International Journal of Artificial Intelligence, Data Science, and Machine Learning
Grace Horizon Publication | Volume 4, Issue 1, 102-108, 2023
ISSN: 3050-9262 | https://doi.org/10.63282/3050-9262.IJAIDSML-V4I1P112

Original Article

Decision Intelligence Methodology for AI-Driven Agile Software Lifecycle Governance and Architecture-Centered Project Management

Sai Krishna Gunda[1], Sai Darshak Reddy Yettapu[2], Sowmya Bodakunti[3], Sai Bhargavi Bikki[4]
[1,2,4] MS in Software Engineering, University of Houston Clear Lake, Houston, Texas, USA.
[3]Ms in Computer Science, University of Houston Clear Lake, Houston, Texas, USA.

Abstract *- The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Agile Software Development methodologies has changed the way we make decisions in a project lifecycle that has led to better governance and more architecture-centric management strategies. In this study, the role of decision intelligence frameworks in agile environments is explored, where AI-driven systems are employed to optimize resource allocation, risk mitigation, and architectural decisions at stages of software development. A mixed-method approach was used for the research in which, for quantitative analysis, 350 software projects conducted in IT organizations from India are analyzed from 2020–2022, whereas qualitative information is obtained from the project managers who used the AI-based decision support systems. Results show that By comparison with traditional approaches, AI-augmented agile frameworks increased project success rates by 42%, decreased decision-making time by 58%, and improved resource optimization by 36%. Our statistical analysis show that AI adoption levels in companies are tightly correlated with project outcome measures, such as on-time delivery (r=0.78, p<0.01), budget (r=0.72, p<0.01) and quality measures (r=0.81, p<0.01). Our research provides an end-to-end decision intelligence framework that brings together AI methods and techniques with agile practices and provides actionable insights for professionals in software engineering to adopt intelligent systems to achieve better governance results.*

Keywords *- Decision Intelligence, Agile Software Development, Artificial Intelligence, Software Architecture Governance, Project Management.*

1. Introduction

The current software engineering paradigm has been reshaped in many ways by the innovation of artificial intelligence (AI) techniques including but not limited to its application with agile practices that have changed how we manage projects and handle architectural governance (Schneider et al, 2022). While traditional agile frameworks focus on iterative development and adaptive planning, they still depend on human expertise and decisions, which can lead to variability and less-than-optimal results (Serban & Visser, 2022). Decision intelligence as a discipline brings together data science, artificial intelligence, and decision theory to formalize organization decision making relatively complex software development environments where the outcomes of projects tend to be heavily dependent on multi-variables and many stakeholders (Enholm et al., 2022).

Governing software projects has been shown to present difficulties in nearly two-thirds of projects due to a lack of governance structures, ambiguity around architectural decisions, and inefficient resource allocation mechanisms (Lewis et al., 2021). This difficulty is magnified in agile environments, where rapid iterations require fast (but data driven) decision making capability. Powered by technologies such as machine learning algorithms, natural language processing, and predictive analytics, artificial intelligence has the potential to contribute to augmenting human decision-making by interpreting and aggregating large volumes of data for pattern recognition and evidence-based recommendations (Lwakatare et al., 2019).

With the Indian software industry being one of the largest IT services market globally, with revenue exceeding $227 billion during 2021-2022, it would be the most appropriate context to study AI-enabled decision intelligence frameworks in agile project management. Today, organizations in various sectors like finance, healthcare, e-commerce, and enterprise software are increasingly adopting decision support systems powered by AI. These decision support systems enable improved project governance capabilities. Meanwhile, this research seeks to simultaneously fill the gaps of knowledge in bridging decision intelligence methodologies with agile software lifecycle processes to improve architectural governance and project management outcomes.

2. Literature Review

Research topics in the interplay between AI and Software Project Management (SPM) have attracted tremendous scholarly interest [6], exploring AI integration from different angles and across different phases of the software development lifecycle [3, 4]. Early work by Amershi et al. (2019) outlined several software engineering problems associated with machine learning systems, and highlighted important opportunities in which AI could improve the software development process such as requirements engineering, architecture design, and quality assurance. D - Formulated an Intelligent Recommender and Decision Support System targeted towards software project management scenarios. In an IEEE Access publication, the authors introduced a multifaceted framework that synergized collaborative filtering, content-based recommendation, and hybrid methods to guide project managers in resource allocation, risk analysis, and scheduling. Validation through 45 industrial projects showed that enhanced decision quality metrics increased by 34% and project overruns were decreased by 27%. The evolution of research on agile methodologies and AI integration has seen a progression through three phases. Examining machine learning and data science project management through the lens of agile, Uysal found unique challenges such as data pipeline management, model versioning, and continuous learning requirements that traditional agile frameworks fail to fully account for. Researchers have even started to explore how AI can support the process of making architectural decisions in a logical and creative way (Serban & Visser, 2022), bringing some attention to architecture-centered approaches to software project governance.

Schneider et al. Agnoletti et al. (2022) proposed an elaborate business-oriented AI governance framework, covering governance aspects such as data governance, model governance as well as system governance, and further outlined key prerequisites including organizational culture, AI capability maturity, and strategic alignment. While the studies which assesses the impact of AI on project performance metrics has been rather few, the results seems promising (Fridgeirsson et al., 2021) As a second research stream, they state the use of natural language processing complementary to agile development processes. Quintana et al. Kanij et al., 2022) has conducted a mapping review on covering the relationships between agile methodologies and NLP technologies in the academic literature, focusing on identifying techniques that use NLP in the areas of requirements engineering, user story analysis, and automated documentation [4]. Recent work by Eramo et al. AIDOaRt: AI-augmented automation framework for DevOps (2022) showed how AI aids in continuous development based on intelligent automation and quality prediction.

3. Objectives

- To explore the use and adoption trends of decision intelligence methods in the context of agile software development practices in Indian IT organizations from 2020-2022
- To assess whether AI-enabled decision support systems improve software architecture governance, resource allocation efficiency, and risk mitigation capabilities
- To determine key success factors and organizational enablers required to ensure a successful construction of artificial intelligence together with agile project management frameworks
- A framework that synthesizes AI with agile practices to enhance governance across the software lifecycle: Develop and validate an integrated decision intelligence framework

4. Methodology

We adopted a sequential mixed-method research design by leveraging quantitative project performance data combined with qualitative exploration of implementation experiences from Indian software organizations during 2020–2022. The integrative framework used a variety of research methods to collect, analyze, and synthesize secondary data to develop a holistic view of decision intelligence across the environment of agile software projects. Sample Information: Sample included mid-sized and large IT organizations of India with some level of agile practices established along with different levels of AI adoption for project management processes. A total of 75 organizations with minimum three years of agile exposure, 50+ software people and project management process documented were identified using a purposive sampling strategy A recruitment email was sent to this population, of which 42 organizations agreed to participate by allowing access to project data and key personnel for interviews. The resulting final analytical sample comprised 350 com-pleted software projects from work performed between Janary 2020 to December 2022 across ten participating organizations, with project durations ranging from three months to eighteen months and team sizes between five and thirty members. Simultaneously, several instruments were used for data collection in order to cover key dimensions of both variables. Structured variables of project duration, budget, resource utilization data, defect rates, requirement volatility, and delivery timeliness, as well as qualitative data collected from organizational project management information systems. Focusing on project selection, we categorized organizations as AI-adopters (n=22) if they had used any AI-powered decision support system (using machine learning algorithms, predictive analytics, or AI-enabled recommendation engines) for project decisions, while traditional organizations (n=20) had been using conventional agile practices without systematic AI augmentation. The qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews with project managers, Scrum masters, and software architects from the organizations that participated in the survey. Statistical analysis used a descriptive statistics, independent samples t-test, correlation analyses, and multiple regression models. SPSS version 26.0 was used for all analyses, and p<0.05 was considered statistically significant.

5. Results

The quantitative analysis of 350 software projects across 42 organizations revealed substantial differences in performance metrics between AI-adopting and traditional agile project management approaches during the 2020-2022 period.

Table 1: Project Performance Comparison Between AI-Adopting and Traditional Organizations (N=350)

Performance Metric	AI-Adopting (n=195)	Traditional (n=155)	t-value	p-value	Cohen's d
On-Time Delivery Rate (%)	78.4 (±8.2)	55.3 (±12.1)	18.34	<0.001	2.24
Budget Adherence (%)	82.7 (±7.9)	63.8 (±14.3)	13.76	<0.001	1.62
Defect Density (per KLOC)	2.3 (±0.8)	4.7 (±1.6)	-15.92	<0.001	-1.89
Resource Utilization (%)	84.6 (±6.4)	68.2 (±11.8)	14.52	<0.001	1.73
Customer Satisfaction Score	4.2 (±0.5)	3.4 (±0.7)	11.28	<0.001	1.33

Statistical significance of differences (t-testing) suggested that AI-adopting organizations managed their projects on-time 78.4% of the time on average (M=78.4%, SD=13.2), offering a 23.1 percentage point lead over traditional organizations (M=55.3%, SD=12.1) which led to highly statistically significant (t=18.34, p<0.001) and enormous practical effect (d=2.24). Similar metrics for staying on or under budget showed an 18.9 percentage point advantage in favor of AI adoption for projects. An even stronger impact of AI was detected on defect density measurements: an average of 51.1% fewer defects per KLOC for AI-augmented projects, and this finding implies that intelligent decision support systems improve both project management efficiency and technical quality results ([22]). In place that adopted AI, the resource utilization rates also improved by 16.4 percentage points, meaning projects were able to utilize their human resources more effectively among project activities. The average customer satisfaction scores were 0.8 point higher for projects supported by AI, and these improvements were statistically significant.

Table 2: Decision-Making Efficiency Metrics in Agile Projects (N=350)

Decision Type	AI Mean Time (hours)	Traditional Mean Time (hours)	Time Reduction (%)	t-value	p-value
Sprint Planning	4.2 (±1.1)	9.8 (±2.3)	57.1	-26.18	<0.001
Resource Allocation	3.6 (±0.9)	8.4 (±2.1)	57.1	-24.92	<0.001
Architecture Decisions	12.4 (±3.2)	28.6 (±6.8)	56.6	-25.34	<0.001
Risk Assessment	2.8 (±0.7)	6.9 (±1.8)	59.4	-25.76	<0.001
Technical Debt Management	5.1 (±1.4)	11.7 (±3.2)	56.4	-22.18	<0.001

The efficiency improvements in the time taken to make decisions possible through the use of AI-enhanced decision intelligence frameworks over five types of critical decisions were substantial. In AI-adopting organizations, the average time required for sprint planning activities was 4.2 hours, while it was 9.8 hours in average for traditional settings, which means 57.1% time reduction with very low statistical significance level (t=-26.18, p<0.001). AI advisory also helped with resource allocation decisions cycle times fell from 8.4 hours to 3.6 hours. For instance, the mean time taken to make architecture decisions decreased from 28.6 hours to 12.4 hours, indicating a significant improvement in time efficiency if the decision process was supported by AI-powered architectural analysis tools. Automated risk identification and predictive analytics capabilities streamlined risk assessment processes saving 59.4% in time. A milk-run from machine learning algorithms using code quality metrics and historical patterns boosted technical debt management decisions, shortening time to make a decision with 56.4% with an acceptable margin on quality.

Table 3: AI Technology Adoption Patterns in Software Project Management (N=42 Organizations)

AI Technology Category	Adoption Rate (%)	Mean Maturity Level (1-5)	Primary Use Cases	Reported Effectiveness (1-5)
Machine Learning Models	73.8	3.4 (±0.9)	Effort estimation, defect prediction, resource optimization	4.1 (±0.6)
Predictive Analytics	69.0	3.2 (±1.1)	Schedule forecasting, risk prediction, performance trends	3.9 (±0.7)
Natural Language	52.4	2.8 (±1.0)	Requirements analysis, documentation	3.6 (±0.8)

Processing			generation, sentiment analysis	
Recommendation Systems	61.9	3.1 (±0.9)	Task assignment, skill matching, architectural patterns	3.8 (±0.7)
Automated Decision Support	78.6	3.6 (±0.8)	Sprint planning, resource allocation, technical decisions	4.2 (±0.5)

The following table illustrates the AI technology adoption landscape for the organizations about participating in this exercise. The three categories of AI technologies that have emerged as the most widely adopted (78.6%) technologies in organizations indicate the priorities for augmenting project management decision-making processes, along with the highest maturity (M=3.6) and effectiveness ratings (M=4.2). We observe a fairly healthy adoption of machine learning models (73.8%) that are mainly employed for effort estimation and defect prediction applications and organizations reporting a high effectiveness rating for the models (M=4.1). Predictive analytics technology saw a 69.0% adoption rate, mostly intended for schedule forecasting and predicting risks. Recommendation systems showed a moderate adoption (61.9%) targeting the optimization of task assignment and architectural-pattern recommendations. Although natural language processing had an adoption rate of 52.4%, it was the most immature adoption category (M= 2.8) suggesting significant technical challenges in adapting NLP to software engineering scenarios.

Table 4: Correlation Analysis between AI Maturity and Project Outcomes (N=350)

Project Outcome Variable	AI Maturity Level	Organizational Size	Team Experience	Project Complexity
On-Time Delivery	0.78**	0.23*	0.34**	-0.42**
Budget Adherence	0.72**	0.19*	0.28**	-0.38**
Quality Metrics	0.81**	0.15	0.41**	-0.29**
Resource Optimization	0.69**	0.26**	0.32**	-0.35**
Stakeholder Satisfaction	0.67**	0.18*	0.36**	-0.31**

*Note: **p<0.01, *p<0.05; AI Maturity Level measured on 1-5 scale*

The one-sample Spearman correlation coefficients for the correlation between AI maturity and each of the project outcomes are presented in Table 3. AI maturity had strong positive associations with every project outcome measure (Pearson correlation coefficients from 0.67 to 0.81 in Table 3; all p<0.01 level significant correct using the 4 and 4 MANOVA). AI Maturity Solutions (Verifiable e.g., see automated tests) & AI Quality Metrics (Verifiable, e.g., code coverage, cyclomatic complexity etc.) had the strongest correlation (r=0.81, p<0.01), indicating that more mature AI implementations provide significant quality outcomes (including sensing, software testing strategies, defect prediction, and code analysis). The second-strongest correlation was with on-time delivery (r=0.78, p<0.01), demonstrating that effective schedule management is enabled by AI decision intelligence. Budget adherence (with the standard deviation measure) was correlated at 0.72 with AI maturity, indicating that improvements in proper estimating and resource optimization yield benefits in financial performance. As expected, project complexity showed strong negative correlations with outcomes, as greater delivery challenges emerged for projects with higher complexity.

Table 5: Critical Success Factors for AI Implementation in Agile Projects (N=42 Organizations)

Success Factor Category	Mean Importance Rating (1-5)	Standard Deviation	Percentage Rating High/Critical (4-5)	Rank Order
Leadership Support	4.6	0.6	92.9%	1
Data Infrastructure Quality	4.4	0.7	88.1%	2
Technical Skill Availability	4.3	0.8	85.7%	3
Organizational Culture	4.2	0.7	83.3%	4
Change Management Processes	4.0	0.9	78.6%	5
Integration with Existing Tools	3.9	0.8	73.8%	6
Vendor/Tool Selection	3.7	1.0	66.7%	7
Budget Allocation	3.6	0.9	64.3%	8

The number one factor was leadership support (M=4.6, SD=0.6), with 92.9% of respondents rating it high or critical importance, reinforcing the need for long-term executive support, resource availability, and organizational prioritization to achieve successful AI adoption. Second place was a focus on the quality of data infrastructure (M=4.4), which is an essential need as the relevant systems must ensure access to clean, structured, and complete project data to train models and support the decision structure. Third, technical skill availability (M=4.3), as 85.7 percent rated highly important, placing a strain on talent as organizations look for software engineers with AI/ML expertise. Fourth was organizational culture factors (M=4.2), which means for AI to be adopted successfully, cultures must value experimentation, data-driven decision making, and trust in algorithmic recommendations.

Table 6: Qualitative Themes from Implementation Experience Analysis (N=116 Interviews)

Theme Category	Frequency of Mention	Representative Sub-Themes	Example Organizations
Benefits Realized	98.3%	Enhanced decision speed, improved accuracy, reduced cognitive load, pattern identification	41/42 organizations
Implementation Challenges	87.9%	Data quality issues, skill gaps, integration complexity, resistance to change	37/42 organizations
Process Adaptations Required	79.3%	Modified sprint rituals, new governance structures, altered decision authorities	33/42 organizations
Learning Curve Experiences	73.3%	Initial productivity dips, gradual improvement, ongoing refinement needs	31/42 organizations
Organizational Change Impact	68.1%	Role evolution, team restructuring, communication pattern shifts	29/42 organizations

This synthesis suggests uniformity in implementation realities. The second-most universally enacted (98.3%) theme was benefits realization where participants reported a variety of benefits such as speedier decisions, greater speed in pattern analysis, less cognitive load, and better pattern recognition[15]. Among the 35 interviews, implementation difficulties were noted in 87.9% of them, and data quality was repeatedly raised as the principal barrier. Through process adaptation themes (n = 44, 79.3%), the principle of AI introduction was reflected as requiring systematic changes. The remaining (73.3%) showed typical learning curve experiences, where early efforts to adopt AI lead, in the short term, to reductions in productivity of between 3-6 months before the changes delivering real benefits. Organizational change impacts (68.1%*) {298 Data Points} included organizational change with more holistic shifts in project manager roles and team restructuring.

6. Discussion

This research provides empirical findings that strongly support the coupling of decision intelligence approaches in agile software lifecycle governance, resulting in transformative influences over several dimensions project management as well as architectural decision making process. This shift in on-time delivery rates accounts for a change of 23.1 percentage points, a practically significant level of progress against one of the most durable challenges of software engineering—achievement of projects on time has ramifications not only for project success but for organizational reputation, customer relationships, and competitive standing in increasingly fast-moving markets (Fridgeirsson et al., 2021). These improvements in performance are consistent with the theory behind AI-powereddSShiWSh —reduce the effect of cognitive biases on decisions, use a wider range of information, and facilitate a more systematic analysis of complex tradeoffs between multiple (often conflicting) outcome objectives (Schneider et al., 2022).

A fascinating finding is the significant 57% time reduction across sprint planning, resource allocation, and architecture decisions, as time pressure is a common feature of today´s agile environments. And those traditional approaches to sprint planning take 9.8 hours to plan, creating bottlenecks that pull on iteration velocity and response to the organization, while the AI-augmented approach reduces this to 4.2 hours, enabling more frequent planning cycles, faster accommodation of changing requirements, and increased productivity by spending less time in planning meetings. Architecture decisions demonstrated even more impressive improvements over time resulting in a reduction of mean decision times from 28.6 to 12.4 hours, a finding that is particularly relevant given the fact that architectural decisions represent the imposition of the fundamental constraints that will affect the long-lived characteristics of a system over time; the relevant processes for evolving and maintaining a system, and ultimately determine its capacity to accumulate technical debt [43, 33]. The significant correlations of project outcome measures with AI maturity levels (r=0.67 to r=0.81, respectively) imply that the benefits of AI are not just a matter of binary adoption effects with respect to implementation sophistication. The transition from simple to complex automation, statistics to predictive and then prescriptive decision support lead to progressively stronger performance improvements which show that sustained investment in AI capability development leads to compounding returns (Eramo et al., 2022). And it is a maturity gradient that has clear repercussions on how to implement AI into organisations, indicating that progression should be incremental starting from basic and foundational capabilities enriched and developed for higher order solutions.

Thus, the third key finding that automated decision support systems are the most widely adopted (78.6%) and the most effective (M=4.2) type of AI technology adoption pattern observed, highlights organizational pragmatism in focusing their AI investments on augmenting human decision-making rather than pursuing the quest for autonomous systems. This collaborative model of human-AI preserves human judgement for strategic, fuzzier or politically sensitive decisions but lets AI take care of the routine, data intensive or pattern recognising work (Jordan & Mitchell, 2015). Compared to the other categories, NLP applications have lower maturity (M=2.8) and effectiveness ratings (M=3.6), indicating that NLP technologies are still less matureAnd applied to software engineering contexts (Quintana et al., 2022). The critical success factor analysis exposing business/leadership support, data infrastructure, and technical skills as some critical top-ranked factors resonates with the larger organizational level literature on AI adoption (Enholm et al., 2022; Lwakatare et al., 2019). Widespread agreement on leadership support as high/critical importance, with 92.9% of respondents rating it as such, reinforces AI adoption as an organizational change exercise, not a technology implementation, requiring executive sponsorship to break down resistance, redirect resources, and maintain commitment through implementation hurdles. The 51.1% decrease in defect density among adopting organizations is especially strong evidence of AI influencing technical quality dimensions of software rather than just project management efficiency metrics.

7. Conclusion

This research is underpinned by strong empirical evidence showing that decision intelligence approaches that combine artificial intelligence with agile software lifecycle governance yield significant project performance improvements in dimensions including delivery timeliness, budget adherence, quality outcomes, and resource optimization. The analysis involved all 350 projects available from 42 organizations between 2020 and 2022, and the results showed that AI-augmented approaches produced median project success rates 42% greater than traditional methodologies, with statistical significance and large effect sizes highlighting the practical importance of the findings. This decision intelligence framework integrates machine learning algorithms, predictive analytics, and recommendation systems with agile practices such as sprint planning, architecture governance, and continuous integration processes, delivering specific intelligent directions to the software engineering practitioners and project managers. We document findings such as the distinctive patterns of AI technology adoption, the critical success factors (with support from top leadership and a robust internal data infrastructure being the most important enablers), and the nature of organizational transformations in conjunction with the implementation of AI. The time savings of 57% from recommendation to making critical project decisions show that AI accelerates responsiveness whilst preserving or increasing the quality of decision making. Defect density decrease up to 51.1% (Quality Improvements) demonstrate that AI effects are not limited to project management efficiency improvements but actually leads to basic software engineering improvements. Implications for research: Results are limited to Indian IT organizations, hindering international generalizability and the use of a cross-sectional design inhibits longitudinal change analysis. More future work needs to further explore AI use within various geographical contextual environments as well as the long-term organizational development with longitudinal designs.

References

[1] Amershi, S., Begel, A., Bird, C., DeLine, R., Gall, H., Kamar, E., Nagappan, N., Nushi, B., & Zimmermann, T. (2019). Software engineering for machine learning: A case study. In International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice (pp. 291-300). IEEE/ACM. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE-SEIP.2019.00042

[2] Enholm, I. M., Papagiannidis, E., Mikalef, P., & Krogstie, J. (2022). Artificial intelligence and business value: A literature review. Information Systems Frontiers, 24(5), 1709-1734. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-021-10186-w

[3] Eramo, R., Muttillo, V., Berardinelli, L., Bruneliere, H., Gomez, A., Bagnato, A., Sadovykh, A., & Cicchetti, A. (2022). AIDOaRt: AI-augmented automation for DevOps, a model-based framework for continuous development in Cyber-Physical Systems. Microprocessors and Microsystems, 94, 104672. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micpro.2022.104672

[4] Fridgeirsson, T. V., Ingason, H. T., Jonasson, H. I., & Jonsdottir, H. (2021). An authoritative study on the near future effect of artificial intelligence on project management knowledge areas. Sustainability, 13(4), 2345. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042345

[5] Jordan, M. I., & Mitchell, T. M. (2015). Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects. Science, 349(6245), 255-260. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa8415

[6] Lewis, G. A., Ozkaya, I., & Xu, X. (2021). Software architecture challenges for ML systems. In International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (pp. 634-638). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSME52107.2021.00071

[7] Lwakatare, L. E., Raj, A., Bosch, J., Olsson, H. H., & Crnkovic, I. (2019). A taxonomy of software engineering challenges for machine learning systems: An empirical investigation. In Agile Processes in Software Engineering and Extreme Programming (pp. 227-243). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19034-7_14

[8] Meske, C., Bunde, E., Schneider, J., & Gersch, M. (2022). Explainable artificial intelligence: Objectives, stakeholders, and future research opportunities. Information Systems Management, 39(1), 53-63. https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2020.1849465

[9] Muccini, H., & Vaidhyanathan, K. (2021). Software architecture for ML-based systems: What exists and what lies ahead. In Workshop on AI Engineering Software Engineering for AI (pp. 121-128). IEEE/ACM. https://doi.org/10.1109/WAIN52551.2021.00026
[10] Quintana, M. A., Palacio, R. R., Soto, G. B., & González-López, S. (2022). Agile development methodologies and natural language processing: A mapping review. Computers, 11(12), 179. https://doi.org/10.3390/computers11120179
[11] Ribeiro, J., Lima, R., Eckhardt, T., & Paiva, S. (2021). Robotic process automation and artificial intelligence in industry 4.0—A literature review. Procedia Computer Science, 181, 51-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2021.01.104
[12] Schneider, J., Abraham, R., Meske, C., & Vom Brocke, J. (2022). Artificial intelligence governance for businesses. Information Systems Management, 39(3), 229-249. https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2022.2085825
[13] Kacheru, G., Bajjuru, R., & Arthan, N. (2019). Security Considerations When Automating Software Development. Revista de Inteligencia Artificial en Medicina, 10(1), 598-617
[14] Serban, A., & Visser, J. (2022). Adapting software architectures to machine learning challenges. In International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (pp. 152-163). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/SANER53432.2022.00029