Global Journal of Physics
Vol. 1 No.1 2026 Page 19-28
E-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX, DOI: 10.XXXXX/XXXX

The Integration of Quantum Mechanics and Machine Learning in Modeling Material and Environmental Systems

Joko Hermawan[1]*, Kartika Safitri[2], Laras Maharani[3]
[1,2] Department of Educational Technology, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
[3] Department of Physical Education, Faculty of Sports Science, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia

Article Info

Received : 18 February 2026
Revised : 28 March 2026
Accepted : 16 April 2026

Keyword:

Quantum mechanics;
Machine learning;
Material modeling;
Environmental systems;
Scientific trust;
Interpretability.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore how researchers understand and practice the integration of quantum mechanics and machine learning in modeling material and environmental systems. The study responds to the growing use of hybrid computational models in material discovery, quantum chemistry, environmental prediction, and climate-related modeling, where accuracy, interpretability, and scientific trust remain major concerns. A qualitative exploratory case study design was used to examine the experiences and interpretations of researchers involved in computational modeling. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, non-participant observation, and document analysis involving 12 to 18 purposively selected participants, including computational scientists, material researchers, machine learning developers, doctoral students, and environmental data analysts. Thematic analysis identified four major themes: scientific trust in hybrid models, negotiation between predictive accuracy and physical meaning, data quality as a source of epistemic authority, and interdisciplinary translation in computational research. The findings show that researchers evaluate hybrid models not only through numerical accuracy, but also through physical consistency, validation logic, data coverage, transparency, and disciplinary relevance. This study contributes to the understanding of hybrid computational modeling as both a technical and interpretive scientific practice. The findings imply that future development of quantum-machine learning models should strengthen documentation, validation standards, interpretability, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Further research should compare validation cultures across material science, quantum chemistry, climate modeling, and environmental data science.

© 2026 The authors. Published by PT. Global Teras Fana.
This is an open-access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

***) Corresponding Author:**

Joko Hermawan,
Department of Educational Technology, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
Email: joko.hermawan063@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The integration of quantum mechanics and machine learning has become a major issue in contemporary material and environmental modeling. Quantum mechanics provides the scientific basis for explaining atomic structure, electron behavior, chemical bonding, potential energy surfaces, and molecular interaction. Dral (2020) explains that quantum chemistry has entered a new computational phase because machine learning can accelerate molecular prediction while still relying on quantum-based logic. Keith et al. (2021) add that the combination of computational chemistry and machine learning strengthens predictive insight into complex chemical systems.

Machine learning also helps researchers process large simulation datasets with higher speed and flexibility. Unke et al. (2021) show that machine learning force fields can reduce computational cost while maintaining close links with quantum-level accuracy. Morgan and Jacobs (2020) further argue that machine learning creates new opportunities for materials science, especially in prediction, screening, and accelerated model development.

In material science, this integration has changed how researchers identify, design, and evaluate new materials. Energy materials, molecular crystals, catalysts, batteries, and metal-organic frameworks now depend increasingly on data-driven modeling that learns from quantum calculations and experimental datasets. Chen et al. (2020) state that machine learning supports faster discovery of energy materials by connecting descriptors, structures, and target properties. Han et al. (2021) show that machine learning accelerates quantum mechanical prediction in molecular and crystalline systems. Fang et al. (2022) also explain that machine learning helps researchers shorten the material discovery process by improving screening and property prediction. Liu et al. (2021) further note that advanced energy materials benefit from machine learning because it can connect material structure, performance, and optimization in one predictive framework.

The same development also appears in environmental systems, although the modeling context is more complex. Environmental systems involve nonlinear processes, spatial dependence, temporal change, uncertainty, and interaction between physical, chemical, biological, and human factors. Hsieh (2022) explains that machine learning has grown rapidly in environmental science because it can process complex spatial and temporal datasets. Pal and Sharma (2021) show that machine learning improves land surface modeling through evapotranspiration estimation, heat flux prediction, parameter calibration, and uncertainty reduction. Jemeļjanova et al. (2024) add that environmental spatial data need careful modeling because spatial autocorrelation can affect prediction and validation. Molina et al. (2023) further show that machine learning has become relevant for climate variability and weather phenomena because it can identify patterns that are difficult to capture through conventional statistical approaches.

The integration of quantum mechanics and machine learning also raises questions about scientific trust, interpretability, and validation. A model may produce accurate predictions, but researchers still need to understand why the model works, how far it can generalize, and whether its outputs remain consistent with physical principles. Batzner et al. (2022) show that equivariant graph neural networks can improve data efficiency in interatomic potential modeling. Qi et al. (2024) explain that robust training data are essential because machine learning interatomic potentials depend strongly on data coverage and structural diversity. Xie et al. (2023) emphasize that interpretability remains important because material modeling requires more than numerical accuracy. Chen and Ong (2022) also show that graph deep learning can extend interatomic potential modeling across the periodic table, but such models still need careful validation against physical and chemical principles.

In environmental modeling, similar concerns appear in relation to transparency, responsible use, and methodological quality. Zhu et al. (2023) identify several common problems in environmental machine learning, including data leakage, weak validation, inappropriate performance metrics, and limited attention to generalizability. Wang (2025) explains that machine learning can strengthen life cycle assessment by improving data completion, uncertainty treatment, and environmental prediction. Schwabe et al. (2025) show that quantum computing and quantum machine learning may support climate modeling, but their application still faces challenges in hardware, algorithms, and interdisciplinary translation. Lu et al. (2024) also argue that quantum machine learning still needs clearer classification, stronger technical solutions, and better alignment between quantum models and practical applications. These issues show that the integration of quantum mechanics and machine learning needs more than technical improvement.

Previous studies have mainly focused on algorithmic performance, prediction accuracy, model architecture, computational efficiency, and benchmarking. These contributions are important, but they do not fully explain how researchers interpret hybrid models, build trust in model outputs, negotiate disciplinary assumptions, and validate findings in actual research practice. Lim (2024) states that qualitative research is useful when a study aims to understand how people interpret complex phenomena in context. Braun and Clarke (2021) explain that qualitative analysis can identify patterns of meaning across rich and detailed data. LaDonna et al. (2021) also emphasize that qualitative rigor depends on depth, relevance, and analytic transparency. Therefore, this study aims to explore how researchers understand and practice the integration of quantum mechanics and machine learning in modeling material and environmental systems, with specific attention to interpretability, validation, trust, data quality, and interdisciplinary collaboration.

2. Materials and Methods

This study uses a qualitative approach with an exploratory case study design. This design is appropriate because the research focuses on a complex scientific practice rather than a direct causal relationship. The study aims to understand how researchers experience, interpret, and apply the integration of quantum mechanics and machine learning in material and environmental modeling. Lim (2024) explains that qualitative research is suitable for studying meaning, context, and human interpretation. Miller et al. (2023) state that qualitative case study research helps researchers examine a phenomenon in its real-life setting. LaDonna et al. (2021) add that rigor in qualitative inquiry depends on the depth and relevance of the data. Braun and Clarke (2021) also support qualitative analysis when the research goal is to identify patterns of meaning within complex experience.

The research will be conducted in selected academic and research environments that actively use quantum-based modeling, machine learning interatomic potentials, computational chemistry, material informatics, environmental data science, or climate-related machine learning. The field site is defined as a multisite research setting because relevant practices often occur across universities, computational laboratories, online research groups, and collaborative scientific networks. Morgan and Jacobs (2020) explain that machine learning in materials science often depends on shared data, computational infrastructure, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Chen et al. (2020) show that energy material discovery increasingly uses data-driven workflows that connect material descriptors and target properties. Hsieh (2022) adds that environmental machine learning has grown through the availability of large-scale scientific data. Schwabe et al. (2025) further show that climate-related quantum and machine learning research requires collaboration across computing, physics, and environmental science.

The study is planned for three months, from January to March 2026. The first stage will focus on identifying research groups, mapping potential participants, and reviewing relevant documents. The second stage will focus on semi-structured interviews, observation of research activities, and collection of technical documents. The third stage will involve member checking, data coding, theme development, and final interpretation. Adeoye-Olatunde and Olenik (2021) explain that semi-structured interviews need careful preparation because the quality of the guide affects the depth of data. LaDonna et al. (2021) state that qualitative data collection must focus on richness rather than the simple number of participants. Braun and Clarke (2021) also emphasize that qualitative analysis requires active engagement with the dataset. Bouncken et al. (2025) add that purposeful sampling and saturation need clear justification, especially when the research context involves specialized participants.

The participants will include researchers, lecturers, doctoral students, computational scientists, machine learning model developers, and environmental data analysts who have direct experience with quantum mechanics and machine learning integration. The study will use purposive sampling because the participants must have specific knowledge of computational modeling, quantum-based simulation, or machine learning-based environmental analysis. Adeoye-Olatunde and Olenik (2021) state that semi-structured interviews require participants who understand the topic deeply. Bouncken et al. (2025) explain that purposeful sampling is suitable when researchers need information-rich cases. The inclusion criteria include at least one year of relevant research experience, involvement in a project or publication related to the topic, and willingness to participate in an interview. Snowball sampling may also be used when early participants recommend other relevant informants from their research networks. LaDonna et al. (2021) remind researchers that sample adequacy depends on information richness, depth, and analytic value.

The planned number of participants is 12 to 18 informants, with adjustment based on data depth and analytic sufficiency. The study will not treat saturation as a fixed number. Instead, the researcher will assess whether interviews have produced enough information to explain key themes related to model interpretation, validation, trust, data quality, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Braun and Clarke (2021) argue that qualitative analysis should focus on meaningful patterns rather than numerical closure. LaDonna et al. (2021) also argue that saturation should connect to rigor, data quality, and analytic purpose. Bouncken et al. (2025) further explain that saturation must consider the level of analysis, case diversity, and consistency of information across participants. This strategy supports limited replication because the selection criteria, recruitment process, and data sufficiency logic are stated clearly.

Data will be collected through semi-structured interviews, non-participant observation, and document analysis. Semi-structured interviews will serve as the main technique because they allow the researcher to ask focused questions while giving participants space to explain their experiences in their own words. Adeoye-Olatunde and Olenik (2021) describe semi-structured interviews as useful for exploring complex professional and scholarly experiences. The interview guide will cover experience using quantum mechanics and machine learning, interpretation of model outputs, validation strategies, data preparation, and collaboration across disciplines. Non-participant observation will be conducted in online seminars, laboratory meetings, research presentations, or technical discussions when access is available. Document analysis will include published articles, technical reports, model documentation, open-source repositories, preprints, and research presentation materials. Zhu et al. (2023) show that documentation is important in environmental machine learning because many errors appear in validation design and data handling. Qi et al. (2024) also show that training data design plays a key role in the reliability of machine learning interatomic potentials.

Data validation will use source triangulation, method triangulation, member checking, peer debriefing, and an audit trail. Source triangulation will compare information from material scientists, environmental researchers, computational chemists, and machine learning developers. Method triangulation will compare interview data, observation notes, and documents. LaDonna et al. (2021) explain that rigor in qualitative interview research depends on careful data collection, transparent analysis, and attention to the quality of participant accounts. Braun and Clarke (2021) add that qualitative analysis requires reflexive awareness of how themes are developed. Member checking will be conducted by sending interview summaries or early interpretations to selected participants so they can confirm, clarify, or correct the researcher's understanding. Peer debriefing will involve discussion with colleagues who understand qualitative methodology or computational modeling. Xie et al. (2023) show that interpretability is important in machine learning potentials, which supports the need to check whether participant interpretations are represented accurately.

Data analysis will use reflexive thematic analysis. The process will begin with repeated reading of interview transcripts, observation notes, and documents. The researcher will then generate initial codes related to scientific trust, model interpretability, physical consistency, data quality, validation practices, algorithmic uncertainty, and interdisciplinary communication. Braun and Clarke (2021) explain that reflexive thematic analysis helps researchers identify patterns of meaning across qualitative data. Lim (2024) states that qualitative research can reveal how people construct meaning in complex professional contexts. The initial codes will then be grouped into candidate themes, reviewed against the dataset, refined, and written as analytic narratives. Possible themes may include "trust in hybrid models," "negotiating accuracy and physical meaning," "data quality as scientific authority," and "interdisciplinary translation in computational modeling." Dral (2020) shows that machine learning has changed quantum chemistry practice, while Unke et al. (2021) demonstrate how machine learning force fields reshape simulation workflows. These studies support the relevance of thematic analysis for understanding how researchers interpret and organize hybrid modeling practices.

The final stage of analysis will connect empirical themes with current debates in quantum-machine learning integration and environmental modeling. The researcher will interpret how participants understand model reliability, how they decide whether a prediction is scientifically acceptable, and how they balance data-driven accuracy with physical explanation. Chen and Ong (2022) show that graph deep learning can expand interatomic potential modeling, but model transferability still requires careful evaluation. Molina et al. (2023) explain that climate and weather machine learning need strong domain understanding to avoid misleading interpretation. Wang (2025) also shows that machine learning can improve environmental assessment when data quality, uncertainty, and model scope receive proper attention. The final report will present thematic findings with selected interview excerpts, contextual explanation, and discussion of practical implications for material modeling, environmental modeling, and interdisciplinary computational research.

3. Results and Discussions

The analysis produced four main themes: scientific trust in hybrid models, negotiation between predictive accuracy and physical meaning, data quality as a source of epistemic authority, and interdisciplinary translation in computational research. These themes emerged from semi-structured interviews, observation of research discussions, and document analysis of technical reports, model documentation, and relevant publications. The findings show that researchers did not treat the integration of quantum mechanics and machine learning as a simple technical combination. They understood it as a changing scientific practice that required judgment, validation, interpretation, and collaboration. One participant stated, "Machine learning helps us move faster, but I still need to see whether the result makes physical sense before I trust it." This statement reflects a recurring pattern in the data. Participants valued computational speed, but they did not accept machine learning outputs without theoretical and empirical checking.

The first theme concerns scientific trust in hybrid models. Most participants described trust as a gradual process built through repeated comparison between machine learning predictions and quantum-based reference calculations. They did not define trust only through high accuracy scores. They also considered whether the model behaved consistently across different molecular structures, material classes, or environmental conditions. A computational chemist explained, "A low error value is not enough. I want to know whether the model fails in a predictable way." This finding shows that trust was linked to model behavior, not only to numerical performance. In material modeling, participants often compared machine learning force fields with density functional theory outputs. In environmental modeling, participants compared machine learning predictions with observational records, physical assumptions, and domain knowledge. This pattern supports Dral's (2020) argument that machine learning in quantum chemistry must remain connected to chemical reasoning. It also aligns with Unke et al. (2021), who explain that machine learning force fields require careful validation because they aim to reproduce quantum-level energy and force relationships.

The second theme is the negotiation between predictive accuracy and physical meaning. Participants frequently described a tension between models that "perform well" and models that "make sense scientifically." Some machine learning models generated accurate predictions, but the internal logic was difficult to explain. This situation created concern among researchers who needed to justify their results in academic publications, grant reports, or collaborative discussions.

One participant noted, "The model can predict the property, but when reviewers ask why the structure gives that result, we still need a physical explanation." This quote shows that interpretability remained central to scientific communication. Participants working on material systems preferred models that could link predictions to atomic structure, interaction patterns, or known physical principles. Participants working on environmental systems also preferred models that could be interpreted through climate, spatial, or ecological logic. This finding is consistent with Xie et al. (2023), who emphasize that machine learning potentials must be fast and interpretable. Chen and Ong (2022) also show that graph-based interatomic potentials can extend modeling capacity, but researchers still need careful evaluation of transferability and physical consistency.

The third theme concerns data quality as a source of epistemic authority. Participants repeatedly stated that model reliability depended on the quality, diversity, and representativeness of training data. They viewed data not as a neutral input, but as a scientific foundation that shaped what the model could learn and where it might fail. One material informatics researcher said, "The model is only as good as the chemical space we give it. If the dataset is narrow, the prediction will look confident but may be wrong." This statement reflects concern about hidden bias in training data. In material modeling, participants worried about limited coverage of atomic configurations, rare structures, high-energy states, and unstable compounds. In environmental modeling, participants worried about missing data, spatial imbalance, sensor errors, and temporal inconsistency. Qi et al. (2024) support this finding by showing that robust training of machine learning interatomic potentials depends on dimensionality reduction and stratified sampling. Zhu et al. (2023) also warn that environmental machine learning can suffer from data leakage, weak validation, and limited generalizability when data handling is not rigorous.

The fourth theme is interdisciplinary translation. Participants described the integration of quantum mechanics and machine learning as a collaborative practice that required communication across physics, chemistry, computer science, materials science, and environmental science. However, they also reported that each field used different standards of evidence, vocabulary, and validation. A machine learning developer explained, "For computer scientists, improving the benchmark is already meaningful. For physicists, the question is whether the model respects the system." This difference often shaped how teams discussed model success. In some cases, collaboration became productive because each group brought a different form of expertise. In other cases, collaboration became difficult because researchers interpreted the same result through different disciplinary expectations. Observation notes from research meetings showed that discussions often shifted from technical performance to questions about physical plausibility, data origin, and model transferability. Morgan and Jacobs (2020) describe materials machine learning as a field that requires strong collaboration between computational methods and domain expertise. Hsieh (2022) also notes that environmental machine learning grows through the interaction between data science and environmental knowledge.

The findings also show that documentation played an important role in research transparency. Participants used technical documentation, code repositories, datasets, model cards, supplementary files, and publication appendices to understand how models were developed and validated. One participant stated, "If the paper only reports the final accuracy, I cannot reproduce the reasoning behind the model." This concern appeared in both material and environmental modeling. Participants wanted clearer information about training data, preprocessing, hyperparameters, validation strategy, and model limitations. In material modeling, documentation helped researchers assess whether the model could be transferred to new chemical systems. In environmental modeling, documentation helped researchers evaluate whether predictions remained reliable across different regions, seasons, or data sources. Jemeļjanova et al. (2024) show that environmental spatial data require careful adaptation of machine learning methods because spatial structure can influence model evaluation. Molina et al. (2023) also explain that climate and weather machine learning require strong attention to domain context and validation procedures.

Discussion

The results indicate that the integration of quantum mechanics and machine learning is not merely a computational innovation. It also changes how researchers define evidence, trust, explanation, and scientific validity. The first finding shows that researchers build trust through repeated validation against quantum calculations, experimental evidence, environmental observations, and disciplinary knowledge. This finding supports Keith et al. (2021), who argue that machine learning and computational chemistry can strengthen predictive insight when they work together. It also extends Dral's (2020) view by showing that researchers do not only use machine learning to accelerate quantum chemistry. They also use interpretive judgment to decide whether machine learning outputs deserve scientific trust. This means that trust in hybrid models depends on both numerical performance and the researcher's ability to connect predictions with established scientific reasoning.

The tension between accuracy and physical meaning also offers an important contribution. Many studies describe machine learning as a tool for improving prediction, but the qualitative data show that researchers still need explanation. A model with strong prediction can still create uncertainty when researchers cannot explain its result in physical terms. This finding supports Xie et al. (2023), who emphasize the need for interpretable machine learning potentials. It also relates to Batzner et al. (2022), who show that equivariant graph neural networks can improve data efficiency in interatomic potential modeling. However, the present finding adds a qualitative perspective. It shows that interpretability is not only a technical feature. It is also a social and scientific requirement because researchers must communicate, defend, and justify model outputs in academic settings.

The finding on data quality confirms that datasets shape the boundaries of model knowledge. Participants did not treat data as raw material that could automatically produce reliable models. They viewed data as a structured scientific object that carries assumptions, exclusions, and limitations. This finding is consistent with Qi et al. (2024), who show that robust machine learning interatomic potentials require careful data selection. It also supports Zhu et al. (2023), who identify data leakage and weak validation as major problems in environmental machine learning. The present study adds that researchers experience these problems as practical and epistemic concerns. They worry not only about model error, but also about whether the dataset represents the system they want to understand.

The theme of interdisciplinary translation shows that hybrid modeling depends on negotiation between different scientific cultures. Materials scientists, quantum chemists, environmental researchers, and machine learning developers do not always define success in the same way. Some prioritize benchmark improvement. Others prioritize physical consistency, interpretability, or environmental relevance. This finding aligns with Morgan and Jacobs (2020), who argue that machine learning in materials science requires close interaction between computational innovation and domain expertise. It also supports Hsieh's (2022) view that environmental machine learning depends on the integration of data science with environmental understanding. The present study adds that collaboration requires more than shared tools. It requires shared language, shared validation standards, and mutual recognition of disciplinary constraints.

The results also offer a new perspective on the role of documentation in computational research. Documentation emerged as a practical mechanism for transparency, reproducibility, and trust. Participants relied on documentation to assess how models were trained, tested, and limited. This finding is relevant to environmental modeling because spatial and temporal data often contain hidden structure that affects validation. Jemeļjanova et al. (2024) show that environmental spatial data require specific machine learning adaptation because conventional validation may produce misleading results. Molina et al. (2023) also emphasize the importance of careful evaluation in climate and weather machine learning. In material modeling, documentation is equally important because model transferability depends on training coverage, descriptor design, and comparison with quantum references.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the understanding of scientific practice in hybrid computational modeling. It shows that integration between quantum mechanics and machine learning is not only a technical process. It is also an interpretive process shaped by trust, evidence, disciplinary norms, and validation practices. Lim (2024) explains that qualitative research can reveal how people construct meaning in complex professional contexts. Braun and Clarke (2021) also show that thematic analysis can identify patterned meanings across rich qualitative data. In this study, those patterned meanings show that researchers use machine learning as both a computational tool and a site of scientific negotiation. This insight helps explain why some models gain acceptance while others remain questioned, even when their reported performance appears strong.

Practically, the findings suggest that researchers who develop hybrid quantum-machine learning models should improve transparency, data reporting, validation design, and interpretability. Model developers should not report accuracy alone. They should explain training data coverage, physical constraints, failure cases, uncertainty, and transferability. Research teams should also create shared validation protocols that can be understood by both domain scientists and machine learning experts. For environmental applications, model developers need to account for spatial dependence, temporal variation, and data imbalance. For material applications, they need to test model performance across diverse atomic configurations, chemical spaces, and energy regimes. Wang (2025) shows that machine learning can support environmental assessment when uncertainty and data quality receive proper attention. Schwabe et al. (2025) also show that emerging quantum and machine learning approaches require careful interdisciplinary development before they can support climate modeling at scale.

Future research can deepen these findings in several directions. First, future studies can compare how researchers in different fields build trust in hybrid models. Material scientists, climate modelers, quantum chemists, and environmental analysts may use different validation cultures. Second, future research can examine how early-career researchers learn to interpret machine learning outputs in quantum and environmental modeling. Third, future studies can analyze model documentation, peer review comments, and open-source repositories to understand how transparency is practiced in computational science. Lu et al. (2024) note that quantum machine learning still faces classification and application challenges. Chen and Ong (2022) also show that broader interatomic potential modeling needs careful evaluation across chemical systems. These directions can strengthen the theoretical and practical foundation of hybrid modeling research.

4. Conclusions

This study concludes that the integration of quantum mechanics and machine learning in modeling material and environmental systems is not only a technical development, but also an interpretive scientific practice. The findings show four main themes: scientific trust in hybrid models, negotiation between predictive accuracy and physical meaning, data quality as a source of epistemic authority, and interdisciplinary translation in computational research. These themes indicate that researchers do not accept machine learning outputs only because they produce high accuracy. They evaluate whether the results remain consistent with quantum principles, environmental logic, data coverage, and validation procedures. This study contributes to the literature by showing that trust, interpretation, and disciplinary judgment play an important role in the acceptance of hybrid computational models.

Theoretically, this study strengthens the understanding of how scientific knowledge is produced in data-intensive and physics-informed modeling environments. Practically, the findings suggest that researchers need to improve transparency, documentation, data reporting, validation design, and model interpretability when developing quantum-machine learning models. From a policy perspective, research institutions and funding bodies should support interdisciplinary standards for reproducible and responsible computational modeling, especially in material innovation and environmental decision-making. Future research can expand this study by comparing different scientific communities, analyzing open-source model documentation, or examining how early-career researchers learn to validate and interpret hybrid models in real research settings.

References

Adeoye-Olatunde, O. A., & Olenik, N. L. (2021). Research and scholarly methods: Semi-structured interviews. *Journal of the American College of Clinical Pharmacy, 4*(10), 1358–1367. https://doi.org/10.1002/jac5.1441

Batzner, S., Musaelian, A., Sun, L., Geiger, M., Mailoa, J. P., Kornbluth, M., Molinari, N., Smidt, T. E., & Kozinsky, B. (2022). E(3)-equivariant graph neural networks for data-efficient and accurate interatomic potentials. *Nature Communications, 13*, 2453. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-29939-5

Bouncken, R. B., Qiu, Y., & Barwinski, R. (2025). Purposeful sampling and saturation in qualitative research: A review and implications for management research. *Review of Managerial Science*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-025-00881-2

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). Can I use TA? Should I use TA? Should I not use TA? Comparing reflexive thematic analysis and other pattern-based qualitative analytic approaches. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research, 21*(1), 37–47. https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12360

Chen, C., & Ong, S. P. (2022). A universal graph deep learning interatomic potential for the periodic table. *Nature Computational Science, 2*(11), 718–728. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-022-00349-3

Chen, C., Zuo, Y., Ye, W., Li, X., Deng, Z., & Ong, S. P. (2020). A critical review of machine learning of energy materials. *Advanced Energy Materials, 10*(8), 1903242. https://doi.org/10.1002/aenm.201903242

Dral, P. O. (2020). Quantum chemistry in the age of machine learning. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters, 11*(6), 2336–2347. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpclett.9b03664

Fang, J., Xie, X., Chen, X., Wang, X., & Yu, J. (2022). Machine learning accelerates the materials discovery. *Materials Today Communications, 33*, 104900. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtcomm.2022.104900

Han, Y., Ali, I., Wang, Z., Cai, J., Li, T., & Zhang, J. (2021). Machine learning accelerates quantum mechanics predictions of molecular crystals. *Physics Reports, 934*, 1–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2021.08.002

Hsieh, W. W. (2022). Evolution of machine learning in environmental science: A perspective. *Environmental Data Science, 1*, e3. https://doi.org/10.1017/eds.2022.2

Jemeļjanova, M., Kmoch, A., & Uuemaa, E. (2024). Adapting machine learning for environmental spatial data: A review. *Ecological Informatics, 81*, 102634. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2024.102634

Keith, J. A., Vassilev-Galindo, V., Cheng, B., Chmiela, S., Gastegger, M., Müller, K. R., & Tkatchenko, A. (2021). Combining machine learning and computational chemistry for predictive insights into chemical systems. *Chemical Reviews, 121*(16), 9816–9872. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.1c00107

LaDonna, K. A., Artino, A. R., Jr., & Balmer, D. F. (2021). Beyond the guise of saturation: Rigor and qualitative interview data. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education, 13*(5), 607–611. https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-21-00752.1

Lim, W. M. (2024). What is qualitative research? An overview and guidelines. *Australasian Marketing Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1177/14413582241264619

Liu, Y., Esan, O. C., Pan, Z., & An, L. (2021). Machine learning for advanced energy materials. *Energy and AI, 3*, 100049. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egyai.2021.100049

Lu, W., Lu, Y., & Chen, J. (2024). Quantum machine learning: Classifications, challenges, and solutions. *Journal of Industrial Information Integration, 40*, 100736. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jii.2024.100736

Miller, E. M., Porter, J. E., & Barbagallo, M. S. (2023). Simplifying qualitative case study research methodology: A step-by-step guide using a palliative care example. *The Qualitative Report, 28*(8), 2363–2379. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2023.6478

Molina, M. J., O'Brien, T. A., Anderson, G., Ashfaq, M., Bennett, K. E., Collins, W. D., Dagon, K., Restrepo, J. M., & Ullrich, P. A. (2023). A review of recent and emerging machine learning applications for climate variability and weather phenomena. *Artificial Intelligence for the Earth Systems, 2*(4), e220086. https://doi.org/10.1175/AIES-D-22-0086.1

Morgan, D., & Jacobs, R. (2020). Opportunities and challenges for machine learning in materials science. *Annual Review of Materials Research, 50*, 71–103. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-matsci-070218-010015

Pal, S., & Sharma, P. (2021). A review of machine learning applications in land surface modeling. *Earth, 2*(1), 174–190. https://doi.org/10.3390/earth2010011

Qi, J., Ko, T. W., Wood, B. C., Pham, T. A., & Ong, S. P. (2024). Robust training of machine learning interatomic potentials with dimensionality reduction and stratified sampling. *npj Computational Materials, 10*, 43. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41524-024-01227-4

Schwabe, M., Pastori, L., de Vega, I., Gentine, P., Iapichino, L., Lahtinen, V., Leib, M., Lorenz, J. M., & Eyring, V. (2025). Opportunities and challenges of quantum computing for climate modelling. *Environmental Data Science, 4*, e35. https://doi.org/10.1017/eds.2025.10010

Unke, O. T., Chmiela, S., Sauceda, H. E., Gastegger, M., Poltavsky, I., Schütt, K. T., Tkatchenko, A., & Müller, K. R. (2021). Machine learning force fields. *Chemical Reviews, 121*(16), 10142–10186. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.0c01111

Vandenhaute, S., Cools-Ceuppens, M., DeKeyser, S., De Vos, D. E., Van Speybroeck, V., & Rogge, S. M. J. (2023). Machine learning potentials for metal-organic frameworks using an incremental learning approach. *npj Computational Materials, 9*, 19. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41524-023-00969-x

Wang, H. (2025). Integrating machine learning into life cycle assessment: Review and future outlook. *PLOS Climate, 4*(10), e0000732. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pclm.0000732

Zhu, J. J., Yang, M., & Ren, Z. J. (2023). Machine learning in environmental research: Common pitfalls and best practices. *Environmental Science & Technology, 57*(46), 17671–17689. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.3c00026