International Journal of Computer Applications Technology and Research
Volume 11–Issue 12, 777 - 784, 2022, ISSN:-2319–8656
DOI:10.7753/IJCATR1112.1035

Integrating Artificial Intelligence into Public Health Preparedness to Strengthen Resilience, Early Warning, and Response Capacity

Amarachi Igwilo
Electrocardiogram Technician,
National Defense College Clinic,
Nigeria

Omotayo Moni Famodu
Masters in Public Health,
Western Illinois University,
USA

Adanna Umeano
Drexel University,
Philadelphia,
USA

Oluremilekun Oyefolu
Johns Hopkins Global Alliance of Perioperative Professionals (GAPP) group,
Baltimore,
USA

Abstract: The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into public health preparedness offers a transformative pathway to strengthening system resilience, enhancing early warning capabilities, and improving response capacity to emerging and ongoing health threats. Traditional public health surveillance and emergency response frameworks often rely on delayed reporting, fragmented data sources, and resource-intensive analytical processes, which can limit timely decision-making. AI addresses these constraints by enabling rapid analysis of large, heterogeneous datasets, including epidemiological records, mobility data, environmental indicators, and digital health signals. Machine learning and predictive analytics support earlier detection of outbreaks, more accurate risk stratification, and scenario modelling to anticipate healthcare system strain. In preparedness planning, AI-driven tools enhance resource allocation, workforce planning, and supply chain resilience, while decision-support systems assist policymakers during crisis response by synthesising real-time evidence. However, effective integration requires robust data governance, interoperability across health systems, transparency of algorithms, and attention to ethical concerns such as bias, privacy, and accountability. This paper examines how AI can be systematically embedded within public health preparedness architectures to complement human expertise, strengthen adaptive capacity, and support proactive rather than reactive responses to health emergencies. By aligning technological innovation with governance and equity considerations, AI can play a critical role in building resilient public health systems capable of responding to complex and evolving risks.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; Public health preparedness; Early warning systems; Health system resilience; Disease surveillance; Emergency response capacity

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Global Burden of Public Health Emergencies and Preparedness Gaps

Public health emergencies, including infectious disease outbreaks, climate-related disasters, and complex humanitarian crises, continue to pose significant threats to population health, economic stability, and social systems globally [1]. Recent decades have demonstrated that the frequency, scale, and transboundary nature of health emergencies are increasing, placing sustained pressure on national and global preparedness capacities [2]. Despite advances in medical science, many health systems remain structurally underprepared to detect, absorb, and respond effectively to rapidly evolving public health threats [3]. Systemic gaps persist in surveillance coverage, early warning, surge capacity, and inter-agency coordination, particularly in low-resource and highly urbanised settings [4].

1.2 Limitations of Traditional Surveillance and Response Systems

Conventional public health surveillance systems largely rely on indicator-based reporting, laboratory confirmations, and hierarchical data flows, which often introduce significant delays between event occurrence and detection [5].
These systems are further constrained by fragmented data infrastructures, limited interoperability, and dependence on manual reporting processes that reduce situational awareness during fast-moving crises [6]. Response mechanisms anchored in static preparedness plans frequently lack the flexibility required to adapt to uncertainty, compounding risks of delayed interventions and inefficient resource deployment [7].

1.3 Emergence of Artificial Intelligence in Health Systems and Emergency Management

Artificial intelligence has emerged as a critical technological development capable of augmenting health system intelligence through advanced data processing, pattern recognition, and predictive modelling [7].

In health systems, AI applications have expanded across disease surveillance, diagnostics, health system planning, and emergency logistics, demonstrating potential to enhance both routine operations and crisis response [8]. The increasing availability of large-scale digital health data, coupled with computational advances, has accelerated interest in AI-driven approaches to public health preparedness and emergency management [2].

1.4 Rationale for Integrating AI into Preparedness Frameworks

Integrating AI into public health preparedness frameworks offers an opportunity to shift from reactive to anticipatory models of risk management by enabling earlier detection, continuous monitoring, and dynamic response planning [3].
AI-driven systems can synthesise heterogeneous data streams in near real time, supporting more accurate risk assessments and timely decision-making under conditions of uncertainty [4]. However, the integration of AI into preparedness architectures remains uneven and insufficiently theorised, particularly with respect to governance, resilience-building, and system-wide implementation [6].

1.5 Study Aims, Scope, and Structure

This paper aims to examine how artificial intelligence can be systematically integrated into public health preparedness to strengthen resilience, early warning, and response capacity across health systems [1]. It synthesises conceptual foundations, functional applications, and governance considerations to propose a structured understanding of AI-enabled preparedness [5].
The paper is organised into conceptual, operational, and policy-oriented sections to inform both academic discourse and practical implementation in public health systems [8].

2. CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS OF AI-ENABLED PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS

2.1 Public Health Preparedness and System Resilience

Public health preparedness is commonly defined as the capacity of health systems to anticipate, respond to, and recover from public health threats while maintaining essential functions [7]. Preparedness encompasses surveillance, workforce readiness, infrastructure capacity, coordination mechanisms, and governance arrangements that operate across the emergency management cycle [9].
Resilience within public health systems refers to the ability to absorb shocks, adapt to evolving conditions, and transform structures and processes in response to systemic stressors [10]. The absorptive dimension of resilience focuses on maintaining core functions during crises, while adaptive capacity enables system adjustments in response to emerging risks [11]. Transformative resilience involves longer-term structural changes that improve preparedness for future threats, including institutional learning and system redesign [12]. Preparedness indicators commonly used in public health assessments include timeliness of detection, surge capacity, continuity of essential services, and coordination effectiveness [13]. However, traditional indicators often fail to capture dynamic system behaviour and real-time adaptive capacity, limiting their utility during rapidly evolving emergencies [14].

2.2 Artificial Intelligence in Health Systems

Artificial intelligence in health systems encompasses computational techniques such as machine learning, natural language processing, and predictive analytics that enable automated pattern recognition and inference from complex datasets [7]. Machine learning models are particularly relevant for public health preparedness due to their ability to identify non-linear relationships and emerging trends across large-scale epidemiological and contextual data [15].
Natural language processing supports the extraction of actionable intelligence from unstructured data sources, including clinical notes, surveillance reports, and digital media signals [16].
Predictive analytics enable scenario modelling and forecasting of disease spread, healthcare demand, and resource needs, supporting anticipatory preparedness planning [9].
A critical distinction exists between AI systems designed for automation and those intended to function as decision-support tools that augment, rather than replace, human judgement [10]. In public health contexts, decision-support-oriented AI is particularly important to ensure accountability, interpretability, and alignment with institutional decision-making processes [11]. Despite growing experimentation, the maturity of AI deployment in public health preparedness remains uneven, with most applications confined to pilot studies or isolated operational use cases [12].
Barriers to maturity include data quality limitations, workforce capacity gaps, governance challenges, and insufficient integration into existing preparedness architectures [14].

Figure 1: Conceptual framework linking AI capabilities to preparedness functions

3. AI-DRIVEN EARLY WARNING AND SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS

3.1 Traditional Surveillance Models and Their Constraints

Indicator-based surveillance has historically formed the backbone of public health monitoring, relying on routinely collected clinical, laboratory, and administrative data to track disease trends [15]. While indicator-based systems provide standardized and comparable metrics, they are often characterised by delayed reporting cycles that limit timely detection of rapidly emerging threats [16]. Event-based surveillance was introduced to complement traditional models by capturing unstructured signals from media reports, community notifications, and informal data sources [17].

Although event-based surveillance can improve sensitivity to unusual events, it frequently suffers from noise, inconsistent validation, and challenges in integrating signals into formal response workflows [18]. Both indicator- and event-based systems are constrained by fragmented data infrastructures, siloed institutional ownership, and limited interoperability across jurisdictions [19]. Reporting delays caused by manual data entry, verification bottlenecks, and hierarchical information flows further weaken early warning capacity during fast-moving outbreaks [20]. These structural limitations reduce situational awareness and hinder the ability of public health authorities to initiate timely, proportionate interventions [21].

3.2 AI-Enhanced Epidemiological Surveillance

AI-enhanced surveillance systems leverage machine learning algorithms to analyse high-volume, high-velocity data streams for early detection of anomalous epidemiological patterns [15]. Supervised and unsupervised learning models have demonstrated capacity to identify outbreak signals earlier than conventional threshold-based approaches [16].

Anomaly detection techniques enable the identification of deviations from expected baseline patterns, supporting proactive investigation of emerging risks [17]. Trend forecasting models use historical and real-time data to project short-term disease trajectories, enhancing preparedness planning and response timing [18]. AI-driven surveillance increasingly incorporates non-traditional data sources, including human mobility data, social media activity, and environmental indicators, to capture behavioural and contextual drivers of transmission [19].

The integration of digital traces expands surveillance coverage beyond formal healthcare settings, particularly in contexts with under-reporting or limited diagnostic capacity [20]. However, reliance on non-traditional data sources introduces challenges related to representativeness, data quality, and signal validation, requiring robust governance mechanisms [21]. When effectively integrated, AI-enhanced surveillance systems improve the timeliness, sensitivity, and adaptability of early warning architectures [22].

3.3 Predictive Modelling and Risk Stratification

Predictive modelling constitutes a central component of AI-driven surveillance by enabling forecasts of disease spread under varying epidemiological and behavioural scenarios [15]. Machine learning models can incorporate demographic, environmental, and mobility variables to generate granular projections of transmission dynamics [18]. Forecasting healthcare demand, including hospital admissions and intensive care utilisation, supports anticipatory planning and surge preparedness [19]. Population-level risk stratification uses AI to classify geographic areas or demographic groups according to vulnerability, exposure, and potential impact [20].

These stratification approaches inform targeted interventions, resource prioritisation, and differentiated public health responses [21]. Uncertainty management remains a critical challenge in AI-based prediction, as model outputs are sensitive to data quality, parameter assumptions, and changing real-world conditions [22]. Transparent communication of uncertainty ranges and scenario assumptions is essential to ensure responsible interpretation and use of predictive outputs in decision-making [16].

Table 1. Comparison of Traditional vs AI-Enabled Surveillance Systems

Dimension	Traditional Surveillance	AI-Enabled Surveillance
Data sources	Clinical and laboratory reports	Multi-source, including digital and environmental data
Timeliness	Delayed, periodic reporting	Near real-time data processing
Analytical approach	Rule-based thresholds	Machine learning and predictive analytics
Adaptability	Static system design	Dynamic model updating
Early warning capacity	Limited	Enhanced and anticipatory

4. STRENGTHENING PUBLIC HEALTH RESILIENCE THROUGH AI

4.1 AI for Health System Stress Testing and Scenario Modelling

Health system stress testing uses AI-based simulation models to assess system performance under varying outbreak severity and demand scenarios [21]. Scenario modelling enables planners to explore the potential impacts of different intervention strategies on healthcare capacity and service continuity [22].
AI-driven simulations can model surge capacity by integrating data on hospital beds, workforce availability, and critical equipment [23]. These models support proactive identification of bottlenecks and vulnerabilities before system thresholds are exceeded [24].
Hospital demand forecasting using machine learning improves the accuracy of short-term and medium-term preparedness planning [25]. Workforce modelling incorporates absenteeism, skill mix, and redeployment scenarios to inform staffing strategies during prolonged emergencies [26].

4.2 Resource Allocation and Supply Chain Resilience

AI-assisted resource allocation supports more efficient distribution of limited healthcare resources during periods of heightened demand [21]. Machine learning models can optimise logistics by forecasting consumption patterns and identifying priority distribution points [22].
AI-driven inventory management systems enhance visibility across supply chains, reducing risks of stockouts and overstocking [23]. Vaccine distribution models use predictive analytics to align supply with population needs, geographic risk profiles, and cold-chain constraints [24].
Similar approaches are applied to essential medical supplies, including personal protective equipment and therapeutics, to strengthen operational resilience [25]. However, the effectiveness of AI-assisted allocation depends on data integration across procurement, distribution, and service delivery systems [27].

4.3 Adaptive Learning and System Feedback Loops

Adaptive learning mechanisms enable AI systems to update models continuously as new data become available during an evolving crisis [22]. Continuous model updating improves responsiveness to changing transmission dynamics, intervention effects, and behavioural shifts [23].
Learning health systems integrate AI feedback loops to support iterative preparedness planning and post-event evaluation [24]. These feedback mechanisms facilitate institutional learning by translating real-time insights into policy and operational adjustments [26]. Embedding adaptive AI within preparedness cycles enhances long-term resilience by supporting evidence-informed transformation of health system structures [28].

Figure 2: AI-enabled resilience pathways in public health systems

5. AI-SUPPORTED EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND DECISION-MAKING

5.1 Real-Time Decision Support for Policymakers

Real-time decision support systems powered by AI enhance situational awareness by aggregating epidemiological, healthcare capacity, and mobility data into unified analytical dashboards [27]. These dashboards enable policymakers to monitor outbreak trajectories, healthcare strain, and intervention effects as conditions evolve [28]. AI-driven analytics reduce cognitive burden by prioritising key signals and highlighting deviations from expected trends during emergencies [29].

Situational awareness tools increasingly integrate geospatial analytics to support region-specific response decisions and resource deployment [30]. Effective emergency response requires that AI outputs are embedded within existing public health command-and-control structures rather than operating as parallel systems [31]. Integration into incident management frameworks ensures that AI-generated insights inform, rather than override, accountable human decision-making [32]. Clear protocols governing how AI recommendations are interpreted and escalated are essential to prevent decision paralysis or overreliance on automated outputs [33].

5.2 Operational Response Optimization

AI-supported operational optimisation improves emergency dispatch by analysing call data, location intelligence, and service availability in real time [27]. Machine learning algorithms can support triage decisions by rapidly classifying cases according to severity and urgency [28].

These systems enhance response efficiency by reducing dispatch delays and improving allocation of emergency medical services [29]. AI-driven models also support targeted non-pharmaceutical interventions by identifying high-risk locations and populations [30].

Targeted interventions, such as localised movement restrictions or testing strategies, reduce the social and economic costs of blanket measures [31]. Operational optimisation depends on continuous data flows from healthcare providers, emergency services, and public health agencies [32]. Failures in data integration or system interoperability can undermine the effectiveness of AI-supported response optimisation [34].

5.3 Communication, Risk Messaging, and Public Trust

Risk communication is a critical component of emergency response, influencing public compliance and trust in public health authorities [27]. AI-assisted communication tools analyse population sentiment and information consumption patterns to tailor risk messaging strategies [28]. Natural language processing supports the rapid generation and adaptation of public health messages across multiple platforms [29].

AI systems are increasingly deployed to detect and track misinformation trends during public health emergencies [30]. Early identification of misinformation enables authorities to intervene before false narratives undermine response measures [31]. However, opaque or poorly governed AI communication tools risk eroding public trust if perceived as manipulative or inaccurate [32]. Maintaining transparency about the role of AI in risk communication is essential to sustaining legitimacy during crises [34].

Table 2. Applications of AI Across Preparedness, Response, and Recovery Phases

Emergency Phase	AI Applications	Functional Contribution
Preparedness	Predictive modelling, scenario analysis	Anticipatory planning
Response	Decision support dashboards, triage tools	Real-time optimisation
Recovery	Impact assessment, system learning	Resilience strengthening

6. GOVERNANCE, ETHICS, AND IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES

6.1 Data Governance, Privacy, and Security

Effective AI integration in public health preparedness depends on robust data governance frameworks that ensure data quality, consistency, and accessibility [33]. Poor data quality undermines model reliability and can lead to misleading risk assessments during emergencies [34].

Interoperability across surveillance systems, healthcare providers, and administrative datasets remains a persistent barrier to AI deployment [35]. Data sharing arrangements must balance public health imperatives with legal and ethical obligations to protect individual privacy [36].

Public health agencies operate within complex regulatory environments that shape how data can be collected, processed, and shared [37]. Inadequate cybersecurity protections expose AI-enabled preparedness systems to risks of data breaches and system manipulation [38].

6.2 Algorithmic Bias, Transparency, and Accountability

Algorithmic bias presents a significant ethical risk when AI systems are trained on data that underrepresent marginalised or vulnerable populations [33]. Biased models can exacerbate health inequities by misallocating resources or underestimating risks in certain communities [34]. Transparency in model design and data inputs is necessary to enable scrutiny and informed use of AI outputs [35].

Explainable AI techniques support accountability by allowing decision-makers to understand the basis of model recommendations [36]. Auditability of AI systems is essential to detect errors, biases, and unintended consequences during deployment [39]. Clear lines of responsibility must be maintained to ensure that human authorities remain accountable for decisions informed by AI [40].

6.3 Institutional Capacity and Workforce Readiness

Institutional capacity constraints limit the ability of public health agencies to adopt and sustain AI-enabled preparedness systems [33]. Skills gaps in data science, informatics, and AI governance are widely documented across public sector health institutions [34]. Workforce readiness requires targeted training programs that enable staff to interpret and critically evaluate AI-generated insights [37].

Human–AI collaboration models emphasise complementarity between computational tools and professional judgement [38]. Embedding AI specialists within public health teams supports contextualisation of models and alignment with operational realities [39]. Long-term preparedness strengthening depends on organisational cultures that support innovation, learning, and responsible technology use [40].

Figure 3: Governance and ethical safeguards for AI in public health preparedness

7. FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The future integration of artificial intelligence into public health preparedness requires deliberate alignment with national and subnational preparedness strategies rather than isolated technological adoption [39]. Embedding AI within formal preparedness frameworks enables continuity between surveillance, response, and recovery functions across emergency cycles [40]. Policy efforts should prioritise the institutionalisation of AI-enabled early warning systems within public health agencies to ensure sustainability beyond pilot initiatives [41].

Cross-sector collaboration between public health authorities, technology developers, academic institutions, and regulators is essential to support scalable and trustworthy AI deployment [42].

Such collaboration can facilitate shared standards for data interoperability, model validation, and performance benchmarking across jurisdictions [39]. Public procurement policies play a critical role in shaping how AI tools are designed, incentivising transparency, explainability, and alignment with public health values [43].

Future research should focus on evaluating the real-world effectiveness of AI-enabled preparedness systems under diverse epidemiological and socio-political conditions [44].

Greater emphasis is needed on comparative studies that assess AI performance across different governance contexts and resource settings [45]. Policy frameworks must also address equity considerations by ensuring that AI systems do not exacerbate existing disparities in preparedness or response capacity [40].

For low-resource and high-risk settings, adaptable and context-sensitive AI solutions are necessary to avoid widening global preparedness gaps [41]. International coordination can support capacity-building through shared tools, open-source platforms, and technical assistance mechanisms [42]. By aligning innovation with governance, ethics, and equity objectives, AI can contribute meaningfully to future-ready public health preparedness systems [45].

8. CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence offers significant potential to transform public health preparedness by enhancing early warning, strengthening system resilience, and improving response capacity in the face of increasingly complex health threats. This paper has demonstrated that AI-enabled approaches can address critical limitations of traditional surveillance and preparedness models by supporting anticipatory risk assessment, adaptive planning, and real-time decision-making. However, the value of AI in preparedness is contingent on responsible integration within existing public health institutions, rather than technological substitution of human expertise.

Effective deployment requires robust data governance, transparency, and accountability mechanisms to ensure that AI systems operate in ways that are ethical, equitable, and trustworthy. Institutional capacity, workforce readiness, and cross-sector collaboration are equally critical determinants of successful implementation. Without sustained investment in these enabling conditions, AI risks remaining fragmented or underutilised in preparedness contexts.

Ultimately, integrating artificial intelligence into public health preparedness represents not only a technological opportunity but also a policy and governance challenge.

When strategically aligned with public health objectives and societal values, AI can support a shift from reactive emergency response toward resilient, adaptive, and proactive public health systems capable of managing future crises.

9. REFERENCES

1. Fant C, Adelman DS. Building community resilience in support of public health emergency preparedness with big data and AI. CIN: Computers, Informatics, Nursing. 2022 Dec 1;40(12):836-40.
2. Uzor D. Systems-level modeling of antimicrobial utilization patterns to optimize stewardship interventions and suppress emerging resistance pathways. GSC Adv Res Rev. 2021;9(3):203–218. doi:10.30574/gscarr.2021.9.3.0310.
3. Eze Dan-Ekeh. Engineering high-value commercialization frameworks integrating technical innovation with strategic sales leadership to drive multimillion-dollar growth in global energy markets. World J Adv Res Rev. 2019;4(2):256-268. doi:10.30574/wjarr.2019.4.2.0152
4. Bedi JS, Vijay D, Dhaka P, Gill JP, Barbuddhe SB. Emergency preparedness for public health threats, surveillance, modelling & forecasting. Indian Journal of Medical Research. 2021 Mar 1;153(3):287-98.
5. Nwenekama Charles-Udeh. Leveraging financial innovation and stakeholder alignment to execute high-impact growth strategies across diverse market environments. Int J Res Finance Manage 2019;2(2):138-146. DOI: 10.33545/26175754.2019.v2.i2a.617
6. Uzor D. Real-time anomaly detection engines enabling rapid cross-department outbreak response through automated exposure notification algorithms. Magna Scientia Advanced Research and Reviews. 2022;6(02):49-64. doi:10.30574/msarr.2022.6.2.0082.
7. Omitoyin G, Moshood M. Evaluating digital transformation strategies in global supply chain management through strategic project leadership and measurable economic impact. *Magna Scientia Adv Res Rev*. 2021;3(2):122–138. doi:10.30574/msarr.2021.3.2.0092. Available from: https://doi.org/10.30574/msarr.2021.3.2.0092
8. Udeh NC. *Building sustainable SME banking strategies that expand market access, boost client retention, and support economic inclusion*. International Journal of Financial Management and Economics. 2018;1(1):126-135. doi:10.33545/26179210.2018.v1.i1.674.
9. World Health Organization. Managing epidemics: key facts about major deadly diseases. Geneva: WHO; 2018.
10. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. Global assessment report on disaster risk reduction. Geneva: UNDRR; 2019.
11. Kandel N, Chungong S, Omaar A, Xing J. Health security capacities in the context of COVID-19 outbreak: an analysis of International Health Regulations annual report data. Lancet. 2020;395(10229):1047–53.
12. Kruk ME, Ling EJ, Bitton A, Cammett M, Cavanaugh K, Chopra M, et al. Building resilient health systems: a proposal for a resilience index. BMJ. 2017;357:j2323.
13. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Public health preparedness capabilities: national standards for state and local planning. Atlanta: CDC; 2019.
14. Dzau VJ, McClellan M, McGinnis JM. Vital directions for health and health care: priorities for 2021. Health Aff. 2020;39(2):197–203.
15. Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nat Med. 2019;25(1):44–56.
16. Panch T, Szolovits P, Atun R. Artificial intelligence, machine learning and health systems. J Glob Health. 2018;8(2):020303.
17. World Health Organization. Joint external evaluation tool: International Health Regulations (2005). 2nd ed. Geneva: WHO; 2018.
18. Blanchet K, Nam SL, Ramalingam B, Pozo-Martin F. Governance and capacity to manage resilience of health systems: towards a new conceptual framework. Int J Health Policy Manag. 2017;6(8):431–5.
19. Hollnagel E, Woods DD, Leveson N. Resilience engineering: concepts and precepts. Aldershot: Ashgate; 2006.
20. Barasa EW, Cloete K, Gilson L. From bouncing back to transformation: the role of resilience in health systems. BMJ Glob Health. 2017;2(2):e000429.
21. Nelson C, Lurie N, Wasserman J, Zakowski S. Conceptualizing and defining public health emergency preparedness. Am J Public Health. 2007;97(Suppl 1):S9–11.
22. Sagan A, Thomas S, McKee M, Karanikolos M, Azzopardi-Muscat N, de la Mata I. COVID-19 and health system resilience. Eurohealth. 2020;26(2):56–60.
23. Shmueli G, Koppius OR. Predictive analytics in information systems research. MIS Q. 2011;35(3):553–72.
24. Reis BY, Mandl KD. Time series modeling for syndromic surveillance. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak. 2003;3:2.
25. Gutpa N. CROSS-SECTOR DATA INTEGRATION AND AI FOR PANDEMIC PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE. Google. com. 2021.
26. Kolawole Oloke. Architecting autonomous financial decision engines through federated learning and hybrid cloud frameworks. Int J Appl Res 2019;5(6):500-510. DOI: 10.22271/allresearch.2019.v5.i6d.13166
27. Pemmasani PK, Abd Nasaruddin MA. Resilient it strategies for governmental disaster response and crisis management. International Journal of Acta Informatica. 2022 Dec 29;1(1):151-63.
28. Eze Dan-Ekeh. DEVELOPING ENTERPRISE-SCALE MARKET EXPANSION STRATEGIES COMBINING TECHNICAL PROBLEM-SOLVING AND EXECUTIVE-LEVEL NEGOTIATIONS TO SECURE TRANSFORMATIVE INTERNATIONAL ENERGY PARTNERSHIPS. International Journal Of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM). 2018Dec21;02(12):165–77.

29. Gneiting T, Katzfuss M. Probabilistic forecasting. Annu Rev Stat Appl. 2014;1:125–51.
30. Litvak E, Long MC, Cooper AB, McManus ML. Emergency department diversion: causes and solutions. Acad Emerg Med. 2001;8(11):1108–10.
31. Deasy J, Rocheteau E, Kohler K, Stubbs DJ, Barbiero P, Liò P, et al. Forecasting ultra-early intensive care strain from COVID-19 in England. J R Soc Interface. 2020;17(168):20200356.
32. Arora S, Stout NK, Anderson KM, Galea S. COVID-19 and the importance of resilient health systems. Health Aff. 2020;39(9):1444–52.
33. Eriksson H, Franke U. Health system resilience: what are we talking about? Soc Sci Med. 2021;272:113581.
34. Ivanov D, Dolgui A. A digital supply chain twin for managing the disruption risks and resilience in the era of Industry 4.0. Prod Plan Control. 2021;32(9):775–88.
35. Thomas JC, Kiely LF. Challenges of ethical decision making in public health emergency preparedness. Disaster Med Public Health Prep. 2020;14(1):8–12.
36. Rivers C, Chretien JP, Riley S, Pavlin JA, Woodward A, Brett-Major D, et al. Using “outbreak science” to strengthen the use of models during epidemics. Nat Commun. 2019;10:3102.
37. Ting DSW, Carin L, Dzau V, Wong TY. Digital technology and COVID-19. Nat Med. 2020;26(4):459–61.
38. Lazer D, Baum MA, Benkler Y, Berinsky AJ, Greenhill KM, Menczer F, et al. The science of fake news. Science. 2018;359(6380):1094–6.
39. O’Neill O. Between consenting adults. Philos Public Aff. 1985;14(3):252–77.
40. Floridi L, Cowls J, Beltrametti M, Chatila R, Chazerand P, Dignum V, et al. AI4People—an ethical framework for a good AI society. Minds Mach. 2018;28(4):689–707.
41. Mehrabi N, Morstatter F, Saxena N, Lerman K, Galstyan A. A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. ACM Comput Surv. 2021;54(6):1–35.
42. Goodman B, Flaxman S. European Union regulations on algorithmic decision-making and a “right to explanation”. AI Mag. 2017;38(3):50–7.
43. London AJ. Artificial intelligence and black-box medical decisions. Hastings Cent Rep. 2019;49(1):15–21.
44. World Health Organization. Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health. Geneva: WHO; 2021.
45. OECD. Artificial intelligence in society. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2019.