Journal of
Semiconductor Devices and Circuits
https://journals.stmjournals.com/josdc

ISSN: 2455-3379
Volume 13, Issue 1, 2026
January–April
DOI (Journal): 10.37591/JoSDC

Review JoSDC

Predictive Maintenance in Semiconductor Systems: Insights from Machine Intelligence and Data-Driven Methods

Shubhii Shukla*

Abstract

With the fast-paced development of semiconductor technology comes the need to focus on device reliability, or how long devices will function and the likelihood of operational issues. Predicting failures and avoiding downtime through the implementation of timely, actionable, and data-driven maintenance strategies are essential to ensuring that devices function sustainably within predetermined performance levels. The implementation of predictive maintenance using artificial intelligence and machine learning technologies will shift the focus of maintenance and repair tasks from post-repair maintenance to proactive management. In this study, I review the literature on predictive maintenance, focusing on new developments in machine intelligence and how they are incorporated into predictive maintenance frameworks in the semiconductor industry. In addition to learning-based predictive models used in semiconductor manufacturing and operation, I assess and compare predictive maintenance solutions, paying particular attention to important performance metrics, including prediction accuracy, system reliability, and operational and geographic scalability. This assessment also examines recent studies on reliability improvement and predictive maintenance tailored to semiconductor devices, pointing out areas where the field lacks attention and adoption. To provide comprehensive insight into areas that need more research and development, the review is structured around the technological difficulties, data constraints, and implementation restrictions that predictive maintenance systems for semiconductors currently face. I survey research on predictive maintenance, particularly cutting-edge machine intelligence and its applications in the semiconductor sector. I evaluate and benchmark predictive maintenance technologies and learning-based predictive models for semiconductor applications based on accuracy, reliability, and geographic and operational scalability. Lastly, this survey details research on predictive maintenance and reliability enhancement specific to semiconductors, highlighting gaps in the field. It is framed around the challenges and limitations that predictive maintenance for semiconductors currently faces in implementation.

Keywords: Decision making, machine learning applications, predictive maintenance, predictive model, semiconductor failure

***Author for Correspondence**
Shubhii Shukla
E-mail: mailingtomani@gmail.com

Assistant Professor, College of Management, IIMT Group of Colleges, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India

Received Date: December 17, 2025
Accepted Date: February 02, 2026
Published Date: March 20, 2026

Citation: Shubhii Shukla. Predictive Maintenance in Semiconductor Systems: Insights from Machine Intelligence and Data-Driven Methods. Journal of Semiconductor Devices and Circuits. 2026; 13(1): 1–9p.

INTRODUCTION

Smart devices play an important role in modern society. Computers, sensors, and smartphones control the electronics industry. They have excellent conductivity levels between conductors and insulators, making them essential in the electronics industry. Semiconductor failures occur when these materials or devices malfunction, leading to failures in electronic systems [1]. Identifying and indicating these failures is critical for maintaining the consistency and efficiency of the device and allowing timely maintenance and repairs. Using machine learning and predictive modeling, specialists can create advanced systems to predict and prevent semiconductor failures, thereby improving device performance and durability across different applications.

Machine learning (ML) has become an increasingly integral part of the semiconductor industry, playing a crucial role in predictive maintenance—proactively identifying potential issues and taking preventive actions to avoid equipment failures. The integration of ML techniques with the abundance of sensor data generated by modern semiconductor manufacturing equipment allows for the development of sophisticated predictive maintenance strategies [2].

Predictive maintenance approaches leverage ML, which can provide noteworthy benefits to semiconductor fabs, including reduced downtime, increased equipment lifetime, and optimized maintenance schedules [3]. By analyzing past equipment performance data and environmental variables, ML models can identify failure signatures and provide accurate predictions of impending equipment failures [4].

Advanced techniques, such as ensemble learning, where multiple ML models are combined to enhance predictive accuracy, have shown promising results in the context of semiconductor predictive maintenance [2]. Furthermore, the adoption of deep neural networks, which represent a powerful class of ML algorithms, has enabled the development of holistic predictive maintenance strategies for wind turbines. These strategies can effectively leverage the large amount of sensor data generated in semiconductor manufacturing environments [3].

The semiconductor industry's embrace of machine-learning-based predictive maintenance is driven by the need to optimize asset utilization, reduce maintenance costs, and minimize production disruption [5]. By proactively identifying issues and taking corrective actions, semiconductor manufacturers can improve overall equipment effectiveness and maintain a competitive edge in the rapidly evolving microelectronics landscape [2, 3].

Monitoring device performance data using ML techniques can benefit semiconductor companies in predicting maintenance requirements more accurately and leading to cost savings, reduced downtime, and increased productivity. Integrating cost-sensitive learning approaches improves model selection based on the economic costs associated with maintenance activities. This can further enhance the effectiveness of predictive maintenance strategies in the semiconductor industry.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: the research questions section presents the objectives of this review paper. The research methodology section presents a systematic procedure to combine a literature review on predictive maintenance using machine learning. The results section provides a basic outline of the review but is illustrated in more detail. It covers the common machine learning algorithms that are widely used in the predictive maintenance process as well as the diagnostic categories where they have already been proven to be useful in one way or the other. The background literature section reviews previous research in the last decade found in the research-based literature on machine learning in predictive maintenance. Numerous other studies have investigated the applicability of different ML algorithms to the preventive maintenance of equipment, which includes minimizing time wasted and preventing the most common kinds of failures. The discussion section explains the predictive maintenance process and the challenges it faces. It describes how a predictive maintenance model based on ML can be used to detect equipment failures before they occur. Timely maintenance actions are then planned almost immediately. The conclusion and future work section concludes all the research, listing the many advantages of predictive maintenance, which include less downtime, lower maintenance costs, and higher operational efficiency. However, it also highlights the challenges and limitations of future research.

Research Questions

This article aims to synthesize existing research on semiconductor failure prediction maintenance, with a focus on the following research questions:

1. What are the state-of-the-art machine intelligence techniques currently used for predictive maintenance in the semiconductor industry?
2. How do various predictive models and ML techniques compare in terms of accuracy, reliability, and scalability for semiconductor maintenance applications?
3. What are the challenges, limitations, and barriers to implementing machine intelligence for predictive maintenance in the semiconductor industry?
4. What future research directions and potential improvements can enhance predictive maintenance practices in the semiconductor industry?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This review adopts a systematic approach to coherently articulate the existing research on predictive maintenance using ML. The strategy is to carry out exhaustive literature searches in academic databases, such as Google Scholar, IEEE, ResearchGate, Science Direct, and Springer, and then to evaluate relevant studies based on the pre-defined keyword terms which include "Machine Learning", and "Semiconductor Failure", "Machine Learning", "Predictive Maintenance", "Predictive Maintenance", "Semiconductor Failure", "Machine Learning Application", "Predictive Maintenance" and to meticulously assess each study to ascertain key findings. This method also involves categorizing the papers according to the ML algorithms used, industries where predictive maintenance was applied, and results achieved.

LITERATURE BACKGROUND

A predictive model for semiconductor failures that focuses on improving predictive maintenance in the context of Industry 4.0. The authors used the SECOM dataset to develop their model [1]. They compared four predictive models based on different algorithms: Naïve Bayes, C4.5 decision tree, multilayer perceptron, and support vector machine. By using different data pre-processing phases, the model achieved a high accuracy rate of 95%. This showcases the potential of ML in predicting semiconductor failures and improving maintenance practices in the semiconductor industry [6]. This study emphasizes the importance of selecting a classifier with detailed evaluation criteria. It is necessary to analyze an ML classifier using a non-traditional evaluation method, which includes precision and recall other than accuracy within the context of wafer defect detection to avoid false negatives and to ensure production yield. Logistic Regression performed the best, providing consistent and reliable classification. In contrast, SVM and k-NN had lower accuracy and greater variability in precision-recall, with SVM showing decreased classification reliability from training to testing. Ten-fold cross-validation was used to avoid overfitting and validate the classifier. To better represent the image data, InceptionV3 transfer learning was used [7]. An ML procedure was proposed that can predict the failure of Smart Manufacturing and focuses specifically on cost-oriented model selection. To broaden the methodologies, the proposed process comprises model selection based on a cost model. The main point is to collect, preprocess, train, evaluate, and select the data model that uses the ML model [8]. This special case is inherent in that the cost of maintenance is the main concern in choosing models. Specifically, the tool used to compare the condition of low costs is the cost matrix mentioned in the maintenance costs. For example, you can see a suitable situation when the methodology is applied, which is mainly a selection of the proper ML model depending on the cost factors and not on the performance. Here, the research will provide a useful addition to predictive maintenance, and novel areas of application will be built, suggesting further improvements in the ML-based process [9]. A predictive maintenance framework for semiconductor lasers using ML techniques to enhance their reliability in optical communication systems. The framework comprises three stages: real-time performance degradation prediction, degradation detection, and remaining useful life (RUL) prediction. It employs attention-based gated recurrent unit (GRU) and convolutional autoencoder models for performance degradation prediction and anomaly detection, as shown in Table 1. The proposed approach demonstrates high prediction accuracy, anomaly detection rate, and RUL estimation capability compared with existing models. Experimental validation using accelerated aging tests confirmed the effectiveness of the framework in predicting laser performance and RUL. Additionally, the study compared the proposed model with other ML methods, showing superior prediction performance and RUL estimation accuracy [10]. presented a novel hybrid deep learning approach for the predictive maintenance of industrial machinery, focusing on fault detection in wind turbine gearboxes. This approach combines convolutional neural networks (CNNs) for spatial feature extraction with long short-term memory (LSTM) networks to capture temporal patterns in multivariate sensor data. The model was evaluated using the AI4I 2020 Predictive Maintenance Dataset, achieving an impressive 97.9% accuracy in fault classification after 10 epochs of training. This study highlights the model's ability to proactively identify potential gearbox failures, leading to timely maintenance scheduling and reduced operational expenses. Future research directions include exploring transfer learning techniques and integrating domain knowledge to enhance prediction accuracy and providing insights into fault mechanisms [11]. introduces a novel predictive maintenance (PdM) methodology that utilizes ML for a cutting machine in an industrial setting. Data from sensors, machine PLCs, and communication protocols are analyzed using a random forest approach on Azure Machine Learning Studio, on a dataset of 530,731 data readings from 15 machine features. Emphasizing the importance of predictive maintenance in Industry 4.0 for reducing downtime and costs, the research explores cloud architecture, ML applications to real machine data, and successful prediction of the main spindle rotor state. Furthermore, the study investigates data analysis techniques and ML methods for PdM and presents experimental findings from a woodworking industry case study, demonstrating the system's efficacy in predictive maintenance by analyzing drive and vibration data to assess spindle health [12]. The study uses various ML techniques: logistic regression, random forest classifier, support vector machine, decision tree classifier, extreme gradient boost, and neural networks, to improve the predictive maintenance of the semiconductor manufacturing process. It is shown that the ML techniques discussed were compressing the training time and enhancing defect prediction, which is expected to enhance the productivity of the semiconductor manufacturing process in the future and reduce equipment failures [13]. Researchers have shown that proactive maintenance uses ML methods, like support vector machines and Bayesian Networks, to predict equipment defects, and its benefits include a reduction of 20% in unplanned downtime and an increase in maintenance scheduling efficiency. In addition, there are concrete financial gains with a 15% reduction in maintenance costs, ultimately improving overall equipment effectiveness (OEE) and operational productivity in manufacturing environments [14]. Employing ML to predict faults in integrated circuits, mainly finding the defect type of bridge faults in Static Random-Access Memory (SRAM) cells etc., research papers have tried some different techniques, such as random forests and t-distributed stochastic neighbor embedding, etc. [15]. using deep learning on sensor data in predictive maintenance, we were able to enhance the prediction accuracy from 93.34% which was achieved using LSTM, to 97.48%, by combining two advanced deep learning architectures of CNN and LSTM in maintenance use cases, it foreseeably predicts the equipment failure and then suggests a maintenance action item to be taken [16].

RESULTS

Various research reports are available in the field of predictive maintenance that apply ML to enhance fault prediction accuracy and efficiency in various domains [15]. A significant report describes a hybrid model designed by the team to combine CNN and LSTM networks. The CNN-LSTM model was developed and yielded an average F1-score of 97.48%, which was significantly higher compared to the LSTM model (93.34% F1-score) and the GBDT (94.59% F1-score), revealing the efficacy of the proposed hybrid model and its superior fault diagnosis and prediction performance [16]. In the field of semiconductor manufacturing, an improved ensemble learning algorithm was proposed in this paper with an accuracy of 0.974 and recall rate of 0.957, which outperformed the boosted decision tree (accuracy 0.966, recall 0.945), decision jungle (accuracy 0.941, recall 0.925), and decision tree (accuracy 0.952, recall 0.928), respectively. In addition, for industrial blister packing machine processes, the ensemble learning algorithm proposed in this paper, with an accuracy of 0.992 and recall

Table 1. Review summary.

Authors	Algorithms	Performance	Limitations	Data
[1]	NB (Naive Bayes),C4.5 (C4.5 Decision Tree Algorithm), MLP (Multilayer Perceptron), SVM (Support Vector Machine)	MLP most efficient model, achieving an accuracy of 91.95% in predicting equipment failures	Data quality issues, implementation complexity, lack of expertise, model generalization challenges, and reliance on historical data availability	SECOM dataset
[5]	LSTM	Shown to reduce unplanned failures and maintenance costs	Data Connectivity, Algorithm Development, Cost of Implementation	Building automation system (BAS), computerized maintenance management system (CMMS), vibration sensors
[10]	CNN, LSTM	CNN-LSTM model achieved accuracy of 97.9% in fault classification	CNN-LSTM architecture could enhance prediction accuracy and provide deeper insights into fault mechanisms, which was not fully explored in this research	AI4I 2020 Predictive Maintenance dataset
[12]	LR, RF, SVM, DT, GBM, NN	Random forest classifier achieved the highest accuracy of over 93.62%, demonstrating effectiveness in predicting wafer failure and enhancing predictive maintenance	Necessity to improve manufacturing techniques and productivity to sustain competitive advantages in the semiconductor sector	SECOM dataset
[15]	CNN and LSTM	Demonstrated superior predictive accuracy, achieving an average F-Score of 97.48%, compared to 93.34% for the regular LSTM	Need large datasets	Microsoft's GitHub repository, consisting of historical sensor data and machine status from 100 machines over a year
[17]	RF, SVM, MLP	Random forest excelled in predicting failures, especially no failure and heat dissipation	SVM and MLP performed well in some areas but struggled with overstrain, random, and tool-wear failures	UC Irvine Machine Learning Repository, consisting of 10,000 records
[18]	ANN, SVM, DT, RL, and LR	90% accuracy and reduced downtime	Data quality, algorithm selection, and data integration	Bosch Data, NASA Turbofan Engine Dataset, and CMAPSS
[19]	CNN, RNN, MLP	CNN algorithm outperformed the other models	Absence of preset RUL labels in the dataset	Sensory data from the Vega shrink-wrapper
[20]	SVM, k-NN	Classification accuracy for the MC PdM (Machine Condition Predictive Maintenance modules) modules was reported to be very high, with values around 97% to 98% across different configurations of the classifiers	Unbalanced datasets	Process and logistic variables collected during production
[21]	SVM, k-NN, DT	The k-NN algorithm achieved a mean absolute error of just 0.75% in the solar inverter profile. In the driving profile, the lowest mean absolute error recorded was 5% with k-NN	Accuracy of predictions is influenced by the quality of sensor data	Sensor Data
[22]	XGBoost, DRF, GBM	GBM model was selected as the optimal classifier due to its highest expected accuracy, up to 98.9%	The authors noted that future work should focus on generalizing the proposed system to other components or types of industrial machines, indicating that the current model may not be universally applicable	The data was collected from Standard Output log files of woodworking machines, specifically from 14 Rover machines

rate of 0.997, is superior to the boosted decision tree (accuracy 0.991 and recall 0.993) [15]. Feature selection is a key factor in predicting the occurrence of machine failures. In a recent study, researchers demonstrated the high effectiveness of random forest (RF) across all types of failures, except for overstrain failure (precision 1.00, recall 0.05). The support vector machine (SVM) and multilayer perceptron (MLP) performed well with no failure and power failure, but struggled with overstrain, random, and tool-wear failures [8]. Predictive maintenance in building facilities has recently acknowledged the potential of ML methods, such as LSTM, for failure prediction, while also emphasizing the challenges related to false positives and undetected failures that need to be addressed to enhance system performance. However, the model that has shown high capability in energy consumption prediction, for example in the context of minimum-energy virtual machine placement, is XGBoost, with the best average R^2 score of 96.5%, RMSE of 11.7 W, and MAPE of 2.8% [12]. In semiconductor manufacturing, the RF classifier has the highest accuracy at 93.62%, outperforming logistic regression, SVM, decision tree, XGBoost, and neural networks [10]. A recent novel hybrid approach for predictive maintenance in the manufacturing of semiconductors, ultrasound, and image processing involves using a hybrid deep learning approach using Convolutional LSTM networks. This model achieved 97.9% accuracy in fault classification, outperforming an LSTM network alone (which had a 95% accuracy for anomaly detection), and the stacked hybrid model of LSTM and deep autoencoders, which were tested on a hot-rolling process dataset and managed to obtain 99% accuracy [21]. Real-time health monitoring of Insulated-Gate Bipolar Transistor (IGBT) has been studied, and it was found that k-nearest neighbors (k-NN) had the best performance overall, especially in the solar inverter dataset. SVM was excellent at predictability at a high level of accuracy but took more execution time, and decision tree algorithms were effective in handling missing attributes in the dataset and could use a nonlinear relationship [22]. In the Industry 4.0 sense, the study of the SOPHIA architecture used IoT (Internet of Things) and ML (Machine Learning) for implementation in predictive maintenance and found that the gradient boosting machine (GBM) model showed the best performance with 98.2% accuracy, 98.6% recall, and 98.3% precision. Additionally, the efficient machine learning-assisted fault analysis method was implemented for the RF classifier and reported approximately an accuracy of 99.5% in defect classification and was effective in identifying defective components of semiconductor circuits [11]. In another study, the efficacy of an RF classifier was re-evaluated for wafer defects and displayed an overall accuracy of 0.95 and good precision and recall metrics. After evaluating the classification of silicon wafer defects, the logistic regression method achieved the best overall classification accuracy during the testing phase (88.0%). After the training phase, k-nearest neighbors (k-NN) showed the lowest accuracy, with accuracy rates of 72.2% and 74.0% in the training and testing phases, respectively [1]. Semiconductor failures were predicted using machine learning, and the highest accuracy was achieved by MLP at 91.95%, compared to SVM, Naïve Bayes, and C4.5 decision tree models in the effective accuracy score. A study of the cost-oriented model for failure prediction found that decision tree (DT) and RF models had high accuracy in failure prediction in a cost-oriented model selection study and were working effectively in testing with different components.

DISCUSSION

The analysis highlights the advantages of hybrid and ensemble learning approaches over traditional ML methods for predictive maintenance. Among them, the CNN-LSTM hybrid model exhibited significantly better predictive accuracy than the other approaches, demonstrating the potential of combining spatial and temporal feature extraction capabilities. Ensemble learning is also effective, especially in complex manufacturing applications, where a bagging or boosting strategy is useful. Both the RF and XGBoost algorithms exhibit high overall performance across various applications, which suggests their robust yet adaptive nature across different datasets and problem domains. However, a few of the models, like SVM and MLP, show drawbacks in managing particular types of failure modes, which highlights the importance of using the most suitable algorithm based on the needs of a given application.

Patterns and Trends

Several patterns and trends emerge from the review:

1. *Hybrid and ensemble models:* These models feature better performance than single models, demonstrating the benefit of integrating various algorithms to maximize their strengths.
2. *High accuracy and recall:* Computational models such as CNN-LSTM and GBM indicate strong performance in predictive maintenance tasks by yielding high accuracy and recall.
3. *Application-specific performance:* The different performances of models in different application areas highlight the necessity of specifying the approach according to various datasets and industry requirements.
4. *Issues with specific failure modes:* Considering failure modes such as overstrain and random failures, SVM and MLP models demonstrate challenges in development and application.

Research Gaps and Limitations

Despite the promising results achieved so far by these algorithms, several gaps and limitations need to be addressed. Firstly, it is evident that many models, especially in the context of building facilities, have difficulty in managing false positives as well as false negatives (undetected) failures, so there is still work to be done in this space. Second, the performance of both the SVM and MLP algorithms is poor when detecting overstrain and random failures. This suggests that for these types of failures, which are critical in diagnosis, model tuning, and feature selection, improvements are urgently needed. Lastly, hybrid and ensemble models appear to perform well in particular scenarios, but testing the generalization of these approaches in diverse applications is still under investigation.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This review outlines the substantial progress in predictive maintenance using hybrid and ensemble learning models. The CNN-LSTM hybrid model and ensemble learning algorithms demonstrated excellent performance and potential for fault diagnosis and prediction in various industries. However, challenges remain, such as false positives, undetected failures, and the recognition of specific failure types. Future research should identify potential future research directions to bridge the gap in research and improve upon the limitations identified in this literature review, including the following:

1. *Improving false positive rates:* Techniques should be developed to reduce false positives and improve the detection of rare failure types.
2. *Enhanced feature selection:* Investigating advanced feature selection techniques to improve model performance in detecting challenging types of failures.
3. *Model generalization:* Investigating the generalization of hybrid and ensemble models across different industries and applications.
4. *Integration with IoT and real-time data:* Improving the integration of the predictive maintenance model with IoT architecture and real-time data to increase the accuracy and timeliness of the predictions.

REFERENCES

1. Mourabit YE, El Y, Zougagh H, Wadiai Y. Predictive system of semiconductor failures based on machine learning approach. Int J Adv Comput Sci Appl. 2020;11(12):199-203. doi:10.14569/IJACSA.2020.0111225.
2. Mujib A, Djatna T. Ensemble learning for predictive maintenance on wafer stick machine using IoT sensor data. 2020 International Conference on Computer Science and Its Application in Agriculture (ICOSICA), Bogor, Indonesia. 2020. p. 1-5. doi:10.1109/ICOSICA49951.2020.9243180.
3. Butte S, Prashanth AR, Patil S. Machine learning based predictive maintenance strategy: A super learning approach with deep neural networks. 2018 IEEE Workshop on Microelectronics and Electron Devices (WMED), Boise, ID, USA. 2018. p. 1-5. doi:10.1109/WMED.2018.8360836.

4. Cline B, Niculescu RS, Huffman D, Deckel B. Predictive maintenance applications for machine learning. 2017 Annual Reliability and Maintainability Symposium (RAMS), Orlando, FL, USA. 2017. p. 1-7. doi:10.1109/RAM.2017.7889679.
5. Bouabdallaoui Y, Lafhaj Z, Yim P, Ducoulombier L, Bennadji B. Predictive maintenance in building facilities: A machine learning-based approach. Sensors. 2021;21(4):1044. doi:10.3390/s21041044.
6. Mat Jizat JA, Majeed AP, Nasir AF, Taha Z, Yuen E. Evaluation of the machine learning classifier in wafer defects classification. ICT Express. 2021;7(4):535-539. doi:10.1016/j.icte.2021.04.007.
7. Tortora AMR, Veneroso CR, Di Pasquale VD, Riemma S, Iannone R. Machine learning for failure prediction: A cost-oriented model selection. Procedia Comput Sci. 2024;232:3195-3205. doi:10.1016/j.procs.2024.02.135.
8. Curran K, King R. Predictive maintenance for vibration-related failures in the semi-conductor industry. J Comput Eng Inf Technol. 2019;8(1):1000215. doi:10.4172/2324-9307.1000215.
9. Abdelli K, Grieser H, Pachnicke S. A machine learning-based framework for predictive maintenance of semiconductor laser for optical communication. J Lightwave Technol. 2022;40(14):4698-4708. doi:10.1109/JLT.2022.3163579.
10. Stow MT. Hybrid deep learning approach for predictive maintenance of industrial machinery using convolutional LSTM networks. Int J Comput Sci Eng. 2024;12(4):1-11. doi:10.26438/ijcse/v12i4.111.
11. Paolanti M, Romeo L, Felicetti A, Mancini A, Frontoni E, Loncarski J. Machine learning approach for predictive maintenance in Industry 4.0. 2018 14th IEEE/ASME International Conference on Mechatronic and Embedded Systems and Applications (MESA), Oulu, Finland. 2018. p. 1-6. doi:10.1109/MESA.2018.8449150.
12. Pradeep D, Vardhan BV, Raiak S, Muniraj I, Elumalai K, Chinnadurai S. Optimal predictive maintenance technique for manufacturing semiconductors using machine learning. 2023 3rd International Conference on Intelligent Communication and Computational Techniques (ICCT), Jaipur, India. 2023. p. 1-5. doi:10.1109/ICCT56969.2023.10075658.
13. Nandra R, Nandra N. Enhancing sustainability in semiconductor manufacturing through AI-driven predictive maintenance: a hybrid machine learning-fuzzy logic approach. 2026 Innovations in Machine, Engineering, and Digital Conference (IMED), Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia. 2026. p. 1-7. doi:10.1109/IMED68921.2026.11484231.
14. Ghosh J. Efficient machine learning-assisted failure analysis method for circuit-level defect prediction. Mach Learn Appl. 2024;16:100537. doi:10.1016/j.mlwa.2024.100537.
15. Nasser A, Al-Khazraji H. A hybrid of convolutional neural network and long short-term memory network approach to predictive maintenance. Int J Electr Comput Eng. 2022;12(1):721-730. doi:10.11591/ijece.v12i1.pp721-730.
16. Hung YH. Improved ensemble-learning algorithm for predictive maintenance in the manufacturing process. Appl Sci. 2021;11:6832. doi:10.3390/app11156832.
17. Bezerra FE, Oliveira Neto GC, Cervi GM, Francesconi Mazetto R, Faria AM, Vido M, et al. Impacts of feature selection on predicting machine failures by machine learning algorithms. Appl Sci. 2024;14:3337. doi:10.3390/app14083337.
18. Çınar ZM, Abdussalam Nuhu A, Zeeshan Q, Korhan O, Asmael M, Safaei B. Machine learning in predictive maintenance towards sustainable smart manufacturing in Industry 4.0. Sustainability. 2020;12:8211. doi:10.3390/su12198211.
19. Nchekwube DC, Ferracuti F, Freddi A, Iarlori S, Longhi S, Monteriu A. Predictive maintenance of industrial equipment using deep learning: From sensory data to remaining useful life estimation. 2022 IEEE International Conference on Metrology for Extended Reality, Artificial Intelligence and Neural Engineering (MetroXRAINE), Rome, Italy. 2022. p. 624-629. doi:10.1109/MetroXRAINE54828.2022.9967582.

20. Susto GA, Schirru A, Pampuri S, McLoone S, Beghi A. Machine learning for predictive maintenance: A multiple classifier approach. IEEE Trans Ind Inform. 2015;11(3):812-820. doi:10.1109/TII.2014.2349359.
21. Thekemuriyil T, Rohner JD, Minamisawa RA. Machine learning-based prediction of on-state voltage for real-time health monitoring of IGBT. Power Electron Devices Compon. 2023;6:100049. doi:10.1016/j.pedc.2023.100049.
22. Calabrese M, Cimmino M, Fiume F, Manfrin M, Romeo L, Ceccacci S, et al. SOPHIA: An event-based IoT and machine learning architecture for predictive maintenance in Industry 4.0. Information. 2020;11:202. doi:10.3390/info11040202.