

Automatic Verification and Validation of Automatically Generated Simulation-Based Digital Twins for Discrete Material Flow Systems

Author: Daniel Fischer

Supervisor: Prof. Christian Schwede

Program: Research Master Data Science

Institution: Hochschule Bielefeld (HSBI)

Submission Date: March 17, 2025

Abstract

Abstract

This thesis investigates the application of Digital Twins within discrete material flow systems, a key component of Industry 4.0. It reviews the progression from Digital Models and Digital Shadows to fully realized Digital Twins that integrate real-time data, simulation, and control mechanisms. While DTs promise enhanced monitoring, predictive analytics, and operational control in manufacturing, their automated generation poses challenges in terms of accuracy, overfitting, and real-time performance. To address these challenges, this research proposes a data-driven framework for automated verification, validation, and uncertainty quantification of simulation-based DTs. Leveraging object-centric event logs and advanced machine learning techniques, the framework aims to seamlessly integrate digital simulation with real-world data. This approach not only improves decision support in dynamic manufacturing settings but also ensures that the resulting DTs maintain high fidelity and robustness by continuously benchmarking their performance against operational metrics. The framework is evaluated via a comprehensive case study examining its effectiveness in enhancing process efficiency and predictive precision.

Keywords: Digital Twins, Automated VVUQ, Process Mining, Machine Learning, Discrete Material Flow Systems.

Contents

List of Abbreviations

— 5

Contents	3
1 Introduction	6
1.1 Initial Situation	6
1.2 Problem	9
1.3 Objective	10
1.4 Structure and Methodology	11
2 Theoretical Foundation	15
2.1 Material Flow Planning and Simulation	16
2.1.1 Basic Concepts	16
2.1.2 Processes and Resources	16
2.1.3 Production Planning and Control	16
2.1.4 Relevant KPIs and Metrics	16
2.2 Digital Twin: Definition and Concepts	16
2.2.1 Types of Digital Twins	16
2.2.2 Data-Driven Digital Twins	16
2.2.3 Automatically Generated Digital Twins	16
2.2.4 Definitions and Differences from Classical Simulation Literature	16
2.3 Process Mining and Event Logs	16
2.3.1 Core Concepts	16
2.3.2 Object-Centric Event Logs as a Data Basis	16
2.3.3 Process Mining as Enabling Technology	16
2.4 VVUQ in the Context of Simulation-Based Digital Twins	16
2.4.1 Historical Development of VVUQ Concepts	16
2.4.2 Requirements of VVUQ for Automatically Generated Models	16
2.4.3 Theoretical Argumentation for Merging Verification, Validation and Uncertainty Quantification	16
2.4.4 Machine Learning-Based Approaches	16
2.4.5 VVUQ in the Context of Digital Twins	16
2.4.6 VVUQ in Corporate Practice	16
3 Framework Design	17
3.1 Requirements Analysis	17
3.2 Data-Based Validation Strategy	17

Contents	4
3.3 Machine Learning-Based Validation Approach	17
3.4 Metrics and Key Figures for Model Evaluation	17
3.5 Online Validation and Continuous Monitoring	17
4 Implementation	18
4.1 Architecture and System Setup	18
4.2 Event Log Processing	18
4.3 Simulation Integration	18
4.4 Machine Learning Pipeline	18
5 Testing	19
5.1 Application Scenario and Data Basis	19
5.2 Automatically Generated Digital Twin	19
5.3 Validation Experiments	19
5.4 Results and Interpretation	19
5.5 Comparison with Manual Validation Methods	19
6 Discussion	20
6.1 Evaluation of the Developed Framework	20
6.2 Significance of Verification in Automatically Gener- ated Digital Twins	20
6.3 Limitations of Automated Validation	20
6.4 Implications for Research and Practice	20
7 Conclusion and Outlook	21
7.1 Summary of the Key Findings	21
7.2 Methodological and Theoretical Insights	21
7.3 Outlook	21
7.4 Recommendations for Practical Application	21

List of Abbreviations

CPS Cyber-Physical System. 1

DES Discrete-Event Simulation. 1

DM Digital Model. 1

DMFS Discrete Material Flow Systems. 1

DS Digital Shadow. 1

DT Digital Twin. 1

IoT Internet of Things. 1

ML Machine Learning. 1

SBDT Simulation-Based Digital Twin. 1

V&V Verification and Validation. 1

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Initial Situation

Digital Twins (DT) are a key technology at the front of the fourth industrial revolution, coined Industry 4.0. The latter term is characterized by the interaction of cyber-physical systems (CPS), the Internet of Things (IoT), and cloud computing to create smart factories with the goal of automation and efficiency (Oztemel & Gursev, 2020). Companies pursue this ideal by trying to remain competitive through the adoption of innovative technologies that promise enhanced productivity and reduced operational costs. One such technology that supports this transformation is the DT. It can be defined as a virtual representation of physical assets enabling real-time monitoring and optimization (Tao et al., 2018). The DT bridges the connection between the two entities with a bi-directional data flow to exchange information and to influence the behaviour of the physical asset (Grieves, 2014). This technology in Industry 4.0 connects the physical and digital worlds through real-time data integration, simulation, and optimization (Judijanto et al., 2024).

Although this field is rapidly evolving, a unified definition of DT has yet to be established due to the diverse requirements and perspectives across different fields. In engineering, the focus might be on the real-time interaction between physical systems and their digital counterparts, whereas in computer science, the emphasis is often on data integration and simulation capabilities. These varying priorities result in multiple interpretations and applications of the term DT. The term was first introduced by Michael Grieves in 2002, defining it as a digital representation of a physical object or system (Grieves, 2014). However, the concept has evolved since then, encompassing a broader range of applications

and technologies. Going back through the literature, there are three terms used to describe similar characteristics of DT: Digital Model (DM), Digital Shadow (DS), and Digital Twin (DT), see Figure 1.1 (Jones et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021).




Figure 1.1: Comparison of Digital Shadow (DS), Digital Model (DM) and Digital Twin (DT) as presented by Kritzinger (2018). This distinction is crucial for understanding validation requirements across different digital representation types.

The DM represents the most basic form. It contains manual data connections between physical and digital entities. These connections can be temporarily shifted or even disconnected. There is no control of the digital object over the physical entity. It rather is a simple or complex model *describing* the modelled object. It can not make decisions by itself to influence the physical object. The reason lies in the potential outdated data the digital part possesses or in the fact that it does not contain logic to control the data flow back to the physical part by itself. The control and the obligation to interpret the results is completely in the hands of the modeller. The DS is a more advanced version of the DM. It is a digital representation of the physical object, which is continuously updated with real-time data. The DS can be used for monitoring, analysis and simulation purposes. It can predict the future state of the physical object based on the current state and historical data. However, the DS is not able to influence the physical object. The control is, similar to the DM, still in the hands of the modeller. A DS is frequently used for simulation purposes and is often misclassified as a DT in the literature (Kritzinger et al., 2018; Sepasgozar, 2021). The DT is the most advanced version of the triplet. It is a digital representation of the physical object, which is also continuously updated with real-time data. The DT can be used for monitoring, analysis, and *control* purposes. It can predict the future state of the physical object based on the current state and historical data. The DT can also influence the physical object by sending control signals to it. The control is partially or completely in the hands of the DT. The DT thus *can* serve more purpose

than modelling or simulating the physical object. It may serve as an autonomic system, updating itself or by help of the modeller (Kritzinger et al., 2018).

DTs are applied across various sectors, including manufacturing, defense, automotive, service, finance and healthcare (Tao et al., 2018). Manufacturing stands out due to its high potential for process optimization and automation. This thesis focuses on the latter, particularly discrete material flow systems (DMFS). These systems process discrete objects (parts) that move along transportation routes or conveyor lines—either at regular or irregular intervals—integrating both production and logistics operations (Arnold & Furmans, 2005; Schwede & Fischer, 2024). A core simplification in their modeling is the abstraction of material flow as a sequence of discrete events, in accordance to the principles of discrete-event simulation (DES) (Kovacs & Kostal, 2016; Robinson, 2014). DES is particularly well-suited for analyzing complex systems where state changes occur at discrete points in time, such as arrivals, departures, and processing steps (Robinson, 2014).

In hindsight, DM played a crucial role in the design, planning, and control of DMFS, primarily through applications such as material flow simulations, logistic assistance systems, and digital factory implementations (Thiede et al., 2013). However, advancements in both DS and DT have enabled a revolution from isolated, usecase-specific models toward complete digital representations that span the entire lifecycle of DMFS (Abdoune et al., 2023). This transition is largely driven by the increasing demand for predictive capabilities by stakeholders and automated decision support in manufacturing systems, reflecting the cornerstones of Industry 4.0 (Frank et al., 2019). A second driver of DT innovation lies in the widely available data from IoT devices and sensors. Unlocking these potentials in model training and real-time adaption of the DT is crucial for its modelling capabilities (Tao et al., 2018).

In practice, the automated data transfer between the digital model and the physical system is of secondary importance for DMFS management. Unlike in time-critical applications, human decision-makers remain an integral part of the control loop, ensuring that real-time automation is not always necessary (Schwede & Fischer, 2024). Consequently, for this thesis, digital simulations and DTs will be treated as equivalent concepts.

Beyond merely replicating the current state and managing historical data, DTs serve a crucial function in predicting system behavior and evaluating potential modifications. The widespread adoption of DES within digital twins highlights the central role of simulation-based DTss (SBDT) in DMFS (Lugaresi & Matta,

2021). As Schwede and Fischer emphasize, SBDTs provide decision support for optimizing cost and performance in highly competitive manufacturing environments. While current SBDTs are primarily developed and updated manually by domain experts, emerging research explores how machine learning (ML) can enhance predictive accuracy and automate model updates by automatically learning model characteristics, reducing costs and development time.

Thus, the progression from digital models to simulation-based DTs reflects an ongoing shift towards data-driven, predictive, and increasingly automated representations of DMFS, ensuring more informed decision-making throughout the whole system lifecycle (Boschert & Rosen, 2016; Lim et al., 2020).

1.2 Problem

Despite the transformative potential of DT, their implementation can be challenging. The creation and maintenance of accurate DTs require substantial investments in technology and domain knowledge. This investment yields no return if the resulting model fails to accurately represent the modelled entity or delivers incorrect results. Automatic generation may be an elegant solution, but possesses the risk of overfitting or biased predictions (Geman et al., 1992). Manufacturing data used as training data must be preprocessed and cleaned rigorously. The DT per definition has to be able to perform real-time decision making without excessive time lags (Sepasgozar, 2021). This yields the requirement to extract, transform, clean and load (ETL process, Vassiliadis et al., 2002) data on the fly. ETL needs to happen fully in cache or memory so that inference can happen instantly. All other persistence methods would lead to excessive disk I/O (Mandala, 2024). All these hurdles are challenges to automatic learning (Ribeiro et al., 2016; Zhao et al., 2024). As industries integrate DT into their production processes, establishing trust becomes fundamental as well (Arrieta et al., 2020; Trauer et al., 2022). To gain widespread acceptance under coworkers, stakeholders and investors, the technology must demonstrate accuracy, transparency, and cost-efficiency (Shao et al., 2023; Wright & Davidson, 2020). Without these qualities, organizations will likely fall back to familiar methods, potentially building resistance to technological advancement (Lapointe & Rivard, 2005). If DTs don't live up to the expectations, divestments will follow (Montgomery & Thomas, 1988).

Even if DT learning is successfully performed, questions regarding its correctness, precision, and robustness remain unanswered. These questions are tackled by validation, verification and uncertainty quantification frameworks (VVUQ)

(Sel et al., 2025). Ensuring the validity, reliability, and accuracy of a DT is critical, yet traditional VVUQ approaches rely heavily on manual expert involvement and case-specific reference values (Bitencourt et al., 2023; Hua et al., 2022). This creates inefficiencies, particularly in the context of automated DT generation, where such manual processes conflict with the goal of reducing development effort. Hua et al. even argue that there are no robust and standardized verification and validation methods for DTs. As (Sel et al., 2025) point out, uncertainty quantification is often overseen, but addresses an important aspect of assessing low noise in explanations. One hurdle to standardized VVUQ frameworks is the lack of a clear definition for validity and verification in the context of DTs (Bitencourt et al., 2023).

For discrete material flow systems, these challenges are even more pressing due to their processual nature and stochasticity. Manufacturing processes may fail due to, among other factors, anomalies, resource constraints, software faults or human error (Cheng et al., 2022). VVUQ approaches have to anticipate these risks. When DTs for these systems are generated automatically, conventional validation approaches become problematic, as they negate much of the efficiency gained through automation. This creates a fundamental conflict: While automated DT generation reduces initial development- and updating efforts, it simultaneously increases the complexity of validation and verification, potentially counteracting its intended efficiency gains.

1.3 Objective

The thesis thus addresses this contradiction by developing a data-driven framework for automated VVUQ of automatically generated, simulation-based DTs which have been learned from data. The focus lies on DMFS due to their practical relevance and dynamical, processual nature. The endeavor can further be concretized by the following research questions (RQ):

- **RQ1:** How can automated validation and verification processes for DTs be efficiently implemented to maintain both accuracy and computational feasibility?
- **RQ2:** Which data-driven approaches are best suited to identify discrepancies between simulated behavior and real operational data in discrete material flow systems?
- **RQ3:** To what extent does the developed framework improve the quality and reliability of DTs compared to traditional VV methods?

This thesis addresses these questions by proposing that object-centric event logs—the same data structures often used to generate DT in manufacturing—can serve as the foundation for an automated, use case-independent validation and verification framework. Such an approach would maintain the efficiency benefits of automated generation while ensuring the resulting DTs meet necessary standards. The development and monitoring of generic, statistically grounded reference values is a key aspect of this approach. Such key indicators need to have an underlying distribution and have to be quantifiable. The framework will be evaluated using a case study from the discrete material flow domain, providing empirical evidence of its effectiveness in improving model accuracy and efficiency.

1.4 Structure and Methodology

Structure

The thesis is structured into eight chapters. Chapter 2 establishes the theoretical groundwork. It begins with broad, domain-specific concepts and progressively narrowing the focus to the core topics of this thesis: Automated verification and validation (VVUQ) of simulation-based digital twins (SBDTs) in discrete material flow systems. Section 2.1 introduces material flow planning and simulation, outlining the fundamental elements of production systems, including processes, resources, and control mechanisms. It defines key performance indicators (KPIs) that are essential for evaluating both real and simulated systems, thereby providing the practical context in which digital twins operate. Section 2.2 then transitions to the DT concepts. A framework for comparing DTs by Schwede and Fischer (2024) is presented. Particular attention is given to data-driven digital twins and their subset, automatically generated digital twins (AGDTs). The section concludes by contrasting AGDTs with classical simulation models, emphasizing the challenges posed by automatically generated models. Building on this foundation, Section 2.3 presents the principles of process mining (PM) and event log analysis, with a focus on object-centric event logs as a data basis for automated validation. This section demonstrates how PM acts as a bridge between real-world process data and model validation, thus enabling continuous verification of SBDTs. Section 2.4 narrows the focus further to VVUQ in the context of SBDTs, beginning with a historical overview of VVUQ methodologies. It then addresses the specific challenges posed by automatically generated models, such as data dependency and lack of transparency in model creation. The section introduces machine learning-based approaches for VVUQ, particularly classification methods for model deviation detection. It also explores the current state

of VVUQ in corporate practice, emphasizing the necessity for continuous and automated validation processes.

Chapter 3 outlines the methodology used to develop the proposed framework. It begins with a classical requirements analysis, deriving functional, technical, and data format requirements from theoretical findings. The chapter elaborates on the data-based validation strategy, machine learning-based validation approach, metrics for model evaluation, and online validation with continuous monitoring.

Chapter 4 presents the framework implementation, starting with the architecture and system setup, followed by detailed descriptions of event log processing, simulation integration, and the machine learning pipeline.

Chapter 5 presents the case study results, evaluating the framework's effectiveness in improving DT quality. It describes the application scenario and data basis, the automatically generated DT, validation experiments, and result interpretation. It concludes with a comparison to manual validation methods.

Chapter 6 discusses the implications of the results and provides recommendations for future research. It evaluates the framework in light of the research questions, examines the significance of verification in automatically generated DT, addresses limitations, and explores implications for research and practice.

Chapter 7 concludes the thesis by summarizing key findings and their implications. It addresses the research questions and hypotheses, discusses the results' significance, acknowledges limitations, and provides recommendations for future work.

Methodology

Methodologically the thesis follows a design science research approach (DSR). This approach is characterized by the development of artifacts to solve practical problems (Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007). Artifacts in the sense of DSR are created objects or constructs which address the given problem and contribute in direction of both theory and practice. The artifacts are evaluated in a real-world context to demonstrate their effectiveness. The thesis follows DSR by applying the cyclical DSR model, see figure 1.2.

The research paradigm of the thesis can be characterized as deductive-theory critical (Eberhard, 1987). A conceptual VVUQ framework is developed based on existing theoretical foundations, while deriving new requirements through a requirements analysis. The framework is then applied in a case study to evaluate its




Figure 1.2: The cyclical design science research model. The model consists of six steps. The problem identification (1) refers to the research gap in automated VVUQ of SBDT. Defining the solution objectives (2) specifies the research gap by formulating questions and hypotheses based on the theoretical foundations. The design and development (3) phase includes the development of the framework. The demonstration (4) phase shows the application of the framework in a case study. The evaluation (5) phase assesses the effectiveness of the framework. The communication (6) phase concludes the research by presenting the results.

effectiveness. The research is critical in the sense that it aims to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of VVUQ for automatically generated DTs. Elements of empirical research are included through the case study and the data-driven approach.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Foundation

2.1 Material Flow Planning and Simulation

2.1.1 Basic Concepts

2.1.2 Processes and Resources

2.1.3 Production Planning and Control

2.1.4 Relevant KPIs and Metrics

2.2 Digital Twin: Definition and Concepts

2.2.1 Types of Digital Twins

2.2.2 Data-Driven Digital Twins

2.2.3 Automatically Generated Digital Twins

2.2.4 Definitions and Differences from Classical Simulation Literature

2.3 Process Mining and Event Logs

2.3.1 Core Concepts

2.3.2 Object-Centric Event Logs as a Data Basis

2.3.3 Process Mining as Enabling Technology

2.4 VVUQ in the Context of Simulation-Based Digital Twins

Digital Twins Master Thesis

2.4.1 Historical Development of VVUQ Concepts

2.4.2 Basic Concepts of VVUQ for Automatically Generated Models

Chapter 3

Framework Design

3.1 Requirements Analysis

3.2 Data-Based Validation Strategy

3.3 Machine Learning-Based Validation Approach

3.4 Metrics and Key Figures for Model Evaluation

3.5 Online Validation and Continuous Monitoring

Chapter 4

Implementation

4.1 Architecture and System Setup

4.2 Event Log Processing

4.3 Simulation Integration

4.4 Machine Learning Pipeline

Chapter 5

Testing

5.1 Application Scenario and Data Basis

5.2 Automatically Generated Digital Twin

5.3 Validation Experiments

5.4 Results and Interpretation

5.5 Comparison with Manual Validation Methods

Chapter 6

Discussion

- 6.1 Evaluation of the Developed Framework**
- 6.2 Significance of Verification in Automatically Generated Digital Twins**
- 6.3 Limitations of Automated Validation**
- 6.4 Implications for Research and Practice**

Chapter 7

Conclusion and Outlook

7.1 Summary of the Key Findings

7.2 Methodological and Theoretical Insights

7.3 Outlook

7.4 Recommendations for Practical Application

Bibliography

- Abdoune, F., Nouiri, M., Cardin, O., & Castagna, P. (2023). Digital twin lifecycle: Core challenges and open issues. In T. Borangiu, D. Trentesaux, & P. Leitão (Eds.), *Service oriented, holonic and multi-agent manufacturing systems for industry of the future: Proceedings of sohoma 2022* (pp. 157–167). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19647-3_14
- Arnold, D., & Furmans, K. (2005). *Materialfluss in logistiksystemen* (4th ed.). Springer-Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.1007/b139029>
- Arrieta, A. B., Díaz-Rodríguez, N., Del Ser, J., Bennetot, A., Tabik, S., Barbado, A., García, S., Gil-López, S., Molina, D., Benjamins, R., et al. (2020). Explainable artificial intelligence (xai): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible ai. *Information fusion*, 58, 82–115.
- Bitencourt, L., Silva, M., & Costa, J. (2023). Building trust in digital twin through verification and validation. *Proceedings of the 2023 International Conference on Digital Twin Technologies*, 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.1000/bitencourt.2023.001>
- Boschert, S., & Rosen, R. (2016). Digital twin—the simulation aspect. *Mechatronic futures: Challenges and solutions for mechatronic systems and their designers*, 59–74.
- Cheng, X., Chaw, J. K., Goh, K. M., Ting, T. T., Sahrani, S., Ahmad, M. N., Abdul Kadir, R., & Ang, M. C. (2022). Systematic literature review on visual analytics of predictive maintenance in the manufacturing industry. *Sensors*, 22(17), 6321.
- Eberhard, K. (1987). *Einführung in die erkenntnis-und wissenschaftstheorie: Geschichte und praxis der konkurrierenden erkenntniswege*. Kohlhammer.
- Frank, A. G., Dalenogare, L. S., & Ayala, N. F. (2019). Industry 4.0 technologies: Implementation patterns in manufacturing companies. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 210, 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2019.01.004>

- Geman, S., Bienenstock, E., & Doursat, R. (1992). Neural networks and the bias/variance dilemma. *Neural Computation*, 4(1), 1–58. <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.1992.4.1.1>
- Grieves, M. (2014). *Digital twin: Manufacturing excellence through virtual factory replication* (tech. rep.) (White Paper).
- Hevner, A. R., March, S. T., Park, J., & Ram, S. (2004). Design science in information systems research. *MIS quarterly*, 75–105.
- Hua, E. Y., Lazarova-Molnar, S., & Francis, D. P. (2022). Validation of digital twins: Challenges and opportunities. *2022 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*, 2900–2911. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WSC57314.2022.10015420>
- Jones, D., Snider, C., Nassehi, A., Yon, J., & Hicks, B. (2020). Characterising the digital twin: A systematic literature review. *CIRP Journal of Manufacturing Science and Technology*, 29, 36–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cirpj.2020.02.002>
- Judijanto, L., Qadriah, L., Prabowo, I. A., Widyatmoko, W., & Sabila, P. C. (2024). Trends in digital twin technology for industry 4.0: A bibliometric study. *The Eastasouth Journal of Information System and Computer Science*, 2(02), 92–104.
- Kovacs, G., & Kostal, P. (2016). Mathematical description of material flow. *Materials science and technology*, 1.
- Kritzinger, W., Karner, M., Traar, G., Henjes, J., & Sihn, W. (2018). Digital twin in manufacturing: A categorical literature review and classification. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 51(11), 1016–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2018.08.474>
- Lapointe, L., & Rivard, S. (2005). A multilevel model of resistance to information technology implementation. *MIS quarterly*, 461–491.
- Lim, K. Y. H., Zheng, P., & Chen, C.-H. (2020). A state-of-the-art survey of digital twin: Techniques, engineering product lifecycle management and business innovation perspectives. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 31(6), 1313–1337.
- Lugaresi, G., & Matta, A. (2021). Automated digital twins generation for manufacturing systems: A case study. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 54(1), 749–754. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2021.08.087>
- Mandala, N. R. (2024). Etl in big data architectures: Challenges and solutions. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 13(10), 1061–1068. <https://doi.org/10.21275/SR241014054151>
- Montgomery, C. A., & Thomas, A. R. (1988). Divestment: Motives and gains. *Strategic Management Journal*, 93–97.

- Oztemel, E., & Gursev, S. (2020). Literature review of industry 4.0 and related technologies. *Journal of intelligent manufacturing*, 31(1), 127–182.
- Peffer, K., Tuunanen, T., Rothenberger, M. A., & Chatterjee, S. (2007). A design science research methodology for information systems research. *Journal of management information systems*, 24(3), 45–77.
- Ribeiro, M. T., Singh, S., & Guestrin, C. (2016). "why should i trust you?" explaining the predictions of any classifier. *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, 1135–1144.
- Robinson, S. (2014). *Simulation: The practice of model development and use*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Schwede, C., & Fischer, D. (2024). Learning simulation-based digital twins for discrete material flow systems: A review. *2024 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*, 3070–3081.
- Sel, K., Hawkins-Daarud, A., Chaudhuri, A., Osman, D., Bahai, A., Paydarfar, D., Willcox, K., Chung, C., & Jafari, R. (2025). Survey and perspective on verification, validation, and uncertainty quantification of digital twins for precision medicine. *npj Digital Medicine*, 8(1), 40.
- Sepasgozar, S. M. (2021). Differentiating digital twin from digital shadow: Elucidating a paradigm shift to expedite a smart, sustainable built environment. *Buildings*, 11(4), 151.
- Shao, G., Hightower, J., & Schindel, W. (2023). Credibility consideration for digital twins in manufacturing. *Manufacturing Letters*, 35, 24–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mfglet.2022.11.009>
- Tao, F., Cheng, J., Qi, Q., Zhang, M., Zhang, H., & Sui, F. (2018). Digital twin-driven product design, manufacturing and service with big data. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 94(9-12), 3563–3576. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-017-0233-1>
- Thiede, S., Seow, Y., Andersson, J., & Johansson, B. (2013). Environmental aspects in manufacturing system modelling and simulation—state of the art and research perspectives. *CIRP Journal of Manufacturing Science and Technology*, 6(1), 78–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cirpj.2012.10.002>
- Trauer, J., Schweigert-Recksiek, S., Schenk, T., Baudisch, T., Mörtl, M., & Zimmermann, M. (2022). A digital twin trust framework for industrial application. *Proceedings of the Design Society*, 2, 293–302.
- Vassiliadis, P., Simitsis, A., & Skiadopoulos, S. (2002). Conceptual modeling for etl processes. *Proceedings of the 5th ACM international workshop on Data Warehousing and OLAP*, 14–21.

- Wright, L., & Davidson, S. (2020). How to tell the difference between a model and a digital twin. *Advanced Modeling and Simulation in Engineering Sciences*, 7(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40323-020-00147-4>
- Zhang, L., Zhou, L., & Horn, B. K. (2021). Building a right digital twin with model engineering. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 59, 151–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2021.02.009>
- Zhao, Y. F., Xie, J., & Sun, L. (2024). On the data quality and imbalance in machine learning-based design and manufacturing—a systematic review. *Engineering*.