

An Empirical Investigation of Pre-Trained Deep Learning Model Reuse in the Scientific Process

Nicholas M. Synovic
nsynovic@luc.edu
Loyola University Chicago
Chicago, Illinois, USA

Karolina Ryzka
kryzka@luc.edu
Loyola University Chicago
Chicago, Illinois, USA

Alessandra V. Vellucci Solari
avelluccisolari@luc.edu
Loyola University Chicago
Chicago, Illinois, USA

Kenny Lyons
hlyons2@luc.edu
Loyola University Chicago
Chicago, Illinois, USA

James C. Davis
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN, USA
davisjam@purdue.edu

George K. Thiruvathukal
Loyola University Chicago
Chicago, IL, USA
gthiruvathukal@luc.edu

Abstract

Deep learning has achieved recognition for its impact within natural sciences, yet the prohibitive financial and technical cost of training models from scratch inhibit adoption. Following software engineering community guidance, natural scientists are reusing pre-trained deep learning models (PTMs) to amortize these costs. While prior works recommend PTM reuse patterns, we present the first empirical study of PTM reuse patterns in the natural sciences, quantifying the utilization and impact of PTM reuse within the scientific process across 17,718 peer reviewed, open access papers. Our results show that “Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology” has outpaced other natural scientific fields in PTM reuse, “adaptation” reuse is the most prevalent PTM reuse pattern identified across all natural science fields, and the “testing” stage of the scientific process has been most impacted by PTM integration.

CCS Concepts

• **Software and its engineering** → **Software reuse**; • **Applied computing** → **Physical sciences and engineering**; **Document management and text processing**.

Keywords

Pre-trained Models, Software Reuse, Empirical Software Engineering, AI for Science, Scientific Workflows, Large Language Models, Automated Literature Review, Research Productivity

1 Introduction

The 2024 Nobel Prizes in Physics [83] and Chemistry [82] honor foundational neural networks [32] and their transformative application to protein structure prediction [41], validating the role of deep learning (DL) in science. DL models enable scientists to extract insights from and model relationships inherent in natural systems [45], frequently matching or exceeding the performance of hand crafted methods [3].

While DL offers a transformative opportunity for the natural sciences, prohibitive financial and technical costs inhibit the capability to create project specific models. Pre-trained DL models (PTMs) are a solution to realize the potential of DL while amortizing the costs associated with DL training [18, 28, 37]. But due to algorithmic complexity [79], strong dependence on data quality [74], and challenges associated with deploying and maintaining models [54] reusing




Figure 1: PTMs augment the scientific process from initial observation and hypothesis formulation to testing and evaluation. By leveraging a robust ecosystem of frameworks, fine tuning algorithms, and model registries, scientists can leverage data driven computational methods in their research.

PTMs is non-trivial. Prior works have proposed qualitative strategies to remedy these challenges [15, 17, 45, 52, 78] however, there remains a knowledge gap in assessing existing PTM reuse within science. To our knowledge, no prior work has empirically quantified the prominence and impact of PTM reuse patterns [18, 37] within the natural sciences.

To address this, we conduct the first empirical investigation of PTM reuse within the natural sciences. Our primary contributions are threefold: (1) a systematic identification of PTM reuse patterns via an automated, large language model (LLM) driven pipeline, (2) an empirical characterization of how these models augment the scientific process to enhance research productivity, and (3) the release of a comprehensive dataset mapping scientific literature to specific PTM reuse patterns and their workflow impacts.

By leveraging this pipeline to analyze 17,718 peer-reviewed, open-access papers from four mega journals [12], we mapped natural science works to their corresponding reused PTMs, reuse patterns, and impacted workflow stages. Of the 17,718 papers analyzed, we identified 1,837 instances of PTM reuse. Within this subset, “Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology” emerged as the dominant field for PTM adoption. Furthermore, the “adaptation” pattern was the predominant mode of reuse, with our analysis revealing that the “testing” stage experienced the most significant impact.

Table 1: PTM reuse patterns, their definitions, and example papers from our study that leverage these patterns.

Reuse Pattern	Definition	Examples
Conceptual	Replicate and reengineer algorithms or model architectures from academic sources, integrating them anew.	[21, 44, 64]
Adaptation	Adapt existing DL models for different tasks.	[13, 27, 70]
Deployment	Deploy PTMs across various computational environments and frameworks.	[19, 53, 62]

2 Background and Related Work

Pre-trained deep learning model (PTM) reuse in the natural sciences draws on established software engineering community reuse patterns and their specialized integrations into the scientific process.

2.1 Pre-Trained Model Reuse

Deep learning (DL) models are emerging as an increasingly important dependency in software systems [38, 39, 79]. However, training these models incurs significant technical [74], financial [73], and environmental [73, 76] costs. To mitigate these, engineers are encouraged to leverage PTMs as they encapsulate DL model’s architecture and learned weights into a distributable software package [18]. The dissemination of these artifacts is facilitated by an ecosystem of deep learning frameworks [5, 89], fine tuning algorithms [67], and PTM registries [1, 93] which serve as hosting infrastructure and provide programmatic interfaces for model management and integration. Within this ecosystem, PTM reuse implementations can be categorized into distinct PTM reuse patterns [18] listed in Table 1.

While prior work has surveyed practitioners to understand PTM applications and challenges [36, 37], current empirical efforts remain focused on general software systems. These include investigations into the performance and portability implications of conceptual reuse [36], taxonomies of adaptation techniques [67], and the technical difficulties inherent in deployment reuse [34]. To our knowledge, this work provides the first empirical study of PTM reuse leveraged within the natural sciences, addressing a significant gap in our understanding of PTM reuse practices.

2.2 Pre-Trained Models in Science

DL methods are being increasingly leveraged in the natural sciences to enable data driven discoveries [4, 11, 20, 45, 52, 69, 78]. To facilitate the democratization of these techniques, current recommendations favor the refinement of existing PTMs on domain specific data over the costly development of bespoke models for individual projects [46]. In practice, deep learning methods have been leveraged to assist in molecular protein design [41, 43, 94], understanding chemical reactions [72, 96], and modeling seismic events [57, 86]. However, to our knowledge, little work has evaluated how PTMs are being integrated into scientific processes.

Our work contributes to the formalization of PTM reuse within the natural sciences by empirically evaluating established PTM

reuse patterns and their impact on the scientific process. By mapping how PTMs are integrated into this process, we provide a framework for assessing their impact on discovery, ultimately informing the development of more robust and reproducible software ecosystems for scientific inquiry. Our work extends existing software engineering foundations by characterizing how scientists employ conceptual, adaptation, and deployment PTM reuse patterns within specific scientific stages, identifying both prevalent practices and underused opportunities for future integration.

We acknowledge an emerging PTM reuse pattern, in which pre-trained language models are wrapped with interfaces and memory to form *agentic reuse*. This approach augments the scientific process by automating complex tasks including parsing academic literature, generating hypotheses, conducting experiments, and synthesizing reports [31, 49, 92]. Given the rapid advances of agentic technology, we defer a discussion of agentic reuse to the Discussion.

3 Research Questions

Natural scientists in biology, chemistry, physics, and environmental science are increasingly leveraging pre-trained deep learning models (PTMs) to enable data driven discoveries. However, the longitudinal evolution of these reuse patterns and their specific use in the scientific process is unknown. We therefore ask:

RQ1 What are the longitudinal changes in PTM reuse patterns?

RQ2 Which stages of the scientific processes are PTMs applied?

Figure 2 presents our methodology. We provide the specific methods and empirical results for RQ1 and RQ2 in Section 4 and Section 5.

4 RQ1: Longitudinal PTM Reuse

This section details our methodology for quantifying the adoption and longitudinal evolution of pre-trained deep learning model (PTM) reuse patterns within natural science between January 1st, 2000 and December 31st, 2025.

4.1 Methods

To identify PTM reuse patterns within the natural sciences, we developed an automated, large language model (LLM) driven pipeline to analyze academic works. First, we extract candidate peer reviewed, open access works published in mega journals and normalize their metadata. Second, we then filter for cited natural science works and transform the prose into a form suitable for LLMs. Third, we load the transformed prose into a LLM to autonomously identify deep learning (DL) and PTM reuse features from the works. We report the methodology for each step in this section.

4.1.1 Extraction of Candidate Papers From Mega Journals We characterize PTM reuse patterns in the natural sciences by constructing a dataset of peer reviewed, open access publications. Existing methodologies for mapping research publications to software rely on tracing citations from known software artifacts [51]. However, because scientific software is frequently under cited [33], a citation centric approach risks omitting a significant volume of relevant work. To mitigate this and ensure the completeness of our dataset, we employ a search strategy where we first query open access mega journals for DL keywords and then normalize the resulting paper metadata with OpenAlex [66].




Figure 2: Overview of the methodology used to identify and analyze peer reviewed open access natural science publications in mega journals. The pipeline queries mega journal databases, enriches retrieved papers with metadata from OpenAlex, and analyzes each document to identify deep learning (DL) usage, reused pre-trained DL models (PTMs), and PTM reuse patterns. Manually curated ground truth labels are used to guide and refine the prompting strategy.




Figure 3: Results of the mega-journal paper filtering process. Our queries returned 17,718 total unique papers between 2000 and 2025, of which 17,364 were indexed by OpenAlex. Of these, 14,998 had citations and 7,212 were natural science papers. 6,956 of these were available in JATS XML format.

Our empirical study analyzes peer reviewed, open access papers published between January 1st, 2000 and December 31st, 2025. We target the BMJ, F1000, FrontiersIn, and PLOS mega journals to serve as representative proxies for broad scientific discourse [12]. We first queried each of these journals using the following keywords: “Deep Learning”, “Deep Neural Network”, “Model Weights”, “Hugging Face” [37], “Model Checkpoint” [38], and “Pre-Trained Model” [18]. The first three keywords are foundational to field of deep learning while the remaining keywords were identified from prior works

Table 2: The seven identified natural science OpenAlex topic fields with example papers from our study.

OpenAlex Topic Field	Examples
Chemistry	[25, 80, 95]
Neuroscience	[56, 61, 84]
Environmental Science	[26, 48, 63]
Physics and Astronomy	[58, 65, 91]
Immunology and Microbiology	[9, 47, 75]
Earth and Planetary Sciences	[35, 42, 55]
Agricultural and Biological Sciences	[24, 71, 77]

on DL and PTM reuse. This search yielded 17,718 unique papers across all four journals as of March 18th, 2026. Figure 3 presents the total number of papers returned per mega journal.

We then normalize the resulting paper metadata using OpenAlex [66] to ensure a consistent data schema for downstream processing tasks on qualitative features of each papers (e.g, number of citations, scientific field). We exclude papers that were not indexed in OpenAlex in our study, resulting in 17,364 papers.

4.1.2 Filtering and Transformation of Natural Science Papers With the set of 17,364 OpenAlex indexed candidate papers, we then proceed to first filter for papers with citations followed by those classified as natural science works, then transform the prose of each natural science work into Markdown for LLM analysis. We filter for papers that OpenAlex reports to have been cited at least once to ensure that our study is focused on works that have made specific impacts in their respective fields. Our filtering on this criteria resulted in 14,998 papers with citations.

We then filter on the OpenAlex topic fields for each candidate work to identify natural science works. OpenAlex independently

classifies papers into 26 distinct topic fields and returns the top three most likely fields for a given work [60]. However, it does not provide an explicit “natural science” classification.

To identify natural science topics, we classified existing OpenAlex topic fields as either “natural science” or “non-natural science” according to the definition provided by [23]. Two authors independently audited the OpenAlex topic fields and engaged in inter-author agreement until total consensus was met on the topic field classification. This resulted in a list of seven identified natural science topic fields. We then filtered for all works that had at least one natural science topic assigned to it, resulting in 7,212 papers. The seven identified natural science tags and example works are presented in Table 2.

We then normalize the paper’s prose into a consistent format. For each candidate natural science work, prose was retrieved in Journal Attribution Tag Suite (JATS) XML format [59]. To remove non-essential content from the paper (*e.g.*, metadata, linked content, citations) all <front>, <back>, and <xref> tags were removed from the XML markup. The remaining content was converted to Markdown using pandoc [50] to provide an unstructured text format suitable for LLM analysis. This final filtering resulted in 6,956 total papers suitable for LLM evaluation.

4.1.3 Automated Analysis of Filtered Papers To characterize the longitudinal shifts in PTM reuse, we developed an automated extraction pipeline to analyze the candidate natural science works. For each publication, we address a four tier hierarchy of inquiries: (1) identification of DL methods, (2) verification of PTM reuse, (3) extraction of specific PTM identifiers, and (4) classification of the associated reuse pattern (*i.e.*, conceptual, adaptation, and deployment). Questions (1) and (2) function as exclusionary filters whereby papers failing to meet these criteria are removed from subsequent analysis.

We utilized CO-STAR templated system prompts [81] to enable OpenAI gpt-5.4-nano-2026-03-17 to analyze each paper. To enhance the recognition of PTM names, we augmented our prompts with a dictionary of known architectures from the Hugging Face Transformers [90] and Diffusers [85] libraries for questions (2), (3) and (4) Prompts were modified until agreement reached 90%. The following example is illustrative.

Prompt Illustration. See artifact for full prompts.

Context: You are an AI model integrated into an automated pipeline that processes academic computational Natural Science papers into a machine-readable format.

...

Objective: Your task is to output only a JSON object containing key-value pairs, where:

...

Style: Responses must be strictly machine-readable JSON. No natural language, commentary, or formatting beyond the JSON object.

Tone: Neutral, objective, and machine-like.

Audience: The audience is a machine system that parses JSON. Human readability is irrelevant.

Response: Return only a JSON object of the form ...

4.2 Implementation

We used the gpt-5.4-nano-2026-03-17 large language model via the OpenAI Batch Inference API to answer these questions. To mitigate the inherent non-determinism of large language models and ensure experimental reproducibility, we implemented a static seed value of 42. Furthermore, the model was configured with a “high” reasoning effort and to generate “detailed” summaries to prioritize complex logical inference.

4.3 Data Analysis

To identify how PTM reuse patterns within the natural sciences have changed, we analyzed the trends in publications that leverage DL, PTMs, and PTM reuse patterns over time. We evaluate these trends over time and by discipline.

4.3.1 Deep Learning Usage Using Prompt 1, we identified papers employing DL methods within our candidate set of natural science publications. Of the 6,956 candidate papers, 4,662 (66.96%) were classified as utilizing DL methods. The earliest identified paper that leverages DL was published in 2009 [8], however it was not until 2012 [68] when every year the number of DL leveraging papers published increased. However, more non-DL leveraging papers are published per year than DL leveraging papers as shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Number of papers identified using deep learning methods per year plotted against papers that do not use deep learning methods. The earliest identified paper that uses deep learning was published in 2009 [8], however it was not until 2012 [68] that the number of papers leveraging deep learning methods began increasing yearly.

When aggregated by field (Figure 5), we find that the three fields with the largest volume of DL leveraging research are “Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology” (3,579 papers), “Neuroscience” (1,814 papers), and “Environmental Science” (1,355 papers). While “Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology” represents the largest cumulative usage of deep learning methods, a longitudinal review shows that “Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology” has also experienced the largest annual growth.




Figure 5: Number of papers using deep learning per year from 2012 to 2025 across measured natural science fields. Panels (A)-(H) correspond to individual fields. The number of papers leveraging deep learning has increased across all fields.




Figure 6: Number of papers identified reusing PTMs per year plotted against papers that do not reuse PTMs. The earliest identified paper that reuses PTMs was published in 2009 [8].

4.3.2 PTM Reuse Using Prompt 2, we identified papers reusing PTMs within our candidate set of DL using, natural science publications. Of the 4,662 papers leveraging deep learning methods, 1,837 (39.40%) were identified as reusing PTMs. The earliest identified paper that reuses PTMs was published in 2009 [8], with substantial uptake beginning around 2012 [68]. Similar to DL usage, there are fewer papers published per year that reuse PTMs as shown in Figure 6. The earliest identified paper that reuses PTMs was published in 2009 [8]. When aggregated by field, we find that the three fields with the largest volume of DL leveraging research are “Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology” (1,529 papers),

“Neuroscience” (624 papers), and “Agricultural and Biological Sciences” (600 papers). While “Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology” represents the largest cumulative usage of PTM reuse, a longitudinal review shows that it also has also experienced the largest annual growth. We visualize the annual publication trends for these specific fields in Figure 7.

4.3.3 PTM Reuse Paradigm Utilization Using Prompt 4, we identified PTM reuse patterns within our candidate set of PTM reusing, natural science publications. Of the 1,837 papers reusing PTMs, 1,329 (70.29%) papers leveraged “adaptation”, 50 (70.29%) papers leveraged “conceptual”, and 318 (70.29%) papers leveraged “deployment” PTM reuse patterns. The earliest identified paper that leveraged “adaptation” reuse was in 2009 [8], “conceptual” reuse was in 2018 [16], and “deployment” reuse was in 2015 [7]. “Adaptation” reuse has seen the largest amount of usage, followed by “deployment” and “conceptual” reuse as shown in Figure 8.

When aggregated by field and reuse pattern (Figure 9), we find “Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology”, “Neuroscience”, and “Agricultural and Biological Sciences” emerge as the primary drivers of “adaptation” and “deployment” reuse patterns. However, “Environmental Science”, “Neuroscience”, and “Physics and Astronomy” leverage “conceptual” reuse more than “Agricultural and Biological Sciences”. While “Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology” represents the largest cumulative usage of PTM reuse patterns, longitudinal data shows all natural science fields have increased “adaptation” reuse.

5 RQ2: PTM Integration In Scientific Processes

This section details our methodology for identifying what stages of the scientific process are being augmented via PTM reuse within natural science between January 1st, 2000 and December 31st, 2025.




Figure 7: Number of papers reusing PTMs per year from 2012 to 2025 across measured natural science fields. Panels (A)-(H) correspond to individual fields. The number of papers reusing PTMs has increased across all fields.




Figure 8: Counts of PTM reuse patterns per year, 2012 to 2025. Adaptation reuse is the most common pattern and grows steadily over time, while deployment reuse appears less frequently and conceptual reuse remains relatively rare.

5.1 Methods

To identify how PTM reuse has augmented the scientific process within natural sciences, we developed a pipeline designed to transition from specific identification of PTMs to the greater context in which they are reused. First, we isolate sections of the prose specifically mentioning PTMs as identified from our previous analysis (Section 5.1.1). We subsequently employ a large language model to map these isolated prose segments against a formalized taxonomy of the scientific process (Section 5.1.2). This allows us to categorize

Table 3: Mapping of hypothetico-deductive (H-D) framework stages to common structural elements of academic papers.

H-D Stage	Paper Section
Observation	Introduction
Hypothesis	Methodology
Background	Experimental Design
Test	Results
Analysis	Discussion

the specific functional role of each PTM utilization instance and determine which scientific stage is being augmented by model reuse. We report the methodology for each step in this section.

5.1.1 Isolation of PTM Reuse Prose To identify at what stage PTM reuse is augmenting the scientific process, we first identify section’s of a paper’s prose that specifically mention previously identified PTMs (Section 4.3.3). While our previous methods to extract PTM model names and reuse patterns returned the most salient prose to confirm the output, it did not return the section in which that prose is located in. To remedy this, we parse the Markdown version of the document for the PTM name, and return the content of a section of the prose that reference the model.

5.1.2 Classification of Augmented Scientific Process To automatically classify the stages of the scientific process have been augmented by PTM reuse, we leverage the gpt-5.4-nano-2026-03-17 large language model with the same parameters outlined in Section 4.1.3. As there is limited consensus as to what is the definitive scientific method [30, 87] we label sections of prose under the hypothetico-deductive (H-D) framework of scientific thought [29]:

- **“Observation”** of a natural phenomenon or a gap in empirical data that requires analysis,




Figure 9: Counts of PTM reuse patterns per year, 2012 to 2025. Adaptation reuse is the most common pattern and grows steadily over time, while deployment reuse appears less frequently and conceptual reuse remains relatively rare.

- **“Hypothesis”** involving a PTM’s learned representations are proposed to explain the observation,
- **“Background”** where the PTM is used to derive testable predictions about unobserved natural states or experimental outcomes,
- **“Test”** which involves using a PTM to inference on experimental data to derive new insights, and
- **“Analysis”** of whether the PTM’s outputs corroborate scientific theory or provide a valid representation of the natural system.

We map this framework to common structural properties of academic papers in Table 3.

We utilized CO-STAR formatted system prompts [81] to enable gpt-5.4-nano-2026-03-17 to analyze the unstructured Mark-down paper prose. To guide system prompt development, 20 LLM responses were validated against manually annotated sections. Prompts were modified until agreement reached 90%. Our Prompt Example presents an example system prompt.

5.2 Data Analysis

To identify how PTM reuse patterns have impacted natural science, we analyzed the trends in publications that reuse PTMs. We evaluate these trends overall, annually, by discipline, and at the intersection of field and year.

5.2.1 PTM Reuse Prose Classification Using Prompt 5, we identify the specific stage of the scientific process where PTMs have made an impact within our candidate set of PTM reusing, natural science publications. Of the 1,837 papers reusing PTMs, 265 (14.42%) leveraged PTMs in the “Analysis” stage, 115 (6.26%) leveraged PTMs in the “Background” stage, 5 (0.27%) papers leveraged PTMs in the “Observation” stage, 55 (2.99%) leveraged PTMs in the “Hypothesis” stage, and 1,123 (61.13%) leveraged PTMs in the “Test” stage.

The earliest identified paper that was impacted in the “Observation” stage was in 2022 [14], “Hypothesis” stage was in 2015 [6], “Background” stage was in 2018 [88], “Test” stage was in 2009 [8],

and “Analysis” stage was in 2016 [10]. The “Test” stage has seen the most PTM impact by volume, followed by the “Analysis” and “Background” stages as shown in Figure 10.

6 Discussion

This study examines how natural scientists integrate pre-trained deep learning models (PTMs) into their scientific workflows to facilitate data driven discovery. We present a qualitative analysis of 17,718 peer reviewed, open access papers in biology, chemistry, physics, and environmental science published in BMJ, F1000, FrontiersIn, and PLOS since January 1st, 2000 to December 31st, 2025. This dataset serves as a proxy for evaluating the current landscape of PTM reuse across the scientific community.

6.1 Implications For Science

PTM Supply Chain Enabling “Adaptation” Reuse The findings in Section 4 suggest a few notable patterns regarding PTM adoption in the natural sciences. First, there is a visible increase in deep learning (DL) and PTM reuse, particularly within “Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology” (Figures 5 and 7). Second, the data shows that the “adaptation” pattern is used more frequently than “deployment” or “conceptual” reuse (Figure 8). By utilizing “adaptation”, researchers are able to lower the technical and computational barriers typically associated with DL methods.

Given the prevalence of the PTM “adaptation” reuse pattern, we posit that scientists leverage this approach to realize the benefits of DL methodologies without incurring the prohibitive financial and computational costs of training models from scratch. In this capacity, PTMs serve as reusable scientific infrastructure that minimizes the need for domain specific specialization. The broader impact is a shift away from training DL models per project, towards the greater integration of existing PTM supply chains into natural science.




Figure 10: Scientific workflow stages impacted by PTM reuse per year, 2017-2025. Panels (A)-(E) show yearly counts of PTM use across different stages of the scientific process: test, analysis, background, hypothesis, and observation. PTM reuse most frequently appears in the testing stage of scientific workflows, with comparatively fewer instances in other stages.

Limited PTM Integration in Scientific Processes As detailed in Section 5, PTM integration is concentrated within the “Test” stage of the scientific process (Figure 10). This concentration suggests that PTMs are currently utilized as evaluative or benchmarking instruments rather than as foundational components of early stage experimental design. Furthermore, the limited reuse of PTMs in other stages of the scientific process implies the existence of persistent integration barriers¹, highlighting a potential missed opportunity to leverage PTMs earlier in the scientific process².

To address this missed opportunity, future research must prioritize the expansion of PTM utility across the broader scientific process. By limiting PTM usage to data evaluation, researchers may be overlooking a significant opportunity to leverage these models during the formative stages of inquiry, such as hypothesis generation or experimental modeling. By shifting the focus toward these earlier stages, the scientific community can move toward a more holistic integration of PTMs.

6.2 Future Directions

Future work will first expand this analysis beyond natural science to a broader range of scientific disciplines, allowing us to determine if common PTM reuse patterns emerge across fields. Next, we aim to investigate the technical implementation of PTMs within scientific software by analyzing how researchers integrate PTMs into their code will to reveal whether models serve as drivers of scientific reasoning or merely as data automation tools, helping establish frameworks for reproducible model reuse.

We recommend the study of agentic scientific workflows. The agentic reuse pattern can redefine scientific inquiry through human-AI collaboration and AI-only discovery [2, 22, 40]. The community needs careful measurement of how embedding agentic systems within scientific workflows reshapes experimental design, validation, and knowledge production while upholding scientific rigor. This pattern is difficult to observe with our bibliographic approach; human-factors methods seem needed.

7 Threats To Validity

Several threats to validity may affect our measurements, causal relationships, and generalizability.

¹From anecdotal conversations with scientists, scientists are hesitant to reuse them due to their inherit biases from training.

²It is also possible that PTMs are used elsewhere in the process but not disclosed, e.g., through undocumented use of LLMs in study design.

Regarding *construct validity*, misclassifications from OpenAlex’s deep-learning-based topic assignments may affect paper selection. Furthermore, reporting bias and varied methodological descriptions in academic prose may cause us to miss potential PTM and deep learning reuse candidates. In operationalizing these constructs, we used large language models, which entail hallucination risks and the possibility of classification errors.³ Mitigations are detailed in Section 4.2. Also note that our methodology relies on keyword searches which may inadvertently exclude valid candidate papers.

Internal validity threats include potential reverse causality, where PTM reuse may drive deep learning adoption rather than vice versa. Additionally, confounding factors—such as increased GPU availability, lower financial and technical barriers, and maturing library support—could further drive this trend.

Lastly, *external validity* is threatened by our selection of journals. Though we deliberately used megajournals to cover the natural sciences broadly, trends may be different in different scientific communities bound by language (e.g., China).

8 Conclusion

To our knowledge, this work presents the first empirical study of pre-trained deep learning model (PTM) reuse patterns within the natural sciences. By examining how scientists reuse PTMs and report how they reused them, we characterize the impact that PTM reuse patterns have made on the scientific process. Our findings highlight the increasing adoption of PTM reuse, the dominance of the “adaptation” reuse pattern, and the primary use-case of PTMs within the scientific process — in the “testing” stage. Collectively, these findings highlight a maturing pattern of PTM integration within the natural sciences characterized by adaptation focused reuse and downstream evaluative application.

Acknowledgments

We thank Kimberly Hung for contributions to the visual design of the paper and figures. This research used resources of the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility, which is a DOE Office of Science User Facility supported under Contract DE-AC02-06CH11357.

³We specifically used gpt-5.4-nano-2026-03-17 which has limited reasoning capacity compared to top-tier frontier models, but was selected due to its competitive performance relative to open models and its more recent training data cutoff.

References

- [1] 2024. Hugging Face – The AI community building the future. <https://huggingface.co/>
- [2] Milad Abolhasani and Eugenia Kumacheva. 2023. The rise of self-driving labs in chemical and materials sciences. 2, 6 (2023), 483–492. doi:10.1038/s44160-022-00231-0 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [3] Josh Abramson, Jonas Adler, Jack Dunger, Richard Evans, Tim Green, Alexander Pritzel, Olaf Ronneberger, Lindsay Willmore, Andrew J. Ballard, Joshua Bambrick, Sebastian W. Bodenstein, David A. Evans, Chia-Chun Hung, Michael O'Neill, David Reiman, Kathryn Tunyasuvunakool, Zachary Wu, Akvilė Žemgulytė, Eirini Arvaniti, Charles Beattie, Ottavia Bertolli, Alex Bridgland, Alexey Cherepanov, Miles Congreve, Alexander I. Cowen-Rivers, Andrew Cowie, Michael Figurnov, Fabian B. Fuchs, Hannah Gladman, Rishub Jain, Yousuf A. Khan, Caroline M. R. Low, Kuba Perlin, Anna Potapenko, Pascal Savy, Sukhdeep Singh, Adrian Stecula, Ashok Thillaisundaram, Catherine Tong, Sergei Yakneen, Ellen D. Zhong, Michal Zielinski, Augustin Židek, Victor Bapst, Pushmeet Kohli, Max Jaderberg, Demis Hassabis, and John M. Schumpert. 2024. Accurate structure prediction of biomolecular interactions with AlphaFold 3. *Nature* 630, 8016 (June 2024), 493–500. doi:10.1038/s41586-024-07487-w Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [4] Christof Angermueller, Tanel Pärnamaa, Leopold Parts, and Oliver Stegle. 2016. Deep learning for computational biology. 12, 7 (2016), 878. doi:10.15252/msb.20156651 Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- [5] Jason Ansel, Edward Yang, Horace He, Natalia Gimelshein, Animesh Jain, Michael Voznesensky, Bin Bao, Peter Bell, David Berard, Evgeni Burovski, Geeta Chauhan, Anjali Chourdia, Will Constable, Alban Desmaison, Zachary DeVito, Elias Ellison, Will Feng, Jiong Gong, Michael Gschwind, Brian Hirsh, Sherlock Huang, Kshiteej Kalambarkar, Laurent Kirsch, Michael Lazos, Mario Lezcano, Yanbo Liang, Jason Liang, Yinghai Lu, CK Luk, Bert Maher, Yunjie Pan, Christian Fuhrsch, Matthias Reso, Mark Saroufim, Marcos Yukio Siraichi, Helen Suk, Michael Suo, Phil Tillet, Eikan Wang, Xiaodong Wang, William Wen, Shunting Zhang, Xu Zhao, Keren Zhou, Richard Zou, Ajit Mathews, Gregory Chanan, Peng Wu, and Soumith Chintala. 2024. PyTorch 2: Faster Machine Learning Through Dynamic Python Bytecode Transformation and Graph Compilation. In *29th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 2 (ASPLOS '24)*. ACM. doi:10.1145/3620665.3640366
- [6] Ehsaneddin Asgari and Mohammad R. K. Mofrad. 2015. Continuous Distributed Representation of Biological Sequences for Deep Proteomics and Genomics. *PLoS ONE* 10, 11 (11 2015), 1–15. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0141287
- [7] Sebastian Bach, Alexander Binder, Grégoire Montavon, Frederick Klauschen, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Wojciech Samek. 2015. On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation. 10, 7 (2015), e0130140. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0130140
- [8] Thorsten Barnickel, Jason Weston, Ronan Collobert, Hans-Werner Mewes, and Volker Stimpfl. 2009. Large Scale Application of Neural Network Based Semantic Role Labeling for Automated Relation Extraction from Biomedical Texts. *PLoS ONE* 4, 7 (07 2009), 1–6. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0006393
- [9] Cairé Barreto, Victor Cardoso-Jaime, and George Dimopoulos. 2024. A novel broad-spectrum antibacterial and anti-malarial Anopheles gambiae Cecropin promotes microbial clearance during pupation. 20, 10 (2024), e1012652. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1012652
- [10] Jaroslav Bendl, Miloš Musil, Jan Štourač, Jaroslav Zendulka, Jiří Damborský, and Jan Brezovský. 2016. PredictSNP2: A Unified Platform for Accurately Evaluating SNP Effects by Exploiting the Different Characteristics of Variants in Distinct Genomic Regions. *PLoS Computational Biology* 12, 5 (05 2016), 1–18. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004962
- [11] Karianne J. Bergen, Paul A. Johnson, Maarten V. de Hoop, and Gregory C. Beroza. 2019. Machine learning for data-driven discovery in solid Earth geoscience. 363, 6433 (2019), eaau0323. doi:10.1126/science.aau0323 Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- [12] Bo-Christer Björk. 2018. Evolution of the scholarly mega-journal, 2006–2017. 6 (2018), e4357. doi:10.7717/peerj.4357 Publisher: PeerJ Inc..
- [13] Yuheng Cai, Xuying Zhang, Shahar Z. Kovalsky, H. Troy Ghashghaei, and Alon Greenbaum. 2021. Detection and classification of neurons and glial cells in the MADM mouse brain using RetinaNet. 16, 9 (2021), e0257426. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0257426
- [14] Cristiano Capone, Paolo Muratore, and Pier Stanislao Paolucci. 2022. Error-based or target-based? A unified framework for learning in recurrent spiking networks. *PLoS Computational Biology* 18, 6 (06 2022), 1–18. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1010221
- [15] Jeffrey C. Carver, Neil P. Chue Hong, and George K. Thiruvathukal. 2016. *Software Engineering for Science*. CRC Press. Google-Books-ID: xSgNDgAAQBAJ.
- [16] Jinbo Chen, Uwe Scholz, Ruonan Zhou, and Matthias Lange. 2018. LAILAPS-QSM: A RESTful API and JAVA library for semantic query suggestions. 14, 3 (2018), e1006058. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006058
- [17] Travers Ching, Daniel S. Himmelstein, Brett K. Beaulieu-Jones, Alexandr A. Kalinin, Brian T. Do, Gregory P. Way, Enrico Ferrero, Paul-Michael Agapow, Michael Zietz, Michael M. Hoffman, Wei Xie, Gail L. Rosen, Benjamin J. Lengerich, Johnny Israeli, Jack Lanchantin, Stephen Woloszynek, Anne E. Carpenter, Avanti Shrikumar, Jinbo Xu, Evan M. Cofer, Christopher A. Lavender, Srinivas C. Turaga, Amr M. Alexandari, Zhiyong Lu, David J. Harris, Dave DeCaprio, Yanjun Qi, Anshul Kundaje, Yifan Peng, Laura K. Wiley, Marwin H. S. Segler, Simina M. Boca, S. Joshua Swamidass, Austin Huang, Anthony Gitter, and Casey S. Greene. 2018. Opportunities and obstacles for deep learning in biology and medicine. doi:10.1101/142760 Pages: 142760 Section: New Results.
- [18] James C. Davis, Purvish Jalal, Wenxin Jiang, Taylor R. Schorlemmer, Nicholas Synovic, and George K. Thiruvathukal. 2023. Reusing Deep Learning Models: Challenges and Directions in Software Engineering. In *2023 IEEE John Vincent Atanasoff International Symposium on Modern Computing (JVA)*. 17–30. doi:10.1109/JVA60410.2023.00015
- [19] Fiona Dick, Gonzalo S. Nido, Guido Werner Alves, Ole-Bjørn Tysnes, Gry Hilde Nilsen, Christian Dölle, and Charalampos Tzoulis. 2020. Differential transcript usage in the Parkinson's disease brain. 16, 11 (2020), e1009182. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1009182
- [20] Eamon Duade, William Dolan, André Bauer, Ian Foster, and Karim Lakhani. 2024. Oil & Water? Diffusion of AI Within and Across Scientific Fields. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2405.15828 arXiv:2405.15828.
- [21] Berceem Dutagaci, Bingbing Duan, Chenxi Qiu, Craig D. Kaplan, and Michael Feig. 2023. Characterization of RNA polymerase II trigger loop mutations using molecular dynamics simulations and machine learning. 19, 3 (2023), e1010999. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1010999
- [22] Emerald Cloud Lab, Inc. 2025. *Emerald Cloud Lab: Remote Controlled Life Sciences Lab*. <https://www.emeraldcloudlab.com/>
- [23] Encyclopædia Britannica. 2025. Natural Science.
- [24] Ebru Ergün. 2025. Attention-enhanced hybrid deep learning model for robust mango leaf disease classification via ConvNeXt and vision transformer fusion. 16 (2025). doi:10.3389/fpls.2025.1638520
- [25] Carlos Gueto-Tettay, Di Tang, Lotta Happonen, Moritz Heusel, Hamed Khakzad, Johan Malmström, and Lars Malmström. 2023. Multienzyme deep learning models improve peptide de novo sequencing by mass spectrometry proteomics. 19, 1 (2023), e1010457. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1010457
- [26] Jinsong Guo, Xiaoxin Lin, and Yingjun Xiao. 2025. Integration of smart sensors and phytoremediation for real-time pollution monitoring and ecological restoration in agricultural waste management. 16 (2025). doi:10.3389/fpls.2025.1550302
- [27] Yeoncheol Ha and Seung-Sep Kim. 2023. Classification of large ornithopod dinosaur footprints using Xception transfer learning. 18, 11 (2023), e0293020. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0293020
- [28] Xu Han, Zhengyan Zhang, Ning Ding, Yuxian Gu, Xiao Liu, Yuqi Huo, Jiezhong Qiu, Yuan Yao, Ao Zhang, Liang Zhang, Wentao Han, Minlie Huang, Qin Jin, Yanyan Lan, Yang Liu, Zhiyuan Liu, Zhiwu Lu, Xipeng Qiu, Ruihua Song, Jie Tang, Ji-Rong Wen, Jinhui Yuan, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Jun Zhu. 2021. Pre-trained models: Past, present and future. *AI Open* 2 (Jan. 2021), 225–250. doi:10.1016/j.aiopen.2021.08.002
- [29] Carl Hempel. 1966. *Philosophy of Natural Science*. Prentice Hall.
- [30] Brian Hepburn and Hanne Andersen. 2026. Scientific Method. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (spring 2026 ed.), Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman (Eds.). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2026/entries/scientific-method/>
- [31] Sirui Hong, Mingchen Zhuge, Jonathan Chen, Xiawu Zheng, Yuheng Cheng, Jinlin Wang, Ceyao Zhang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, Chenyu Ran, Lingfeng Xiao, Chenglin Wu, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2023. MetaGPT: Meta Programming for a Multi-Agent Collaborative Framework. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VtmBAGCN7o>
- [32] J.J. Hopfield. 1982. Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 79, 8 (April 1982), 2554–2558. doi:10.1073/pnas.79.8.2554 Publisher: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.
- [33] James Howison and Julia Bullard. 2016. Software in the scientific literature: Problems with seeing, finding, and using software mentioned in the biology literature. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 67, 9 (2016), 2137–2155. doi:10.1002/asi.23538 _eprint: <https://asistdl.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/asi.23538>
- [34] Purvish Jalal, Wenxin Jiang, Arav Tewari, Joseph Woo, George K. Thiruvathukal, and James C. Davis. 2023. Analysis of Failures and Risks in Deep Learning Model Converters: A Case Study in the ONNX Ecosystem. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.17708> version: 2.
- [35] Shailesh Kumar Jha, Vivek Gupta, Priyank J. Sharma, Anurag Mishra, and Saksham Joshi. 2025. Deep learning super-resolution for temperature data down-scaling: a comprehensive study using residual networks. 7 (2025). doi:10.3389/fclim.2025.1572428
- [36] Wenxin Jiang, Vishnu Banna, Naveen Vivek, Abhinav Goel, Nicholas Synovic, George K. Thiruvathukal, and James C. Davis. 2024. Challenges and practices of deep learning model reengineering: A case study on computer vision. *Empirical Softw. Engg.* 29, 6 (Aug. 2024). doi:10.1007/s10664-024-10521-0
- [37] Wenxin Jiang, Nicholas Synovic, Matt Hyatt, Taylor R. Schorlemmer, Rohan Sethi, Yung-Hsiang Lu, George K. Thiruvathukal, and James C. Davis. 2023. An

- Empirical Study of Pre-Trained Model Reuse in the Hugging Face Deep Learning Model Registry. In *Proceedings of the 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '23)*. IEEE Press, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, 2463–2475. doi:10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00206
- [38] Wenxin Jiang, Nicholas Synovic, Rohan Sethi, Aryan Indarapu, Matt Hyatt, Taylor R. Schorlemmer, George K. Thiruvathukal, and James C. Davis. 2022. An Empirical Study of Artifacts and Security Risks in the Pre-trained Model Supply Chain. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Workshop on Software Supply Chain Offensive Research and Ecosystem Defenses (SCORED'22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 105–114. doi:10.1145/3560835.3564547
- [39] Wenxin Jiang, Jerin Yasmin, Jason Jones, Nicholas Synovic, Jiashen Kuo, Nathaniel Bielanski, Yuan Tian, George K. Thiruvathukal, and James C. Davis. 2024. PeaTMOSS: A Dataset and Initial Analysis of Pre-Trained Models in Open-Source Software. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Mining Software Repositories* (New York, NY, USA, 2024-07-02) (*MSR '24*). Association for Computing Machinery, 431–443. doi:10.1145/3643991.3644907
- [40] Shilan Jin, James R. Deneault, Benji Maruyama, and Yu Ding. 2022. Autonomous Experimentation Systems and Benefit of Surprise-Based Bayesian Optimization. 2022 (2022), 173–179. doi:10.11509/isfa.2022.173
- [41] John Jumper, Richard Evans, Alexander Pritzel, Tim Green, Michael Figurnov, Olaf Ronneberger, Kathryn Tunyasuvunakool, Russ Bates, Augustin Židek, Anna Potapenko, Alex Bridgland, Clemens Meyer, Simon A. A. Kohl, Andrew J. Ballard, Andrew Cowie, Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Stanislav Nikolov, Rishub Jain, Jonas Adler, Trevor Back, Stig Petersen, David Reiman, Ellen Clancy, Michal Zielinski, Martin Steinegger, Michalina Pacholska, Tamas Berghammer, Sebastian Bodenstein, David Silver, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew W. Senior, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Pushmeet Kohli, and Demis Hassabis. 2021. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature* 596, 7873 (Aug. 2021), 583–589. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03819-2
- [42] Margaret Kosmala, Koen Hufkens, and Andrew D. Richardson. 2018. Integrating camera imagery, crowdsourcing, and deep learning to improve high-frequency automated monitoring of snow at continental-to-global scales. 13, 12 (2018), e0209649. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0209649
- [43] Rohith Krishna, Jue Wang, Woody Ahern, Pascal Sturm, Preetham Venkatesh, Indrek Kalvet, Gyu Rie Lee, Felix S. Morey-Burrows, Ivan Anishchenko, Ian R. Humphreys, Ryan McHugh, Dionne Vafeados, Xinting Li, George A. Sutherland, Andrew Hitchcock, C. Neil Hunter, Alex Kang, Evans Brackenbrough, Asim K. Bera, Minkyung Baek, Frank DiMaio, and David Baker. 2024. Generalized biomolecular modeling and design with RoseTTAFold All-Atom. 384, 6693 (2024), eadl2528. doi:10.1126/science.adl2528 Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- [44] Julianne LaChance and Daniel J. Cohen. 2020. Practical fluorescence reconstruction microscopy for large samples and low-magnification imaging. 16, 12 (2020), e1008443. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008443
- [45] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2015. Deep learning. *Nature* 521, 7553 (May 2015), 436–444. doi:10.1038/nature14539 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [46] Benjamin D. Lee, Anthony Gitter, Casey S. Greene, Sebastian Raschka, Finlay Maguire, Alexander J. Titus, Michael D. Kessler, Alexandra J. Lee, Marc G. Chevrette, Paul Allen Stewart, Thiago Britto-Borges, Evan M. Cofer, Kun-Hsing Yu, Juan Jose Carmona, Elana J. Fertig, Alexandr A. Kalinin, Brandon Signal, Benjamin J. Lengerich, Timothy J. Triche Jr, and Simina M. Boca. 2022. Ten quick tips for deep learning in biology. 18, 3 (2022), e1009803. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009803 Publisher: Public Library of Science.
- [47] Hyunho Lee, Kyoungseob Shin, Yongju Lee, Soobin Lee, Seungyoun Lee, Eun-jae Lee, Seung Woo Kim, Ha Young Shin, Jong Hoon Kim, Junho Chung, and Sungheon Kwon. 2024. Identification of B cell subsets based on antigen receptor sequences using deep learning. 15 (2024). doi:10.3389/fimmu.2024.1342285
- [48] Gen Li, Anji Lian, Zidan Yao, Yu Hu, Guoliang Pang, Taiping Yuan, Zhenhua Li, Xiaohua Huang, and Gang Wang. 2025. Fish keypoint detection for offshore aquaculture: a robust deep learning approach with PCA-based shape constraint. 12 (2025). doi:10.3389/fmars.2025.1619457
- [49] Chris Lu, Cong Lu, Robert Tjarko Lange, Jakob Foerster, Jeff Clune, and David Ha. 2024. The AI Scientist: Towards Fully Automated Open-Ended Scientific Discovery. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2408.06292 arXiv:2408.06292 [cs].
- [50] John MacFarlane, Albert Krewinkel, and Jesse Rosenthal. [n. d.]. *Pandoc*. <https://github.com/jgm/pandoc>
- [51] Addi Malviya-Thakur, Reed Milewicz, Lavinia Paganini, Ahmed Samir Imam Mahmoud, and Audris Mockus. 2023. SciCat: A Curated Dataset of Scientific Software Repositories. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2312.06382 arXiv:2312.06382 [cs].
- [52] Adam C. Mater and Michelle L. Coote. 2019. Deep Learning in Chemistry. 59, 6 (2019), 2545–2559. doi:10.1021/acs.jcim.9b00266 Publisher: American Chemical Society.
- [53] Reny Mathew and Charles H. Opperman. 2019. The genome of the migratory nematode, *Radopholus similis*, reveals signatures of close association to the sedentary cyst nematodes. 14, 10 (2019), e0224391. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0224391
- [54] Ahmed Menshaw, Zeeshan Nawaz, and Mahmoud Fahmy. 2024. Navigating Challenges and Technical Debt in Large Language Models Deployment. In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Machine Learning and Systems* (New York, NY, USA, 2024-04-22) (*EuroMLSys '24*). Association for Computing Machinery, 192–199. doi:10.1145/3642970.3655840
- [55] Xiangying Miao, Hongli Miao, Yongjun Jia, and Yingting Guo. 2018. Using a stacked-autoencoder neural network model to estimate sea state bias for a radar altimeter. 13, 12 (2018), e0208989. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0208989
- [56] Ahmad H. Milyani and Eyad Talal Attar. 2025. Deep learning for inner speech recognition: a pilot comparative study of EEGNet and a spectro-temporal Transformer on bimodal EEG-fMRI data. 19 (2025). doi:10.3389/fnhum.2025.1668935
- [57] S. Mostafa Mousavi and Gregory C. Beroza. 2022. Deep-learning seismology. 377, 6607 (2022), eabm4470. doi:10.1126/science.abm4470 Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- [58] Guangyu Mu, Zehan Liao, Jiaxue Li, Nini Qin, and Ziye Yang. 2023. IPSO-LSTM hybrid model for predicting online public opinion trends in emergencies. 18, 10 (2023), e0292677. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0292677
- [59] National Information Standards Organization JATS Standing Committee. 2024. ANSI/NISO Z39.96-2024, JATS: Journal Article Tag Suite, version 1.4. doi:10.3789/ansi.niso.z39.96-2024
- [60] No Author. 2024. Overview | OpenAlex technical documentation. <https://docs.openalex.org>
- [61] Zhenis Otarbay and Abzal Kyzrkanov. 2025. SVM-enhanced attention mechanisms for motor imagery EEG classification in brain-computer interfaces. 19 (2025). doi:10.3389/fnins.2025.1622847
- [62] Usua Oyarbide, Laura Joan Feyrer, and Jonathan Gordon. 2023. Sperm and northern bottlenose whale interactions with deep-water trawlers in the western North Atlantic. 18, 8 (2023), e0289626. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0289626
- [63] Naveen Palanichamy, Su-Cheng Haw, Subramanian S. Rishanti Murugan, and Kuhaneswaran Govindasamy. 2022. *Machine learning methods to predict particulate matter PM_{2.5}*. doi:10.12688/f1000research.73166.1
- [64] Xu Pan, Annie DeForge, and Odelia Schwartz. 2023. Generalizing biological surround suppression based on center surround similarity via deep neural network models. 19, 9 (2023), e1011486. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1011486
- [65] Huan-Kai Peng and Radu Marculescu. 2015. Multi-Scale Compositionality: Identifying the Compositional Structures of Social Dynamics Using Deep Learning. 10, 4 (2015), e0118309. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0118309
- [66] Jason Priem, Heather Piwowar, and Richard Orr. 2022. OpenAlex: A fully-open index of scholarly works, authors, venues, institutions, and concepts. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2205.01833 arXiv:2205.01833.
- [67] Nusrat Jahan Prottasha, Upama Roy Chowdhury, Shetu Mohanto, Tasfia Nuzhat, Abdullah As Sami, Md Shamol Ali, Md Shohanur Islam Sobuj, Hafijur Raman, Md Kowsher, and Ozlem Ozmen Garibay. 2025. PEFT A2Z: Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning Survey for Large Language and Vision Models. arXiv:2504.14117 [cs] doi:10.48550/arXiv.2504.14117
- [68] Yanjun Qi, Merja Oja, Jason Weston, and William Stafford Noble. 2012. A Unified Multitask Architecture for Predicting Local Protein Properties. 7, 3 (2012), e32235. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0032235
- [69] Bharath Ramsundar, Peter Eastman, Pat Walters, and Vijay Pande. 2019. *Deep Learning for the Life Sciences: Applying Deep Learning to Genomics, Microscopy, Drug Discovery, and More*. O'Reilly Media.
- [70] Jennifer B. Rattray, Ryan J. Lowhorn, Ryan Walden, Pedro Márquez-Zacarias, Evgeniya Molotkova, Gabriel Perron, Claudia Solis-Lemus, Daniel Pimentel Alarcon, and Sam P. Brown. 2023. Machine learning identification of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* strains from colony image data. 19, 12 (2023), e1011699. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1011699
- [71] Zafar Salman, Abdullah Muhammad, and Dongli Han. 2025. Plant disease classification in the wild using vision transformers and mixture of experts. 16 (2025). doi:10.3389/fpls.2025.1522985
- [72] Philippe Schwaller, Benjamin Hoover, Jean-Louis Reymond, Hendrik Strobelt, and Teodoro Laino. 2021. Extraction of organic chemistry grammar from unsupervised learning of chemical reactions. 7, 15 (2021), eabe4166. doi:10.1126/sciadv.abe4166 Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- [73] Roy Schwartz, Jesse Dodge, Noah A. Smith, and Oren Etzioni. 2020. Green AI. *Commun. ACM* 63, 12 (Nov. 2020), 54–63. doi:10.1145/3381831
- [74] D. Sculley, Gary Holt, Daniel Golovin, Eugene Davydov, Todd Phillips, Dietmar Ebner, Vinay Chaudhary, Michael Young, Jean-François Crespo, and Dan Dennison. 2015. Hidden Technical Debt in Machine Learning Systems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 28. Curran Associates, Inc. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2015/hash/86df7dcfd896caf2674f757a2463eba-Abstract.html
- [75] Zachary Sethna, Giulio Isacchini, Thomas Dupic, Thierry Mora, Aleksandra M. Walczak, and Yuval Elhanati. 2020. Population variability in the generation and selection of T-cell repertoires. 16, 12 (2020), e1008394. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008394
- [76] Emma Strubell, Ananya Ganesh, and Andrew McCallum. 2020. Energy and Policy Considerations for Modern Deep Learning Research. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 34, 09 (April 2020), 13693–13696.

- doi:10.1609/aaai.v34i09.7123 Number: 09.
- [77] Zhiping Tan, Dapeng Ye, Jiancong Wang, and Wenxiang Wang. 2025. P4CN-YOLOv5s: a passion fruit pests detection method based on lightweight-improved YOLOv5s. 16 (2025). doi:10.3389/fpls.2025.1612642
- [78] Akinori Tanaka, Akio Tomiya, and Koji Hashimoto. 2021. *Deep Learning and Physics*. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-981-33-6108-9
- [79] Yiming Tang, Raffi Khatchadourian, Mehdi Bagherzadeh, Rhia Singh, Ajani Stewart, and Anita Raja. 2021. An Empirical Study of Refactorings and Technical Debt in Machine Learning Systems. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering* (Madrid, Spain, 2021-11-05) (ICSE '21). IEEE Press, 238–250. doi:10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00033
- [80] Muhammad Usman Tariq and Fahad Saeed. 2021. SpeCollate: Deep cross-modal similarity network for mass spectrometry data based peptide deductions. 16, 10 (2021), e0259349. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0259349
- [81] Sheila Teo. 2023. How I Won Singapore's GPT-4 Prompt Engineering Competition. <https://towardsdatascience.com/how-i-won-singapores-gpt-4-prompt-engineering-competition-34c195a93d41/>
- [82] The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences. 2024. *The Nobel Prize in Chemistry 2024*. <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/chemistry/2024/press-release/>
- [83] The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences. 2024. *The Nobel Prize in Physics 2024*. <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/physics/2024/press-release/>
- [84] Muhammad Umair, Muhammad Shahbaz Khan, Muhammad Hanif, Wad Ghaban, Ibtehal Nafea, Sultan Noman Qasem, and Faisal Saeed. 2025. Privacy-preserving dementia classification from EEG via hybrid-fusion EEGNetv4 and federated learning. 19 (2025). doi:10.3389/fncom.2025.1617883
- [85] Patrick von Platen, Suraj Patil, Anton Lozhkov, Pedro Cuenca, Nathan Lambert, Kashif Rasul, Mishig Davaadorj, Dhruv Nair, Sayak Paul, Steven Liu, William Berman, Yiyi Xu, and Thomas Wolf. [n. d.]. *Diffusers: State-of-the-art diffusion models*. <https://github.com/huggingface/diffusers>
- [86] Yongji Wang, Ching-Yao Lai, David J. Prior, and Charlie Cowen-Breen. 2025. Deep learning the flow law of Antarctic ice shelves. 387, 6739 (2025), 1219–1224. doi:10.1126/science.adp3300 Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- [87] Steven Weinberg. 1995. The methods of science ... and those by which we live. 8, 2 (1995), 7–13. doi:10.1007/BF02683184
- [88] Dong Wen, Zhenhao Wei, Yanhong Zhou, Guolin Li, Xu Zhang, and Wei Han. 2018. Deep Learning Methods to Process fMRI Data and Their Application in the Diagnosis of Cognitive Impairment: A Brief Overview and Our Opinion. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics* Volume 12 - 2018 (2018). doi:10.3389/fninf.2018.00023
- [89] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander M. Rush. 2020. HuggingFace's Transformers: State-of-the-art Natural Language Processing. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1910.03771 arXiv:1910.03771.
- [90] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander M. Rush. 2020. Transformers: State-of-the-Art Natural Language Processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 38–45. <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.emnlp-demos.6>
- [91] Fan Yang, Jingxian Liu, Ruisheng Zhang, and Yabing Yao. 2023. Diffusion characteristics classification framework for identification of diffusion source in complex networks. 18, 5 (2023), e0285563. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0285563
- [92] Hui Yang, Sifu Yue, and Yunzhong He. 2023. Auto-GPT for Online Decision Making: Benchmarks and Additional Opinions. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2306.02224 arXiv:2306.02224 [cs].
- [93] Hongkun Yu, Chen Chen, Xianzhi Du, Yeqing Li, Abdullah Rashwan, Le Hou, Pengchong Jin, Fan Yang, Frederick Liu, Jaeyoun Kim, and Jing Li. 2020. TensorFlow Model Garden. <https://github.com/tensorflow/models>
- [94] Vinicius Zambaldi, David La, Alexander E. Chu, Harshnira Patani, Amy E. Danson, Tristan O. C. Kwan, Thomas Frerix, Rosalia G. Schneider, David Saxton, Ashok Thillaisundaram, Zachary Wu, Isabel Moraes, Oskar Lange, Eliseo Papa, Gabriella Stanton, Victor Martin, Sukhdeep Singh, Lai H. Wong, Russ Bates, Simon A. Kohl, Josh Abramson, Andrew W. Senior, Yilmaz Alguel, Mary Y. Wu, Irene M. Aspalter, Katie Bentley, David L. V. Bauer, Peter Cherepanov, Demis Hassabis, Pushmeet Kohli, Rob Fergus, and Jue Wang. 2024. De novo design of high-affinity protein binders with AlphaProteo. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2409.08022 arXiv:2409.08022.
- [95] Wanqiu Zhang, Nathan Heath Patterson, Nico Verbeek, Jessica L. Moore, Alice Ly, Richard M. Caprioli, Bart De Moor, Jeremy L. Norris, and Marc Claesen. 2024. Multimodal MALDI imaging mass spectrometry for improved diagnosis of melanoma. 19, 5 (2024), e0304709. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0304709
- [96] Yu Zhang, Yang Han, Shuai Chen, Ruijie Yu, Xin Zhao, Xianbin Liu, Kaipeng Zeng, Mengdi Yu, Jidong Tian, Feng Zhu, Xiaokang Yang, Yaohui Jin, and Yanyan Xu. 2025. Large language models to accelerate organic chemistry synthesis. 7, 7 (2025), 1010–1022. doi:10.1038/s42256-025-01066-y Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.