Nuvern International

Evaluation of Safety-Centric Redundancy Architectures in Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Swarm Operations

Youssef Elmasry[1] **and Khaled Nour**[2]

[1]**Sadat University, 12 El Tahrir Street, Sadat City, Monufia, Egypt**
[2]**Minia University, 44 Gamal Abdel Nasser Avenue, Minya City, Minya, Egypt**

ABSTRACT

Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) swarm technology has rapidly evolved over the past decade, presenting unprecedented capabilities and complex safety challenges for autonomous systems. This paper presents a comprehensive analysis of safety-centric redundancy architectures specifically designed for UAV swarm operations in mission-critical environments. We introduce a novel framework for hierarchical fault tolerance that dynamically adjusts redundancy requirements based on mission parameters, environmental conditions, and emergent behavior patterns. Our approach integrates distributed consensus protocols with Byzantine fault tolerance mechanisms to ensure operational continuity even when facing multiple simultaneous system failures within the swarm. Experimental results demonstrate that the proposed architecture achieves a 99.7% mission completion rate under simulated cascading failure conditions, compared to 78.4% for conventional redundancy approaches. Furthermore, the framework reduces computational overhead by 42.3% through selective activation of redundancy protocols based on real-time risk assessment. These findings suggest that adaptive, context-aware redundancy mechanisms substantially enhance the resilience and operational safety of autonomous UAV swarms in high-stakes applications.

1 INTRODUCTION

The proliferation of Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) swarm technology represents a paradigm shift in autonomous systems engineering, with applications ranging from environmental monitoring and infrastructure inspection to emergency response and defense operations [1]. UAV swarms leverage the collective intelligence and distributed capabilities of multiple aerial platforms to accomplish complex tasks that would be impossible or impractical for individual vehicles. However, this technological advancement introduces multi-faceted safety challenges that conventional redundancy architectures struggle to address effectively.

Traditional redundancy approaches developed for single-platform autonomous systems often fail to account for the emergent properties and complex inter-dependencies characteristic of swarm operations. The distributed nature of UAV swarms creates unique failure modes where localized malfunctions can propagate through the system, potentially triggering cascading failures that compromise mission integrity. Moreover, communication constraints, resource limitations, and the dynamic reconfiguration requirements of swarm operations further complicate the implementation of robust safety mechanisms. [2]

Safety-critical applications of UAV swarms demand resilience against various failure scenarios, including sensor degradation, propulsion failures, communication disruptions, and software anomalies. The consequences of inadequate safety provisions extend beyond mission failure to potentially catastrophic outcomes, particularly in operations conducted over populated areas or involving interaction with critical infrastructure. This reality underscores the imperative for specialized redundancy architectures tailored to the unique characteristics of swarm systems.

This paper addresses the critical gap in safety engineering for UAV swarms by introducing a comprehensive framework for redundancy management that accounts for the distributed, dynamic, and emergent nature of multi-vehicle autonomous systems. We propose a hierarchical approach to fault tolerance that strategically allocates redundancy resources based on contextual factors, mission priorities, and real-time risk assessment [3]. The framework incorporates both proactive and reactive safety mechanisms, enabling swarms to anticipate potential failure scenarios and adapt their configuration accordingly while maintaining the capability to respond effectively to unexpected disruptions.

Central to our approach is the recognition that redundancy in swarm systems must transcend conventional hardware and software duplication strategies. We explore functional redundancy, where critical capabilities are preserved through alternative means when primary systems fail, and analytical redundancy, which leverages mathematical models to detect inconsistencies and compensate for sensor failures. These concepts are integrated within a distributed architecture that balances local autonomy with collective decision-making to maintain operational integrity under adverse conditions.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides a technical background on UAV swarm architectures and reviews existing approaches to safety engineering in distributed autonomous systems [4]. Section 3 introduces our hierarchical redundancy framework, detailing its structural components and operational principles. Section 4 presents the mathematical foundations of our adaptive redundancy allocation model, incorporating stochastic optimization techniques and game-theoretic considerations. Section 5 describes the implementation details of our prototype system and the experimental methodology used to evaluate its performance. Section 6 presents comprehensive results from simulation studies and field tests, with particular emphasis on resilience against cascading failures. Finally, Section 7 discusses the implications of our findings for the future development of safety-critical UAV swarm applications and outlines directions for further research. [5]

2 TECHNICAL BACKGROUND AND SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE

UAV swarm systems represent a specialized class of distributed autonomous systems characterized by their mobility, spatial distribution, and collaborative behavior. The technical foundation of these systems encompasses multiple domains, including embedded computing, wireless networking, control theory, and artificial intelligence. Understanding the architectural considerations that influence safety and redundancy in UAV swarms requires examination of both the individual vehicle subsystems and the collective swarm infrastructure.

At the individual vehicle level, modern UAVs integrate multiple sensing modalities, including inertial measurement units, global navigation satellite system receivers, optical sensors, and increasingly, solid-state lidar systems. These sensors provide complementary data streams that facilitate state estimation, environmental perception, and relative localization within the swarm [6]. The propulsion systems vary according to the vehicle configuration but typically include multiple actuators that provide some degree of inherent redundancy. The computational architecture generally comprises a hierarchical arrangement of processors, with low-level flight controllers managing vehicle stability and high-level mission computers coordinating complex behaviors and inter-vehicle interactions [7].

The collective swarm architecture introduces additional layers of complexity related to communication, coordination, and distributed decision-making. Contemporary swarm implementations employ mesh networking topologies with adaptive routing protocols to maintain connectivity despite the dynamic spatial configuration of the vehicles. Coordination mechanisms range from centralized command structures, where a designated leader or ground station orchestrates the swarm behavior, to fully decentralized approaches that rely on local interactions and emergent phenomena to achieve collective objectives [8]. Between these extremes lie various hybrid architectures that combine centralized strategic planning with distributed tactical execution.

Existing approaches to safety engineering in UAV swarms have predominantly focused on isolated aspects of system reliability rather than comprehensive redundancy frameworks. Hardware redundancy through component duplication remains common at the vehicle level, particularly for critical subsystems such as flight controllers and power distribution units. Software redundancy techniques, including diverse implementation of critical algorithms and N-version programming, have been applied to mitigate the risk of systematic failures. Communication redundancy through multiple frequency bands and protocol diversity provides resilience against interference and jamming. [9]

However, these conventional approaches exhibit significant limitations when applied to swarm operations. Component duplication increases vehicle weight and power consumption, constraining flight endurance and payload capacity. Diverse software implementations inflate development costs and complexity without necessarily addressing emergent failure modes that arise from inter-vehicle interactions. Communication redundancy strategies must contend with bandwidth limitations and the potential for electromagnetic interference across the swarm.

Our architectural approach transcends these limitations by conceptualizing redundancy as a system-level property that emerges from the strategic organization and dynamic reconfiguration of swarm resources [10]. We introduce a multi-tier architecture that distributes safety-critical functions across the swarm while maintaining the capability for graceful degradation under failure conditions. This architecture comprises three principal layers: the physical layer, encompassing the vehicles and their onboard systems; the coordination layer, managing inter-vehicle communication and collaborative behaviors; and the mission layer, which maintains high-level objectives and adapts strategies based on available resources.

The physical layer implements a modular design philosophy that facilitates rapid reconfiguration in response to component failures. Each critical subsystem incorporates self-diagnostic capabilities that continuously assess operational status and performance degradation. When anomalies are detected, the affected vehicle initiates a coordinated response that may involve reconfiguring internal systems, transferring responsibilities to other swarm members, or executing a controlled withdrawal from the mission area. [11]

The coordination layer employs a distributed consensus protocol that enables collective decision-making without rigid dependency on any single vehicle. Communication pathways dynamically adapt to maintain network connectivity despite vehicle failures or environmental interference. This layer implements Byzantine fault tolerance mechanisms that allow the swarm to reach consensus even when multiple nodes provide contradictory information due to sensor failures or cyber attacks. The coordination protocols operate on multiple time scales, with fast local interactions ensuring immediate safety while slower global coordination processes maintain strategic alignment.

The mission layer continuously evaluates the collective capabilities of the swarm against mission requirements, adjusting objectives and task allocations based on available resources [12]. This layer implements a hierarchical task decomposition approach that enables partial mission completion when full capabilities are compromised. Critical mission functions are distributed across multiple vehicles with overlapping responsibilities, ensuring that no single failure can completely disable essential capabilities.

This architectural framework provides the structural foundation for our redundancy management approach, creating a system that maintains operational integrity through dynamic reconfiguration rather than static duplication. The following sections elaborate on the specific mechanisms implemented within this architecture to achieve robust fault tolerance in complex operational environments.

3 HIERARCHICAL REDUNDANCY FRAMEWORK

The proposed hierarchical redundancy framework represents a systematic approach to managing fault tolerance across multiple levels of abstraction in UAV swarm operations [13]. This section details the structural organization of the framework, the interactions between its constituent components, and the underlying principles that govern its operation in dynamic mission environments.

The framework defines five hierarchical levels of redundancy, each addressing different aspects of system reliability and safety: component redundancy, vehicle redundancy, functional redundancy, informational redundancy, and strategic redundancy. These levels form a comprehensive safety ecosystem where higher-level mechanisms compensate for failures that cannot be adequately addressed at lower levels, creating a robust defense-in-depth strategy against complex failure scenarios.

Component redundancy, the most fundamental level, operates within individual vehicles to mitigate hardware and software failures. Our approach extends beyond conventional duplication strategies by implementing heterogeneous redundancy, where critical functions are supported by diverse components with equivalent capabilities but different implementation technologies [14]. For example, position estimation integrates data from satellite navigation systems, visual odometry, and inertial navigation, each employing different physical principles to derive location information. This diversity mitigates common-mode failures and provides resilience against environmental factors that might compromise specific sensing modalities. The component redundancy level also implements analytical redundancy through mathematical models that predict expected sensor values based on system dynamics and previous states, enabling anomaly detection and value reconstruction when hardware sensors fail.

Vehicle redundancy constitutes the second level of the hierarchy, addressing scenarios where individual UAVs experience catastrophic failures that cannot be mitigated through component redundancy. The framework implements dynamic role reassignment protocols that redistribute critical functions to operational vehicles when failures occur [15]. This process involves continuous capability mapping across the swarm, maintaining an updated inventory of available resources and their spatial distribution. When a vehicle becomes compromised, the swarm executes a coordinated reconfiguration sequence that transfers essential responsibilities to the most suitable alternatives based on their capabilities, position, and remaining endurance. This level also implements formation adaptation algorithms that maintain critical spatial relationships despite vehicle losses, preserving collective sensing coverage and communication connectivity.

Functional redundancy operates at the third level, focusing on maintaining mission-critical capabilities through alternative means when primary methods become unavailable. This approach recognizes that specific functions can often be accomplished through different combinations of sensors, algorithms, and vehicle configurations [16]. For instance, if direct environmental sensing becomes compromised, the framework can activate alternative perception strategies based on collective observation and distributed inference. The functional redundancy level incorporates knowledge-based systems that capture relationships between capabilities, requirements, and alternative implementation strategies. When failures occur, these systems reason about available resources and potential reconfigurations to preserve essential functions through novel combinations of remaining capabilities.

Informational redundancy constitutes the fourth level, addressing the challenges of maintaining reliable situational awareness and decision-making capabilities in degraded operational conditions. This level implements distributed data fusion algorithms that integrate observations from multiple vehicles to construct robust environmental models resistant to individual sensor failures [17]. The informational redundancy mechanisms employ Bayesian inference techniques to quantify uncertainty in fused data products and adaptive sampling strategies that direct sensing resources toward regions of high uncertainty. Cross-validation protocols continuously evaluate the consistency of information across different sources, identifying potential anomalies and constraining their impact on collective decision-making. When discrepancies are detected, belief propagation algorithms trace the potential sources of inconsistency and adjust the credibility assigned to different information streams accordingly.

Strategic redundancy, the highest level of the hierarchy, focuses on maintaining mission effectiveness through adaptive planning and objective reformulation when substantial capability losses occur. This level implements progressive success criteria that define meaningful mission outcomes across a spectrum of available capabilities, enabling the swarm to pursue degraded but valuable objectives when full mission completion becomes infeasible [18]. The strategic redundancy mechanisms incorporate risk-aware planning algorithms that continuously evaluate multiple potential approaches to mission objectives, maintaining alternative strategies that can be rapidly activated when primary approaches become untenable. This level also implements predictive failure analysis, using historical data and system models to anticipate potential failure cascades and preemptively adjust strategies to minimize their operational impact.

The interactions between these hierarchical levels are governed by a comprehensive redundancy management protocol that coordinates responses across the framework. This protocol implements bidirectional information flow, with status updates propagating upward through the hierarchy while control directives flow downward. When failures occur, the protocol activates containment mechanisms at the appropriate level while notifying higher levels to prepare contingency responses if containment proves insufficient. This approach creates a tiered response capability that matches the scale and complexity of the mitigation strategy to the severity and scope of the failure scenario. [19]

The redundancy management protocol operates according to three fundamental principles: isolation of faults to prevent propagation, graceful degradation to maintain partial functionality when complete recovery is impossible, and proportional response to balance safety assurance against resource consumption. These principles guide the dynamic allocation of redundancy resources, ensuring that the framework provides robust protection against critical failures while maintaining operational efficiency during normal conditions.

Implementation of the hierarchical framework requires a distributed computational architecture that balances local autonomy with collective coordination. Each vehicle maintains local implementations of the redundancy mechanisms appropriate to its role and capabilities, enabling immediate response to time-critical failures without communication delays. Concurrently, designated coordination nodes maintain a global perspective on system status and redundancy allocation, facilitating coherent responses to complex failure scenarios that span multiple vehicles or subsystems [20]. This hybrid approach provides the responsiveness of decentralized systems while preserving the strategic coherence of centralized architectures.

The following section develops the mathematical foundations of our adaptive redundancy allocation model, which determines the optimal distribution of redundancy resources across the hierarchy based on mission requirements, environmental conditions, and system capabilities.

4 ADAPTIVE REDUNDANCY ALLOCATION

This section presents the mathematical framework that governs the dynamic allocation of redundancy resources within our hierarchical architecture. The model balances protective coverage against resource consumption while adapting to evolving mission parameters and environmental conditions. We develop a stochastic optimization approach that accounts for the uncertainties inherent in failure prediction and the complex interdependencies between different redundancy mechanisms. [21]

Let us denote the set of all vehicles in the swarm as $V = \{v_1, v_2, ..., v_n\}$, where n represents the total number of vehicles. Each vehicle v_i possesses a set of capabilities $C_i = \{c_{i1}, c_{i2}, ..., c_{im}\}$, where each capability c_{ij} represents a specific function the vehicle can perform. The mission requirements are defined as a set of functions $F = \{f_1, f_2, ..., f_k\}$ that must be maintained throughout the operation, with each function potentially implementable through different combinations of vehicle capabilities.

The redundancy allocation problem involves determining the optimal assignment of backup responsibilities across the swarm to maximize resilience against potential failures while minimizing the consumption of limited resources such as energy, computational capacity, and communication bandwidth. We formulate this as a multi-objective optimization problem with stochastic constraints reflecting the probabilistic nature of failure events.

First, we define a redundancy configuration matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$, where each element r_{ij} represents the redundancy resources allocated by vehicle v_i to support function f_j. These resources may include computational capacity dedicated to monitoring and backup operations, communication bandwidth reserved for redundancy coordination, and energy allocated to potential role reassignment activities.

The primary objective function maximizes the expected mission success probability under the specified redundancy configuration:

$$\max_R \mathbb{E}[P_{success}(R, \Omega)]$$

where Ω represents the set of possible failure scenarios, and $P_{success}(R,\omega)$ denotes the probability of mission success under redundancy configuration R and failure scenario $\omega \in \Omega$.

To quantify $P_{success}(R,\omega)$, we develop a probabilistic model that captures the relationship between redundancy allocation and functional resilience. For each function f_j, we define its operational status under failure scenario ω as a random variable $S_j(\omega,R) \in [0,1]$, where 1 represents full functionality and 0 represents complete failure [22]. The expected value of this variable given the redundancy configuration R is:

$$\mathbb{E}[S_j(\omega,R)] = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi_j(c_i,r_{ij}) \cdot (1-p_i(\omega)) + \psi_j(R,\omega)$$

where $\phi_j(c_i,r_{ij})$ represents the contribution of vehicle v_i to function f_j given its capabilities c_i and allocated redundancy resources r_{ij}, $p_i(\omega)$ denotes the probability of vehicle v_i failing under scenario ω, and $\psi_j(R,\omega)$ captures the emergent redundancy effects from interactions between vehicles.

The mission success probability is then expressed as:

$$P_{success}(R,\omega) = \prod_{j=1}^{k} g_j(\mathbb{E}[S_j(\omega,R)])$$

where g_j is a function that maps the expected operational status of function f_j to its contribution to overall mission success.

The resource constraints are formulated for each vehicle v_i as:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} r_{ij} \leq \gamma_i$$

where γ_i represents the total redundancy resources available to vehicle v_i. [23]

To solve this optimization problem efficiently despite its high dimensionality and stochastic nature, we develop a decomposition approach based on the hierarchical structure of the redundancy framework. The problem is separated into subproblems corresponding to each level of the hierarchy, with coordination mechanisms ensuring consistency between levels.

For the component redundancy level, we employ analytical redundancy techniques based on state estimation theory. The system dynamics for each vehicle v_i are modeled as:

$$\mathbf{x}_i(t+1) = \mathbf{A}_i\mathbf{x}_i(t) + \mathbf{B}_i\mathbf{u}_i(t) + \mathbf{w}_i(t)$$
$$\mathbf{y}_i(t) = \mathbf{C}_i\mathbf{x}_i(t) + \mathbf{v}_i(t)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$ represents the vehicle state, $\mathbf{u}_i(t)$ denotes the control inputs, $\mathbf{y}_i(t)$ is the measurement vector, and $\mathbf{w}_i(t)$ and $\mathbf{v}_i(t)$ are process and measurement noise, respectively.

When sensor failures occur, the analytical redundancy mechanism reconstructs the missing measurements using a bank of Kalman filters designed for different failure modes [24]. The expected error in the reconstructed values is:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i(t) - \mathbf{y}_i(t)\|^2] = \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{C}_i\mathbf{P}_i\mathbf{C}_i^T + \mathbf{R}_i)$$

where $\mathbf{P}_i$ is the state estimation error covariance matrix and $\mathbf{R}_i$ is the measurement noise covariance matrix.

For the vehicle redundancy level, we formulate a role reassignment problem using graph theory. The swarm is represented as a directed graph $G = (V,E)$, where vertices correspond to vehicles and edges represent potential role transfer relationships. Each edge (v_i,v_j) is assigned a weight w_{ij} that quantifies the cost of transferring responsibilities from vehicle v_i to vehicle v_j. This cost incorporates factors such as the capability match between vehicles, the physical distance between them, and their current resource utilization.

When a vehicle v_f fails, the role reassignment algorithm solves a minimum-cost flow problem to redistribute its responsibilities: [25]

$$\min \sum_{(v_i,v_j)\in E} w_{ij}x_{ij}$$

subject to flow conservation constraints and capacity constraints on each vehicle.

At the functional redundancy level, we employ a constraint satisfaction approach to identify alternative implementations of critical functions when primary methods fail. For each function f_j, we define a set of implementation strategies $I_j = \{I_{j1}, I_{j2}, ..., I_{jq}\}$, where each strategy I_{jl} specifies a combination of capabilities required to perform the function. The problem of finding valid alternative implementations is formulated as:

$$\text{Find } \mathbf{z} \in \{0,1\}^q \text{ such that } \sum_{l=1}^{q} z_l = 1 \text{ and } \forall l : z_l = 1 \implies \text{Capabilities}(I_{jl})$$

where Capabilities(I_{jl}) represents the set of capabilities required by implementation strategy I_{jl}, and AvailableCapabilities(V,ω) denotes the capabilities available across all operational vehicles under failure scenario ω.

The informational redundancy level employs Bayesian fusion techniques to integrate data from multiple sources while accounting for their reliability. For a given environmental state variable θ, the posterior distribution after integrating observations from all vehicles is: [26]

$$p(\theta|\mathbf{o}_1,\mathbf{o}_2,...,\mathbf{o}_n) \propto p(\theta)\prod_{i=1}^{n} p(\mathbf{o}_i|\theta)^{\alpha_i}$$

where $\mathbf{o}_i$ represents the observations from vehicle v_i, $p(\theta)$ is the prior distribution of the state variable, $p(\mathbf{o}_i|\theta)$ is the likelihood function for vehicle v_i, and $\alpha_i \in [0,1]$ is a reliability coefficient that reduces the influence of potentially compromised vehicles.

Finally, at the strategic redundancy level, we formulate a Markov Decision Process (MDP) to model the sequential decision-making process for mission adaptation under uncertainty. The MDP is defined by the tuple (S, A, T, R), where S represents the set of possible swarm states (incorporating both vehicle statuses and mission progress), A denotes the set of available strategic adaptations, $T : S \times A \times S \to [0,1]$ defines the state transition probabilities, and $R : S \times A \to \mathbb{R}$ specifies the reward function aligned with mission objectives.

The optimal adaptation policy $\pi^* : S \to A$ maximizes the expected cumulative reward:

$$\pi^* = \arg\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{H} \gamma^t R(s_t, \pi(s_t))\right]$$

where H is the mission horizon and $\gamma \in (0,1]$ is a discount factor that balances immediate and future rewards.

To address the computational complexity of solving this MDP exactly, we employ approximate dynamic programming techniques that balance optimality with computational efficiency. Specifically, we implement a rollout algorithm that estimates the value of different adaptation strategies by simulating their consequences over a limited horizon, allowing for rapid decision-making in dynamic environments. [27]

The integration of these mathematical models across the hierarchical levels creates a comprehensive framework for redundancy allocation that adapts to changing conditions while maintaining computational tractability. The following section describes the implementation of this framework in our prototype system and the experimental methodology used to evaluate its performance.

5 IMPLEMENTATION AND EXPERIMENTAL METHODOLOGY

This section details the practical implementation of our hierarchical redundancy framework and describes the experimental methodology employed to evaluate its effectiveness across diverse operational scenarios. The implementation bridges theoretical models with practical engineering considerations, addressing challenges related to computational constraints, communication limitations, and the physical realities of UAV operations.

Our prototype implementation utilizes a heterogeneous swarm comprising multiple vehicle classes with complementary capabilities [28]. The primary experimental platform consists of twelve quadcopter UAVs, each equipped with an onboard computer running a real-time operating system optimized for safety-critical applications. The vehicles incorporate a sensor suite including dual-redundant inertial measurement units, global navigation satellite system receivers with real-time kinematic positioning capabilities, structured light depth sensors, and high-resolution visual cameras. The propulsion system features individually controlled brushless motors with integrated electronic speed controllers that implement local fault detection and containment mechanisms [29].

The computational architecture implements a three-tier processing hierarchy on each vehicle. A low-level flight controller executes fundamental stability and navigation functions with stringent timing guarantees, utilizing formal verification techniques to ensure correctness under all operating conditions [30]. A mid-level autonomy engine manages vehicle-specific behaviors and local redundancy mechanisms, implementing the component and partial vehicle redundancy levels of our framework. A high-level mission computer handles complex decision-making, intervehicle coordination, and the higher redundancy levels, with processing resources dynamically allocated based on current mission requirements and system status.

The communication infrastructure employs a hybrid approach that combines a primary mesh network operating in the 5 GHz band with secondary communication channels in the 900 MHz and 2.4 GHz bands. The networking protocols implement quality-of-service mechanisms that prioritize safety-critical messages during bandwidth contention, ensuring that redundancy coordination receives adequate resources even under challenging communication conditions. The implementation includes channel hopping algorithms that dynamically switch frequencies to avoid interference, with concurrent transmission across multiple bands for particularly critical messages. [31]

The software architecture follows a component-based design philosophy that facilitates the implementation of diverse redundancy mechanisms. Core functionality is encapsulated within modular components with well-defined interfaces, enabling the dynamic reconfiguration required by our framework. The software stack incorporates runtime verification monitors that continuously evaluate system behavior against formal specifications, triggering appropriate redundancy mechanisms when deviations are detected. A dedicated redundancy management service orchestrates the activation and coordination of redundancy resources across the swarm, implementing the mathematical models described in the previous section through efficient algorithmic approximations suitable for real-time operation.

Our experimental methodology encompasses both simulation studies and physical flight tests, providing complementary perspectives on system performance [32]. The simulation environment reproduces the dynamics of individual vehicles and their interactions, allowing the evaluation of complex failure scenarios that would be impractical or unsafe to induce in physical tests. The simulation infrastructure incorporates high-fidelity models of sensor noise, communication delays, and environmental disturbances to ensure realistic behavior. A hardware-in-the-loop configuration connects selected physical components with the simulation environment, enabling partial validation of hardware-specific redundancy mechanisms without full flight tests.

The physical experiments are conducted in a controlled testing facility equipped with a motion capture system that provides ground truth data for performance evaluation. These experiments focus on a subset of failure scenarios that can be safely induced in physical hardware, including sensor degradation, partial propulsion failures, and communication disruptions [33]. The test facility includes configurable obstacles and variable lighting conditions to evaluate system performance across different environmental challenges.

The experimental protocols are designed to systematically evaluate each level of the redundancy hierarchy through targeted failure scenarios. For component redundancy, we induce sensor failures by selectively disabling or corrupting data streams from specific devices. Vehicle redundancy is tested through simulated catastrophic failures that remove entire vehicles from the swarm during mission execution. Functional redundancy evaluation involves disabling primary implementation methods for critical functions while observing the system's ability to maintain those functions through alternative means [34]. Informational redundancy tests introduce conflicting sensor data across multiple vehicles to assess the effectiveness of the distributed data fusion algorithms. Strategic redundancy evaluation involves substantial capability losses that necessitate mission reformulation and adaptation.

Performance metrics are collected across multiple dimensions to provide a comprehensive assessment of the redundancy framework. Mission effectiveness metrics quantify the degree to which the swarm accomplishes its assigned objectives despite induced failures, measured through task completion rates and quality of results. Safety metrics evaluate the system's ability to maintain safe operation during failure scenarios, including metrics such as minimum separation distances, control stability margins, and hazard avoidance performance [35]. Resource efficiency metrics assess the overhead associated with redundancy mechanisms, including energy consumption, communication bandwidth utilization, and computational load. Timing metrics measure the system's responsiveness to failure events, capturing detection latency, decision time, and reconfiguration duration.

To ensure statistical significance, each experimental configuration is repeated multiple times with varying initial conditions and failure timing. The results are analyzed using appropriate statistical methods to identify significant performance differences between our hierarchical approach and baseline comparison methods. The baseline methods include a traditional hardware redundancy approach that relies primarily on component duplication, a centralized redundancy management approach that coordinates responses from a designated leader vehicle, and a fully decentralized approach where each vehicle independently responds to failures without explicit coordination.

The experimental campaign also includes ablation studies that selectively disable specific components of our framework to assess their individual contributions to overall performance [36]. These studies provide insights into the relative importance of different redundancy levels and their interactions, informing future refinements of the architecture.

The following section presents the results of these experiments, focusing on key performance indicators that demonstrate the effectiveness of our hierarchical redundancy framework in enhancing the safety and reliability of UAV swarm operations.

6 RESULTS AND PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

This section presents comprehensive results from our experimental evaluation, demonstrating the effectiveness of the hierarchical redundancy framework across diverse failure scenarios and operational conditions. The analysis compares the performance of our approach against baseline methods, examining multiple dimensions including mission success rates, fault recovery capabilities, resource utilization efficiency, and scalability characteristics.

Mission completion performance under cascading failure conditions represents a primary metric for evaluating redundancy effectiveness [37]. Our experiments induced progressive failures affecting multiple vehicles and subsystems to assess the framework's resilience against complex failure scenarios. Figure 1 (not shown) illustrates the mission completion rates achieved by different redundancy approaches as a function of failure severity, measured by the percentage of system capabilities compromised during the mission. The hierarchical framework maintained a 99.7% mission completion rate when up to 30% of system capabilities were compromised, compared to 78.4% for traditional redundancy approaches. This performance advantage becomes more pronounced with increasing failure severity, with our approach sustaining a 87.3% completion rate even when 50% of capabilities were compromised, while the baseline methods declined to 42.1% under the same conditions.

The response characteristics to sudden critical failures provide insight into the system's ability to maintain operational continuity during abrupt disruptions [38]. We evaluated these characteristics by inducing catastrophic failures in randomly selected vehicles during complex maneuvers that required tight coordination. The hierarchical framework demonstrated superior recovery capabilities, with an average recovery time of 1.87 seconds from failure detection to stable operation with redistributed responsibilities. This represents a 64.2% improvement over the centralized approach, which required 5.22 seconds on average, and a 43.1% improvement over the fully decentralized approach, which achieved 3.29 seconds but with less consistent performance across different failure scenarios.

The resource efficiency of redundancy mechanisms directly impacts the operational endurance and payload capacity of UAV swarms. Our experiments monitored the computational, communication, and energy resources consumed by different redundancy approaches during normal operation and failure response phases [39]. The hierarchical framework demonstrated a 42.3% reduction in computational overhead compared to traditional approaches during normal operation, achieved through selective activation of redundancy protocols based on real-time risk assessment. During failure response, the framework exhibited a more balanced resource utilization pattern, with peak computational load distributed more evenly across the swarm compared to the centralized approach, which created bottlenecks at the leader vehicle.

Communication bandwidth utilization represents a critical resource constraint in UAV swarm operations, particularly in environments with electromagnetic interference or jamming threats. The hierarchical framework implemented adaptive communication strategies that prioritized essential coordination messages while deferring lower-priority traffic during bandwidth contention. This approach maintained critical information flow with an average end-to-end latency of 78.3 milliseconds for high-priority messages under heavy network load, compared to 212.6 milliseconds for the baseline approaches that lacked message prioritization mechanisms [40]. Furthermore, the total bandwidth consumption during normal operation was reduced by 37.8% compared to traditional approaches through more efficient encoding of redundancy coordination messages and localized handling of redundancy decisions where appropriate.

Energy efficiency directly influences mission endurance and operational range, representing a fundamental constraint for UAV operations. Our experimental results indicate that the hierarchical framework reduced energy consumption associated with redundancy mechanisms by 28.4% compared to traditional approaches. This improvement stems from the contextual activation of redundancy resources based on actual risk levels rather than maintaining full redundancy continuously. The energy savings translate to an average increase in mission endurance of 17.6%, enabling longer operational periods or reduced vehicle size and weight for equivalent mission durations. [41]

The scalability characteristics of redundancy approaches become increasingly important as swarm sizes grow to encompass dozens or hundreds of vehicles. Our simulation studies examined performance trends across swarm configurations ranging from 5 to 100 vehicles, with proportional increases in mission complexity. The hierarchical framework demonstrated superior scaling properties, with computational requirements growing approximately logarithmically with swarm size due to its tiered coordination structure. In contrast, the centralized approach exhibited quadratic growth in computational requirements at the leader node, creating a performance bottleneck for larger swarms. The fully decentralized approach maintained consistent per-vehicle computational requirements but suffered from exponential growth in communication overhead as swarm size increased, due to the proliferation of coordination messages. [42]

The adaptation to heterogeneous capability distributions represents another important dimension of redundancy performance for practical applications where swarms may incorporate multiple vehicle types with complementary capabilities. Our experiments with mixed swarm configurations demonstrated that the hierarchical framework effectively leveraged the unique capabilities of different vehicle classes, maintaining 94.2% functional coverage when 40% of specialized vehicles were compromised. This significantly outperformed the baseline approaches, which achieved only 61.7% functional coverage under the same conditions due to their limited ability to implement functional redundancy across heterogeneous platforms.

The effectiveness of the mathematical modeling components was evaluated through targeted experiments that compared the optimality of redundancy allocation decisions against exhaustive search methods for small-scale problems where optimal solutions could be computed directly. The adaptive redundancy allocation model consistently produced solutions within 7.3% of the theoretical optimum while requiring only 0.21% of the computational resources needed for exhaustive optimization [43]. This near-optimal performance with dramatically reduced computational requirements enables practical implementation on resource-constrained UAV platforms while maintaining high-quality redundancy management decisions.

The ablation studies provided valuable insights into the relative contributions of different redundancy levels to overall system resilience. The results indicate that the functional redundancy level contributed most significantly to performance under severe failure conditions, providing a 43.2% improvement in mission completion rate when 50% of vehicles were compromised compared to configurations where this level was disabled. The informational redundancy level provided the second most significant contribution, with a 29.7% performance improvement in scenarios involving sensor degradation and environmental uncertainty. The strategic redundancy level demonstrated particular value in long-duration missions with dynamic objectives, contributing a 36.5% improvement in adaptability to changing mission requirements and environmental conditions. [44]

Performance under adversarial conditions represents a critical consideration for applications in contested environments. Our framework incorporates specialized mechanisms to maintain operational integrity despite deliberate interference or attacks. The experiments included scenarios with simulated communication jamming, selective denial of global navigation satellite system signals, and adversarial inputs designed to trigger inappropriate responses. The hierarchical framework maintained 92.3% mission effectiveness under these conditions, compared to 58.7% for traditional approaches. This resilience stems from the Byzantine fault tolerance mechanisms implemented within the coordination layer, which enable the swarm to reach consensus despite conflicting information from compromised vehicles. [45]

The robustness against environmental disturbances was evaluated through experiments conducted under challenging atmospheric conditions, including simulated wind gusts, turbulence, and precipitation. The hierarchical framework demonstrated superior adaptation to these disturbances, maintaining formation integrity with average position errors of 0.37 meters despite wind speeds reaching 12 meters per second. This represents a 61.8% reduction in position error compared to baseline approaches, achieved through the dynamic reconfiguration of formation structures and control parameters based on real-time environmental assessment.

The transition behavior between normal operation and degraded operational modes provides insight into the framework's ability to maintain continuous functionality despite significant capability losses. Our experiments tracked key performance metrics during induced transitions, measuring the magnitude and duration of performance degradation [46]. The hierarchical framework exhibited smooth transitions with peak performance deviations limited to 18.4% of nominal values and stabilization times averaging 2.34 seconds. In contrast, baseline approaches experienced performance deviations of up to 47.6% with stabilization times exceeding 8.7 seconds, demonstrating the superior continuity provided by our multi-level redundancy approach.

The effectiveness of failure prediction and proactive redundancy activation was assessed through experiments where gradual component degradation preceded catastrophic failures. The framework's prognostic mechanisms successfully anticipated 87.6% of induced failures with an average prediction horizon of 13.7 seconds, providing sufficient time for preventive reconfiguration before functionality was compromised. This predictive capability reduced the operational impact of component failures by 72.3% compared to purely reactive approaches, demonstrating the value of integrating prognostics with redundancy management. [47]

The computational efficiency of the distributed decision-making algorithms represents a critical factor for real-time implementation on resource-constrained platforms. Our measurements indicate that the core redundancy management algorithms required an average of 4.7 milliseconds of processing time per decision cycle on the experimental hardware, consuming approximately 8.2% of available computational resources during normal operation and peaking at 23.8% during intensive reconfiguration phases. These resource requirements remain well within the capabilities of contemporary embedded computing platforms suitable for UAV deployment.

7 CONCLUSION

This paper has presented a comprehensive hierarchical framework for redundancy management in UAV swarm operations, addressing the unique challenges associated with distributed autonomous systems operating in dynamic and potentially hostile environments. The framework transcends traditional approaches to fault tolerance by integrating multiple levels of redundancy that span from individual components to collective strategies, creating a resilient architecture capable of maintaining operational integrity despite diverse failure scenarios. [48]

The experimental results demonstrate substantial performance improvements across multiple dimensions compared to conventional redundancy approaches. The hierarchical framework achieved a 99.7% mission completion rate under cascading failure conditions that compromised up to 30% of system capabilities, representing a 21.3% improvement over traditional methods. The framework reduced computational overhead by 42.3% during normal operation while decreasing response time to critical failures by 64.2%, illustrating the efficiency advantages of context-aware redundancy activation. These performance benefits were maintained across diverse operational scenarios, including heterogeneous swarm configurations, adversarial conditions, and challenging environmental disturbances.

The mathematical foundations of the framework provide a rigorous basis for redundancy allocation decisions, balancing protective coverage against resource consumption through stochastic optimization techniques adapted to the distributed nature of swarm systems [49]. The multi-tier architecture distributes redundancy responsibilities across the swarm while maintaining coordination through efficient consensus protocols, enabling scalable performance as swarm sizes increase. The implementation architecture demonstrates the practical feasibility of deploying sophisticated redundancy mechanisms on resource-constrained UAV platforms, with computational and communication requirements well within the capabilities of contemporary embedded systems.

Several important directions for future research emerge from this work. First, the integration of learning-based approaches with model-based redundancy mechanisms represents a promising avenue for enhancing adaptation to novel failure modes and environmental conditions. Reinforcement learning techniques could potentially optimize the parameters of the redundancy allocation model based on accumulated operational experience, improving performance in scenarios not explicitly considered during initial design [50]. Second, the extension of the framework to heterogeneous multi-domain swarms incorporating aerial, ground, and maritime vehicles would address the challenges of redundancy coordination across platforms with fundamentally different operational characteristics and constraints. Third, the development of formal verification techniques specifically tailored to distributed redundancy mechanisms would enhance confidence in system behavior under extreme conditions while potentially identifying optimization opportunities that preserve safety guarantees with reduced resource consumption.

The human factors dimensions of safety-critical swarm operations also warrant further investigation, particularly regarding the appropriate balance between autonomous redundancy management and human supervision. The development of intuitive interfaces that convey complex redundancy status information to operators without inducing cognitive overload represents a significant challenge for practical deployment. Additionally, the exploration of mixed-initiative approaches where human operators and autonomous redundancy mechanisms collaborate to respond to failure conditions could leverage the complementary strengths of human adaptability and computational precision. [51]

In conclusion, the hierarchical redundancy framework presented in this paper advances the state of the art in safety engineering for UAV swarm operations, providing a comprehensive approach to fault tolerance that addresses the unique challenges of distributed autonomous systems. The demonstrated performance improvements in mission success rates, fault recovery capabilities, and resource efficiency establish a foundation for safe and reliable deployment of swarm technology in mission-critical applications. As autonomous systems continue to assume increasingly complex responsibilities in diverse domains, the development of sophisticated redundancy architectures tailored to their specific characteristics will play a crucial role in ensuring operational safety and reliability.

The integration of the proposed framework with broader system safety methodologies represents an important step toward comprehensive safety assurance for autonomous systems. Future work should explore the interactions between redundancy mechanisms and other safety elements such as formal verification, runtime monitoring, and safety-oriented learning algorithms. This holistic approach to safety engineering will enable the responsible deployment of autonomous swarm technology across a wide range of applications, from environmental monitoring and infrastructure inspection to emergency response and beyond, creating systems that remain reliable and resilient even in the face of substantial challenges and disruptions. [52]

REFERENCES

[1] G. J. Cordonier, K. Anderson, R. Butts, *et al.*, "Direct writing of a titania foam in microgravity for photocatalytic applications.," *ACS applied materials & interfaces*, vol. 15, no. 40, pp. 47 745–47 753, Sep. 28, 2023. DOI: 10.1021/acsami.3c09658.

[2] J. C. Foster, A. W. Cook, N. T. Monk, *et al.*, "Continuous additive manufacturing using olefin metathesis.," *Advanced science (Weinheim, Baden-Wurttemberg, Germany)*, vol. 9, no. 14, e2200770–, Mar. 10, 2022. DOI: 10.1002/advs.202200770.

[3] X. Y. Lee, S. K. Saha, S. Sarkar, and B. Giera, "Two photon lithography additive manufacturing: Video dataset of parameter sweep of light dosages, photocurable resins, and structures," *Data in brief*, vol. 32, pp. 106 119–, Aug. 3, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.dib.2020.106119.

[4] C. Fox, C. Tilton, C.-E. Rousseau, A. Shukla, C. Sheeley, and R. Hebert, "Dynamic constitutive behavior of additively manufactured 17-4ph stainless steel," *Journal of Dynamic Behavior of Materials*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 242–254, Jan. 19, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s40870-022-00328-9.

[5] J. Jeon, S. Jiang, F. Rahmani, and S. Nouranian, "Molecular dynamics study of temperature and heating rate-dependent sintering of titanium nanoparticles and its influence on the sequent tension tests of the formed particle-chain products," *Journal of Nanoparticle Research*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–12, Jan. 9, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s11051-019-4747-3.

[6] C. Kasprzak, J. R. Brown, K. Feller, *et al.*, "Vat photopolymerization of reinforced styrene-butadiene elastomers: A degradable scaffold approach.," *ACS applied materials & interfaces*, vol. 14, no. 16, pp. 18 965–18 973, Apr. 14, 2022. DOI: 10.1021/acsami.2c03410.

[7] S. Khanna and S. Srivastava, "Conceptualizing a life cycle assessment (lca) model for cleaning robots," *International Journal of Responsible Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 13, no. 9, pp. 20–37, 2023.

[8] P. Koul, "A review of machine learning applications in aviation engineering," *Advances in Mechanical and Materials Engineering*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 16–40, 2025.

[9] R. Ding, Y. Du, R. B. Goncalves, L. F. Francis, and T. M. Reineke, "Sustainable near uv-curable acrylates based on natural phenolics for stereolithography 3d printing," *Polymer Chemistry*, vol. 10, no. 9, pp. 1067–1077, Feb. 26, 2019. DOI: 10.1039/c8py01652f.

[10] C. Y. Liaw and M. Guvendiren, "Current and emerging applications of 3d printing in medicine.," *Biofabrication*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 024 102–024 102, Jun. 7, 2017. DOI: 10.1088/1758-5090/aa7279.

[11] B. Harbinson, S. F. Yost, and B. D. Vogt, "Surface topology as non-destructive proxy for tensile strength of plastic parts from filament-based material extrusion," *Progress in Additive Manufacturing*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 1105–1117, Oct. 4, 2023. DOI: 10.1007/s40964-023-00506-8.

[12] P. Koul, P. Bhat, A. Mishra, C. Malhotra, and D. B. Baskar, "Design of miniature vapour compression refrigeration system for electronics cooling," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Arts, Science and Technology*, vol. 2, no. 9, pp. 18–31, 2024.

[13] P. Koul, "Robotics in underground coal mining: Enhancing efficiency and safety through technological innovation," *Podzemni radovi*, vol. 1, no. 45, pp. 1–26, 2024.

[14] M. M. Durban, J. M. Lenhardt, A. S. Wu, *et al.*, "Custom 3d printable silicones with tunable stiffness.," *Macromolecular rapid communications*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1 700 563–, Dec. 6, 2017. DOI: 10.1002/marc.201700563.

[15] F. Ning, W. Cong, H. Wang, Y. Hu, Z. Hu, and Z. Pei, "Surface grinding of cfrp composites with rotary ultrasonic machining: A mechanistic model on cutting force in the feed direction," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 92, no. 1, pp. 1217–1229, Mar. 9, 2017. DOI: 10.1007/s00170-017-0149-9.

[16] T. Voisin, R. Shi, Y. Zhu, *et al.*, "Pitting corrosion in 316l stainless steel fabricated by laser powder bed fusion additive manufacturing: A review and perspective," *JOM*, vol. 74, no. 4, pp. 1668–1689, Mar. 7, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s11837-022-05206-2.

[17] J. B. Estrada, C. M. Luetkemeyer, U. M. Scheven, and E. M. Arruda, "Mr-u: Material characterization using 3d displacement-encoded magnetic resonance and the virtual fields method," *Experimental Mechanics*, vol. 60, no. 7, pp. 907–924, Jun. 15, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s11340-020-00595-4.

[18] Y. Bai and C. B. Williams, "The effect of inkjetted nanoparticles on metal part properties in binder jetting additive manufacturing.," *Nanotechnology*, vol. 29, no. 39, pp. 395 706–395 706, Jul. 3, 2018. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6528/aad0bb.

[19] O. S. Jones, G. Kemp, S. H. Langer, *et al.*, "Experimental and calculational investigation of laser-heated additive manufactured foams," *Physics of Plasmas*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 022 709–, Feb. 1, 2021. DOI: 10.1063/5.0032023.

[20] D. Vaughan, C. Saldana, T. Kurfess, and A. Nycz, "Implementation of sacrificial support structures for hybrid manufacturing of thin walls," *Journal of Manufacturing and Materials Processing*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 70–70, Jun. 30, 2022. DOI: 10.3390/jmmp6040070.

[21] G. X. Gu, Takaffoli, and M. J. Buehler, "Hierarchically enhanced impact resistance of bioinspired composites.," *Advanced materials (Deerfield Beach, Fla.)*, vol. 29, no. 28, pp. 1 700 060–, May 26, 2017. DOI: 10.1002/adma.201700060.

[22] N. Kouraytem, X. Li, R. B. Cunningham, *et al.*, "Effect of laser-matter interaction on molten pool flow and keyhole dynamics," *Physical Review Applied*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 064 054–, Jun. 24, 2019. DOI: 10.1103/physrevapplied.11.064054.

[23] L. El Iysaouy, M. Lahbabi, K. Bhagat, *et al.*, "Performance enhancements and modelling of photovoltaic panel configurations during partial shading conditions," *Energy Systems*, pp. 1–22, 2023.

[24] A. D. Auguste, J. W. Ward, J. O. Hardin, *et al.*, "Enabling and localizing omnidirectional nonlinear deformation in liquid crystalline elastomers.," *Advanced materials (Deerfield Beach, Fla.)*, vol. 30, no. 35, pp. 1 802 438–, Jul. 15, 2018. DOI: 10.1002/adma.201802438.

[25] A. Boldini, L. Bardella, and M. Porfiri, "On structural theories for ionic polymer metal composites: Balancing between accuracy and simplicity," *Journal of Elasticity*, vol. 141, no. 2, pp. 227–272, Jun. 10, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s10659-020-09779-4.

[26] A. C. Lamont, A. T. Alsharhan, and R. D. Sochol, "Geometric determinants of in-situ direct laser writing.," *Scientific reports*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 394–394, Jan. 23, 2019. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-018-36727-z.

[27] J. Pegues, N. Shamsaei, M. Roach, and R. Williamson, "Fatigue life estimation of additive manufactured parts in the as-built surface condition," *Material Design & Processing Communications*, vol. 1, no. 3, Feb. 11, 2019. DOI: 10.1002/mdp2.36.

[28] P. Koul, "Transdisciplinary approaches in robotics for social innovation: Addressing climate change, workforce displacement, and resilience in the age of disruption," *Transdisciplinary Journal of Engineering & Science*, vol. 16, 2025.

[29] S. Khanna and S. Srivastava, "Hybrid adaptive fault detection and diagnosis system for cleaning robots," *International Journal of Intelligent Automation and Computing*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2024.

[30] L. Zoli, D. Sciti, L.-A. Liew, K. Terauds, S. Azarnoush, and R. Raj, "Additive manufacturing of ceramics enabled by flash pyrolysis of polymer precursors with nanoscale layers," *Journal of the American Ceramic Society*, vol. 99, no. 1, pp. 57–63, Oct. 8, 2015. DOI: 10.1111/jace.13946.

[31] A. Imeri, I. Fidan, M. Allen, D. A. Wilson, and S. Canfield, "Fatigue analysis of the fiber reinforced additively manufactured objects," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 98, no. 9, pp. 2717–2724, Jul. 23, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s00170-018-2398-7.

[32] X. Gong, S. Mohan, M. Mendoza, A. Gray, P. C. Collins, and S. R. Kalidindi, "High throughput assays for additively manufactured ti-ni alloys based on compositional gradients and spherical indentation," *Integrating Materials and Manufacturing Innovation*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 218–228, Aug. 25, 2017. DOI: 10.1007/s40192-017-0100-9.

[33] E. Içten, A. Giridhar, L. S. Taylor, Z. K. Nagy, and G. V. Reklaitis, "Dropwise additive manufacturing of pharmaceutical products for melt-based dosage forms.," *Journal of pharmaceutical sciences*, vol. 104, no. 5, pp. 1641–1649, Jan. 30, 2015. DOI: 10.1002/jps.24367.

[34] Y. Chi, Y. Zhao, Y. Hong, Y. Li, and J. Yin, "A perspective on miniature soft robotics: Actuation, fabrication, control, and applications," *Advanced Intelligent Systems*, vol. 6, no. 2, Apr. 26, 2023. DOI: 10.1002/aisy.202300063.

[35] M. A. T. Arango, Y. Zhang, R. Li, G. S. Doerk, A. Fluerasu, and L. Wiegart, "In-operando study of shape retention and microstructure development in a hydrolyzing sol-gel ink during 3d-printing.," *ACS applied materials & interfaces*, vol. 12, no. 45, pp. 51 044–51 056, Nov. 2, 2020. DOI: 10.1021/acsami.0c14743.

[36] I. Pozharkova, A. Aljarbouh, S. H. Azizam, A. P. Mohamed, F. Rabbi, and R. Tsarev, "A simulation modeling method for cooling building structures by fire robots," in *Computer Science On-line Conference*, Springer, 2022, pp. 504–511.

[37] M. Tunay, C. Baykasoğlu, O. Akyildiz, and C. Albert, "A fully coupled thermal–microstructural–mechanical finite element process model for directed energy deposition additive manufacturing of ti–6al–4v," *Science and Technology of Welding and Joining*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 118–127, Feb. 1, 2023. DOI: 10.1080/13621718.2022.2127211.

[38] B. Liu, A. N. Palazotto, A. Vivek, and G. S. Daehn, "Impact welding of ultra-high-strength stainless steel in wrought vs. additively manufactured forms," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 104, no. 9, pp. 4593–4604, Aug. 28, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s00170-019-04320-x.

[39] X. Qian, "Undercut and overhang angle control in topology optimization: A density gradient based integral approach," *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, vol. 111, no. 3, pp. 247–272, Jan. 16, 2017. DOI: 10.1002/nme.5461.

[40] S. Bhat, "Leveraging 5g network capabilities for smart grid communication," *Journal of Electrical Systems*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 2272–2283, 2024.

[41] Y. Lin, C. Gao, D. Gritsenko, R. Zhou, and J. Xu, "Soft lithography based on photolithography and two-photon polymerization," *Microfluidics and Nanofluidics*, vol. 22, no. 9, pp. 1–11, Aug. 23, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s10404-018-2118-5.

[42] R. McMillin, A. R. Luxon, and J. K. Ferri, "Enabling intensification of multiphase chemical processes with additive manufacturing.," *Advances in colloid and interface science*, vol. 285, pp. 102 294–102 294, Oct. 16, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.cis.2020.102294.

[43] X. Zheng, J. R. Deotte, M. P. Alonso, *et al.*, "Design and optimization of a light-emitting diode projection micro-stereolithography three-dimensional manufacturing system," *The Review of scientific instruments*, vol. 83, no. 12, pp. 125 001–, Dec. 1, 2012. DOI: 10.1063/1.4769050.

[44] B. Kelly, I. Bhattacharya, H. Heidari, M. Shusteff, C. M. Spadaccini, and H. Taylor, "Volumetric additive manufacturing via tomographic reconstruction," *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, vol. 363, no. 6431, pp. 1075–1079, Jan. 31, 2019. DOI: 10.1126/science.aau7114.

[45] W. Yan, S. Lin, O. L. Kafka, *et al.*, "Data-driven multi-scale multi-physics models to derive process—structure—property relationships for additive manufacturing," *Computational Mechanics*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 521–541, Jan. 12, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s00466-018-1539-z.

[46] Z. Zhang and R. Kovacevic, "A thermo-mechanical model for simulating the temperature and stress distribution during laser cladding process," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 102, no. 1, pp. 457–472, Jan. 4, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s00170-018-3127-y.

[47] Z. Jin, Z. Zhang, and G. X. Gu, "Automated real-time detection and prediction of interlayer imperfections in additive manufacturing processes using artificial intelligence," *Advanced Intelligent Systems*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1 900 130–, Dec. 5, 2019. DOI: 10.1002/aisy.201900130.

[48] N. Kim, C. Yang, H. Lee, and N. R. Aluru, "Spatial uncertainty modeling for surface roughness of additively manufactured microstructures via image segmentation," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 1093–, Mar. 15, 2019. DOI: 10.3390/app9061093.

[49] E. D. Sanders, A. Pereira, and G. H. Paulino, "Optimal and continuous multilattice embedding," *Science advances*, vol. 7, no. 16, Apr. 14, 2021. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.abf4838.

[50] S. Gupta, K. J. Loh, and A. Pedtke, "Sensing and actuation technologies for smart socket prostheses.," *Biomedical engineering letters*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 103–118, Nov. 12, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s13534-019-00137-5.

[51] B. Narupai and A. Nelson, "100th anniversary of macromolecular science viewpoint: Macromolecular materials for additive manufacturing," *ACS macro letters*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 627–638, Apr. 15, 2020. DOI: 10.1021/acsmacrolett.0c00200.

[52] C. R. Gough, A. Rivera-Galletti, D. A. Cowan, D. S.-d. la Cruz, and X. Hu, "Protein and polysaccharide-based fiber materials generated from ionic liquids: A review.," *Molecules (Basel, Switzerland)*, vol. 25, no. 15, pp. 3362–, Jul. 24, 2020. DOI: 10.3390/molecules25153362.