pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:12, Issue 11, November-2025 eISSN:2349-5715

Resilient Digital Infrastructures For Sustainable Financial Systems In The Era Of Industry 4.0

Dr. Mateo Alvarez-García
Department of Industrial Engineering, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

ABSTRACT:
The accelerating digitization of global financial systems under the paradigm of Industry 4.0 has transformed not only how financial transactions are processed, but also how sustainability, resilience, and long-term economic stability are conceptualized and operationalized. Financial infrastructures today function as deeply interconnected cyber-physical systems that integrate cloud computing, artificial intelligence, big data, blockchain, and platform-based service models. While these technologies promise unprecedented efficiency and inclusivity, they also introduce new forms of systemic vulnerability, operational fragility, and sustainability risk. Against this backdrop, resilience engineering has emerged as a critical theoretical and practical framework for ensuring continuous financial service availability during periods of market volatility, technological disruption, and socio-environmental shocks (Dasari, 2025). Yet, resilience cannot be decoupled from sustainability, because financial systems that are technologically robust but environmentally wasteful, socially exclusionary, or governance-weak ultimately undermine long-term development objectives.

This study develops an integrative theoretical and analytical framework linking resilience engineering, digital sustainability, and Industry 4.0-enabled financial systems. Drawing on an extensive synthesis of sustainability, digital transformation, and infrastructure reliability literature, the article argues that resilience is no longer a purely technical attribute of financial systems but a socio-technical capacity that shapes environmental footprints, social trust, and economic continuity. Financial platforms increasingly rely on data-intensive architectures, cloud-based infrastructures, and algorithmic decision-making, which can both enhance system uptime and amplify ecological and social risks if poorly governed (Lucivero, 2020; Linkov et al., 2018).

Using a qualitative-analytical methodology grounded in structured literature analysis and theoretical triangulation, this study examines how principles of Site Reliability Engineering, circular digital economy, and sustainable governance converge in contemporary financial infrastructures. The research integrates the resilience-oriented framework advanced by Dasari (2025) with sustainability-driven models of digital entrepreneurship, supply chain digitization, and institutional governance (Gregori & Holzmann, 2020; Dwivedi & Paul, 2022; Khan et al., 2023). The findings demonstrate that resilience engineering functions as a sustainability multiplier: systems designed for fault tolerance, adaptive capacity, and rapid recovery also reduce energy waste, data redundancy, and socio-economic disruption.

The results further reveal that digitally resilient financial systems are more capable of supporting sustainable development goals by stabilizing capital flows, enabling green investments, and maintaining trust during crises. However, this potential is constrained by governance gaps, data-center externalities, and unequal access to digital financial services. The discussion therefore advances a model of "sustainable financial resilience" in which technical reliability, environmental stewardship, and social equity are co-produced through digitally enabled institutional design.

By positioning financial resilience within the broader sustainability and Industry 4.0 discourse, this study contributes a novel conceptual lens for scholars and policymakers seeking to reconcile technological innovation with long-term socio-economic and environmental stability.

Keywords: Digital resilience; sustainable finance; Industry 4.0; financial infrastructure; resilience engineering; digital sustainability

INTRODUCTION

The digital transformation of financial systems represents one of the most consequential shifts in the contemporary global economy. What were once predominantly physical, paper-based, and institutionally bounded systems have evolved into complex, data-driven, and highly interconnected digital ecosystems. This transformation is deeply embedded in the broader trajectory of Industry 4.0, characterized by cyber-physical systems, artificial intelligence, distributed ledgers, cloud computing, and the Internet of Things, all of which now structure how value is created, exchanged, and governed across societies (Lohmer et al., 2024; Kayikci, 2018). Financial institutions, from multinational banks to decentralized fintech platforms, increasingly depend on digital infrastructures whose performance, stability, and sustainability have become central determinants of economic resilience.

Yet, as financial systems become more digitized, they also become more vulnerable to new forms of disruption. Cyberattacks, algorithmic failures, data-center outages, and cascading system breakdowns can now paralyze entire markets within minutes, threatening not only economic continuity but also social trust and institutional legitimacy. In this context, resilience engineering has gained prominence as a strategic paradigm for designing financial infrastructures that can maintain uptime, absorb shocks, and recover rapidly under conditions of extreme volatility (Dasari, 2025). Resilience is no longer merely an operational concern; it has become a foundational requirement for sustainable economic development in a digitally mediated world.

At the same time, the sustainability implications of digital finance are increasingly under scrutiny. Digital financial systems are often portrayed as inherently efficient and environmentally benign, yet their reliance on energy-intensive data centers, continuous data processing, and expanding digital hardware ecosystems generates substantial environmental footprints (Lucivero, 2020). Moreover, the social consequences of digital financialization—such as algorithmic bias, financial exclusion, and labor displacement—raise critical questions about whether digitally resilient systems are also socially sustainable (Mishra et al., 2024; Gupta & Degbelo, 2023). These tensions suggest that resilience and sustainability must be theorized together rather than treated as separate or competing objectives.

The academic literature reflects this growing convergence between digital transformation and sustainability. Scholars of Industry 4.0 have shown how digitization can support circular economy models, optimize supply chains, and reduce waste through real-time monitoring and automation (Dwivedi & Paul, 2022; Khan et al., 2023). Similarly, research on digital entrepreneurship demonstrates how platform-based business models can embed social and environmental value creation into their core logic (Gregori & Holzmann, 2020). Yet, within financial systems, these insights remain fragmented. Much of the existing research focuses either on technological reliability or on sustainability outcomes, but rarely on how the two interact in shaping long-term financial system performance.

This gap is particularly significant because financial infrastructures are not merely passive channels of economic activity; they actively shape investment patterns, risk allocation, and development trajectories. A financial system that is resilient but environmentally destructive may sustain short-term stability while undermining long-term planetary boundaries, whereas a system that is environmentally oriented but operationally fragile may fail to deliver continuous economic support during crises. The challenge, therefore, lies in conceptualizing financial infrastructures that are simultaneously resilient, sustainable, and socially legitimate.

Resilience engineering, as articulated in contemporary infrastructure research, offers a powerful lens for addressing this challenge. By focusing on anticipatory capacity, adaptive learning, and fault-tolerant design, resilience engineering moves beyond traditional risk management toward a dynamic understanding of system survival under uncertainty (Dasari, 2025). In financial contexts, this approach reframes digital uptime not simply as a technical metric but as a socio-economic safeguard that protects livelihoods, investment flows, and institutional trust during periods of turbulence. When integrated with sustainability frameworks, resilience engineering can also be understood as a mechanism for reducing systemic waste, preventing resource-intensive system failures, and minimizing the environmental costs of recovery processes.

The broader sustainability literature further reinforces the importance of this integration. Studies of digital governance highlight the need for institutional frameworks that align technological innovation with sustainable development goals, ensuring that digital systems serve public rather than purely commercial interests (Linkov et al., 2018). Similarly, research on big data and sustainability warns that without careful design, digitalization can generate "big waste" in the form of excessive energy consumption, data redundancy, and electronic waste, thereby undermining the very efficiency gains it promises (Lucivero, 2020). Financial systems, as some of the largest generators and processors of data, are particularly implicated in these dynamics.

Universities and knowledge institutions also play a critical role in shaping how these issues are understood and addressed. As Mian et al. (2020) and Flórez-Parra et al. (2024) argue, sustainability education in the context of Industry 4.0 must integrate technological literacy with ethical and environmental awareness. This is especially relevant for finance professionals, whose decisions increasingly rely on complex digital tools and analytics that can either amplify or mitigate sustainability risks. The dissemination of economic, social, and environmental information within academic and professional networks thus becomes a key driver of how resilient and sustainable financial infrastructures are conceptualized and implemented.

Despite these converging strands of scholarship, a coherent theoretical framework linking resilience engineering in financial systems with digital sustainability remains underdeveloped. Much of the existing literature treats financial resilience in terms of capital adequacy, liquidity buffers, and regulatory compliance, while sustainability is addressed through separate metrics such as green finance, ESG reporting, or carbon accounting. These approaches, while valuable, fail to capture the infrastructural and technological foundations upon which modern finance now rests. As financial services migrate to cloud platforms, distributed ledgers, and AI-driven decision systems, the material and energetic dimensions of digital infrastructure become inseparable from questions of financial stability and sustainability.

This study responds to this gap by developing an integrated analysis of resilient digital infrastructures for sustainable financial systems. Building on the resilience engineering framework articulated by Dasari (2025) and the broader literature on digital sustainability, Industry 4.0, and governance, the article seeks to answer three interrelated questions. First, how do principles of resilience engineering shape the sustainability performance of digital financial infrastructures? Second, in what ways do Industry 4.0 technologies simultaneously enhance and threaten the long-term viability of financial systems? Third, how can governance and institutional design align digital resilience with social and environmental objectives?

By addressing these questions, the article advances a novel conceptualization of financial infrastructure as a socio-technical system whose resilience and sustainability are mutually constitutive. Rather than viewing digitalization as a purely efficiency-driven process, the analysis situates it within a broader ethical and ecological context, highlighting both its transformative potential and its latent risks. In doing so, the study contributes to ongoing debates about the future of finance in a world marked by climate change, technological acceleration, and deepening socio-economic interdependence (Khan et al., 2023; Linkov et al., 2018).

The remainder of this article develops this argument through a comprehensive methodological, analytical, and theoretical examination of the literature. By synthesizing insights from resilience engineering, digital sustainability, and Industry 4.0 research, it seeks to provide scholars, practitioners, and policymakers with a robust framework for designing financial systems that are not only technologically advanced but also environmentally responsible and socially resilient.

METHODOLOGY

The methodological design of this research is grounded in qualitative-analytical synthesis, a strategy particularly suited for investigating complex socio-technical systems such as digitally mediated financial infrastructures. Because the core objective of this study is not to test a single hypothesis through numerical modeling but to integrate, reinterpret, and theoretically advance existing knowledge on resilience engineering and sustainability, the research relies on a structured interpretive methodology that draws from interdisciplinary literature in engineering, sustainability science, digital governance, and financial systems research (Martin-Martín et al., 2018; Linkov et al., 2018). This approach is consistent with sustainability scholarship, which recognizes that system-level transformations cannot be fully captured through reductionist metrics alone but require deep conceptual and contextual analysis (Mishra et al., 2024).

The first methodological pillar of this study is systematic conceptual mapping. Instead of focusing on empirical datasets, the research maps how key concepts such as resilience, digital infrastructure, sustainability, and Industry 4.0 are defined and operationalized across the selected references. This allows the identification of convergences and contradictions among scholars studying digital entrepreneurship, circular economy, big data, governance, and reliability engineering (Gregori & Holzmann, 2020; Dwivedi & Paul, 2022; Lucivero, 2020). By tracing how these concepts evolve across disciplines, the study constructs a coherent theoretical narrative explaining how resilient financial systems can also be sustainable systems.

The second methodological pillar is comparative theoretical synthesis. Here, the resilience engineering framework proposed for financial systems by Dasari (2025) is treated as a conceptual anchor. This framework, which emphasizes uptime, redundancy, fault tolerance, and adaptive recovery during volatility, is systematically compared with sustainability-oriented frameworks such as digital supply chain circularity (Dwivedi & Paul, 2022), sustainable digital entrepreneurship (Gregori & Holzmann, 2020), and governance for a sustainable digital world (Linkov et al., 2018). Through this comparison, the study identifies areas of complementarity, such as how redundancy reduces both financial risk and environmental waste, as well as areas of tension, such as how high-frequency trading infrastructures may increase energy consumption despite improving liquidity.

A third methodological dimension is critical discourse analysis. This involves examining how the literature frames the relationship between technology and sustainability. For example, the optimistic narratives of Industry 4.0 as an enabler of efficiency and sustainability (Hassoun et al., 2022; Kayikci, 2018) are contrasted with critical perspectives that emphasize digital waste, data center emissions, and algorithmic opacity (Lucivero, 2020; Linkov et al., 2018). In the context of financial systems, this tension is particularly salient because high-speed digital infrastructures can both stabilize markets and exacerbate inequality or environmental externalities.

To ensure analytical rigor, the study adopts a triangulation strategy that integrates insights from multiple domains. Financial resilience is examined through the lens of reliability engineering (Dasari, 2025), while sustainability outcomes are interpreted through circular economy and governance frameworks (Dwivedi & Paul, 2022; Linkov et al., 2018). Education and institutional capacity-building are also considered, drawing on university-level sustainability dissemination research (Mian et al., 2020; Flórez-Parra et al., 2024), because the long-term viability of resilient financial systems depends on how future professionals are trained to manage digital infrastructures responsibly.

The methodological logic is therefore iterative rather than linear. Concepts are revisited and refined as they are examined across different literatures. For instance, the idea of uptime, central to resilience engineering in financial systems (Dasari, 2025), is not treated merely as a technical metric but is reinterpreted as a sustainability variable, because system outages generate economic loss, energy-intensive recovery operations, and social disruption. Similarly, digitalization is not treated as an inherently positive force but as a contingent process whose sustainability impact depends on governance, design, and institutional context (Linkov et al., 2018; Lucivero, 2020).

One limitation of this methodological approach is that it does not produce new empirical data. However, this is consistent with the study's objective, which is to develop an integrative theoretical framework rather than to measure specific system performance indicators. In sustainability and infrastructure research, such theoretical integration is essential because empirical metrics often lag behind technological change and fail to capture systemic interactions (Mishra et al., 2024). Another limitation is that the literature itself reflects regional and sectoral biases, particularly toward industrial and urban contexts. Nevertheless, financial systems are inherently global and interconnected, making the selected references appropriate for capturing broad structural dynamics (Lohmer et al., 2024).

Overall, the methodology is designed to ensure that every analytical claim is grounded in established scholarship while allowing for theoretical innovation through synthesis. By situating resilience engineering within the wider discourse on digital sustainability and Industry 4.0, the study provides a robust interpretive foundation for understanding how future financial systems can be both technologically resilient and environmentally and socially sustainable (Dasari, 2025; Khan et al., 2023).

RESULTS

The analytical synthesis of the literature reveals several interrelated patterns that clarify how resilience engineering and sustainability interact within digitally mediated financial systems. The first major result is that resilience, when embedded in digital financial infrastructure, functions as a stabilizing force not only for markets but also for sustainability outcomes. According to Dasari (2025), systems engineered for high uptime during volatility rely on redundancy, automated failover, and real-time monitoring. These same mechanisms reduce the need for emergency interventions that typically involve energy-intensive data migrations, hardware replacements, and crisis-driven overprovisioning, all of which contribute to digital waste and environmental degradation (Lucivero, 2020). Thus, resilience engineering indirectly supports environmental sustainability by minimizing the material and energetic costs of system failure.

A second key result is that Industry 4.0 technologies amplify both the positive and negative sustainability impacts of financial systems. On the positive side, digital platforms enable the rapid mobilization of capital toward green investments, circular economy initiatives, and socially responsible enterprises (Gregori & Holzmann, 2020; Dwivedi & Paul, 2022). Blockchain-based systems, for instance, enhance transparency and traceability, making it easier to verify sustainable financial flows and prevent fraud in green finance markets (Gong et al., 2022). At the same time, these technologies significantly increase data volumes and computational intensity, which, if unmanaged, can lead to escalating carbon footprints and electronic waste (Lucivero, 2020). Resilience-oriented architectures mitigate this risk by optimizing resource use and preventing cascading failures that would otherwise necessitate large-scale system rebuilds (Dasari, 2025).

The results also show that governance plays a decisive role in determining whether digital financial resilience translates into sustainable development. Governance frameworks for a sustainable digital world emphasize transparency, accountability, and stakeholder participation in technological decision-making (Linkov et al., 2018). When financial infrastructures are governed in this way, resilience strategies such as distributed cloud architectures and automated risk management systems can be aligned with broader social and environmental objectives. Conversely, in the absence of such governance, resilience may be pursued in purely commercial terms, leading to overinvestment in high-energy technologies that improve uptime but exacerbate inequality and environmental harm (Khan et al., 2023).

Another important finding concerns the role of institutional knowledge and education. Universities and professional training systems that integrate sustainability with digital competence are more likely to produce financial engineers and managers capable of designing resilient yet responsible infrastructures (Mian et al., 2020; Flórez-Parra et al., 2024). The dissemination of sustainability-oriented information within academic and professional networks thus acts as a multiplier for both resilience and sustainability, shaping how future financial systems are built and maintained.

Finally, the results indicate that resilient digital financial systems are more capable of supporting social stability during periods of economic stress. Social protection programs and digital financial inclusion initiatives depend on continuous system availability to deliver benefits, process payments, and maintain trust among vulnerable populations (Mishra et al., 2024). When digital infrastructures fail, the social costs are disproportionately borne by those with the least financial and technological resilience. By contrast, systems designed according to resilience engineering principles ensure that essential financial services remain accessible even during crises, thereby reinforcing the social dimension of sustainability (Dasari, 2025; Gupta & Degbelo, 2023).

Taken together, these findings demonstrate that resilience engineering is not merely a technical strategy for ensuring financial uptime but a foundational element of sustainable digital finance. Through its influence on energy use, governance alignment, institutional capacity, and social equity, resilience shapes the long-term viability of financial systems in the era of Industry 4.0 (Lohmer et al., 2024; Linkov et al., 2018).

DISCUSSION

The integration of resilience engineering with sustainability-oriented digital finance represents a profound shift in how financial infrastructures are theorized and governed. Traditionally, financial resilience was understood primarily in terms of capital buffers, regulatory compliance, and risk diversification. However, as financial systems become increasingly dependent on complex digital infrastructures, resilience must be reinterpreted as a property of socio-technical systems whose stability is inseparable from environmental and social conditions (Dasari, 2025; Linkov et al., 2018). This discussion elaborates on the theoretical, practical, and ethical implications of this shift.

From a theoretical perspective, the findings support a systems-based understanding of sustainability in which digital infrastructures act as mediating layers between economic activity and ecological and social systems. Industry 4.0 technologies create what Lohmer et al. (2024) describe as an "internet of value," where financial flows, data streams, and material processes are tightly coupled. In such an environment, resilience engineering ensures that these couplings remain functional under stress, preventing disruptions that would otherwise propagate across sectors and undermine sustainable development. Yet, the same tight coupling also means that failures can have amplified environmental and social consequences, reinforcing the need for governance frameworks that align resilience with sustainability goals (Linkov et al., 2018).

One of the most significant implications concerns the environmental footprint of digital finance. Critics of digitalization have warned that big data and high-performance computing generate forms of "hidden waste" that are often overlooked in sustainability assessments (Lucivero, 2020). Financial systems, with their continuous trading, risk modeling, and real-time analytics, are among the most data-intensive sectors. Resilience engineering addresses this challenge by promoting efficient system design, predictive maintenance, and adaptive scaling, all of which reduce unnecessary computational load and energy consumption (Dasari, 2025; Jasiulewicz-Kaczmarek et al., 2020). However, this potential is realized only when sustainability is explicitly incorporated into infrastructure design criteria, rather than treated as an afterthought.

Social sustainability is equally affected by digital financial resilience. As Gupta and Degbelo (2023) show in the context of sustainable cities, AI-driven financial services can enhance access and efficiency, but they also risk reinforcing existing inequalities if not carefully governed. Resilient infrastructures that ensure continuous service delivery during crises are particularly important for social protection programs and small enterprises, which rely on digital finance for survival (Mishra et al., 2024). In this sense, resilience engineering becomes a tool for social justice, ensuring that technological failures do not disproportionately harm the most vulnerable.

Yet, there are important counterarguments. Some scholars argue that the pursuit of ever-higher levels of digital resilience may lead to excessive investment in redundant infrastructures that consume large amounts of energy and resources (Lucivero, 2020). From this perspective, resilience could conflict with environmental sustainability if it results in overbuilt systems designed to handle rare extreme events. This critique highlights the need for balanced design principles that optimize rather than maximize resilience, taking into account both risk and resource constraints (Khan et al., 2023; Dwivedi & Paul, 2022). Governance frameworks that incorporate life-cycle assessment and circular economy principles can help resolve this tension by ensuring that redundancy does not translate into waste (Linkov et al., 2018).

Education and institutional capacity emerge as critical mediating factors in this debate. Universities that integrate sustainability, digital ethics, and engineering principles create a workforce capable of navigating the complex trade-offs between resilience and environmental impact (Mian et al., 2020; Flórez-Parra et al., 2024). Without such capacity-building, financial institutions may default to narrow technical solutions that address uptime but ignore broader sustainability implications.

Future research should therefore move beyond siloed analyses of finance, technology, and sustainability. Empirical studies that examine how specific resilience engineering practices affect energy use, social inclusion, and investment patterns would provide valuable insights into the real-world trade-offs identified here. Additionally, comparative research across different regulatory and cultural contexts could illuminate how governance shapes the relationship between digital resilience and sustainability (Linkov et al., 2018; Lohmer et al., 2024).

CONCLUSION

This study has argued that the future of sustainable finance depends fundamentally on the resilience of its digital infrastructures. By integrating resilience engineering with sustainability-oriented digital governance, financial systems can be designed to support economic stability, environmental stewardship, and social equity simultaneously. The framework articulated by Dasari (2025) demonstrates that uptime, redundancy, and adaptive recovery are not merely technical objectives but essential components of sustainable development in a digitally mediated economy. When aligned with circular economy principles, ethical governance, and institutional learning, resilient financial infrastructures become powerful enablers of long-term societal well-being. As Industry 4.0 continues to reshape global finance, the challenge for scholars, practitioners, and policymakers will be to ensure that technological robustness and sustainability are pursued as mutually reinforcing, rather than competing, goals.

REFERENCES

1. Dasari, H. (2025). Implementing Site Reliability Engineering (SRE) in Legacy Retail Infrastructure. The American Journal of Engineering and Technology, 7(07), 167–179. https://doi.org/10.37547/tajet/Volume07Issue07-16

2. Lohmer, J., Birkel, H., & Müller, J. M. (2024). The internet of value: Towards a definition, framework, and understanding of its sustainability implications. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 206, 123466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2024.123466
3. Mian, S. H., Salah, B., Ameen, W., Moiduddin, K., & Alkhalefah, H. (2020). Adapting Universities for Sustainability Education in Industry 4.0: Channel of Challenges and Opportunities. Sustainability, 12(15), 6100.
4. Linkov, I., Trump, B. D., Poinsatte-Jones, K., & Florin, M.-V. (2018). Governance strategies for a sustainable digital world. Sustainability, 10(2), 440.
5. Lucivero, F. (2020). Big data, big waste? A reflection on the environmental sustainability of big data initiatives. Science and Engineering Ethics, 26(2), 1009–1030.
6. Gong, Y., Wang, Y., Frei, R., Wang, B., & Zhao, C. (2022). Blockchain application in circular marine plastic debris management. Industrial Marketing Management, 102, 164–176. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.INDMARMAN.2022.01.010
7. Gregori, P., & Holzmann, P. (2020). Digital sustainable entrepreneurship: A business model perspective on embedding digital Technologies for Social and Environmental Value Creation. Journal of Cleaner Production, 272, 122817. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122817
8. Mishra, N., Grima, S., & Ozen, E. (2024). Unpacking the black box: Investigating the role of social protection Programmes in promoting decent work and economic growth in low-income countries. Sustainable Development. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.3008
9. Khan, S. A., Rehman, M. T., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Embracement of industry 4.0 and sustainable supply chain practices under the shadow of practice-based view theory: Ensuring environmental sustainability in corporate sector. Journal of Cleaner Production, 398, 136609. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.136609
10. Flórez-Parra, J. M., López-Pérez, M. V., López-Hernández, A. M., & Arco-Castro, M. L. (2024). Determinants of the dissemination of economic, social and environmental information at the university level in the context of commitment to the sustainable development goals. Sustainable Development, 32(3), 1925–1939. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2760
11. Dwivedi, A., & Paul, S. K. (2022). A framework for digital supply chains in the era of circular economy: Implications on environmental sustainability. Business Strategy and the Environment, 31(4), 1249–1274. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2953
12. Gupta, S., & Degbelo, A. (2023). An empirical analysis of AI contributions to sustainable cities (SDG 11). Philosophical Studies Series, 152, 461–484. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21147-8_25
13. Kayikci, Y. (2018). Sustainability impact of digitization in logistics. Procedia Manufacturing, 21, 782–789.
14. Jasiulewicz-Kaczmarek, M., Legutko, S., & Kluk, P. (2020). Maintenance 4.0 technologies–new opportunities for sustainability driven maintenance. Management and Production Engineering Review, 11.
15. Martin-Martín, A., Orduna-Malea, E., Thelwall, M., & López-Cózar, E. D. (2018). Google scholar, web of science, and Scopus: A systematic comparison of citations in 252 subject categories. Journal of Informetrics, 12(4), 1160–1177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2018.09.002
16. Millard, J., Sorivelle, M. N., Deljanin, S., Unterfrauner, E., & Voigt, C. (2018). Is the maker movement contributing to sustainability? Sustainability, 10(7), 2212.
17. Hassoun, A., Prieto, M. A., Carpena, M., Bouzembrak, Y., Marvin, H. J. P., Pallarés, N., Barba, F. J., Bangar, S. P., Chaudhary, V., Ibrahim, S., & Bono, G. (2022). Exploring the role of green and industry 4.0 Technologies in Achieving Sustainable Development Goals in food sectors. Food Research International, 162, 112068.
18. Epifani, S. (2020). Sostenibilità Digitale. In Perché La Sostenibilità Non Può Prescindere Dalla Trasformazione Digitale. Digital Transformation Institute.
19. Dasari, H. (2025). Resilience engineering in financial systems: Strategies for ensuring uptime during volatility. The American Journal of Engineering and Technology, 7(7), 54–61. https://doi.org/10.37547/tajet/Volume07Issue07-06