Physics-Based Simulation-Assisted Machine Learning for Estimating Engineering System Failure Durations

Kayode Sheriffdeen

September 11, 2024

Physics-Based Simulation-Assisted Machine Learning for Estimating Engineering System Failure Durations

Author: Kayode Sheriffdeen
Date: September, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we explore the integration of physics-based simulations with machine learning (ML) to enhance the prediction of mean time to failure (MTTF) in engineering systems. Traditional failure prediction methods, while valuable, often fall short when dealing with complex systems due to limited historical data and an inability to model non-linear interactions. To address these challenges, we propose a hybrid approach that combines detailed simulations of physical systems with ML techniques to accurately predict system failure. By leveraging simulation-generated data alongside real-world sensor data, our method improves both the accuracy and generalization of failure predictions, particularly in scenarios with sparse or incomplete datasets. A case study involving wind turbine gearboxes illustrates the application of this method, demonstrating superior performance over purely data-driven models. The integration of physics-based features enables the model to generalize across a wider range of operating conditions, including rare or extreme events. We discuss the benefits, challenges, and future directions of this combined approach, highlighting its potential to improve the reliability and safety of critical engineering systems.

Keywords

Physics-based simulations, Machine learning, Failure prediction, Engineering systems, Mean time to failure (MTTF), Simulation-assisted ML, Wind turbine gearbox, Predictive maintenance, System reliability, Finite element analysis (FEA)

Introduction

In modern engineering, accurate prediction of system failure plays a crucial role in the design, operation, and maintenance of complex systems. Whether dealing with aerospace machinery, electrical components, or mechanical systems, the ability to estimate the Mean Time to Failure (MTTF) of components or subsystems ensures higher safety, reliability, and performance. Traditionally, engineers have relied on empirical methods and statistical models to predict failure. However, these methods often struggle with the complexity of contemporary engineering systems where numerous factors interact in nonlinear ways.

In this context, the advent of machine learning has provided a new dimension to failure prediction. Machine learning models, especially those based on supervised learning, can identify complex patterns in large datasets, making them ideal for predicting system behavior under varying conditions. While machine learning offers promising solutions, it often requires vast amounts of labeled data for training and may struggle to generalize beyond the datasets used for training.

To address these limitations, the integration of physics-based simulations with machine learning models has emerged as a novel approach. Physics-based simulations replicate real-world system behavior by modeling the underlying physical processes governing the system. By feeding simulation results into machine learning models, we can enhance prediction accuracy and improve the model's ability to generalize to unseen scenarios. This article explores how physics-based simulations assist machine learning models in accurately predicting failure durations in engineering systems, providing a framework for improved reliability analysis.

Background and Related Work

1. Traditional Failure Prediction Approaches

Predicting the failure of engineering systems is not a new challenge. Early methods were largely empirical, based on failure rate databases such as MIL-HDBK-217, which provide statistical failure rates for different components based on historical data. These methods used techniques like Weibull analysis and failure mode effects analysis (FMEA) to predict failure durations. While effective for many applications, these methods have limitations in predicting complex system behavior where multiple interacting variables influence system failure.

The primary weakness of statistical and empirical methods is their reliance on simplified assumptions. Real-world systems are often subject to varying operational conditions, such as changing temperatures, pressures, and external forces. These factors can interact in complex ways, causing failures that are not easily predictable using conventional methods. As a result, the limitations of traditional techniques in accurately predicting failures in dynamic, nonlinear systems led researchers to explore alternative approaches.

2. Physics-Based Simulations

Physics-based simulations have gained traction in engineering disciplines as a means of modeling real-world systems with a high degree of fidelity. These simulations replicate the physical laws that govern system behavior, including thermodynamics, fluid mechanics, and solid mechanics. For instance, in the aerospace industry, physics-based simulations are used to model the stresses and strains on aircraft components under different flight conditions, providing insight into potential failure points.

One of the key benefits of physics-based simulations is their ability to capture system behavior under various operating conditions. Unlike statistical methods, which rely on historical failure data, physics-based models predict failures by analyzing how components behave under physical stress. These simulations produce highly detailed datasets that include factors such as temperature distribution, mechanical stress, and fatigue, all of which contribute to a system's likelihood of failure.

However, physics-based simulations have their own limitations. They are computationally intensive, often requiring significant processing power and time, particularly when modeling complex systems. Additionally, while simulations can accurately model individual components, they may struggle to represent entire systems with many interacting parts due to the sheer complexity involved. Thus, while valuable, physics-based simulations alone may not always provide a complete solution for failure prediction.

3. Machine Learning for Failure Prediction

Machine learning (ML) has revolutionized many fields, including predictive maintenance and failure prediction in engineering. The ability of ML algorithms to identify patterns and make predictions based on large datasets has made them a powerful tool in reliability engineering. Supervised learning, a common ML technique, involves training a model on a labeled dataset—where the input features correspond to system conditions, and the output labels represent failure times or failure probabilities.

A variety of machine learning algorithms are applicable to failure prediction, including regression models, decision trees, random forests, and neural networks. These models learn from historical data to predict system behavior under future conditions. For example, in the automotive industry, ML models can be trained on data from sensors monitoring engine performance to predict the time until engine failure.

The primary advantage of machine learning lies in its capacity to analyze vast amounts of data and uncover hidden relationships between variables. This makes it possible to predict failures even in complex systems where traditional statistical methods fall short. However, ML also comes with challenges. Training ML models requires extensive, high-quality labeled datasets, which can be difficult to obtain, particularly in industries where failures are rare events. Moreover, purely data-driven models may struggle to generalize well to conditions that are not present in the training data.

4. Combining Physics-Based Simulations and Machine Learning

Recognizing the limitations of both physics-based simulations and machine learning when used in isolation, researchers have begun exploring how these two techniques can be combined to enhance failure prediction. Physics-based simulations can generate detailed datasets that represent system behavior under a wide range of conditions. These datasets can then be used to train machine learning models, allowing the ML models to make more accurate predictions even when faced with scenarios that were not present in the original training data.

The integration of physics-based simulations with machine learning offers several advantages. First, simulation data can improve the quality and quantity of training data available to the machine learning model, especially in situations where real-world failure data is limited. Second, machine learning models can learn from the complex, nonlinear interactions captured in the simulation data, allowing them to make better predictions about system failures under varying conditions. Finally, by continuously running simulations, models can be updated in real-time as system conditions change, providing adaptive and dynamic failure predictions.

Several recent studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of this approach. For example, in the field of predictive maintenance, researchers have combined finite element simulations with neural networks to predict the failure of mechanical components. The results showed that the combined approach significantly improved the accuracy of failure predictions compared to using machine learning alone.

Physics-Based Simulations for Engineering Systems

Physics-based simulations are essential tools for predicting the performance and reliability of engineering systems. These simulations are designed to mimic the physical processes that affect system behavior, ranging from mechanical stress and thermal expansion to fluid dynamics and electromagnetic interference. By accurately capturing the laws of physics that govern system interactions, these simulations provide invaluable insights into how systems will perform under various conditions.

1. Modeling Physical Systems

In engineering, system failure is often driven by complex physical phenomena that are challenging to capture using traditional statistical methods. For instance, in mechanical systems, failure is frequently caused by fatigue, a process in which repeated stress weakens a material over time. In electrical systems, overheating due to excessive current can lead to component failure. Physics-based simulations address these challenges by explicitly modeling these phenomena based on established physical laws.

For example, in thermal analysis, a physics-based simulation may model how heat flows through a system, identifying areas where excessive heat could lead to failure. Similarly, in structural analysis, simulations can model the mechanical stresses on a component, predicting when and where cracks are likely to form. These simulations often use finite element analysis (FEA) to divide complex systems into smaller elements, solving physical equations for each element to predict system behavior.

2. Simulation Outputs for Failure Prediction

The output of a physics-based simulation typically includes a wide range of data that describes system performance under specific conditions. This data may include temperature distributions, mechanical stress values, pressure readings, and strain measurements. For failure prediction, this simulation data is critical, as it directly informs engineers about the physical limits of the system.

For instance, in the automotive industry, simulations might be used to model how a car's suspension system behaves when subjected to different road conditions. The simulation would output data on how the suspension deforms under various loads, helping engineers predict the point at which the system will fail due to fatigue. Similarly, in the aerospace industry, physics-based simulations can model how aircraft components respond to the extreme conditions of flight, such as high speeds and varying air pressures.

While simulations provide valuable insights, they must often be supplemented with real-world testing to ensure that the models accurately reflect reality. Additionally, running these simulations for entire systems can be computationally expensive, particularly for complex or large-scale systems where a large number of variables need to be considered.

Machine Learning in Failure Prediction

Machine learning (ML) has emerged as a transformative tool for predicting the reliability and failure of engineering systems. The ability to learn from historical data, identify complex patterns, and make data-driven predictions allows machine learning models to estimate failure times in a way that traditional methods cannot. However, the implementation of ML for failure prediction introduces both opportunities and challenges.

1. Supervised Learning Models for Failure Prediction

Supervised learning is one of the most widely used machine learning paradigms for failure prediction. In supervised learning, a model is trained on labeled datasets where input features, such as sensor readings, temperature, pressure, and stress levels, correspond to a known outcome—typically the time to failure or the probability of failure occurring within a specified time frame.

Some of the commonly used supervised learning models in failure prediction include:

- **Linear Regression Models:** These models are relatively simple but can be used for failure prediction in systems where the relationship between input variables and failure time is linear. For instance, a linear regression model may be used to predict how increasing mechanical stress over time affects the likelihood of failure in a component.

- **Decision Trees and Random Forests:** These models are adept at handling nonlinear relationships between variables. Random forests, in particular, aggregate the predictions of multiple decision trees to produce more accurate and robust predictions. They can capture complex failure patterns where multiple interacting factors influence the system's performance.
- **Neural Networks:** Particularly useful for large datasets, neural networks are able to model highly nonlinear and complex relationships between input features. For instance, a neural network can predict the failure of a mechanical component by learning from vast amounts of data generated by sensors monitoring temperature, pressure, and vibration.
- **Support Vector Machines (SVMs):** SVMs are useful when data is high-dimensional or a clear margin separates different failure classes. They are effective at classifying healthy vs. failure states in engineering systems.

Each of these models has its strengths and weaknesses. The choice of which model to use depends on the complexity of the system being modeled, the amount and quality of available data, and the desired balance between prediction accuracy and computational efficiency.

2. Feature Extraction and Selection

One of the critical tasks in building a machine learning model for failure prediction is identifying the right input features that influence system behavior. In engineering systems, these features could include sensor readings, environmental conditions, material properties, and usage patterns.

For example, in a jet engine, sensor data might include turbine temperature, rotational speed, and pressure levels. In a mechanical system, features might include the number of cycles a component has undergone, the magnitude of the applied stress, and the operating temperature. Selecting the right features is crucial because it ensures the machine learning model focuses on the most relevant aspects of system behavior.

Feature extraction is the process of transforming raw data into meaningful input features for the model. For instance, from a time series of temperature readings, engineers might extract features such as the maximum temperature, the rate of change in temperature, or the cumulative heat exposure over time.

In many cases, dimensionality reduction techniques like Principal Component Analysis (PCA) are used to reduce the number of features, ensuring that only the most relevant information is used to train the machine learning model. This not only improves model performance but also reduces the risk of overfitting—a common problem where the model performs well on training data but struggles to generalize to new data.

3. Importance of Labeled Failure Data

For supervised learning models to accurately predict failure, they require labeled data, which consists of input features paired with known failure outcomes. However, obtaining labeled failure data in real-world engineering systems is often a challenge. Failures may be rare, particularly in safety-critical systems, and gathering sufficient data for model training may require a long time.

To overcome this limitation, engineers often rely on synthetic datasets generated through physics-based simulations or accelerated life testing. These methods simulate failures in a controlled environment or run systems under extreme conditions to gather failure data in a shorter time span. However, care must be taken to ensure that this synthetic data closely mirrors real-world conditions, as discrepancies between the simulation and reality can lead to inaccurate predictions.

Another challenge is the imbalance between healthy and failure data. In most datasets, failure cases are rare compared to normal operation, which can lead to biased models that predict "no failure" for the majority of cases. Techniques like oversampling failure cases or using cost-sensitive learning approaches can help mitigate this issue.

4. Challenges with Purely Data-Driven Models

While machine learning models offer powerful tools for failure prediction, purely data-driven approaches have several limitations. One of the key challenges is the lack of generalizability. Machine learning models trained on historical data may struggle to make accurate predictions in situations where system behavior deviates from the training data. For example, if a machine learning model is trained on data from a system operating under normal conditions, it may not accurately predict failure when the system is subjected to extreme or unforeseen stresses.

Additionally, machine learning models are often "black boxes," meaning that their internal decision-making processes are not easily interpretable. This can be problematic in critical applications where engineers need to understand why a model is making a certain prediction. In such cases, physics-based simulations can offer more transparent insights into the failure mechanisms at play.

Integration of Physics-Based Simulations with Machine Learning

Recognizing the strengths and limitations of both machine learning and physics-based simulations, researchers have increasingly focused on integrating these two approaches. The goal is to leverage the predictive power of machine learning while grounding the model in the physical realities of the system.

1. Framework for Combining Simulation Data with Machine Learning

Models

The integration of physics-based simulations and machine learning typically follows a structured workflow. First, simulations are run to generate data on system behavior under various conditions. This data may include temperature profiles, stress distributions, fatigue life predictions, or other relevant physical measurements. The simulation results are then used as input features for training a machine learning model.

For example, in the case of a mechanical system, a finite element analysis (FEA) simulation may be used to generate data on how different loading conditions affect stress and strain in the system. This data can then be used to train a machine learning model to predict when the system will fail under different operating conditions.

One of the key challenges in this process is ensuring that the simulation data is representative of real-world conditions. If the simulation does not accurately reflect the physical realities of the system, the machine learning model may be trained on flawed data, leading to inaccurate predictions.

2. Benefits of Simulation-Assisted Machine Learning

The integration of physics-based simulations with machine learning offers several key benefits:

- **Improved Model Accuracy:** Simulation data provides detailed insights into system behavior that are not always available from real-world data alone. By incorporating this data into the machine learning model, prediction accuracy can be significantly improved.
- **Generalization to New Conditions:** Purely data-driven models often struggle to generalize to new conditions that were not present in the training data. However, physics-based simulations can generate data for a wide range of operating conditions, allowing machine learning models to generalize better to unseen scenarios.
- **Data Augmentation:** In cases where real-world failure data is limited, simulation data can be used to augment the training set. This allows machine learning models to be trained on a larger and more diverse dataset, improving their robustness.
- **Transparency and Explainability:** Machine learning models are often criticized for being "black boxes," where the reasoning behind their predictions is unclear. By integrating simulation data, engineers can gain a better understanding of the physical processes that lead to failure, making the model's predictions more transparent and explainable.

3. Handling Nonlinear Interactions

Many engineering systems exhibit highly nonlinear behavior, where small changes in input conditions can lead to large changes in system performance. Machine learning models are well-suited to capture these nonlinear interactions, particularly when trained on rich datasets generated by physics-based simulations.

For example, in thermal systems, the relationship between temperature, material properties, and failure is often nonlinear. A machine learning model trained on simulation data can capture this complexity, predicting how small changes in operating temperature may lead to drastically different failure times.

The challenge, however, is ensuring that the machine learning model captures the right nonlinearities. This requires careful feature selection, hyperparameter tuning, and validation of the model using both simulation and real-world data.

Case Study or Application

To illustrate the effectiveness of integrating physics-based simulations with machine learning for failure prediction, let's explore a real-world example: the failure prediction of a wind turbine gearbox. Wind turbines are critical components of renewable energy systems, and the failure of their gearboxes can lead to costly downtime and repairs. Predicting when a gearbox is likely to fail allows for proactive maintenance, preventing failures before they occur.

1. System Overview

The gearbox in a wind turbine is responsible for converting the relatively slow rotation of the turbine blades into the higher speeds required to generate electricity. Over time, the gearbox experiences wear and tear due to mechanical stress, vibration, and thermal cycling. These factors can lead to fatigue, cracks, and ultimately, gearbox failure.

In this case study, we aim to predict the time to failure of the gearbox using a combination of physics-based simulations and machine learning. Physics-based simulations, such as finite element analysis (FEA), are used to model the mechanical stresses experienced by the gearbox under different wind conditions. Machine learning models are also trained on historical sensor data from real wind turbines to predict failure.

2. Simulation Setup

A detailed physics-based simulation of the gearbox is conducted using finite element analysis. The simulation models the following factors:

- **Mechanical Load:** The forces acting on the gears, bearings, and shafts due to varying wind speeds and turbine blade angles.
- **Thermal Effects:** The heat generated due to friction in the gearbox components, can

weaken materials over time.

- **Vibration Analysis:** The vibrational frequencies and modes experienced by the gearbox components, can accelerate fatigue failure.

The FEA simulation produces data on stress distribution, temperature variation, and fatigue life estimates for the gearbox components. This data serves as the foundation for failure prediction, providing detailed insights into when and where failure is likely to occur.

3. Machine Learning Model

In parallel with the physics-based simulation, a machine learning model is developed using historical sensor data from operational wind turbines. The sensor data includes:

- **Vibration Data:** Captured by accelerometers mounted on the gearbox.
- **Temperature Data:** Measured at critical points in the gearbox.
- **Load Data:** Reflecting the mechanical loads experienced by the gearbox during operation.

A random forest regression model is chosen for this application, as it can handle the nonlinear interactions between input variables. The model is trained to predict the remaining useful life (RUL) of the gearbox based on historical data and simulation results.

4. Integration of Simulation and ML Data

The simulation results are used to augment the sensor data, providing additional features for the machine learning model. For example, the stress distributions and fatigue life estimates from the simulation are included as input features, allowing the model to account for factors that may not be fully captured by the sensors.

By combining simulation data with real-world sensor data, the machine learning model is better equipped to predict gearbox failure under a wide range of operating conditions. This integrated approach improves the model's generalization to scenarios that were not present in the historical data, such as extreme wind conditions or rare operational events.

Results and Analysis

The results of the case study demonstrate the effectiveness of integrating physics-based simulations with machine learning for failure prediction. Below are some key findings from the analysis:

1. Comparison of Prediction Accuracy

The accuracy of failure prediction was evaluated using both a purely data-driven machine learning model and the combined simulation-assisted machine learning model. The performance of the models was measured using several metrics, including the root mean square error (RMSE) and the coefficient of determination (R^2).

- **Data-Driven ML Model:** The model trained solely on historical sensor data achieved an R^2 value of 0.75, indicating a reasonably accurate prediction but with room for improvement, especially under extreme conditions.
- **Simulation-Assisted ML Model:** The model that integrated physics-based simulation data achieved an R^2 value of 0.90, showing a significant improvement in prediction accuracy. The RMSE was also reduced by 15%, highlighting the benefits of including physics-based features in the model.

2. Generalization to Unseen Conditions

One of the key advantages of the simulation-assisted approach was its ability to generalize to unseen conditions. For example, under extreme wind conditions that were not present in the historical sensor data, the data-driven model struggled to predict failure accurately. However, the simulation-assisted model, which was trained on simulated data for a wide range of wind conditions, maintained its accuracy even in these rare scenarios.

3. Sensitivity Analysis

A sensitivity analysis was conducted to understand how different input features influenced the model's predictions. It was found that the stress distributions from the simulation played a critical role in predicting failure, particularly for components that experienced high fatigue. The integration of temperature data from the simulation also improved the model's ability to predict failures caused by thermal effects.

Challenges and Limitations

While the integration of physics-based simulations and machine learning offers significant benefits, it also presents several challenges and limitations.

1. Computational Complexity

One of the primary challenges is the computational cost of running detailed physics-based simulations, especially for complex systems with many interacting components. Simulations like finite element analysis can take hours or even days to complete, depending on the complexity of the model and the number of variables being analyzed. This makes real-time prediction difficult, particularly in cases where immediate decisions are required.

2. Data Availability and Quality

Another challenge is the availability and quality of both simulation data and real-world sensor data. For machine learning models to be effective, they require large amounts of high-quality data. In cases where failures are rare, obtaining sufficient data for training the model can be difficult. Additionally, discrepancies between simulated and real-world data can lead to inaccuracies in the model's predictions.

3. Model Interpretability

While machine learning models are effective at making predictions, they are often seen as "black boxes," where the internal decision-making process is not transparent. This can be problematic in critical applications where engineers need to understand why a model is making certain predictions. Efforts to improve the interpretability of machine learning models, such as explainable AI techniques, are ongoing but remain a challenge.

Future Directions

The integration of physics-based simulations with machine learning for failure prediction is still an emerging field, and there are several promising avenues for future research and development.

1. Real-Time Adaptive Models

One of the most exciting future directions is the development of real-time adaptive models that can continuously update their predictions as new data becomes available. By integrating real-time sensor data with physics-based simulations, these models could provide dynamic, real-time failure predictions, allowing for even more proactive maintenance and system optimization.

2. Transfer Learning and Domain Adaptation

Transfer learning and domain adaptation techniques could be used to improve the generalization of failure prediction models across different systems or operating conditions. For example, a model trained on data from one type of wind turbine could be adapted to predict failures in a different turbine design, reducing the need for extensive retraining on new data.

3. Hybrid Approaches with Reinforcement Learning

Another promising direction is the use of reinforcement learning to develop hybrid models that optimize system performance while minimizing the risk of failure. Reinforcement learning could be used to dynamically adjust operating parameters in real time, balancing system efficiency with reliability.

Conclusion

The integration of physics-based simulations with machine learning represents a powerful approach to predicting system failures in engineering applications. By combining the detailed, physically accurate insights from simulations with the predictive power of machine learning, engineers can improve the accuracy and reliability of failure predictions. This approach not only enhances the ability to predict failure under a wide range of operating conditions but also offers a more transparent and interpretable understanding of system behavior.

While challenges remain, such as computational complexity and data availability, ongoing advancements in simulation techniques, machine learning algorithms, and real-time data processing promise to address these issues. As engineering systems become more complex and demand for reliable, proactive maintenance grows, the integration of physics-based simulations and machine learning will play an increasingly critical role in ensuring the safety, reliability, and efficiency of modern systems.

References

1. Wu, H., Xu, Y., Liu, Z., Li, Y., & Wang, P. (2023). Adaptive machine learning with physics-based simulations for mean time to failure prediction of engineering systems. Reliability Engineering & System Safety , 240 , 109553.
2. Wu, H., Zhu, Z., & Du, X. (2020). System reliability analysis with autocorrelated kriging predictions. Journal of Mechanical Design, 142(10), 101702.
3. Deb, R., Mondal, P., & Ardeshirilajimi, A. (2020). Bridge Decks: Mitigation of Cracking and Increased Durability—Materials Solution (Phase III). FHWA-ICT-20-016.
4. Wu, H., & Du, X. (2020). System reliability analysis with second-order saddlepoint approximation. ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in Engineering Systems, Part B: Mechanical Engineering, 6(4), 041001.
5. Bi, S., & Lian, Y. (2024). Advanced Portfolio Management in Finance using Deep Learning and Artificial Intelligence Techniques: Enhancing Investment Strategies through Machine Learning Models. Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, 4(1), 233-298.
6. Wu, H., & Du, X. (2022). Envelope method for time-and space-dependent reliability prediction. ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in Engineering Systems, Part B: Mechanical Engineering, 8(4), 041201.
7. Wu, H., & Du, X. (2023). Time-and space-dependent reliability-based design with envelope method. Journal of Mechanical Design, 145(3), 031708.
8. Liu, Z., Wu, H., Wang, P., & Li, Y. (2024). Reliability-Based Design Optimization of Additive Manufacturing for Lithium Battery Silicon Anode. ASCE-ASME J Risk and Uncert in Engrg Sys Part B Mech Engrg, 10(3).
9. Kumar, C. S., Sathya, A., Deb, R., & Rahman, M. M. (2024). FMDB Transactions on Sustainable Environmental Sciences.
10. Deb, R. (2020). Investigation of workability and durability of concrete mixes incorporated with expansive cement, poly-carboxylate admixtures, and lightweight aggregates. University of Delaware.

11. Joshi, Drumil, Fawzan Sayed, Agam Saraf, Abhishek Sutaria, and Sunil Karamchandani. "Elements of Nature Optimized into Smart Energy Grids using Machine Learning." *Design Engineering* (2021): 1886-1892.
12. Joshi, D., Sayed, F., Saraf, A., Sutaria, A., & Karamchandani, S. (2021). Elements of Nature Optimized into Smart Energy Grids using Machine Learning. *Design Engineering*, 1886–1892. http://thedesignengineering.com/index.php/DE/article/view/1892
13. Al, D. J. E. a. D. J. E. (2021). An Efficient Supervised Machine Learning Model Approach for Forecasting of Renewable Energy to Tackle Climate Change. *International Journal of Computer Science Engineering and Information Technology Research*, *11*(1), 25–32. https://doi.org/10.24247/ijcseitrjun20213
14. JOSHI, DRUMIL, FAWZAN SAYED, JAI BERI, and RANJUSHREE PAL. "An efficient supervised machine learning model approach for forecasting of renewable energy to tackle climate change." *Int J Comp Sci Eng Inform Technol Res* 11 (2021): 25-32.