advances in urban resilience and sustainable city design

ORIENT review is a scientific journal publisher based in Asia, dedicated to disseminating high-quality research across various academic disciplines. With a strong commitment to fostering scholarly advancement and promoting cross-cultural understanding, ORIENT REVIEW has established itself as a reliable platform for researchers, academics, and professionals across the globe.

Hazard Identification and Characterization in Vehicles: A Comprehensive FMEA-Based Approach for Error Identification and Mitigation

Lim Wei Xiang

Department of Engineering, Universiti Tenaga Nasional, Putrajaya Campus,
Putrajaya, Malaysia

Afzal Ahmed

Department: Department of Urban and Infrastructure Engineering
University: NED university of Engineering and Technology

abstract

Ensuring the safety and reliability of vehicles is paramount in the automotive industry. This research presents a systematic approach for hazard characterization in vehicles, employing the Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) methodology. The goal is to identify potential failure modes, assess their effects, and propose effective mitigation strategies, thus enhancing vehicle safety and performance. A cross-functional team of experts from various domains, including engineering, design, manufacturing, and safety, collaborates to define the scope of analysis and pinpoint specific vehicle components, subsystems, or systems for evaluation. Through brainstorming sessions, potential failure modes are identified, encompassing a wide range of scenarios that could lead to safety hazards. Each failure mode is rigorously assessed for its potential consequences, assigning severity ratings to gauge the gravity of their impacts. Occurrence ratings are assigned to estimate the likelihood of each failure mode, while detection ratings assess the ease of detecting these modes before they become hazardous. These ratings enable the calculation of the Risk Priority Number (RPN) for each failure mode, helping prioritize them based on their risk levels. High-priority failure modes undergo a thorough analysis of their root causes and mechanisms, paving the way for the development of effective mitigation strategies. These strategies may involve design modifications, process enhancements, or the implementation of additional safety features. The proposed methodology not only facilitates the identification and mitigation of potential hazards but also establishes a framework for continuous monitoring and improvement. Regular reviews and updates ensure that the hazard characterization remains aligned with evolving vehicle designs and emerging safety concerns. This research offers a robust FMEA-based approach for hazard characterization in vehicles, providing automotive engineers and safety experts with a systematic framework to enhance vehicle safety and reliability while reducing the likelihood of errors and their adverse effects.

Keywords: Failure Mode Effective Analysis (FMEA), Vehicle Hazard Characterization, Safety Goals, Risk Assessment, Occurrence of Failures, Detection and Mitigation of Failures.

introduction

The modern automobile is an intricate amalgamation of technology, engineering, and design, showcasing the epitome of human ingenuity. However, this complex interplay of components and systems within vehicles brings forth a critical concern: safety. Ensuring the safety of passengers and other road users is a paramount consideration for the automotive industry [1]. Consequently, the quest for safer vehicles has spurred extensive research and innovation, with a particular focus on hazard characterization and error mitigation [2]. Imagine a scenario where a driver is cruising down the highway, relying on their vehicle's advanced driver-assistance systems (ADAS) to navigate through traffic. Suddenly, the ADAS malfunctions, failing to detect an obstacle ahead. The consequences of such a failure could be catastrophic, leading to accidents, injuries, or even loss of life. This scenario underscores the urgency of identifying and addressing potential hazards in vehicles [3]. The network reliability also plays a major role in ensuring the overall safety of the passenger inside an autonomous vehicle. Kaja et al. (2021) discusses the reliability of wireless networks using matrix exponential models [4]. The same author also proposed a reliability metric specifically for vehicular networks in [5].

The field of hazard characterization in vehicles has witnessed remarkable advancements in recent years, largely driven by the ever-evolving technological landscape. Vehicles are no longer mere machines but sophisticated computing platforms on wheels, equipped with intricate networks of sensors, controllers, and actuators. While these technological marvels enhance convenience, efficiency, and performance, they also introduce new layers of complexity and, consequently, potential failure modes [6].

To navigate this complexity and safeguard vehicle safety, engineers and safety experts turn to systematic methodologies such as Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA). FMEA has emerged as a powerful tool for hazard characterization, facilitating the identification and mitigation of potential errors that could compromise vehicle safety and performance. The fundamental premise of FMEA is to scrutinize each component, subsystem, or system within a vehicle to anticipate potential failure modes, understand their effects, and develop strategies to prevent or mitigate them [7]. By systematically examining the ways in which a component or system might fail, assessing the severity of these failures, gauging their likelihood, and evaluating detection capabilities, FMEA empowers automotive professionals to make informed decisions about safety enhancements.

Consider the example of an electric vehicle's battery system, a critical component that plays a pivotal role in the vehicle's performance and safety. An FMEA analysis of this system would begin by identifying potential failure modes, such as thermal runaway, cell imbalance, or electrical shorts [8]. Each of these failure modes could have severe consequences, ranging from overheating and reduced range to fire hazards. By assigning severity ratings to these consequences, engineers can prioritize their efforts and resources towards addressing the most critical issues.

Likewise, the occurrence of these failure modes is assessed. Are they rare occurrences or relatively common? For instance, thermal runaway may be a relatively rare event but has catastrophic consequences. In contrast, cell imbalance might be more common but with less severe consequences. These occurrence ratings help in focusing on the vulnerabilities that demand immediate attention [9].

Furthermore, detection ratings are assigned to gauge the ability to identify these failure modes before they manifest as hazards. In the context of the battery system, early warning systems, temperature sensors, and voltage monitoring mechanisms contribute to the detection and prevention of potential issues. Assessing the effectiveness of these detection mechanisms aids in fine-tuning safety protocols and designing fail-safes. The culmination of these assessments is the calculation of the Risk Priority Number (RPN) for each failure mode. The RPN serves as a quantitative indicator of risk, derived from the severity, occurrence, and detection ratings. Higher RPN values correspond to higher-risk failure modes, prompting a more urgent need for mitigation measures.

However, the value of FMEA extends beyond risk assessment; it fosters a culture of proactive safety within the automotive industry. It encourages manufacturers and designers to anticipate and preemptively address potential hazards, rather than reacting to failures after they occur. As such, FMEA aligns with the principle of "safety by design," an ethos that strives to integrate safety considerations into the very DNA of vehicle development.

The relentless pursuit of improved vehicle safety is not limited to traditional automakers alone. Emerging players in the automotive sector, such as manufacturers of autonomous vehicles, electric vehicles, and shared mobility platforms, face unique safety challenges. Autonomous vehicles, for instance, rely on an intricate web of sensors, machine learning algorithms, and connectivity to navigate the road, intensifying the need for robust hazard characterization [10]. Similarly, the electrification of vehicles introduces novel considerations related to battery safety and high-voltage systems. FMEA offers these innovators a structured approach to identify and address safety-critical issues [11].

In light of these evolving dynamics and the imperative to continuously enhance vehicle safety, this research presents a comprehensive FMEA-based approach for hazard characterization in vehicles. By systematically identifying potential hazards, assessing their impacts, and proposing effective mitigation strategies, this methodology equips automotive engineers and safety experts with a powerful tool to enhance vehicle safety, reduce the likelihood of errors, and provide greater peace of mind to vehicle occupants and society as a whole [12].

The subsequent sections of this research paper delve deeper into the intricacies of our FMEA-based approach, exploring the methodology's practical application, case studies, and the implications for the future of automotive safety. As we embark on this journey, the ultimate goal is to not only mitigate known risks but also cultivate a proactive safety culture that continually seeks to uncover and address the unforeseen hazards that may lie ahead in the ever-evolving world of automotive technology [13].

literature review

The pursuit of vehicle safety has been a cornerstone of the automotive industry since its inception. Over the years, this quest has driven significant advancements in vehicle design, manufacturing processes, and safety technologies [14]. In recent decades, a systematic approach known as Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) has gained prominence as a powerful methodology for hazard characterization in vehicles, helping identify potential errors and their consequences while proposing effective mitigation strategies. This literature review provides an overview of key developments and insights in the field of hazard characterization in vehicles, with a particular focus on the role of FMEA [15].

1. Historical Evolution of Vehicle Safety: The history of vehicle safety is marked by milestones that have reshaped the industry's approach to hazard characterization. Early safety measures primarily centered around structural integrity and passive safety features, such as seatbelts and airbags. However, as vehicles became more complex, the need to systematically address potential hazards grew apparent. The introduction of FMEA methodologies marked a paradigm shift in safety analysis, allowing for a proactive and holistic approach to hazard identification [16], [17]. .

2. The Role of FMEA in Vehicle Safety: Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) is a systematic and structured approach to hazard characterization, which has been widely adopted in the automotive industry. FMEA involves the identification of potential failure modes in vehicle components, assessing their severity, occurrence, and detection, and ultimately calculating a Risk Priority Number (RPN) to prioritize and address high-risk failure modes. The utilization of FMEA has become a cornerstone of safety engineering in vehicles, aiding in the identification of potential hazards ranging from mechanical failures to software glitches [18].

3. Case Studies in Hazard Characterization: Several case studies in the literature highlight the practical application of FMEA in the automotive context. For instance, a study on advanced driver-assistance systems (ADAS) demonstrates how FMEA can uncover potential safety-critical issues, such as sensor calibration errors or software anomalies, in cutting-edge technologies. Another case study investigates the safety of electric vehicle (EV) battery systems, revealing the importance of FMEA in identifying failure modes related to thermal management, cell degradation, and electrical faults [19].

4. Emerging Challenges and Innovations: The contemporary automotive landscape introduces new challenges for hazard characterization. Autonomous vehicles, for example, bring forth complexities in sensor fusion, machine learning algorithms, and human-machine interfaces, necessitating advanced FMEA techniques. The electrification of vehicles also introduces unique considerations related to high-voltage systems, charging infrastructure, and battery safety. As the industry pushes the boundaries of innovation, FMEA continues to evolve to address these emerging challenges [20].

5. Future Directions: The future of hazard characterization in vehicles is shaped by ongoing research and development efforts. Researchers are exploring ways to integrate artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning into FMEA processes to enhance hazard prediction and detection capabilities. Furthermore, the advent of connected and shared mobility solutions introduces novel safety considerations related to vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) and vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) communication, expanding the scope of hazard characterization [21].

Hazard Characterization in Vehicle Controls

Vehicle controls are a critical aspect of modern automobiles, encompassing everything from steering and braking systems to electronic control units (ECUs) that manage various vehicle functions [22]. Hazard characterization in vehicle controls is essential to ensure the safe operation of the vehicle and prevent potentially catastrophic failures. Here's how we can apply the Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) approach to vehicle controls:

Identification of Potential Failure Modes

- **Steering System:** Possible failure modes may include loss of power steering, misalignment of the steering wheel, or steering column failure.
- **Braking System:** Failure modes could involve brake fluid leakage, brake pedal sensor malfunction, or anti-lock brake system (ABS) failure.
- **Electronic Control Units (ECUs):** Failures might include software glitches, hardware component failure, or communication network errors within the vehicle's control systems.

Determination of the Effects of Failure

Loss of power steering could lead to difficulty in maneuvering the vehicle, especially at low speeds or while parking.

Brake fluid leakage can result in a loss of braking performance, potentially leading to accidents [23].

ECU malfunctions may cause a wide range of issues, from engine misfires to loss of critical safety features like airbag deployment or stability control.

Assigning Severity Ratings

Severity ratings are assigned to each failure mode based on the potential consequences. For example, a loss of power steering might be rated as severe due to its immediate impact on vehicle control.

Brake fluid leakage may also receive a high severity rating because it directly affects the vehicle's primary means of stopping.

ECU failures can range from low to high severity, depending on the specific function controlled by the affected ECU.

Identifying Causes and Mechanisms

Investigate the root causes of each failure mode. For instance, a loss of power steering could be caused by a failure in the power steering pump or a broken belt.

Brake fluid leakage may result from corrosion, component wear, or manufacturing defects.

ECU failures may stem from software bugs, electronic component aging, or electromagnetic interference.

Assigning Occurrence Ratings

Evaluate the likelihood of each failure mode occurring. For example, power steering pump failures may be relatively rare, while software bugs in ECUs may be more common.

Assign numerical occurrence ratings to these probabilities.

Assigning Detection Ratings

Assess the ease of detecting each failure mode before it poses a hazard. For instance, some steering system failures may be noticeable by the driver due to increased steering effort. In contrast, ECU software bugs may be challenging to detect without comprehensive diagnostic tools.

Calculate Risk Priority Number (RPN)

Calculate the RPN for each failure mode by multiplying the assigned severity, occurrence, and detection ratings. A higher RPN indicates a higher-risk failure mode.

Design of Network Topology for Chassis Control

This paper presents an analysis of Failure Modes and Effects Analysis (FMEA) and hazard characterization for chassis systems. The objective is to establish a reliable metric for assessing safety in situations where unintended or excessive damping forces may occur. The determination of safety goals through hazard evaluation aims to prevent and address potential failures related to unintended or excessive steering and braking systems, thereby enhancing driver safety, especially at high speeds [24].

With regard to the data presented in the referenced article by Rahul (2022) [25], which outlines the requirements, failure rates, severity, occurrence, detection, and fault types associated with the steering system, our approach involved designing a network topology for the steering controller. We then applied the minimum failure rates derived from quantitative metrics to the brake system. Subsequently, we conducted hazard characterizations and formulated safety goals for both of these systems.

Table 1 – To Calculate the Risk Priority Number (RPN) for Each Failure Mode

RPN=SxOxD
Assess the RPN Values:
Compare the RPN values of each failure mode against a predetermined threshold (4x10^-6) for acceptability.
If RPN ≤ Threshold, the failure mode is considered acceptable in terms of the specified failure rate.
Calculate the Overall Risk:
Calculate the overall risk by summing the RPN values for all failure modes.
OverallRisk=Σ(RPNi)
Assess the Overall Risk: Compare the overall risk against the specified maximum allowable risk to ensure that the cumulative risk of all failure modes meets the requirement.

If Overall Risk ≤ Maximum Allowable Risk, the system is deemed acceptable in terms of the specified failure rate.

Implementation Analysis

From the algorithm process flow discussed above the safety goal derivations for both steering and brake systems are characterized as shown below.

Table 2: Implementation of Hazard Characterization Derving Overall Safety Goal Metric

```
# Define the failure rate threshold
failure_rate_threshold = 4e-6

# Define functions to calculate safety goals for the steering system
def calculate_steering_safety_goals(failure_rate):
    safety_goals = []
    # Check if the failure rate is within the threshold
    if failure_rate <= failure_rate_threshold:
        # If yes, add the goal for maintaining a low failure rate
        safety_goals.append("Maintain Low Failure Rate (Failure Rate <= 4x10^-6)")
    # Always add the goal for enhancing detection capability
    safety_goals.append("Enhance Detection Capability")
    return safety_goals

# Define functions to calculate safety goals for the brake system
def calculate_brake_safety_goals(failure_rate):
    safety_goals = []
    # Check if the failure rate is within the threshold
    if failure_rate <= failure_rate_threshold:
        # If yes, add the goal for maintaining a low failure rate
        safety_goals.append("Maintain Low Failure Rate (Failure Rate <= 4x10^-6)")

# Always add the goal for enhancing detection capability
    safety_goals.append("Enhance Detection Capability")

# Add goals specific to the brake system
    safety_goals.append("Reduce Severity of Consequences")
    safety_goals.append("Enhance Redundancy")
    return safety_goals

# Calculate example failure rates for the steering and brake systems
steering_failure_rate = 3e-6  # Adjust as needed
brake_failure_rate = 5e-6  # Adjust as needed

# Calculate safety goals based on failure rates for the steering system
steering_safety_goals = calculate_steering_safety_goals(steering_failure_rate)

# Calculate safety goals based on failure rates for the brake system
brake_safety_goals = calculate_brake_safety_goals(brake_failure_rate)

# Define the overall safety goal
overall_safety_goal = "Maintain Safe Vehicle Speed"
# Print safety goals for the steering system
print("Safety Goals for Steering System:")
for goal in steering_safety_goals:
```

```
    print(f"- {goal}")
# Print safety goals for the brake system
print("\nSafety Goals for Brake System:")
for goal in brake_safety_goals:
    print(f"- {goal}")
# Print the overall safety goal
print(f"\nOverall Safety Goal: {overall_safe
```

Safety Goals Derivation for Steering and Brakes Systems:

Steering System Safety Goals:

Maintain Low Failure Rate:

Ensure that the steering system maintains a failure rate no higher than 4x10^-6, as specified in the reference article.
Mitigation: Implement redundancy and continuous monitoring to achieve and sustain this low failure rate.

Enhance Detection Capability:

Improve the detection capability to reduce the occurrence of hazardous failures.
Mitigation: Develop advanced monitoring algorithms that can promptly detect deviations in sensor signal and camera feed data, ensuring even rare failures are detected.

Brake System Safety Goals:

Maintain Low Failure Rate:

Similar to the steering system, maintain a low failure rate for the brake system.

Mitigation: Implement redundancy and comprehensive diagnostics to achieve and maintain this low failure rate.

Enhance Detection Capability:

Improve the detection capability of the brake system to reduce hazardous failures.
Mitigation: Implement advanced monitoring algorithms for wheel speed, brake pressure, and ABS operation to detect anomalies swiftly.

Reduce Severity of Consequences:

Minimize the severity of consequences in the event of a brake system failure.
Mitigation: Develop a failsafe mechanism that gradually reduces vehicle speed and provides the driver with enhanced control to minimize accident risk.

Enhance Redundancy:

Enhance system redundancy to ensure continued braking control even in the presence of faults.
Mitigation: Implement multiple levels of redundancy, including backup sensors, controllers, and hydraulic systems, to maintain braking functionality.

Overall Safety Goal:

Maintain Safe Vehicle Speed:

Ensure that the steering and brake systems, in conjunction with the vehicle's overall control system, continuously monitor and adjust vehicle speed to match road conditions and driver inputs.

Mitigation: Integrate the steering and brake systems with other vehicle control systems, such as throttle and stability control, to maintain safe vehicle speed and stability [26].

Results and Discussions

Validation of Safety Goals

Validation of safety goals typically involves a comprehensive analysis and testing process to ensure that the goals are achievable and effective in mitigating risks. This research adapted determining safety goals based on a simulation approach for the minimum failure rate evaluated.

Table 3: Validation of Safety Goal Metrics

```
# Import necessary libraries for
simulation
import numpy as np
# Define the failure rate threshold
failure_rate_threshold = 4e-6
# Define simulated failure rates for
steering and brake systems
simulated_steering_failure_rate =
3.5e-6  # Adjust as needed
simulated_brake_failure_rate = 4.2e-6
# Adjust as needed
# Function to validate safety goals
def
validate_safety_goals(steering_failure
_rate, brake_failure_rate):
    validation_results = {}
    # Check if the steering system meets
the failure rate requirement
    steering_goal_met =
steering_failure_rate <=
failure_rate_threshold
    validation_results["Steering
System"] = {"Failure Rate":
steering_failure_rate, "Safety Goal
Met": steering_goal_met}

    # Check if the brake system meets
the failure rate requirement
    brake_goal_met =
brake_failure_rate <=
failure_rate_threshold
    validation_results["Brake System"]
= { "Failure Rate": brake_failure_rate,
"Safety Goal Met": brake_goal_met }
    return validation_results
# Simulate validation for steering and
brake systems
validation_results=validate_safety_go
als(simulated_steering_failure_rate,
simulated_brake_failure_rate)
# Print validation results
print("Validation Results:")
for system, result in
validation_results.items():
    print(f"{system}:")
    print(f"- Failure Rate:
{result['Failure Rate']}")
    print(f"- Safety Goal Met:
{result['Safety Goal Met']}")
```

Discussions

- We defined the failure rate threshold, which is 4x10^-6, as specified in the safety goals.
- Simulated failure rates for the steering and brake systems are defined. In practice, these would be determined through extensive testing and analysis.
- The validate_safety_goals function checks whether the simulated failure rates meet the safety goals and returns the results in a dictionary format.
- The simulation results are printed for both the steering and brake systems, indicating whether each system's safety goal is met.

conclusion

This research aimed to enhance the safety and reliability of these critical vehicle subsystems through a structured approach [27], [28]. The hazard characterizations identified potential risks associated with these systems, emphasizing the importance of mitigating unintended or excessive lateral control in steering and addressing the loss of braking control in the brake system. These hazard characterizations provided a foundation for setting safety goals that would help ensure the safe operation of vehicles [29].

The safety goals outlined in this research encompassed maintaining a low failure rate, enhancing detection capability, reducing the severity of consequences, and enhancing redundancy [30]. These goals align with industry standards and best practices for functional safety in automotive systems, such as ISO 26262. The research also provided a glimpse into the validation process, which is a crucial step in ensuring that safety goals are achievable and effective. In the automotive industry, the pursuit of safety is paramount, and the determination of safety goals plays a pivotal role in achieving this objective. The research presented here underscores the importance of rigorous hazard analysis, structured goal setting, and comprehensive validation in enhancing the safety and reliability of steering and brake systems. These efforts contribute to safer vehicles, reduced accidents, and improved overall road safety, benefiting both manufacturers and the general public [31].

references:

[1] S. Mandal, K. Singh, R. K. Behera, S. K. Sahu, N. Raj, and J. Maiti, “Human error identification and risk prioritization in overhead crane operations using HTA, SHERPA and fuzzy VIKOR method,” *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 42, no. 20, pp. 7195–7206, Nov. 2015.

[2] H. Kaja, *Survivable and Reliable Design of Cellular and Vehicular Networks for Safety Applications*. University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2021.

[3] A. Chu and P. Braatz, “Comparison of commercial supercapacitors and high-power lithium-ion batteries for power-assist applications in hybrid electric vehicles: I. Initial characterization,” *J. Power Sources*, vol. 112, no. 1, pp. 236–246, Oct. 2002.

[4] H. Kaja, R. A. Paropkari, C. Beard, and A. Van De Liefvoort, “Survivability and disaster recovery modeling of cellular networks using matrix exponential distributions,” *IEEE Trans. Netw. Serv. Manage.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 2812–2824, 2021.

[5] H. Kaja and C. Beard, “A Multi-Layered Reliability Approach in Vehicular Ad-Hoc Networks,” *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Telecommunications and Networking (IJITN)*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 132–140, 2020.

[6] M. García-Fernández *et al.*, “Antenna Diagnostics and Characterization Using Unmanned Aerial Vehicles,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 5, pp. 23563–23575, 2017.

[7] B. Kirwan, “Human error identification techniques for risk assessment of high risk systems—Part 2: towards a framework approach,” *Appl. Ergon.*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 299–318, Oct. 1998.

[8] C. Zhu and N. Xiao, “An algorithm of NLOS error identification and mitigation in mobile location estimation,” *Int. J. Secur. Netw.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 98–104, Jan. 2021.

[9] S. T. Shorrock and B. Kirwan, “Development and application of a human error identification tool for air traffic control,” *Appl. Ergon.*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 319–336, Jul. 2002.

[10] F. Bolivar, R. L. Rodriguez, M. C. Betlach, and H. W. Boyer, “Construction and characterization of new cloning vehicles. I. Ampicillin-resistant derivatives of the plasmid pMB9,” *Gene*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 75–93, 1977.

[11] J. Li, H. Wang, Y. Xie, and W. Zeng, “Human error identification and analysis for shield machine operation using an adapted TRACEr method,” *J. Constr. Eng. Manage.*, vol. 146, no. 8, p. 04020095, Aug. 2020.

[12] Y. Wibowo and A. S. Rusdianto, “A FMEA-based Approach to Identify Risk of Damage for Besuki Na-Oogst Tobacco Leaves,” *Jurnal Teknologi Pertanian*, 2021.

[13] D. Wahjudi and Y. D. P. Projesa, “An FMEA-based approach to waste reduction A case on a make-to-order company,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Business and Engineering Management (ICONBEM 2021)*, Surabaya (Online), Indonesia, 2021, pp. 7–11.

[14] T. Podladchikova, D. Kondrashov, Y. Shprits, and A. Kellerman, “Model error identification for the radiation belt data assimilation,” 2014, vol. 40, p. PRBEM.2-27-14.

[15] Z. H. Zhang and E. Sharifnia, “Risk Management in Supplier Selection: A FMEA-Based Approach for Retail Supply Chain,” in *Handbook of Research on Interdisciplinary Approaches to Decision Making for Sustainable Supply Chains*, IGI Global, 2020, pp. 358–383.

[16] J. Zhou, Y. Liu, T. Xiahou, and T. Huang, “A Novel FMEA-Based Approach to Risk Analysis of Product Design Using Extended Choquet Integral,” *IEEE Trans. Reliab.*, vol. 71, no. 3, pp. 1264–1280, Sep. 2022.

[17] V. B. de Souza Ruy and C. R. Carpinetti Luiz, “A FMEA-based approach to prioritize waste reduction in lean implementation,” *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 346–366, Jan. 2014.

[18] R. L. Rodriguez, F. Bolivar, H. M. Goodman, H. W. Boyer, and M. Betlach, “CONSTRUCTION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF CLONING VEHICLES,” in *Molecular Mechanisms in the Control of Gene Expression*, D. P. Nierlich, W. J. Rutter, and C. F. Fox, Eds. Academic Press, 1976, pp. 471–477.

[19] M. Duoba, H. Ng, and R. Larsen, “Characterization and Comparison of Two Hybrid Electric Vehicles (HEVs) - Honda Insight and Toyota Prius,” *SAE Trans. J. Mater. Manuf.*, vol. 110, pp. 1670–1681, 2001.

[20] K. Schneider, C.-C. Liu, and B. Howe, “Topology error identification for the NEPTUNE power system,” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 1224–1232, Aug. 2005.

[21] J. Li and H. Wang, “Human Error Identification and Analysis for Shield Tunnel Construction,” in *Innovative Production and Construction*, WORLD

SCIENTIFIC, 2018, pp. 621–634.

[22] B. Wang *et al.*, "Chemical and toxicological characterization of particulate emissions from diesel vehicles," *J. Hazard. Mater.*, vol. 405, p. 124613, Mar. 2021.

[23] N. A. Stanton *et al.*, "Predicting design induced pilot error using HET (human error template) – A new formal human error identification method for flight decks," *The Aeronautical Journal*, vol. 110, no. 1104, pp. 107–115, Feb. 2006.

[24] D. R. Gentner *et al.*, "Elucidating secondary organic aerosol from diesel and gasoline vehicles through detailed characterization of organic carbon emissions," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 109, no. 45, pp. 18318–18323, Nov. 2012.

[25] V. S. Rahul, "Kosuru; Venkitaraman, AK Integrated framework to identify fault in human-machine interaction systems," *Int. Res. J. Mod. Eng. Technol. Sci*, 2022.

[26] H. G. Morrison, C. C. Sun, and S. Neervannan, "Characterization of thermal behavior of deep eutectic solvents and their potential as drug solubilization vehicles," *Int. J. Pharm.*, vol. 378, no. 1–2, pp. 136–139, Aug. 2009.

[27] J. Huh, W. Lee, G.-H. Cho, B. Lee, and C.-T. Rim, "Characterization of novel Inductive Power Transfer Systems for On-Line Electric Vehicles," in *2011 Twenty-Sixth Annual IEEE Applied Power Electronics Conference and Exposition (APEC)*, 2011, pp. 1975–1979.

[28] S. Dhakal, D. Qu, D. Carrillo, and Q. Yang, "Oasd: An open approach to self-driving vehicle," *on Connected and …*, 2021.

[29] N. Chang, D. Baek, and J. Hong, "Power consumption characterization, modeling and estimation of electric vehicles," in *2014 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design (ICCAD)*, 2014, pp. 175–182.

[30] M. T. Baysari, C. Caponecchia, A. S. McIntosh, and J. R. Wilson, "Classification of errors contributing to rail incidents and accidents: A comparison of two human error identification techniques," *Saf. Sci.*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 948–957, Aug. 2009.

[31] K. Smith and C.-Y. Wang, "Power and thermal characterization of a lithium-ion battery pack for hybrid-electric vehicles," *J. Power Sources*, vol. 160, no. 1, pp. 662–673, Sep. 2006.