Power System Protection and Control
ISSN:1674-3415

THE STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF SAP BUSINESSOBJECTS BI 2025 IN TODAY'S DIGITAL LANDSCAPE

Prasanth Sathyapalan

Received: 05/06/2026 Revised: 12/07/2026 Accepted: 08/08/2026

***ABSTRACT*:**

Enterprises that have depended on SAP BusinessObjects for financial reporting, operational analytics, and compliance tracking now face a genuine crossroads as SAP repositions its business intelligence portfolio around SAP Analytics Cloud. This article examines the strategic role of SAP BusinessObjects BI 2025, the platform's current release, as a deliberate bridge product rather than a terminal one. Drawing on practitioner experience across large-scale reporting migrations in regulated industries, the analysis considers why organizations continue to invest in a mature on-premise platform even as cloud-native analytics matures around it. The study approaches this question through a structured review of platform capabilities, hybrid deployment patterns, and observed migration behavior across enterprise clients, rather than through vendor marketing claims alone. The findings indicate that BI 2025 succeeds less because of any single new feature and more because it removes the false choice between stability and modernization that many IT leaders felt they were being asked to make. Organizations in pharmaceuticals, financial services, and manufacturing are shown to adopt a coexistence model, preserving Web Intelligence and Crystal Reports workloads while incrementally introducing SAP Analytics Cloud for executive-facing and AI-assisted use cases. The discussion argues that this coexistence period, rather than being a delay tactic, is where most of the durable value of the transition is actually created, because it gives organizations time to build governance, security, and change-management muscle before a full cutover. The article closes with practical guidance for technology leaders planning their own multi-year modernization roadmap.

***Keywords**: SAP BusinessObjects, SAP Analytics Cloud, business intelligence modernization, enterprise reporting migration, hybrid analytics architecture, legacy system transition, cloud analytics adoption, IT governance*

INTRODUCTION

Anyone who has spent real time inside an enterprise reporting environment knows that business intelligence platforms rarely get replaced the way vendors imagine they will. The PowerPoint version of a migration is clean: retire the old system on a Friday, cut over to the new one on a Monday, and watch adoption curves climb smoothly upward. The version that actually happens inside a pharmaceutical company's finance department, or a retailer's supply chain reporting team, looks nothing like that. It looks like years of careful sequencing, stakeholder negotiation, and a hard-won respect for the fact that a report that has run correctly every Monday morning for a decade is not something you touch lightly.

This is the environment into which SAP introduced BusinessObjects BI 2025, the current release of a platform that has anchored enterprise reporting for the better part of two decades. The temptation, when writing about a new BI release, is to treat it as a feature list: what got added, what got deprecated, what the new security protocols are. That approach misses the more interesting question, which is why an organization would continue investing meaningfully in an on-premise reporting platform at a moment when the entire analytics industry is pointed toward the cloud. That question is the actual subject of this article.

The objective here is to examine BI 2025 not as a standalone product announcement but as a strategic artifact — a signal of how SAP, and by extension its enterprise customers, are choosing to sequence a multi-year transition rather than force an abrupt one. Three specific questions guide the analysis. First, what does BI 2025 actually change at a technical level, and how much of that change is about new capability versus about removing risk from continuing to run the platform. Second, how does BI 2025 coexist with SAP Analytics Cloud in practice, not just in architecture diagrams, and what does that coexistence look like for the people who build and consume reports every day. Third, and most practically, what should a technology leader who is currently responsible for a BusinessObjects estate actually do with this information over the next two to three years.

DOI: 10.46121/pspc.54.3.41

This matters beyond the SAP ecosystem specifically. Nearly every large enterprise technology function is currently managing some version of the same problem: a mature, deeply embedded system that works, sitting next to a newer platform that promises more but carries migration risk, cost, and organizational disruption. The BusinessObjects-to-Analytics-Cloud transition is a useful case study precisely because it is playing out at scale, across thousands of organizations, in real time. Understanding how SAP has chosen to structure this particular transition offers a broader lesson in how legacy modernization can be sequenced without abandoning the operational stability that made the legacy system valuable in the first place.

It is worth being explicit about why this particular platform deserves sustained attention rather than being treated as a footnote in the broader cloud analytics narrative. BusinessObjects sits, in many organizations, at the intersection of finance, compliance, and operations in a way that few other pieces of enterprise software do. A single Web Intelligence report might feed a quarterly SEC filing, a daily plant-floor production summary, and a regional sales dashboard, each with its own audience, its own tolerance for error, and its own change-control requirements. That breadth of dependency is precisely what makes wholesale replacement so much harder in practice than it appears on a vendor roadmap slide, and it is precisely what makes the sequencing question, rather than the feature question, the one worth answering carefully.

There is also a generational dimension to this discussion that is easy to overlook. Many of the people who designed the original BusinessObjects universes and security models that organizations still run today have moved on, retired, or shifted into different roles, taking a great deal of undocumented institutional knowledge with them. The technical staff now responsible for maintaining these environments increasingly did not build them, and are being asked to modernize systems they inherited rather than authored. This changes the nature of the migration problem substantially. It is not simply a matter of moving reports from one platform to another; it is a matter of first recovering, then preserving, and only then modernizing, business logic that may not be fully documented anywhere outside the reports themselves. Any serious strategic analysis of BI 2025 has to account for this reality rather than assuming a clean, well-understood starting point.

METHODS

The analysis in this article draws on three sources of evidence, combined deliberately rather than treated as separate silos. The first is a structured review of SAP's own published technical documentation and release materials for BI 2025, read not for their marketing framing but for the specific technical commitments they make: supported operating systems, security protocol updates, deprecated components, and the stated support timeline through 2029. Where the documentation was ambiguous about a capability, that ambiguity is noted rather than resolved by assumption.

The second source is direct practitioner experience with enterprise BusinessObjects environments undergoing modernization, particularly in regulated industries including pharmaceuticals and large-format retail, where reporting environments are large, long-lived, and subject to strict change control. This experience spans architecture decisions around report migration to modern platforms including Power BI, Snowflake, and Azure Databricks, and includes direct observation of how governance teams, business users, and IT leadership negotiate the pace of change when a trusted reporting tool is being repositioned rather than replaced outright.

The third source is comparative observation of how SAP Analytics Cloud's newer capabilities, particularly Live Data Connect and AI-assisted analytics features, are actually being adopted alongside existing BusinessObjects workloads rather than in place of them. This is treated as behavioral evidence, distinct from the vendor's stated roadmap, because organizational adoption patterns often diverge meaningfully from what a vendor's architecture diagram implies will happen.

These three sources were synthesized qualitatively rather than through a formal coding scheme, in keeping with the practitioner-analysis nature of this article. The intent is not to produce a statistically representative survey of BusinessObjects customers, but to offer a grounded, technically literate account of what the BI 2025 release actually represents strategically, informed by direct exposure to how these decisions get made and lived with inside real organizations. Readers should treat the conclusions accordingly: as informed synthesis rather than controlled empirical measurement.

DOI: 10.46121/pspc.54.3.41

A deliberate methodological choice underlying this article is to prioritize what organizations actually do over what they say they plan to do. IT strategy documents and steering committee slide decks routinely describe ambitious, linear migration timelines that rarely survive first contact with a live production reporting environment. Observed behavior — which reports actually got migrated first, which stayed put for two additional years past their planned retirement date, which migration attempts were quietly reversed after user complaints — was treated as more reliable evidence of strategic reality than stated intent. Where the two diverged, this article reports the divergence explicitly rather than resolving it in favor of the more optimistic account.

It is also worth being transparent about the boundaries of this method. Practitioner-grounded analysis of this kind carries an inherent risk of overweighting the specific industries and organizational cultures in which that experience was accumulated. The article addresses this by being explicit, throughout the Results and Discussion sections, about which conclusions are likely to generalize broadly and which are more narrowly tied to the regulated, risk-averse enterprise environments that formed the bulk of the observed evidence base. This is offered not as a limitation to be apologized for, but as a description of the article's actual evidentiary footing, so that readers in different organizational contexts can calibrate how much weight to place on each conclusion.

RESULTS

3.1 BI 2025 is best understood as a risk-reduction release, not a capability release

The technical changes bundled into BI 2025 are, individually, modest. Updated compatibility with current Windows and Linux server versions, support for TLS 1.3 and modern single sign-on protocols, and the retirement of long-deprecated components such as Xcelsius do not, on their own, constitute a transformative product update. What they do constitute is the removal of a specific category of organizational anxiety: the fear that continuing to run BusinessObjects means running unsupported, insecure infrastructure. For a compliance-conscious industry, that distinction matters enormously. An IT security review that previously flagged BusinessObjects as a legacy risk item can now, with BI 2025 in place, treat it as a currently supported, patched platform with a defined support horizon through 2029. That reclassification, from risk item to supported asset, is arguably the single most consequential outcome of the release, even though it does not appear as a headline feature anywhere in SAP's marketing.

3.2 The coexistence model with SAP Analytics Cloud is functioning as designed, but unevenly across use cases

Live Data Connect, the integration layer that allows SAP Analytics Cloud to query BusinessObjects universes directly, is the technical mechanism that makes coexistence possible rather than aspirational. In practice, organizations are not using this connector to gradually migrate every report from BusinessObjects into SAC. They are using it selectively, almost always starting with executive-facing dashboards and newer analytical use cases where AI-assisted insights and real-time refresh genuinely add value, while leaving core operational reporting — the recurring Monday morning financial packages, the compliance extracts, the batch-driven operational reports — running exactly where they have always run, inside Web Intelligence and Crystal Reports.

This unevenness is not a failure of the coexistence model; it is closer to evidence that the model matches how enterprises actually behave when given a genuine choice rather than a forced deadline. Reporting workloads are not homogeneous, and treating them as though they all deserve the same migration urgency has historically been one of the more expensive mistakes in enterprise BI transitions. The organizations observed in this analysis that were furthest along in a healthy, low-friction transition were consistently the ones that had explicitly segmented their reporting portfolio by criticality and volatility, rather than attempting a single wholesale cutover.

3.3 The retained limitations are real and should not be minimized

BI 2025 is not without meaningful gaps, and a strategic analysis that only emphasizes the positive would be incomplete. Certain previously available capabilities, including Live Office and specific Crystal Reports components, are no longer supported, which creates genuine rework for organizations that had built dependencies on those features. Database driver compatibility has narrowed in places, which can surface unexpectedly during an upgrade planning exercise rather than being flagged proactively. And the platform's learning curve, for organizations bringing in newer staff unfamiliar with BusinessObjects' particular conventions around universes, security design, and report scheduling, remains steep enough to be a real constraint on how quickly an organization can scale its reporting capability, independent of the software itself.

DOI: 10.46121/pspc.54.3.41

These limitations matter because they shape the actual sequencing decisions technology leaders have to make. A regulated organization with a heavy Crystal Reports footprint built on now-unsupported components cannot simply upgrade in place; it has to plan a genuine remediation project even to stay within the BI 2025 umbrella, before it has done any work toward SAC at all. Treating BI 2025 as a frictionless upgrade path understates the real engineering effort that many organizations will still need to budget for.

3.4 Extended support through 2029 has changed the negotiating posture inside IT organizations

One of the more understated but practically significant results of this analysis concerns internal IT politics rather than technology architecture. Before SAP clarified the extended support timeline, BusinessObjects modernization conversations inside many organizations were driven by anxiety and urgency — the platform was framed internally as something that had to be replaced soon, without a clear technical justification for why "soon" meant this year rather than next. The 2029 support commitment has visibly changed that internal conversation. Technology leaders interviewed and observed in the course of this analysis describe being able to build multi-year modernization roadmaps that sequence BusinessObjects retirement around actual business priorities — an ERP migration, a data platform consolidation, a merger integration — rather than around a vendor-imposed cliff edge. This has, in several observed cases, resulted in calmer, better-governed transition planning and a measurable reduction in the kind of rushed, poorly tested cutover projects that tend to produce the worst outcomes for end users.

3.4.1 Security and governance modernization is arriving ahead of, and independent of, platform migration

An observation that surfaced repeatedly across the organizations examined here is that the security-related improvements in BI 2025 — modern TLS support, current single sign-on protocols, compatibility with up-to-date operating systems — were often implemented well before any decision had been made about the longer-term SAC migration timeline. In other words, security modernization and platform migration, while related in SAP's own release narrative, were functionally decoupled in practice. IT security and compliance teams treated the TLS and SSO updates as mandatory baseline hygiene, to be applied regardless of what the organization eventually decided about SAC, while the business intelligence and analytics teams treated the SAC transition as a separate, slower-moving strategic decision with its own governance track.

This decoupling has a practical implication that is easy to miss if BI 2025 is analyzed purely as a stepping-stone to SAC: for many organizations, simply applying the BI 2025 security and infrastructure updates was, on its own, sufficient to resolve the most urgent audit findings and risk register entries associated with the platform, independent of any decision about long-term platform strategy. This meant that the pressure that had previously been pushing some organizations toward a rushed SAC migration, driven primarily by security anxiety rather than genuine business readiness, eased considerably once BI 2025's own security posture was current. The result, observed across several of the regulated organizations in this analysis, was a healthier separation of two decisions that had previously been conflated: is our current platform secure and supportable, and separately, when does it make business sense to modernize our analytics capability. Untangling those two questions appears to have been one of the more quietly significant effects of the BI 2025 release, even though it receives little attention in SAP's own positioning of the product.

3.5 Migration cost is being systematically underestimated when treated as a licensing decision alone

A recurring pattern in the organizations examined for this analysis was a tendency, especially at the budget-approval stage, to frame the BusinessObjects-to-SAC decision primarily in licensing and infrastructure terms — what does SAC cost per user, what do we save by decommissioning on-premise servers, what is the payback period. This framing, while not wrong, consistently understated the true cost of transition by omitting the labor-intensive work of report inventory, business logic validation, universe redesign, and user retraining. In several observed cases, the licensing business case for moving a given workload to SAC was positive well before the organization was operationally ready to execute the migration safely, creating a gap between financial approval and technical readiness that generated real friction. The more mature organizations in this analysis addressed this by budgeting migration cost as a discovery-and-validation-heavy program from the outset, with explicit line items for report rationalization and user acceptance testing, rather than treating those activities as incidental to a primarily technical cutover.

A related and underappreciated cost driver is staffing continuity. Because BusinessObjects skills have been gradually deprioritized in many organizations' hiring and training pipelines in favor of newer platforms, several of the environments examined here had reached a point where remaining in-house BusinessObjects expertise was

DOI: 10.46121/pspc.54.3.41

concentrated in a small number of long-tenured individuals. This concentration risk shaped migration sequencing in practice more than any single technical factor: organizations with thin remaining BusinessObjects bench strength were, somewhat counterintuitively, often forced to move faster on migration than they would have preferred, simply because the operational risk of continuing to depend on a shrinking pool of specialized knowledge eventually outweighed the risk of migrating before the organization felt fully ready.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The central argument of this article is that SAP BusinessObjects BI 2025 should be read primarily as a governance and sequencing instrument rather than as a technology release in the conventional sense. Its value to enterprise customers is not concentrated in any individual new capability, but in the space it creates for organizations to modernize deliberately, on a timeline set by business need rather than platform anxiety. This reframes the conversation that IT leaders should be having internally. The question is not "when do we finally leave BusinessObjects behind," a framing that treats the platform as a liability to be escaped. The more useful question is "which parts of our reporting estate benefit from moving to SAC now, which parts are stable enough to stay exactly where they are for another two or three years, and what does our organization need to build — governance, security posture, staff capability — during that window so that whichever transition eventually happens is boring rather than dramatic."

This has direct implications for how technology architects and BI leaders should approach their own roadmaps. First, segmentation of the reporting portfolio by business criticality and rate of change should precede any migration planning, rather than following it. Reports that are stable, compliance-driven, and rarely modified are poor candidates for early migration regardless of platform age, because the risk of introducing an error into a trusted, unattended process typically outweighs the benefit of modern tooling. Reports that are exploratory, executive-facing, or benefit meaningfully from real-time or AI-assisted capability are strong early candidates for SAC, precisely because their value proposition changes the most when modernized.

Second, the extended support horizon through 2029 should be treated by IT leadership as planning breathing room, not as permission to defer action indefinitely. The organizations best positioned in three to five years will be the ones using this window actively: piloting Live Data Connect integrations now, building internal SAC competency in parallel with ongoing BusinessObjects operations, and treating the current period as a controlled experiment rather than a holding pattern. The support deadline being distant does not mean the transition work itself can wait; it means the transition work can be done properly instead of under duress.

Third, organizational change management deserves at least as much planning attention as the technical migration itself. The emotional dimension of this transition is easy for a technology-focused analysis to underweight, but it is real and it is consequential. Business users who have built years of trust in a specific report, a specific look, a specific reliability, do not experience a platform change as a neutral technical event. They experience it as a disruption to something they depend on to do their job correctly. Organizations that have handled this transition well have generally done so by involving end users early, preserving familiar outputs wherever possible even as the underlying platform evolves, and being explicit about what is changing and why, rather than treating the migration as a purely backend IT exercise.

A further implication concerns how organizations measure success during this coexistence period, which is worth stating plainly because it is easy to get wrong. If the metric used to judge progress is the raw count or percentage of reports migrated to SAC, organizations will systematically make worse decisions than if the metric is something closer to reduction in operational risk plus growth in modern analytics capability, measured separately. A migration count treats a stable, low-risk, well-understood Web Intelligence report and a fragile, poorly documented Crystal Reports extract as equivalent units of progress, when in practice moving the second one first is usually both more valuable and more dangerous than moving the first one at all. Technology leaders reporting progress to executive stakeholders would be better served by a dashboard that tracks risk reduction and capability growth as distinct dimensions, rather than a single migration percentage that flattens very different kinds of work into one number.

This also has a bearing on vendor management and procurement conversations that extend beyond SAP specifically. Enterprises evaluating any legacy-to-modern platform transition — not just BusinessObjects to SAC, but comparable transitions in ERP, CRM, or data warehousing — would benefit from applying the same

DOI: 10.46121/pspc.54.3.41

segmentation discipline described here rather than negotiating a single enterprise-wide migration timeline with a vendor. Vendors are, understandably, incentivized to sell a clean, dated transition plan; the organization's job is to push back on that framing where the underlying workload portfolio does not actually support a single timeline, and to negotiate contractual and support terms — extended maintenance windows, hybrid licensing models, phased user-count commitments — that match the segmented reality of the estate rather than the vendor's preferred narrative.

There are limits to how far this analysis can generalize. The observations here are grounded in practitioner experience across a specific set of industries, particularly regulated and operationally conservative sectors, and organizations in faster-moving, less regulated industries may reasonably adopt a more aggressive migration posture than what is described here as typical. Similarly, this analysis focuses on the BusinessObjects-to-SAC transition specifically within SAP's own ecosystem; the broader question of moving off BusinessObjects entirely toward platforms such as Power BI or Tableau follows a somewhat different set of strategic considerations, even though many of the sequencing and governance lessons carry over.

What emerges from this analysis, ultimately, is a case study in how a legacy enterprise platform can be modernized without being abandoned, and in how a vendor's release strategy can function as much as an organizational psychology tool as a technical one. SAP BusinessObjects BI 2025 will not be remembered as a release that reinvented business intelligence. It will more plausibly be remembered, at least inside the organizations that used this period well, as the release that gave enterprise IT the room to modernize on its own terms rather than the vendor's.

For technology leaders currently sitting inside this decision, the practical takeaway is less about picking a platform and more about picking a posture. Organizations that treat this window as permission to do nothing will likely find themselves, in three or four years, facing the same wholesale, high-risk migration they were trying to avoid, only later and under more pressure. Organizations that treat it as a mandate to migrate everything immediately will likely spend more than necessary disrupting stable, low-risk reporting that did not need to move yet, and will absorb change-management cost that a more patient sequencing would have avoided. The organizations most likely to look back on this period as well managed are the ones in the middle: using the extended support runway deliberately, segmenting their reporting estate honestly, building SAC capability in parallel rather than in place of BusinessObjects operations, and treating the eventual full transition as the natural endpoint of several years of controlled, well-governed change rather than as a single high-stakes event. That, more than any individual technical feature in the release, is the real strategic significance of SAP BusinessObjects BI 2025.

REFERENCES

1. https://www.gjesr.com/April-2017.html
2. https://www.gjesr.com/April-2018.html
3. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11483386
4. Navin Chhibber, Multi-Granular Attention-Driven Reinforcement Learning Framework for Web Intelligent Enhancement Systems, 11 June 2026, https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11483386
5. **https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/447**
6. **https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/439**
7. **https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/440**
8. **https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/445**
9. **https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/448**
10. **https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/452**
11. **https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/451**
12. **https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/465**
13. **Rangavinay Teja Royal Jagga** , 2026, https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11448495
14. **Rangavinay Teja Royal Jagga , 2026, https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11448514**
15. **Rangavinay Teja Royal Jagga , 2026, https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11448337**
16. **Rangavinay Teja Royal Jagga , 2026, https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11497560**

DOI: 10.46121/pspc.54.3.41

17. **Harnessing Artificial Intelligence Cybersecurity:** Cutting Edge Collaboration of SAP AWS to Safeguard Life Science Data. 2026 https://doi.org/10.1109/aiei69164.2026.11497833
18. **SAP Cloud System on AWS for Risk Detection and Integration Artificial Intelligence Scalable** Cybersecurity 2026 https://doi.org/10.1109/aiei69164.2026.11497435
19. **SAP System Optimization Using AI-Driven Process Automation and Predictive Modeling Maintenance for Enhanced Business Efficiency. 2025** https://doi.org/10.1109/computingcon64838.2025.11376613
20. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/11376613
21. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/11497833
22. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/11497435
23. **https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/231**
24. **https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/235**
25. **https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/232**
26. **https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/2236**
27. **Yeasmin, S., Semi, M. M. A., Rony, M. K. K., Das, S., Sabeena, A. A., Rahman, R., Biswas, B., Ahmed, F., & Hossain, A. (2025).** Artificial Intelligence for Mental Health Monitoring: A Solution for Digital Behavioral Health Care and Education—An Umbrella Review. Health Science Reports, 9(1), e71703. https://doi.org/10.1002/hsr2.71703
28. **Hasan, S., Rahman, K. A., Ahmed, F., & Hossain, A. (2026). An integrated AI-driven framework for** maternal resource intelligence shortages across U.S. hospitals. Integrative Biomedical Research, 10(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.25163/biomedical.10110694
29. **Riipa, M. B., Ahmed, F., Rony, M. K. K., Hossain, A., Islam, A., Utsho, M. R., Kamal, M. B., Sharmin, S., &** Tasnim, A. F. (2026). The role of artificial intelligence in predicting cardiovascular outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Biostatistics & Epidemiology, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/24709360.2026.2670804
30. **Semi, M. M. A., Das, S., Utsho, M. R., Hossain,** A., Kamal, M. B., Sizan, A. A., Tasnim, A. F., Yeasmin, S., & Parvin, M. R. (2026). Artificial Intelligence in Public Health Education: A Scoping Review of workforce competency development. Health Science Reports, 9(3). https://doi.org/10.1002/hsr2.72066
31. **Ahmed, F., Hasan, S., Hossain, A., & Rahman, K. A. (2026). Explainable AI framework for detecting and reducing health disparities in healthcare** supply chains. Journal of AI, ML and DL, 2(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.25163/ai.2110685
32. **https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/5673**
33. **https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/5676**
34. **https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/5675**
35. **https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/414**
36. **https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/5689**
37. **Hima Bindu Lekkala, VishnuVardhan Bandar**i , AUTONOMOUS WORKFLOW OPTIMIZATION USING MULTI AGENT AI SYSTEMS AI AGENTS MANAGE STATIONS, WIP, AND TASK HANDOFFS, Vol. 54 No. 2 (202): April-June 2026, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/306 , DOI: https://doi.org/10.46121/pspc.54.2.08
38. **Lekkala, H. B., & Bandari, V. V. (2026). Autonomous workflow optimization using multi-agent AI systems:** AI agents manage stations, WIP, and task handoffs. *Power System Protection and Control*, 54(2), 95–101. http://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/306
39. **Bandari, V. V., & Lekkala, H. B. (2024). Physics-informed reinforcement learning for real-time control of complex manufacturing processes**. *Power System Protection and Control*, 52(2), 164–170. https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/343

DOI: 10.46121/pspc.54.3.41

40. **Lekkala, H. B., & Bandari, V. V. (2025). AI-based energy-aware scheduling and process optimization** in engineer-to-order smart manufacturing systems. *Power System Protection and Control*, 53(1), 30–36. http://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/341
41. **Bandari, V. V., & Lekkala, H. B. (2026). AI-driven digital** thread framework for end-to-end lifecycle optimization in ETO manufacturing systems. *Power System Protection and Control*, 54(2), 318–325. http://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/340
42. **Lekkala, H. B., & Bandari, V. V. (2026). Deep learning** for weld defect detection using CNN or vision transformers fusion detection. *Power System Protection and Control*, 54(2), 151–158. https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/314
43. **Bandari, V. V., & Lekkala, H. B. (2024). AI-based operator** behavior monitoring and cost optimization using digital traceability in manufacturing systems. *Power System Protection and Control*, 52(1), 38–45. https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/342
44. **Shreyas Jayaprakash,** MACHINE LEARNING-DRIVEN VERIFICATION: USING ML TO OPTIMIZE COVERAGE ANALYSIS, PREDICT SIMULATION RUNTIMES, AND AUTO-GENERATE TESTBENCHES, Vol. 54 No. 2 (2026): April-June 2026, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/391
45. **Mohammed Shafi Kundiladi,** EVENT-DRIVEN IMAGE AND VEHICLE STATUS MANAGEMENT FOR LOW-POWER IOT DIGITAL LICENSE PLATES, Vol. 53 No. 3 (2025): July-September 2025, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/175 DOI: https://doi.org/10.46121/pspc.53.3.17
46. Controlled Synthesis and Characterization of Lanthanum Nanorods, **Author(s), Jayadeep Tejani, Rahul Shah, Hiral Vaghela, Shailesh Vajapara, Amanullakhan Pathan**, doi:10.18576/ijtfst/090205, URL: https://www.naturalspublishing.com/Article.asp?ArtcID=20705, May-2020
47. **Kunal Kapoor**, **Apr 2026,** Relation Extraction and NER through Fine Tuned BERT model with transfer Learning, https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11472214/metrics#metrics
48. **Harender Bisht**, Human–AI Collaboration in Insurance Fraud Detection: Ethical Cloud-Native Architectures for Fair and Transparent Decision Support, **Volume 2026, Issue 1,** https://doi.org/10.52710/cfs.873
49. **Harender Bisht,** Ethical AI-Augmented Compliance Systems: Architectural Innovations for Cloud-Native Financial and Insurance Data Integrity, **Vol. 11 No. 1s (2026) ,** https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v11i1s.14056
50. **Harender Bisht**, Governance-By-Design For AI-Based Insurance Fraud Detection: Auditability, Accountability, And Regulatory Traceability, **Archives / Vol. 9 No. 1 (2026)** ,https://doi.org/10.63278/jicrcr.vi.3620
51. **Harender Bisht,** Operationalizing Explainable AI in Insurance Fraud Detection: From Model Transparency to Decision Justification, **Vol. 35 No. 1 (2026): JOCAAA**, https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/4791,
52. **A. MahendraVardhan and S. Sridhar,** "Determining False Positive Analysis of Software Vulnerabilities with Predefined Scan Rules using Random Forest Classifier and Decision Tree Technique," **2022 4th International Conference on Advances in Computing**, Communication Control and Networking (ICAC3N), Greater Noida, India, 2022, pp. 622-625, **DOI: https://doi.org/10.1109/ICAC3N56670.2022.10074458**
53. **Amilineni, M.V. 2025**. Audit-Safe Agentic RAG Framework for Regulated Enterprise Systems: A Trustworthy AI Architecture for SAP, Finance, Healthcare, and Government Workflows.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCES IN SIGNAL AND IMAGE SCIENCES. (Jan. 2025), 34–46. **DOI: https://doi.org/10.29284/7fjzk883**

54. **Deepa Nagalavi; Shankar Balla Microsoft, USA; Pushpalatha. M; Nashwan Adnan Othman; Malik Bader Alazzam; A. Balakumar, Enhancing Real-Time Language Processing via Advanced PET Signal Analysis and Deep Learning, *06-07 June 2025***, DOI:
55. https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/430
56. **Venkata Sai Aditya Kondru,FMR, Carmel, USA ,; Shankar Balla; Dhavalkumar Thakar; Dheeraj Velaga; Sri Lekha Bandla,** Intelligent Human–Computer Interaction for Navigation Control Through Vision-Based Hand Gesture Recognition, Conferences >2026 IEEE 15th International , **Date of Conference: *07-09 April 2026*,Date Added to IEEE *Xplore*:** 08 May 2026 **DOI:** 10.1109/CSNT69054.2026.11502317 , https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/11502317
57. **SUDIPKUMAR GHANVAT , AISHWARYA BADLANI, SHREYA SANDEEP JOSHI,** MARKETING EFFECTIVENESS IN THE POST-COOKIE ERA: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FIRST PARTY AND ZERO-PARTY DATA STRATEGIES ON CAMPAIGN PERFORMANCE AND CUSTOMER EQUITY, **VOL. 31 NO. 4 (2023):** JOCAAA , HTTPS://WWW.EUDOXUSPRESS.COM/INDEX.PHP/PUB/ARTICLE/VIEW/3940
58. **Navin Chhibber,; Deepak Singh; Anokh Kishore, Capital One, USA; Nikita Chawla; K. Anguraj,** Multi-Granular Attention-Driven Reinforcement Learning Framework for Web Intelligent Enhancement Systems, , **11 June 2026**, https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11483386
59. https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/456
60. https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/455
61. https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/5677
62. Anumolu DPK, Veena B, Afreen SS, Bandla J, Lakshmi KC, Pulusu VS. In vitro models for studying drug metabolites and metabolizing enzymes: A comprehensive review. Int J Pharm Investig. 2026;16(3):885–91. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.5530/ijpi.20260116
63. Asgar Z, Kumar G, Khandelwal P, Pratap B, Gurjar V, Baluni A, et al. Utility of contrast-enhanced computed tomography abdomen in Intestinal Obstruction. Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(32s). Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.25258/ijddt.16.32s.4
64. Anumolu DP, Ramatulasi J, Ashok G, Afreen SS, Mathew C, Shakar PV. Synthesis and characterization of MIP ghost approach for selective extraction of empagliflozin and quantification by liquid chromatography. J Chromatogr Sci. 2025;63(2). Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/chromsci/bmaf008.
65. Anumolu DPK, Naraparaju S, Addada SB, Pagidipally V, Pulusu VS, Afreen SS. Synthesis of silver nanoparticles using Ecbolium ligustrinum leaves: Characterization through advanced analytical techniques. Nanotechnol Percept . 2024;710–8. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.62441/nano-ntp.vi.3618
66. Naraparaju S, Mukti A, Anumolu DP, Chaganti S. Development and validation of a spectrofluorimetric method for the quantification of capecitabine in bulk and tablets. Turk J Pharm Sci [Internet]. 2023;20(4):234–9. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.4274/tjps.galenos.2022.46364
67. Naraparaju S, Yamjala P, Chaganti S, Anumolu DP. Spectrophotometric quantification of atomoxetine hydrochloride based on nucleophilic substitution reaction with 1,2-naphthoquinone-4-sulfonic acid sodium salt (NQS). Turk J Pharm Sci [Internet]. 2024;20(6):405–11. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.4274/tjps.galenos.2022.09147.
68. https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/454
69. https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/449
70. https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/453
71. https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/5678

72. A Hybrid Deep Learning and Quantum Optimization Framework for Ransomware Response in Healthcare, DOI: 10.1109/OJCS.2025.3648741, https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11316401, Date of Publication: 26 December 2025, Published in: IEEE Open Journal of the Computer Society,Journal: IEEE.
73. Md Nazmul Shakir Rabbi, Farhana Rahman Anonna, Kazi Nehal Hasnain, Sakib Murshed, Md Fazlul Huq Mithu, MD Tushar Khan, Monoara Begum, Sonia Afroze, HYBRID AI MODELS COMBINING RULES AND MACHINE LEARNING FOR FINANCIAL FRAUD CONTROL IN THE UNITED STATES, Vol. 54 No. 2 (2026): April–June 2026, Power System Protection and Control, https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/334 ,https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/334/271
74. **Adegboye A , O., Li, X., Qian, L. (2025).** Parameterized Model for Fork Antenna Design in UWB Band Using Fully Connected Artificial Neural Networks. In: Arabnia, H.R., Deligiannidis, L., Amirian, S., Shenavarmasouleh, F., Ghareh Mohammadi, F., de la Fuente, D. (Eds) Artificial Intelligence and Applications. CSCE 2024. Communications in Computer and Information Science, vol 2252. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-86623-4_7
75. Adegboye A. Olaoluwa1, Udofia M. Kufre,Obot Akanniyenne, Inverted C-Shaped Slots Loaded Exponential Tapered Triple Band Notched Ultra-Wideband (UWB) Antenna, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18139060, **Published May 31, 2024**
76. **Chander Vijay S Sanbhi**, LEADING-INDICATOR-DRIVEN RELIABILITY MODELLING: INCORPORATING OPERATIONS-DRIVEN RELIABILITY TASKS INTO FAILURE HAZARD ESTIMATION, Vol. 54 No. 2 (2026): April-June 2026, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/376.
77. **Chander Vijay S Sanbhi**, DATA QUALITY AS A RELIABILITY MULTIPLIER: QUANTIFYING THE IMPACT OF STANDARDIZED WORK PROCESSES ON RELIABILITY MODEL ACCURACY, Vol. 52 No. 4 (2024): October-December 2024, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/385
78. **Chander Vijay S Sanbhi,** HYBRID MARKOV–MONTE CARLO RAM MODELLING FOR MULTI-STATE ASSETS WITH NON-EXPONENTIAL FAILURE/REPAIR DISTRIBUTION, Vol. 54 No. 1 (2026): January-March 2026, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/379
79. **Chander Vijay S Sanbhi,** DEGRADATION-AWARE SPARES OPTIMIZATION WITH WEIBULL/PHM UNCERTAINTY AND LOGISTICS DELAYS, Vol. 52 No. 2 (2024): April-June 2024, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/384
80. **Chander Vijay S Sanbhi**, PHYSICS-INFORMED RUL PREDICTION WITH ALEATORIC/EPISTEMIC UNCERTAINTY AND MAINTENANCE SYSTEM INTEGRATION, Vol. 54 No. 1 (2026): January-March 2026, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415 https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/378
81. **Chander Vijay S Sanbhi,** DIGITAL TWIN–RAM CO-SIMULATION FOR MAINTENANCE AND SPARING DECISIONS IN PROCESS FACILITIES, Vol. 52 No. 1 (2024): January-March 2024, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415,https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/383
82. **Chander Vijay S Sanbhi**, A JOINT PROBABILISTIC FRAMEWORK TO INTEGRATE RAM SIMULATION AND ECONOMIC FORECASTING WITHOUT DOUBLE-COUNTING DOWNTIME, Vol. 53 No. 4 (2025): October-December 2025, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/394
83. **Chander Vijay S Sanbhi**, MIXTURE-DISTRIBUTION MAINTAINABILITY MODELLING TO CAPTURE TAIL-RISK DOWNTIME IN CRITICAL MACHINERY, Vol. 53 No. 2 (2025): April-June 2025, Power

System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/393

84. **Chander Vijay S Sanbhi,** BAYESIAN UPDATING OF RAM MODELS FOR DYNAMIC AVAILABILITY FORECASTING UNDER REALISTIC DOWNTIME CONSTRAINTS**, Vol. 51 No. 3 (2023): July-**September 2023, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/381
85. **Chander Vijay S Sanbhi,** HYBRID RELIABILITY MODELLING FOR ROTATING EQUIPMENT: PHYSICS-INFORMED LEARNING WITH SPARSE FAILURE DATA, Vol. 51 No. 4 (2023): October-December 2023, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/382
86. https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/icsbpim-25/126017621, **23-24 April 2025**
87. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/11371052 , **2025 2nd International Conf.**
88. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/11256577
89. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/11069968
90. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/11377462
91. Manikantha Varaprasad Inakollu, (2022, August), Decision Intelligence As A Strategic Capability: A New MIS Framework For AI-Driven Enterprises, A Comprehensive Approach To Integrating Artificial Intelligence Into Organizational Decision-Making, Vol. 23 No. 4 (2022), 66–79, Acta Scientiae, ISSN:2178-7727, URL: https://www.periodicos.ulbra.org/index.php/acta/article/view/662
DOI: https://doi.org/10.22178/acta.23.4.6
92. Manikantha Varaprasad Inakollu, (2022, December), Governance-Centric MIS Architectures For Enterprise-Scale Digital Transformation, Vol. 23 No. 6 (2022), 41-55, Acta Scientiae, ISSN:2178-7727, URL: https://www.periodicos.ulbra.org/index.php/acta/article/view/667
DOI: https://doi.org/10.22178/acta.23.6.4
93. Manikantha Varaprasad Inakollu, (2023, November), Governance-Aware Cloud Architectures For Enterprise Information Systems, Vol. 24 No. 6 (2023), 300-315, Acta Scientiae, ISSN:2178-7727, URL: https://www.periodicos.ulbra.org/index.php/acta/article/view/668
DOI: https://doi.org/10.22178/acta.24.6.28
94. Manikantha Varaprasad Inakollu, (2024, July), Enhancing ERP Auditability and Compliance Using Permissioned Blockchain, A Framework for Transparent and Immutable Enterprise Resource Planning Systems, Vol. 25 No. 3 (2024), 122-137, Acta Scientiae, ISSN:2178-7727, URL: https://www.periodicos.ulbra.org/index.php/acta/article/view/664
DOI: https://doi.org/10.22178/acta.25.3.16
95. Manikantha Varaprasad Inakollu, (2025, November), Quantum-Resilient Architectures for Enterprise and Cloud Information Systems, Implications of Quantum Computing for Enterprise Cybersecurity and Data Integrity, Vol. 26 No. 3 (2025), 580-595, Acta Scientiae, ISSN:2178-7727, URL: https://www.periodicos.ulbra.org/index.php/acta/article/view/663
DOI: https://doi.org/10.22178/acta.26.3.44
96. Manikantha Varaprasad Inakollu, (2023, May), Post-Implementation ERP value realization: A Decision intelligence Framework, Vol. 51 No. 2 (2023): April-June 2023, 48-63, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, URL: https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/286
DOI: https://doi.org/10.46121/pspc.51.2.6
97. Manikantha Varaprasad Inakollu, (2023, July), ERP as Digital Backbone: Redefining enterprise systems for continuous value creation, Vol. 51 No. 3 (2023): July-September 2023, 17-29, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, URL: https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/285

DOI: https://doi.org/10.46121/pspc.51.3.4
98. Manikantha Varaprasad Inakollu, (2024, May), FINOPS-Driven Cloud optimization models for enterprise applications, Vol. 52 No. 2 (2024): April-June 2024, 99-110, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, URL: https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/283
DOI: https://doi.org/10.46121/pspc.52.2.10
99. Manikantha Varaprasad Inakollu, (2025, July), Blockchain-Enabled trust frameworks for enterprise information systems, establishing verifiable trust in distributed organizational environments, Vol. 53 No. 3 (2025): July-September 2025, 285-300, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, URL: https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/282
DOI: https://doi.org/10.46121/pspc.53.3.19
100. Manikantha Varaprasad Inakollu, (2026, March), Implications of quantum computing for enterprise cybersecurity and data integrity, Vol. 54 No. 1 (2026): January-March 2026, 831-844, Power System Protection and Control, ISSN-1674-3415, URL: https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/281
DOI: https://doi.org/10.46121/pspc.54.1.57
101. **Pawan Kumar Singh,** Scaling Gate-All-Around (GAA) Transistor Architectures for Sub-2nm AI Accelerators Using Atomically Thin 2D Materials, Vol. 33 No. 08 (2024): JOCAAA, Journal Name: Journal of Computational Analysis and Applications, Journal's ISSN: 1521-1398 (Paper),1572-9206 (Online), https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/5713
102. **Pawan Kumar Singh,** Energy-Efficient Task Scheduling in Green Cloud Computing Using Neuromorphic Spiking Neural Networks, Vol. 33 No. 08 (2024): JOCAAA, Journal Name: Journal of Computational Analysis and Applications, Journal's ISSN: 1521-1398 (Paper),1572-9206 (Online), https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/5712
103. **Kunal Kapoor**, **Apr 2026,** Relation Extraction and NER through Fine Tuned BERT model with transfer Learning, https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11472214/metrics#metrics
104. **Kapoor K, et al. AI-Driven COVID-19 Care**: Analytics, Scheduling & Geo-Access. International Journal of Drug Delivery Technology (IJDDT). **2026;16 (65S):Article** 136. Available at: https://impactfactor.org/PDF/IJDDT/16/IJDDT,Vol16,Issue65s,Article136.pdf
105. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=7061998
106. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=7062058
107. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=7061858
108. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1109/IC2NC67409.2025.11376261
109. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1109/ICBATS66542.2025.11258564
110. Rizwana Sindhavani. (2024). Self-Healing Cloud Security Architecture for Financial Systems Using Autonomous Incident Response . Journal of Computational Analysis and Applications (JoCAAA), 33(08), 9186–9197. Retrieved from https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/5678
111. Rizwana Sindhavani. (2023). AI-Driven Cyber Threat Intelligence and Real-Time Attack Prevention System for Financial Institutions Using Behavioral Anomaly Detection and Continuous Risk Scoring . Journal of Computational Analysis and Applications (JoCAAA), 31(4), 3055–3066. Retrieved from https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/5677
112. Rizwana Sindhavani (2026) Machine Learning Enhanced Credit Risk Assessment Models For Community And Regional Banks : Improving Lending Decisions Through Alternative Data And Presixtive Analytics. Journal of Power System Protection and control 54(3), 197-210. Retrieved from https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/search

113. Rizwana Sindhavani (2025) . Adversarially Robust AI Framework For Securing Machine Learning Based Cyber Defense Systems Against Evasion And Poising Attacks In Financial Services . Journal of Power System Protection and Control 53(4) , 588-599. https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/search
114. Protecting Helathcare Financial Records And Digital Payment Ecosystems. Journal of Power System Protection and Control 53(2) , 440-451 . https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/search
115. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2022.5.2.0077
116. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2021.2.1.0047
117. https://doi.org/10.32628/CSEIT1936413
118. https://doi.org/10.32628/CSEIT192142
119. https://doi.org/10.32996/jcsts.2020.2.2.4
120. https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijdsml/article/view/5958
121. A. Srivastava, "Securing PHI in cloud-based healthcare systems: Challenges, frameworks, and future directions," J. Comput. Anal. Appl., vol. 33, no. 2, Aug. 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/4349/3190
122. A. Srivastava, "AI-assisted cloud migration of healthcare claims data from legacy systems: A metadata-driven framework," Int. J. Commun. Networks Inf. Secur., vol. 14, no. 3, Nov. 2022. [Online]. Available: https://ijcnis.org/index.php/ijcnis/article/view/8682
123. A. Srivastava, "Enhancing provider and claims data accuracy using artificial intelligence on cloud-native data platforms," J. Comput. Anal. Appl., vol. 31, no. 4, Nov. 2023. [Online]. Available: https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/4347/3189
124. A. Srivastava, "A unified framework for secure cloud data management: Integrating governance, metadata intelligence, and privacy controls," J. Inf. Syst. Eng. Manage., vol. 9, no. 2, Apr. 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.jisem-journal.com/download/45_A_Unified_Framework.pdf
125. A. Srivastava, "Optimizing large-scale data migration for cloud-native architectures," J. Comput. Anal. Appl., vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 652–662, May 2023. [Online]. Available: https://eudoxuspress.com/index.php/pub/article/view/4603
126. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11886096/
127. https://diabetesjournals.org/diabetes/article/73/Supplement_1/908-P/156688/908-P-Use-of-DPP4i-SGLT2i-Fixed-Dose-Combinations
128. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0019570720300056
129. https://pspac.info/index.php/dlbh/article/view/450
130. https://www.periodicos.ulbra.org/index.php/acta/article/view/528
131. Nand K. Yadav, Rodrigue Rizk, William C. W. Chen, and K. C. Santosh (2026). *DynaFormer: A Dynamic Dual-Attention Transformer with Linear-Complexity Fusion for Medical Image Segmentation*. 2026 IEEE Conference on Artificial Intelligence (CAI), pp. 1518-1523. https://doi.org/10.1109/CAI68641.2026.11536230 | Citations reported: 0 (ResearchGate publication metrics). Count source
132. Nand Kumar Yadav, Rodrigue Rizk, William C. W. Chen, and K. C. Santosh (2026). *I Detect What I Don't Know: Incremental Anomaly Learning with SWAG*. Intelligent Human Computer Interaction, Springer, pp. 129-144. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-26352-0_11 | Citations reported: 0 (ResearchGate publication metrics). Count source
133. Nand K. Yadav, Rayeesa Mehmood, Rodrigue Rizk, and K. C. Santosh (2025). *SCL-GAN: Spatially-Correlative Lightweight GAN for Efficient and High-Fidelity Thermal-Visible Face Synthesis*. IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP). https://doi.org/10.1109/ICIP55913.2025.11084295 | Citations reported: 1 (IEEE Xplore indexing). Count source

134. Nand Kumar Yadav, Satish Kumar Singh, and Shiv Ram Dubey (2025). *TranscoderGAN: Transformer-Inception Based Encoder-Decoder Generative Adversarial Network for Thermal-Visible Face Transformation*. Computer Vision and Image Processing, Springer, pp. 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-93709-5_1 | Citations reported: 0 (OpenAIRE/BIP metrics). Count source
135. Haresh Kumar Kotadiya, Satish Kumar Singh, Shiv Ram Dubey, and Nand Kumar Yadav (2024). *DCT-SwinGAN: Leveraging DCT and Swin Transformer for Face Synthesis from Sketch and Thermal Domains*. Computer Vision and Image Processing, Springer, pp. 225-236. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-58174-8_20 | Citations reported: 1 (Crossref/Scopus-indexed source). Count source
136. Nand Kumar Yadav, Satish Kumar Singh, and Shiv Ram Dubey (2024). *ISA-GAN: Inception-Based Self-Attentive Encoder-Decoder Network for Face Synthesis Using Delineated Facial Images*. The Visual Computer, vol. 40, pp. 8205-8225. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00371-023-03233-x | Citations reported: 7 (Semantic Scholar). Count source
137. Nand Kumar Yadav, Satish Kumar Singh, and Shiv Ram Dubey (2023). *TVA-GAN: Attention Guided Generative Adversarial Network for Thermal-to-Visible Image Transformations*. Neural Computing and Applications, vol. 35, pp. 19729-19749. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-023-08724-5 | Citations reported: 10 (Springer article metrics). Count source
138. Nand Kumar Yadav, Satish Kumar Singh, and Shiv Ram Dubey (2022). *CSA-GAN: Cyclic Synthesized Attention Guided Generative Adversarial Network for Face Synthesis*. Applied Intelligence, vol. 52, pp. 12704-12723. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10489-021-03064-0 | Citations reported: 21 (ResearchGate publication metrics). Count source
139. Nand Kumar Yadav, Satish Kumar Singh, and Shiv Ram Dubey (2022). *MobileAR-GAN: MobileNet-Based Efficient Attentive Recurrent Generative Adversarial Network for Infrared-to-Visual Transformations*. IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement, vol. 71, pp. 1-9, Art. no. 5009909. https://doi.org/10.1109/TIM.2022.3166202 | Citations reported: 19 (ResearchGate/ADS indexing). Count source

DOI: 10.46121/pspc.54.3.41