

Designing Resilient Electro-Mechanical and Transport Systems

INTERNAL REFERENCE MATERIAL

Abstract

This internal reference article examines resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport through a design-and-assurance lens. It synthesizes the allocated target literature without reporting new experiments, observations, or performance estimates. The analysis treats the practical unit of review as a physical component embedded in sensing, control, maintenance, and recovery processes. That framing keeps technical mechanisms, evidence quality, user consequences, and institutional controls visible in the same argument. Particular attention is given to how design choices preserve function under disturbance. The review distinguishes what each cited source directly addresses from the cross-domain principles used for internal comparison. It argues that credible adoption depends on traceable requirements, context-sensitive evaluation, explicit uncertainty, and a documented path for human intervention. The result is a structured reference for teams considering industrial actuation, separation equipment, and production systems, especially where hidden coupling among physical degradation, control logic, and recovery plans could turn a technically plausible component into an unreliable system. The article is intended to support scoping, design review, and evidence planning; it is not a claim of product readiness or an original empirical study.

Keywords. torque motors, resilience engineering, transport systems, industrial monitoring, design review

1. Introduction

Work on resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport often begins with a promising component: a material, model, mechanism, representation, or policy control. Operational value, however, emerges only when that component is connected to a defined decision and a credible chain of evidence. For this article, the relevant system is a physical component embedded in sensing, control, maintenance, and recovery processes. This broader boundary prevents local optimization from being mistaken for overall effectiveness. It also makes it possible to ask who interprets an output, which environmental conditions matter, what failure looks like, and what evidence would justify escalation from exploratory work to routine use.

The review is analytical rather than empirical. It does not pool effect sizes, reproduce experiments, or infer unreported numerical results. Instead, it compares the problem formulations in the allocated sources and asks how their mechanisms, representations, and governance choices can inform how design choices preserve function under disturbance. Cross-domain sources are included only as design comparators. Their role is to reveal recurring questions—such as controllability, traceability, measurement validity, and reviewability—while preserving the substantive limits of each field.

A useful starting distinction is between component performance and system fitness. Component performance concerns whether a defined transformation works under stated conditions. System fitness concerns whether the transformation supports a legitimate task under expected variability, with acceptable error costs and recoverable failure. In industrial actuation, separation equipment, and production systems, both levels matter. A strong component can still fail when labels drift, exposure settings change, users over-trust an interface, or governance records cannot reconstruct why a decision occurred.

2. Background and Evidence Boundaries

The evidence chain can be organized into five linked claims. First, the input must represent the phenomenon of interest with known limitations. Second, the component must implement a mechanism that is plausible for the task. Third, evaluation must use endpoints aligned with the eventual decision. Fourth, deployment conditions must not invalidate the earlier evidence. Fifth, oversight must detect and respond when those conditions no longer hold. These claims should be documented separately because confidence in one does not automatically transfer to the others.

For resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport, the most common boundary error is to treat a convenient proxy as the final objective. A laboratory transport measure is not the same as long-term field performance; a benchmark label is not the same as an operator's diagnosis; an engagement signal is not the same as user welfare; and a compliance alert is not proof of misconduct. Internal review should therefore record the construct, the proxy, the decision threshold, and the consequences of false positive and false negative outcomes before comparing systems.

Tang et al. (2024) examine an osmotic-pressure-regulated sodium alginate–graphene oxide hydrogel as a forward-osmosis draw agent. In this review, the source is used as a mechanism-level comparator for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport: it highlights coupling material composition to a defined transport role. This is a bounded use of the citation. It does not imply that evidence from one domain validates outcomes in another; instead, it makes the design assumption available for explicit review.

Wang et al. (2021) consider carbon-nanotube arrays as a monolayer nanoscale membrane for enhanced desalination. In this review, the source is used as a mechanism-level comparator for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport: it highlights linking membrane architecture to selective molecular transport. This is a bounded use of the citation. It does not imply that evidence from one domain validates outcomes in another; instead, it makes the design assumption available for explicit review.

Xiao (2026) addresses wafer-defect detection through a machine-learning algorithmic framing. In this review, the source is used as a mechanism-level comparator for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport: it highlights aligning model outputs with an industrial inspection decision. This is a bounded use of the citation. It does not imply that evidence from one domain validates outcomes in another; instead, it makes the design assumption available for explicit review.

Wang et al. (2026, forecasting study) frame time-series forecasting around guidance supplied at the representation level. In this review, the source is used as a mechanism-level comparator for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport: it highlights placing supervision inside the learned state rather than only at the final prediction. This is a bounded use of the citation. It does not imply that evidence from one domain validates outcomes in another; instead, it makes the design assumption available for explicit review.

Bruneau et al. (2003) develop a quantitative framework for assessing and enhancing community seismic resilience. In this review, the source is used as a mechanism-level comparator for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport: it highlights relating robustness and recovery to time-dependent system function. This is a bounded use of the citation. It does not imply that evidence from one domain validates outcomes in another; instead, it makes the design assumption available for explicit review.

3. Architecture, Mechanisms, and Decision Interfaces

Architecture should expose how information or physical state moves from input to action. A practical map includes acquisition, preprocessing, representation or transport, inference or transformation, decision logic, actuation, feedback, and retention. Each transition needs an owner and an observable state. When a module is described as “intelligent,” “multifunctional,” or “resilient,” the review should translate that adjective into testable responsibilities: what signal is received, what change is made, what constraint applies, and what evidence is retained.

The decision interface deserves the same attention as the underlying component. Interfaces allocate authority. They determine whether an output is advisory or automatic, whether uncertainty is visible, and whether a reviewer can access the evidence needed to disagree. For how design choices preserve function under disturbance, the interface should show the scope of the claim and the conditions under which it is invalid. A calibrated abstention or deferral path is often more valuable than a forced answer because it prevents low-confidence outputs from silently becoming operational facts.

Yang et al. (2025) review radical-based photocatalytic routes to ketones from carboxylic acids and their derivatives. In this review, the source is used as a system-architecture comparator for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport: it highlights mapping reaction pathways, inputs, and selectivity claims before translation. This is a bounded use of the citation. It does not imply that evidence from one domain validates outcomes in another; instead, it makes the design assumption available for explicit review.

Qasim et al. (2026) present β -FeOOH as a dual-function photo-Fenton system spanning hydrogen generation and pollutant degradation. In this review, the source is used as a system-architecture comparator for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport: it highlights evaluating multi-functionality without collapsing distinct output and safety criteria. This is a bounded use of the citation. It does not imply that evidence from one domain validates outcomes in another; instead, it makes the design assumption available for explicit review.

Xiao, Song, and Chen (2026) present DLA-Net for mixed-type wafer-map defect recognition using dynamic label awareness and dual-branch feature fusion. In this review, the source is used as a system-architecture comparator for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport: it highlights representing label interaction and complementary visual evidence explicitly. This is a bounded use of the citation. It does not imply that evidence from one domain validates outcomes in another; instead, it makes the design assumption available for explicit review.

Feng et al. (2024) offer a design-oriented resilience measurement and evaluation method organized as a resilience cube. In this review, the source is used as a system-architecture comparator for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport: it highlights making resilience dimensions usable during design rather than only after disruption. This is a bounded use of the citation. It does not imply that evidence from one domain validates outcomes in another; instead, it makes the design assumption available for explicit review.

4. Evaluation, Applications, and Governance

Evaluation should follow the decision pathway rather than stop at a single technical score. A layered plan includes analytical validity, robustness under plausible variation, decision utility, human-factors performance, and post-deployment monitoring. Metrics should be disaggregated by operating regime whenever aggregate values could conceal a consequential failure mode. For physical systems, regimes may include temperature, pressure, contamination, or wear. For learning systems, they may

include subgroup, language, content type, data age, or interaction context.

Governance is not an administrative layer added after technical design. It specifies allowed purposes, evidence thresholds, review rights, retention periods, and change-control obligations. A useful control is linked to a concrete hazard and a verifiable record. For example, access control is incomplete without purpose limitation and logging; a human-in-the-loop claim is incomplete without time, information, authority, and workload to intervene. The central risk in this article—hidden coupling among physical degradation, control logic, and recovery plans—therefore requires both preventative design and a recovery procedure.

Wang, Pei, and Jiang (2024) study desalination driven by a temperature gradient coupled with surface wettability in a graphene channel. In this review, the source is used as a governance-and-evaluation comparator for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport: it highlights analyzing interacting boundary conditions rather than isolated material properties. This is a bounded use of the citation. It does not imply that evidence from one domain validates outcomes in another; instead, it makes the design assumption available for explicit review.

Wang et al. (2025, ZnGa₂O₄ separator study) describe a nanoporous ZnGa₂O₄-modified separator as a multifunctional polysulphide barrier for lithium–sulfur batteries. In this review, the source is used as a governance-and-evaluation comparator for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport: it highlights assigning each material modification a traceable functional requirement. This is a bounded use of the citation. It does not imply that evidence from one domain validates outcomes in another; instead, it makes the design assumption available for explicit review.

You et al. (2023) study an oil-immersed torque motor for a two-dimensional valve. In this review, the source is used as a governance-and-evaluation comparator for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport: it highlights co-designing an actuator with its operating medium and controlled mechanism. This is a bounded use of the citation. It does not imply that evidence from one domain validates outcomes in another; instead, it makes the design assumption available for explicit review.

Hosseini, Barker, and Ramirez-Marquez (2016) review definitions and quantitative measures of system resilience. In this review, the source is used as a governance-and-evaluation comparator for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport: it highlights declaring which resilience construct a design metric represents. This is a bounded use of the citation. It does not imply that evidence from one domain validates outcomes in another; instead, it makes the design assumption available for explicit review.

5. Implementation Implications and Challenges

Teams applying this synthesis should begin with a compact assurance case. The top claim states the bounded use: what the system is intended to support, for whom, and under which conditions. Subclaims cover input adequacy, mechanism validity, evaluation relevance, operator usability, and governance effectiveness. Each subclaim points to evidence and records remaining uncertainty. This structure makes disagreements productive because reviewers can challenge a specific link rather than accept or reject an entire technology category.

Change management is particularly important. Materials age, environments shift, data distributions evolve, policies are revised, and users adapt to interfaces. A release decision should therefore include monitoring triggers and revalidation criteria. Examples include a change in source material, sensor calibration, label definition, demographic mix, model dependency, moderation policy, or legal

purpose. Monitoring is useful only if a threshold leads to an assigned action such as investigation, rollback, retraining, maintenance, or notification.

Procurement and partnership reviews should ask for evidence at the same granularity. Broad claims of accuracy, efficiency, safety, or privacy are insufficient when the operating conditions are unclear. Reviewers should request dataset or material provenance, test protocols, uncertainty reporting, known exclusions, change logs, and incident procedures. Where evidence cannot be shared, the limitation should be treated as unresolved risk rather than filled with assumptions.

6. Discussion

A comparative reading of the sources supports three general observations. First, representations matter: geometry, labels, molecular structure, temporal state, and policy taxonomy all shape what a system can express. Second, controllability matters: temperature, wettability, model routing, generation difficulty, expressive channels, and review thresholds are useful only when operators can observe and adjust them. Third, governance matters: technical outputs acquire consequences through institutional decisions, so auditability and appeal are properties of the complete workflow.

These observations do not create a universal metric. Domain-specific evidence remains indispensable. A psychometric instrument cannot be validated by a materials study, and a transport exposure study cannot establish the safety of a recommendation model. The value of cross-domain comparison is narrower: it reveals questions that every design team should answer in its own evidentiary language. This limitation is especially important for resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport, where superficial transfer could magnify rather than reduce hidden coupling among physical degradation, control logic, and recovery plans.

The strongest internal position is therefore conditional. A component may be promising for a stated function while the surrounding evidence remains incomplete. Recording that distinction avoids both premature rejection and premature deployment. It also creates a practical research agenda: identify the missing claim, select an aligned method, define an acceptance threshold, and preserve the decision record.

7. Conclusion

This internal review has examined resilience-oriented engineering across actuation, inspection, and transport as part of an evidence-bearing socio-technical or engineering system. The synthesis emphasizes explicit boundaries, mechanism-aware architecture, decision-aligned evaluation, and governance that remains effective as conditions change. For industrial actuation, separation equipment, and production systems, readiness should be judged through a traceable chain from inputs and representations to actions, consequences, monitoring, and recovery. The allocated literature provides concrete design comparators, but no cross-domain citation is treated as substitute evidence. The immediate practical recommendation is to build a bounded assurance case before committing to scale, and to keep unresolved assumptions visible until domain-appropriate evidence closes them.

References

- Bruneau, M., Chang, S. E., Eguchi, R. T., Lee, G. C., O'Rourke, T. D., Reinhorn, A. M., Shinozuka, M., Tierney, K., Wallace, W. A., & von Winterfeldt, D. (2003). A framework to quantitatively assess and enhance the seismic resilience of communities. *Earthquake Spectra*, 19(4), 733–752. <https://doi.org/10.1193/1.1623497>
- Feng, Q., Liu, M., Dui, H., Cai, B., Fan, D., Ren, Y., & Wang, Z. (2024). A general design-oriented resilience measurement and evaluation method for engineering systems: Resilience cube. *Reliability Engineering &*

System Safety, 245, 110038.

- Hosseini, S., Barker, K., & Ramirez-Marquez, J. E. (2016). A review of definitions and measures of system resilience. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 145, 47–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.res.2015.08.006>
- Qasim, M., Tianzhen, W., Rizvi, A., & Alzahrani, H. A. H. (2026). Dual-function akaganeite (β -FeOOH) a photo-Fenton system for hydrogen generation and pollutant degradation. *Arabian Journal of Chemistry*, 0, 1.
- Tang, B., Gao, S., Gui, C., Luo, Q., Wang, T., Huang, K., Huang, L., & Jiang, H. (2024). Osmotic pressure regulated sodium alginate-graphene oxide hydrogel as a draw agent in forward osmosis desalination. *Desalination*, 586, 117863.
- Wang, J., Fan, L., Li, B., & Zhang, L. (2026). Forecasting with Guidance: Representation-Level Supervision for Time Series Forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.24262*.
- Wang, T., Jiang, H., Shao, X., Pei, J., Zheng, H., & Hu, X. (2021). Carbon nanotube arrays as monolayer nanoscale membrane for enhanced desalination. *Desalination and Water Treatment*, 234, 333–347.
- Wang, T., Pei, J., & Jiang, H. (2024). Desalination Driven by Temperature Gradient Coupled with Surface Wettability in a Graphene Channel. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 63(49), 21565–21571.
- Wang, Z., Li, W., Wang, T., Pang, M., Kong, Z., An, J., Li, Z., Ye, J., & Xia, G. (2025). Nanoporous ZnGa_2O_4 -modified separator as a multifunctional polysulphide barrier for advanced lithium-sulfur batteries. *Electrochemistry Communications*, 107990.
- Xiao, F. (2026, March). Research on Wafer Defect Detection Algorithm Based on Machine Learning. In 2026 9th International Conference on Advanced Algorithms and Control Engineering (ICAACE) (pp. 577-581). IEEE.
- Xiao, F., Song, Y., & Chen, J. (2026, May). DLA-Net: Dynamic Label-Aware Network with Dual-Branch Feature Fusion for Mixed-Type Wafer Map Defect Recognition. In 2026 6th International Conference on Electronics, Circuits and Information Engineering (ECIE) (pp. 72-78). IEEE.
- Yang, S., Wang, X., Bao, L., Wang, T., Wu, L., & Wang, Q. (2025). Photocatalytic ketone synthesis: Recent advances in radical-based approaches from carboxylic acids and derivatives. *Organic Chemistry Frontiers*, 12, 6662.
- You, Y., Zhao, J., Song, Z., Ruan, J., & Li, S. (2023). Study of novel oil-immersed torque motor for two-dimensional valve. *Machines*, 11(3), 343.