57–74, Jan. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajrcos/2024/v17i3424>.
- [22] R. Aziz, S. Banerjee, S. Bouzefrane, and T. Le Vinh, "Exploring Homomorphic Encryption and Differential Privacy Techniques towards Secure Federated Learning Paradigm," *Future Internet*, vol. 15, no. 9, p. 310, Sep. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi15090310>.
- [23] S. O. Olabanji, T. O. Oladoyinbo, C. U. Asonze, C. S. Adigwe, O. J. Okunleye, and O. O. Olaniyi, "Leveraging FinTech Compliance to Mitigate Cryptocurrency Volatility for Secure US Employee Retirement Benefits: Bitcoin ETF Case Study," *Asian journal of economics, business and accounting*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 147–167, Feb. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajeba/2024/v24i41270>.
- [24] T. O. Oladoyinbo, O. O. Adebisi, J. C. Ugonnia, O. O. Olaniyi, and O. J. Okunleye, "Evaluating and Establishing Baseline Security Requirements in Cloud Computing: An Enterprise Risk Management Approach," *Asian journal of economics, business and accounting*, vol. 23, no. 21, pp. 222–231, Oct. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajeba/2023/v23i211129>.
- [25] G. Georgiadis and G. Poels, "Establishing a Comprehensive Privacy Impact Assessment Methodology for Big Data Analytics in Compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation," *SSRN*, Jan. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4757166>.
- [26] U. Pagallo, "On the Principle of Privacy by Design and Its Limits: Technology, Ethics and the Rule of Law," *Springer Link*, vol. 35, pp. 111–127, Dec. 2020, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-54522-2_8.
- [27] F. H. Semantha, S. Azam, K. C. Yeo, and B. Shanmugam, "A Systematic Literature Review on Privacy by Design in the Healthcare Sector," *Electronics*, vol. 9, no. 3, Mar. 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics9030452>.
- [28] F. G. Olaniyi, O. O. Olaniyi, C. S. Adigwe, A. I. Abalaka, and N. Shah, "Harnessing Predictive Analytics for Strategic Foresight: A Comprehensive Review of Techniques and Applications in Transforming Raw Data to Actionable Insights," *Asian journal of economics, business and accounting*, vol. 23, no. 22, pp. 441–459, Nov. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajeba/2023/v23i221164>.
- [29] S. Sun, X. Zheng, J. Villalba-Díez, and J. Ordieres-Meré, "Data Handling in Industry 4.0: Interoperability Based on Distributed Ledger Technology," *Sensors*, vol. 20, no. 11, p. 3046, May 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/s20113046>.

- [30] O. O. Olaniyi, A. I. Abalaka, and S. O. Olabanji, "Utilizing Big Data Analytics and Business Intelligence for Improved Decision-Making at Leading Fortune Company," *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, vol. 29, no. 9, pp. 64–72, Sep. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2023/v29i91785>.
- [31] M. M. A. Saeed, R. A. Saeed, and Z. E. Ahmed, "Data Security and Privacy in the Age of AI and Digital Twins," *www.igi-global.com*, 2024. <https://www.igi-global.com/chapter/data-security-and-privacy-in-the-age-of-ai-and-digital-twins/336453> (accessed Aug. 14, 2024).
- [32] J. Bugeja and A. Jacobsson, "On the Design of a Privacy-Centered Data Lifecycle for Smart Living Spaces," *IFIP advances in information and communication technology*, vol. 576, pp. 126–141, Jan. 2020, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-42504-3_9.
- [33] O. O. Olaniyi, O. J. Okunleye, and S. O. Olabanji, "Advancing Data-Driven Decision-Making in Smart Cities through Big Data Analytics: A Comprehensive Review of Existing Literature," *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, vol. 42, no. 25, pp. 10–18, Aug. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/cjast/2023/v42i254181>.
- [34] K. Munjal and R. Bhatia, "A systematic review of homomorphic encryption and its contributions in healthcare industry," *Complex & Intelligent Systems*, vol. 9, May 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40747-022-00756-z>.
- [35] O. O. Olaniyi, O. J. Okunleye, S. O. Olabanji, C. U. Asonze, and S. A. Ajayi, "IoT Security in the Era of Ubiquitous Computing: A Multidisciplinary Approach to Addressing Vulnerabilities and Promoting Resilience," *Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 354–371, Dec. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajrcos/2023/v16i4397>.
- [36] B. Pulido-Gaytan *et al.*, "Privacy-preserving neural networks with Homomorphic encryption: Challenges and opportunities," *Peer-to-Peer Networking and Applications*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 1666–1691, Mar. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12083-021-01076-8>.
- [37] O. O. Olaniyi, S. O. Olabanji, and A. I. Abalaka, "Navigating Risk in the Modern Business Landscape: Strategies and Insights for Enterprise Risk Management Implementation," *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, vol. 29, no. 9, pp. 103–109, Sep. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2023/v29i91789>.
- [38] C. D. Raab, "Information privacy, impact assessment, and the place of ethics," *Computer Law & Security Review*, vol. 37, p. 105404, Mar. 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2020.105404>.
- [39] O. O. Olaniyi, O. O. Olaoye, and O. J. Okunleye, "Effects of Information Governance (IG) on Profitability in the Nigerian Banking Sector," *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*, vol. 23, no. 18, pp. 22–35, Jul. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajeba/2023/v23i181055>.
- [40] Y. Alghofaili, A. Albattah, N. Alrajeh, M. A. Rassam, and B. A. S. Al-rimy, "Secure Cloud Infrastructure: A Survey on Issues, Current Solutions, and Open Challenges,"

Applied Sciences, vol. 11, no. 19, p. 9005, Sep. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/app11199005>.

[41] P. Gupta and P. K. Gupta, "Trust Modeling in Cloud," *Springer eBooks*, pp. 77–93, Jan. 2020, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-37319-1_4.

[42] O. O. Olaniyi and D. S. Omubo, "The Importance of COSO Framework Compliance in Information Technology Auditing and Enterprise Resource Management," *International journal of innovative research and development*, Jun. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.24940/ijird/2023/v12/i5/may23001>.

[43] Ö. Aslan, S. S. Aktuğ, M. Ozkan-Okay, A. A. Yilmaz, and E. Akin, "A Comprehensive Review of Cyber Security Vulnerabilities, Threats, Attacks, and Solutions," *Electronics*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 1–42, Mar. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics12061333>.

[44] V. Chang *et al.*, "A Survey on Intrusion Detection Systems for Fog and Cloud Computing," *Future Internet*, vol. 14, no. 3, p. 89, Mar. 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi14030089>.

[45] G. Carrera, "BUILDING A COMPREHENSIVE CLOUD SECURITY AUDIT PROGRAM," *EDPACS*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 1–4, Dec. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07366981.2021.2004689>.

[46] O. O. Olaniyi, J. C. Ugongia, F. G. Olaniyi, A. T. Arigbabu, and C. S. Adigwe, "Digital Collaborative Tools, Strategic Communication, and Social Capital: Unveiling the Impact of Digital Transformation on Organizational Dynamics," *Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 140–156, Mar. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajrcos/2024/v17i5444>.

[47] M. Chauhan and S. Shiaeles, "An Analysis of Cloud Security Frameworks, Problems and Proposed Solutions," *Network*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 422–450, Sep. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/network3030018>.

[48] Y. S. Rajesh, G. Kiran, and A. Poojari, "A Unified Approach Toward Security Audit and Compliance in Cloud Computing," *Journal of The Institution of Engineers (India): Series B*, vol. 105, Mar. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40031-024-01034-x>.

[49] F. A. Ezeugwa, O. O. Olaniyi, J. C. Ugongia, A. S. Arigbabu, and P. C. Joeaneke, "Artificial Intelligence, Big Data, and Cloud Infrastructures: Policy Recommendations for Enhancing Women's Participation in the Tech-Driven Economy," *Journal of Engineering Research and Reports*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 1–16, May 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/jerr/2024/v26i61158>.

[50] M. Rizvi, "Enhancing cybersecurity: The power of artificial intelligence in threat detection and prevention," *International Journal of Advanced Engineering Research and Science*, vol. 10, no. 05, May 2023, Accessed: Aug. 14, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://i.ihspublishing.com/index.php/ijaers/article/view/243>

[51] S. Rangaraju, "SECURE BY INTELLIGENCE: ENHANCING PRODUCTS WITH AI-DRIVEN SECURITY MEASURES," *EPH - International Journal of Science And*

Engineering, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 36–41, Dec. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.53555/ephiise.v9i3.212>.

[52] N. Pureti, “Zero-Day Exploits: Understanding the Most Dangerous Cyber Threats,” *International Journal of Advanced Engineering Technologies and Innovations*, vol. 01, no. 2, p. 2, 2022, Accessed: Aug. 15, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://ijaeti.com/index.php/Journal/article/download/361/372>

[53] U. T. I. Igwenagu, A. A. Salami, A. S. Arigbabu, C. E. Mesode, T. O. Oladoyinbo, and O. O. Olaniyi, “Securing the Digital Frontier: Strategies for Cloud Computing Security, Database Protection, and Comprehensive Penetration Testing,” *Journal of Engineering Research and Reports*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 60–75, May 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/jerr/2024/v26i61162>.

[54] A. Yaseen, “AI-DRIVEN THREAT DETECTION AND RESPONSE: A PARADIGM SHIFT IN CYBERSECURITY,” *International Journal of Information and Cybersecurity*, vol. 7, no. 12, pp. 25–43, Dec. 2023, Accessed: Aug. 15, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://publications.dlpress.org/index.php/ijic/article/view/73>

[55] T. O. Oladoyinbo, S. O. Olabanji, O. O. Olaniyi, O. O. Adebisi, O. J. Okunleye, and A. I. Alao, “Exploring the Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in Data Integrity and its Influence on Social Dynamics,” *Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 1–23, Jan. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajarr/2024/v18i2601>.

[56] T. K. Vashishth, V. Sharma, K. K. Sharma, B. Kumar, S. Chaudhary, and R. Panwar, “Enhancing Cloud Security: The Role of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning,” *www.igi-global.com*, 2024. <https://www.igi-global.com/chapter/enhancing-cloud-security/338350> (accessed Aug. 15, 2024).

[57] O. O. Olaniyi, F. A. Ezeugwa, C. G. Okatta, A. S. Arigbabu, and P. C. Joeaneke, “Dynamics of the Digital Workforce: Assessing the Interplay and Impact of AI, Automation, and Employment Policies,” *Archives of current research international*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 124–139, Apr. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/acri/2024/v24i5690>.

[58] R. Kaur, D. Gabrijelčič, and T. Klobučar, “Artificial Intelligence for Cybersecurity: Literature Review and Future Research Directions,” *Information Fusion*, vol. 97, no. 101804, p. 101804, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2023.101804>.

[59] P. Chen, L. Wu, and L. Wang, “AI Fairness in Data Management and Analytics: A Review on Challenges, Methodologies and Applications,” *Applied sciences*, vol. 13, no. 18, pp. 10258–10258, Sep. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/app131810258>.

[60] M. Mylrea and N. Robinson, “Artificial Intelligence (AI) Trust Framework and Maturity Model: Applying an Entropy Lens to Improve Security, Privacy, and Ethical AI,” *Entropy*, vol. 25, no. 10, p. 1429, Oct. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/e25101429>.

[61] V. Hemamalini, A. K. Mishra, A. K. Tyagi, and V. Kakulapati, “Artificial Intelligence–Blockchain-Enabled–Internet of Things-Based Cloud Applications for Next-Generation Society,” *Wiley Online Library*, pp. 65–82, Nov. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394213948.ch4>.

- [62] S. Cherbal, A. Zier, S. Hebal, L. Louail, and B. Annane, "Security in internet of things: a review on approaches based on blockchain, machine learning, cryptography, and quantum computing," *The Journal of Supercomputing*, vol. 80, Sep. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11227-023-05616-2>.
- [63] O. O. Olaniyi, S. O. Olabanji, and O. J. Okunleye, "Exploring the Landscape of Decentralized Autonomous Organizations: A Comprehensive Review of Blockchain Initiatives," *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, vol. 29, no. 9, pp. 73–81, Sep. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2023/v29i91786>.
- [64] J. Han, S. Park, and J. Kim, "Dynamic OverCloud: Realizing Microservices-Based IoT-Cloud Service Composition over Multiple Clouds," *Electronics*, vol. 9, no. 6, p. 969, Jun. 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics9060969>.
- [65] O. O. Olaniyi, O. O. Omogoroye, F. G. Olaniyi, A. I. Alao, and T. O. Oladoyinbo, "CyberFusion Protocols: Strategic Integration of Enterprise Risk Management, ISO 27001, and Mobile Forensics for Advanced Digital Security in the Modern Business Ecosystem," *Journal of Engineering Research and Reports*, vol. 26, no. 6, p. 32, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/JERR/2024/v26i61160>.
- [66] S. Henning and W. Hasselbring, "A configurable method for benchmarking scalability of cloud-native applications," *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 27, no. 6, Aug. 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-022-10162-1>.
- [67] Y. S. Abdulsalam and M. Hedabou, "Security and Privacy in Cloud Computing: Technical Review," *Future Internet*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 11, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi14010011>.
- [68] F. Olariu and L. Alboaie, "Challenges In Optimizing Migration Costs From On-Premises To Microsoft Azure," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 225, pp. 3649–3659, Jan. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2023.10.360>.
- [69] M. Caballer, M. Antonacci, Z. Šustr, M. Perniola, and G. Moltó, "Deployment of Elastic Virtual Hybrid Clusters Across Cloud Sites," *Journal of Grid Computing*, vol. 19, no. 1, Feb. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10723-021-09543-5>.
- [70] A. A. Salami, U. T. I. Igwenagu, C. E. Mesode, O. O. Olaniyi, and O. B. Oladoyinbo, "Beyond Conventional Threat Defense: Implementing Advanced Threat Modeling Techniques, Risk Modeling Frameworks and Contingency Planning in the Healthcare Sector for Enhanced Data Security," *Journal of Engineering Research and Reports*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 304–323, Apr. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/jerr/2024/v26i51156>.
- [71] D. Shivaramakrishna and M. Nagaratna, "A novel hybrid cryptographic framework for secure data storage in cloud computing: Integrating AES-OTP and RSA with adaptive key management and Time-Limited access control," *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, vol. 84, pp. 275–284, Dec. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2023.10.054>.
- [72] E. A. A. Ghaleb, P. D. D. Dominic, S. M. Fati, A. Muneer, and R. F. Ali, "The Assessment of Big Data Adoption Readiness with a Technology–Organization–

Environment Framework: A Perspective towards Healthcare Employees,” *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 15, p. 8379, Jul. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13158379>.

[73] O. O. Olateju, S. U. Okon, O. O. Olaniyi, A. D. Samuel-Okon, and C. U. Asonze, “Exploring the Concept of Explainable AI and Developing Information Governance Standards for Enhancing Trust and Transparency in Handling Customer Data,” *Journal of Engineering Research and Reports*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 244–268, Jun. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/jerr/2024/v26i71206>.

[74] O. C. Adeusi, Y. O. Adebayo, P. A. Ayodele, T. T. Onikoyi, K. B. Adebayo, and I. O. Adenekan, “IT standardization in cloud computing: Security challenges, benefits, and future directions,” *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 2050–2057, Jun. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.22.3.1982>.

[75] U. Shakir, “Here’s how Apple’s AI model tries to keep your data private,” *The Verge*, Jun. 13, 2024. <https://www.theverge.com/2024/6/13/24175985/apple-intelligence-ai-model-local-cloud-privacy-how-it-works> (accessed Aug. 15, 2024).

[76] S. Bigelow, “What is Microsoft Azure and How Does It Work?,” *SearchCloudComputing*, Oct. 2022. <https://www.techtarget.com/searchcloudcomputing/definition/Windows-Azure> (accessed Aug. 15, 2024).

[77] A. Akremi and M. Rouached, “A comprehensive and holistic knowledge model for cloud privacy protection,” *The Journal of Supercomputing*, vol. 77, no. 8, pp. 7956–7988, Jan. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11227-020-03594-3>.

[78] E. Dias Canedo, A. Toffano Seidel Calazans, E. Toffano Seidel Masson, P. H. Teixeira Costa, and F. Lima, “Perceptions of ICT Practitioners Regarding Software Privacy,” *Entropy*, vol. 22, no. 4, p. 429, Apr. 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/e22040429>.

[79] T. Zaid and S. Garai, “Emerging Trends in Cybersecurity: A Holistic View on Current Threats, Assessing Solutions, and Pioneering New Frontiers,” *Blockchain in Healthcare Today*, vol. 7, no. 1, Apr. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.30953/bhty.v7.302>.

[80] A. J. Apeh, A. O. Hassan, O. O. Oyewole, O. G. Fakeyede, P. A. Okeleke, and O. R. Adaramodu, “GRC STRATEGIES IN MODERN CLOUD INFRASTRUCTURES: A REVIEW OF COMPLIANCE CHALLENGES,” *Computer Science & IT Research Journal*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 111–125, Nov. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.51594/csitrj.v4i2.609>.

[81] C. Pilton, S. Faily, and J. Henriksen-Bulmer, “Evaluating privacy - determining user privacy expectations on the web,” *Computers & Security*, vol. 105, p. 102241, Jun. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2021.102241>.

[82] O. O. Olateju, S. U. Okon, U. T. I. Igwenagu, A. A. Salami, T. O. Oladoyinbo, and O. O. Olaniyi, “Combating the Challenges of False Positives in AI-Driven Anomaly Detection Systems and Enhancing Data Security in the Cloud,” *Asian Journal of*

Research in Computer Science, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 264–292, Jun. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajrcos/2024/v17i6472>.

[83] S. Quach, P. Thaichon, K. D. Martin, S. Weaven, and R. W. Palmatier, “Digital technologies: Tensions in Privacy and Data,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 1299–1323, 2022, Accessed: Aug. 15, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11747-022-00845-y>

[84] A. D. Samuel-Okon, O. O. Olateju, S. U. Okon, O. O. Olaniyi, and U. T. I. Igwenagu, “Formulating Global Policies and Strategies for Combating Criminal Use and Abuse of Artificial Intelligence,” *Archives of current research international*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 612–629, Jun. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/acri/2024/v24i5735>.

[85] T. Wittkopp and A. Acker, “Decentralized Federated Learning Preserves Model and Data Privacy,” *Lecture notes in computer science*, vol. 12632, pp. 176–187, Jan. 2021, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-76352-7_20.

[86] C. T. Kenny, S. Kuriwaki, C. McCartan, E. T. R. Rosenman, T. Simko, and K. Imai, “The use of differential privacy for census data and its impact on redistricting: The case of the 2020 U.S. Census,” *Science Advances*, vol. 7, no. 41, Oct. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abk3283>.

[87] S. Z. El Mestari, G. Lenzini, and H. Demirci, “Preserving data privacy in machine learning systems,” *Computers & Security*, vol. 137, p. 103605, Feb. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2023.103605>.

[88] S. M. Williamson and V. Prybutok, “Balancing Privacy and Progress: A Review of Privacy Challenges, Systemic Oversight, and Patient Perceptions in AI-Driven Healthcare,” *Applied Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 2, p. 675, Jan. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/app14020675>.

[89] N. Rodríguez-Barroso *et al.*, “Federated Learning and Differential Privacy: Software tools analysis, the Sherpa.ai FL framework and methodological guidelines for preserving data privacy,” *Information Fusion*, vol. 64, pp. 270–292, Dec. 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2020.07.009>.

[90] N. Kaaniche, M. Laurent, and S. Belguith, “Privacy enhancing technologies for solving the privacy-personalization paradox: Taxonomy and survey,” *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 171, p. 102807, Dec. 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnca.2020.102807>.

[91] H. Roberts *et al.*, “Artificial intelligence in support of the circular economy: ethical considerations and a path forward,” *AI & SOCIETY*, vol. 39, Nov. 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01596-8>.

[92] A. De Paula Vieira and R. Anthony, “Recalibrating Veterinary Medicine through Animal Welfare Science and Ethics for the 2020s,” *Animals*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. 654, Apr. 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10040654>.

[93] J. Tanisha, P. A. Rajesh, R. G. Singh, K. Adhip, K. Stuti, and D. Ajitha, “Privacy and data protection challenges in industry 4.0: An AI-driven perspective,” *World Journal of*

Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 064–089, Jul. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjaets.2024.12.2.0287>.

[94] H. Arabi, A. AkhavanAllaf, A. Sanaat, I. Shiri, and H. Zaidi, “The promise of artificial intelligence and deep learning in PET and SPECT imaging,” *Physica Medica*, vol. 83, pp. 122–137, Mar. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmp.2021.03.008>.

[95] G. A. Kaissis, M. R. Makowski, D. Rückert, and R. F. Braren, “Secure, privacy-preserving and federated machine learning in medical imaging,” *Nature Machine Intelligence*, vol. 2, no. 6, pp. 305–311, Jun. 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-020-0186-1>. Available: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s42256-020-0186-1>

[96] D. Eckhoff and I. Wagner, “Privacy in the Smart City—Applications, Technologies, Challenges, and Solutions,” *IEEE Communications Surveys Tutorials*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 489–516, 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/COMST.2017.2748998>. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/8025782>

[97] S. Wairimu, Leonardo Horn Iwaya, L. Fritsch, and S. Lindskog, “On the Evaluation of Privacy Impact Assessment and Privacy Risk Assessment Methodologies: A Systematic Literature Review,” *IEEE access*, pp. 1–1, Jan. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2024.3360864>

[98] L. Alkhariji, N. Alhirabi, M. N. Alraja, M. Barhamgi, O. Rana, and C. Perera, “Synthesising Privacy by Design Knowledge Toward Explainable Internet of Things Application Designing in Healthcare,” *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications*, vol. 17, no. 2s, pp. 1–29, Jun. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3434186>

[99] G. Danezis *et al.*, “Privacy and Data Protection by Design - from policy to engineering,” *arXiv.org*, 2015, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2824/38623> Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1501.03726>

[100] H. Mehr, “Artificial Intelligence for Citizen Services and Government,” 2017. Available: <https://creatingfutureus.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Mehr-2017-AlforGovCitizenServices.pdf> [Accessed: Aug. 15, 2024]