WORLD JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH
SJIF Impact Factor 8.453
Volume 14, Issue 12, 393-405. Review Article ISSN 2277–7105

LEVERAGING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE FOR NON-ANIMAL TOXICITY TESTING: A NEW ERA OF ETHICAL TOXICOLOGY

Sunil Kumar[1]* and Sahana V. M. Vats[2]

[1]Associate Professor, Dept. of Agad Tantra, BDM College of Ayurveda Science & Hospital, Chhuchhakwas, Jhajjar.

[2]Associate Professor, Dept. of Dravya Guna, National College of Ayurveda, Barwala.

Article Received on
01 May 2025,

Revised on 20 May 2025,
Accepted on 08 June 2025

DOI: 10.20959/wjpr202512-37177

***Corresponding Author**
Sunil Kumar
Associate Professor, Dept. of Agad Tantra, BDM College of Ayurveda Science & Hospital, Chhuchhakwas, Jhajjar.

ABSTRACT

The field of toxicology stands at a pivotal crossroads, shifting from reliance on traditional animal testing- fraught with ethical dilemmas, high costs, and limited human relevance-toward innovative, artificial intelligence (AI)-driven, animal-free approaches. This narrative review offers a comprehensive conceptual framework for this paradigm transition, critically analyzing the inherent limitations of in-vivo animal models, including species-specific biological discrepancies and scalability issues. It highlights groundbreaking AI-powered alternatives such as advanced Quantitative Structure-Activity Relationship (QSAR) models, organ-on-chip (OoC) technologies augmented with machine learning, and sophisticated in silico virtual screening techniques that integrate multi-omics and big data analytics for improved toxicity prediction. The review further explores the evolving regulatory landscape, acknowledging cautious but growing acceptance of AI tools by global agencies, while identifying key challenges related to model validation, transparency, ethical AI deployment, and data bias. Emphasizing interdisciplinary collaboration and scientific transparency, this article advocates for a future toxicology framework that balances technological innovation with ethical responsibility. Ultimately, the fusion of AI and toxicology represents more than a methodological upgrade, it is a transformative step toward a humane, efficient, and scientifically strong approach to toxicological safety assessment.

KEYWORDS: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Toxicology, Non-Animal Testing, QSAR Models, Organ-on-Chip, In Silico Methods, Virtual Screening, Ethical Toxicology, Regulatory Science, Computational Toxicology, Predictive Modeling, 3Rs Principle (Replace, Reduce, Refine)

INTRODUCTION

Toxicology stands at a critical intersection. For over a century, animal testing has been the backbone of safety evaluation for chemicals, drugs, and consumer products.[1] Yet, the scientific community increasingly recognizes that these traditional methods come with glaring drawbacks, ethical dilemmas surrounding animal welfare[2], species differences that limit human relevance, high costs, and lengthy timelines.[3] The urgent call for more humane, efficient, and predictive toxicological assessments has never been louder.

Enter Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a transformative force poised to redefine how we understand and predict toxicity.[4] AI-powered technologies, including machine learning-enhanced QSAR models[5], organ-on-chip systems coupled with real-time data analytics[6], and sophisticated in-silico simulations[7], offer promising alternatives that can reduce or eliminate reliance on animal experimentation. These cutting-edge tools can analyze vast chemical spaces, decipher complex biological interactions, and generate human-relevant predictions with unprecedented speed and precision.

This article presents a narrative review of the current landscape of AI-driven toxicology methods and situates these advancements within a broader conceptual framework. It explores how integrating AI can facilitate the transition from traditional animal-based testing to a new paradigm one that is scientifically boosts, ethically sound, and aligned with evolving regulatory demands. By weaving together existing evidence and forward-looking perspectives, this review aims to chart a roadmap for toxicology's transformation into an AI-driven, animal-free discipline, heralding a future where innovation and compassion coexist.

1. Limitations of Traditional Animal Testing in Toxicology

For decades, animal testing has been regarded as the cornerstone of toxicological evaluation[8], largely because it allows researchers to observe whole-organism responses to chemicals, drugs, and environmental agents. However, despite its historical significance, this method is now widely acknowledged to suffer from critical limitations that compromise both ethical acceptability[9] and scientific validity.[10]

First and foremost, ethical concerns surrounding animal welfare have moved from the margins to the forefront of scientific and public debate. The use of animals in experiments inevitably involves pain, distress, and sacrifice, raising profound moral questions. While institutional animal care and use committees (IACUCs) and guidelines such as the 3Rs principle (Replacement, Reduction, Refinement) aim to mitigate suffering[11], they cannot eliminate the intrinsic ethical dilemma of using sentient beings for research.[12]

Scientifically, the species differences between humans and animal models pose significant challenges. Key physiological and biochemical disparities such as variations in drug metabolism enzymes, receptor binding affinities, and immune system function result in poor translation of animal toxicity data to human outcomes.[13] For example, drugs like thalidomide and Vioxx passed animal safety tests but caused severe adverse effects in humans, highlighting the limitations of animal models in predicting human toxicity.[14]

Furthermore, animal experiments are time-consuming and expensive. Maintaining colonies, conducting prolonged dosing studies, and performing histopathological evaluations require extensive resources. This process is incompatible with the modern need to rapidly evaluate thousands of new chemicals entering the market, especially in the pharmaceutical, cosmetic, and agrochemical industries.[15]

Animal testing is also low-throughput and lacks scalability, which severely restricts its utility for large-scale screening programs. For instance, the US Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) ToxCast program tested over a thousand chemicals using in vitro and computational methods, an undertaking impractical with traditional animal tests.[16]

On the regulatory front, while there is slow progress toward accepting alternative methods, many agencies still require animal data for safety assessments.[17] This regulatory inertia creates a bottleneck that slows the adoption of innovative technologies and prolongs reliance on animal testing.

Together, these ethical, scientific, and practical limitations underscore the urgent need for reliable, efficient, and ethically acceptable non-animal toxicological testing approaches.

2.1 AI-Enhanced QSAR Models

Quantitative Structure-Activity Relationship (QSAR) models have long served as foundational tools in computational toxicology.[18] At their core, QSAR models establish

mathematical correlations between chemical structures and biological activities, enabling predictions of toxicity without the need for physical testing. Traditionally, QSAR approaches employed linear regression, multiple linear regression (MLR), or simpler statistical techniques, which, while useful, were limited in their capacity to capture the intricate, nonlinear relationships often inherent in biological systems.[19]

The advent of Artificial Intelligence (AI) especially machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL) algorithms—has dramatically transformed QSAR modeling, overcoming these traditional limitations. AI-enhanced QSAR models leverage algorithms like neural networks, support vector machines (SVM), random forests, and gradient boosting, enabling:
Nonlinear Modeling- Unlike classical QSAR, which assumes a linear or simple relationship between molecular descriptors and toxic outcomes, AI models adeptly capture complex, nonlinear interactions within high-dimensional chemical descriptor spaces. Neural networks, for example, mimic biological neural processing and can model multifaceted feature interactions that traditional methods.[20]

Handling High-Dimensional Data- Modern chemical databases contain thousands of molecular descriptors per compound, along with extensive bioactivity data from high-throughput screening. AI algorithms excel at processing such voluminous, multi-feature datasets, uncovering subtle patterns and correlations in chemical toxicity that evade conventional methods.[21]

Improved Predictive Accuracy- Empirical studies consistently demonstrate that AI-enhanced QSAR models outperform classical QSAR approaches in both internal validation and external predictive power. For instance, deep neural networks have shown superior accuracy in predicting mutagenicity, carcinogenicity, and other toxic endpoints.[22] This improved performance translates directly into better early-stage hazard identification, reducing the need for animal testing by prioritizing chemicals more likely to pose risks.

Moreover, AI-based QSAR models can integrate multi-modal data sources, combining chemical descriptors, omics data, and phenotypic readouts to generate holistic toxicity predictions, further advancing the field toward more human-relevant, mechanistically informed assessments.[23]

In summary, AI-enhanced QSAR models are not just incremental upgrades; they represent a paradigm shift, turning QSAR into a powerful, scalable, and ethically responsible tool that accelerates toxicological screening with higher precision.

2.2 In Silico Toxicology and Virtual Screening

In silico toxicology refers to the use of computational tools and models to predict the toxicological properties of chemicals without conducting physical experiments. This approach harnesses the power of computer simulations to replicate biological processes and chemical interactions at various scales—from molecular binding events to systemic ADMET (Absorption, Distribution, Metabolism, Excretion, and Toxicity) profiles.[24]

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into in silico toxicology has substantially accelerated and refined virtual screening techniques, providing rapid, cost-effective, and ethically superior alternatives to animal testing.

Key advances include

Rapid Prediction of ADMET Properties- Predicting pharmacokinetic and toxicity parameters early in drug development is critical to minimizing late-stage failures. AI models, including deep learning and ensemble methods, process large chemical libraries to estimate ADMET characteristics with high accuracy, enabling the early identification of potentially harmful compounds.[25] This predictive capability helps screen out toxic candidates before costly in vitro or in vivo studies.

Mining Biomedical Literature with Natural Language Processing (NLP)- Toxicity knowledge is often buried in vast, unstructured biomedical literature and databases. NLP techniques powered by AI can automatically extract relevant toxicity information, such as adverse effects, mechanisms of action, and chemical interactions, from published texts. This enhances data-driven toxicology by integrating existing knowledge into computational models, improving prediction reliability and uncovering novel insights.[26]

Integrative Multi-Source Data Modeling- Toxicity is a multifactorial phenomenon, influenced by chemical structure, genetic factors, and environmental context. AI-driven in silico approaches combine heterogeneous data—such as chemical descriptors, genomic/omics profiles, and clinical outcomes—to construct comprehensive toxicity profiles.[27] This

integrative modeling facilitates a more mechanistic understanding of toxicity pathways and better human relevance.

In silico toxicology and virtual screening not only accelerate the early phases of chemical risk assessment but also significantly reduce animal usage by providing high-throughput, scalable, and mechanistically informed toxicity predictions[28]. These advances align perfectly with the 3Rs principles (Replacement, Reduction, Refinement) in toxicology, helping regulatory agencies and industry stakeholders adopt safer, more ethical testing paradigms.

3. Regulatory Progress and Challenges

The toxicology field stands at a regulatory crossroads. As AI-powered alternatives to animal testing gain scientific traction, regulatory agencies worldwide are cautiously but steadily warming up to these novel methodologies, aiming to balance innovation with public health and safety.

Regulatory Endorsement and Guidance

International organizations such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) have taken critical steps by publishing guidelines for the validation and use of QSAR models in regulatory toxicology (OECD, 2014). These guidelines establish principles for model transparency, applicability domains, and endpoint relevance, providing a benchmark to ensure computational predictions meet acceptable scientific standards.

Agencies like the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) are also encouraging the adoption of Integrated Testing Strategies (ITS), which blend AI-driven models with traditional data and in vitro tests to reduce animal use while maintaining safety assessments (ECHA, 2020; EPA, 2019). For example, the EPA's ToxCast and Tox21 programs deploy high-throughput screening paired with AI analytics to predict chemical bioactivity and toxicity, demonstrating regulatory openness to non-animal methods.[29]

Challenges Impeding Regulatory Acceptance

Despite these advances, several formidable barriers impede the wholesale integration of AI-powered alternatives into official regulatory frameworks:

Validation and Standardization- Regulatory authorities require models to be reproducible, transparent, and predictive across diverse chemical classes and toxicological endpoints. Many

AI models, particularly deep learning "black boxes," struggle to meet explainability demands, which fuels scepticism regarding their reliability and hinders regulatory endorsement.[30] Efforts to develop interpretable AI and standardized validation protocols are ongoing but remain a work in progress.

Regulatory Trust and Benchmarking- Building trust in AI methods demands extensive benchmarking studies, inter-laboratory reproducibility tests, and real-world case studies demonstrating consistent performance in safety decisions. Regulatory bodies are cautious by necessity; without transparent validation data, AI-driven results risk rejection or limited use.

Ethical and Data Concerns- AI toxicology also faces ethical scrutiny related to data biases, quality, and representativeness. Biased training datasets can lead to skewed predictions disproportionately affecting vulnerable populations or certain chemical classes, raising concerns about fairness and equity in toxicological evaluations.[31] Moreover, data privacy and proprietary data issues complicate collaborative efforts to improve AI models.

The Way Forward

Despite these hurdles, regulatory frameworks are evolving toward fit-for-purpose AI integration, adopting a pragmatic, staged approach that balances innovation with safety. Increasingly, regulators are promoting transparency, open data sharing, and cross-sector collaboration to foster model improvement and regulatory confidence (European Commission, 2021).

The shift is gradual but undeniable: AI-powered toxicology is no longer a fringe concept but an emerging cornerstone of future regulatory science, paving the way for more ethical, efficient, and human-relevant chemical safety assessments.

4. Future Perspectives and Ethical Implications

As the dawn of an AI-driven, animal-free toxicology paradigm rises, it carries the promise of reshaping the entire landscape of drug development, chemical safety, and environmental health assessment. This future is not merely about faster or cheaper methods, it is a profound transformation with ripple effects on public health and ethical science worldwide.[32]

Accelerating Innovation, Enhancing Safety

Harnessing AI's unprecedented computational power, toxicologists can screen millions of compounds swiftly, uncover subtle toxicity signals invisible to traditional methods, and

model complex human biology with refined precision. This speed and granularity could slash the time from lab bench to market, preventing harmful substances from ever reaching the public and accelerating the development of safer medicines.[33]

Transparency and Explainability- The Non-Negotiables

However, this bright future demands vigilance. The temptation to accept AI outputs as infallible can lead us into the dangerous fog of "black box" decisions, where models deliver predictions without understandable reasoning. Transparency and explainability must be built into every AI tool to ensure that toxicological decisions are scientifically sound, reproducible, and trustworthy.[34] Without this clarity, regulatory and public trust will falter, and we risk replacing one ethical dilemma that is animal suffering with another: opaque algorithms making life-or-death calls.

Addressing Data Gaps and Biases

Data remains the lifeblood of AI. Yet, gaps and biases in toxicological datasets—historically skewed by limited chemical diversity, human population representation, and inconsistent reporting- threaten to undermine model fairness and accuracy. Vigilant curation, inclusive data collection, and ongoing validation are imperative to uphold scientific rigor and ethical integrity. Otherwise, the models might inadvertently perpetuate disparities or miss critical hazards.[35]

Interdisciplinary Collaboration- The Heartbeat of Progress

The complexity of this transition demands more than computational horsepower; it calls for a tapestry of expertise. Toxicologists, biologists, data scientists, ethicists, and regulators must coalesce, forging shared vocabularies and frameworks. This collaboration nurtures innovation that is not only technologically advanced but also grounded in biological reality and societal values.[36]

Keeping Compassion Front and Centre

Finally, amidst algorithms and data, the core mission must remain profoundly humane. Each AI model represents a step away from animal suffering- a testament to scientific conscience evolving in tandem with technology. These humane imperative grounds the revolution in ethical purpose, reminding us that progress is measured not only by metrics and models but by the lives spared and compassion extended.

In essence, the integration of AI and toxicology is more than a technological upgrade, it is a renaissance of scientific conscience. It reflects a future where innovation harmonizes with compassion, where science advances hand in hand with ethics, crafting a world that honors both human health and animal dignity.

5. CONCLUSION

The transition from animal-based toxicology to AI-powered, human-relevant models is not merely a scientific evolution, it is a moral imperative. This review has explored how artificial intelligence, when integrated with cutting-edge technologies like QSAR modeling, organ-on-chip systems, and in silico simulations, offers a promising, scalable, and ethically grounded alternative to traditional animal testing. These approaches not only enhance predictive accuracy and reduce time and cost but also align with the growing societal demand for cruelty-free science.

However, the road ahead requires deliberate navigation. Regulatory harmonization, model validation, data transparency, and interdisciplinary collaboration must be prioritized to ensure these tools are not just scientifically robust, but also ethically sound and publicly trusted. Moreover, AI models must remain interpretable and inclusive, avoiding the pitfalls of data bias or algorithmic opacity that could undermine their credibility.

In essence, we are witnessing a profound reimagining of toxicological science—where compassion meets computation, and ethics fuel innovation. The convergence of AI and toxicology has the potential to redefine not just how we test chemicals, but how we value life, responsibility, and scientific progress. The challenge is not only to build better models but to shape a better paradigm one that protects both human health and animal welfare, guided by the principles of precision, transparency, and humanity.

REFERENCES

1. Hajar R. Animal testing and medicine. Heart Views, 2011 Jan; 12(1): 42. doi: 10.4103/1995-705X.81548. PMID: 21731811; PMCID: PMC3123518.
2. Kiani AK, et ai; INTERNATIONAL BIOETHICS STUDY GROUP. Ethical considerations regarding animal experimentation. J Prev Med Hyg., 2022 Oct 17; 63(2 Suppl 3): E255-E266. doi: 10.15167/2421-4248/jpmh2022.63.2S3.2768. PMID: 36479489; PMCID: PMC9710398.

3. Goñi-Balentziaga, O., Ortega-Saez, I., Vila, S., & Azkona, G. A survey on the use of mice, pigs, dogs and monkeys as animal models in biomedical research in Spain. Laboratory Animal Research, 2022; 38(1): 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42826-022-00124-5.
4. Basile AO, Yahi A, Tatonetti NP. Artificial Intelligence for Drug Toxicity and Safety. Trends Pharmacol Sci., 2019 Sep; 40(9): 624-635. doi: 10.1016/j.tips.2019.07.005. Epub 2019 Aug 2. PMID: 31383376; PMCID: PMC6710127.
5. Zhang, F., Wang, Z., Peijnenburg, W. J. G. M., & Vijver, M. G. Machine learning-driven QSAR models for predicting the mixture toxicity of nanoparticles. Environment International, 2023; 177: 108025. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2023.108025.
6. Deng S, Li C, Cao J, Cui Z, Du J, Fu Z, Yang H, Chen P. Organ-on-a-chip meets artificial intelligence in drug evaluation. Theranostics, 2023 Aug 15; 13(13): 4526-4558. doi: 10.7150/thno.87266. PMID: 37649608; PMCID: PMC10465229.
7. Killeen, B. D., Cho, S. M., Armand, M., Taylor, R. H., & Unberath, M. In silico simulation: a key enabling technology for next-generation intelligent surgical systems - IOPscience. Progress in Biomedical Engineering, 2023; 5(3). https://doi.org/10.1088/2516-1091/acd28b.
8. Gerald Ngo Teke, Victor Kuete, Acute and Subacute Toxicities of African Medicinal Plants, Editor(s): Victor Kuete, Toxicological Survey of African Medicinal Plants, Elsevier, 2014; 63-98. ISBN 9780128000182, https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-800018-2.00005-4.
9. Kiani Akat el; INTERNATIONAL BIOETHICS STUDY GROUP. Ethical considerations regarding animal experimentation. J Prev Med Hyg., 2022 Oct 17; 63(2 Suppl 3): E255-E266. doi: 10.15167/2421-4248/jpmh2022.63.2S3.2768. PMID: 36479489; PMCID: PMC9710398.
10. Obrink KJ, Rehbinder C. Animal definition: a necessity for the validity of animal experiments? Lab Anim., 2000 Apr; 34(2): 121-30. doi: 10.1258/002367700780457608. PMID: 10817450.
11. Russell, W. M. S., & Burch, R. L. (1959). The Principles of Humane Experimental Technique. London: Methuen & Co. Limited.
12. Lee, K.H., Lee, D.W. & Kang, B.C. The 'R' principles in laboratory animal experiments. Lab Anim Res., 2020; 36: 45. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42826-020-00078-6.

13. Bailey, J., Thew, M., & Balls, M. An analysis of the use of animal models in predicting human toxicology and drug safety. Alternatives to Laboratory Animals, 2014; 42(3): 181-199. https://doi.org/10.1177/026119291404200304.
14. Olson, H., et al. Concordance of the toxicity of pharmaceuticals in humans and in animals. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, 2000; 32(1): 56-67. https://doi.org/10.1006/rtph.2000.1399
15. Hartung, T. Toxicology for the twenty-first century. Nature, 2009; 460(7252): 208-212. https://doi.org/10.1038/460208a
16. Judson, R. S., et al. In vitro screening of environmental chemicals for targeted testing prioritization: The ToxCast project. Environmental Health Perspectives, 2010; 118(4): 485-492. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.0901392
17. Ban on animal testing. (n.d.). Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs. Retrieved from https://single-market-economy.ec.europa.eu/sectors/cosmetics/ban-animal-testing_en
18. Bastikar V, Bastikar A, Gupta P. Quantitative structure–activity relationship-based computational approaches. Computational Approaches for Novel Therapeutic and Diagnostic Designing to Mitigate SARS-CoV-2 Infection., 2022; 191–205. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-323-91172-6.00001-7. Epub 2022 Jul 15. PMCID: PMC9300454.
19. Tropsha, A. Best practices for QSAR model development, validation, and exploitation. Molecular Informatics, 2010; 29(6-7): 476-488. https://doi.org/10.1002/minf.201000061
20. Ma, J., Sheridan, R. P., Liaw, A., Dahl, G. E., & Svetnik, V. Deep neural nets as a method for quantitative structure–activity relationships. Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling, 2015; 55(2): 263-274. https://doi.org/10.1021/ci500747n
21. Mak, K.-K., Wong, Y.-H., & Pichika, M. R. (2024, January 1). Artificial Intelligence in Drug Discovery and Development. Springer International Publishing. https://link.springer.com/rwe/10.1007/978-3-031-35529-5_92
22. Lin Z, Chou WC. Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence in Toxicological Sciences. Toxicol Sci., 2022 Aug 25; 189(1): 7-19. doi: 10.1093/toxsci/kfac075. PMID: 35861448; PMCID: PMC9609874.
23. Wang, S., Sun, H., Zeng, S., & Liu, H. Integrating multi-omics data for toxicology prediction: Advances and challenges. Current Opinion in Toxicology, 2021; 27: 56-65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cotox.2021.07.003

24. Raies, A. B., & Bajic, V. B. In silico toxicology: computational methods for the prediction of chemical toxicity. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Molecular Science, 2016; 6(2): 147-172. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcms.1240
25. Chen, H., Engkvist, O., Wang, Y., Olivecrona, M., & Blaschke, T. The rise of deep learning in drug discovery. Drug Discovery Today, 2018; 23(6): 1241-1250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2018.01.039
26. Kilicoglu, H., Rosemblat, G., & Fiszman, M. Extracting pharmacogenomic information from text: Clinical implications and perspectives. Briefings in Bioinformatics, 2017; 18(2): 286-299. https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbw133
27. Corradi, M. P. F., de Haan, A. M., Staumont, B., Piersma, A. H., Geris, L., Pieters, R. H. H., Krul, C. A. M., & Teunis, M. A. T. Natural language processing in toxicology: Delineating adverse outcome pathways and guiding the application of new approach methodologies. Biomaterials and Biosystems, 2022; 7: 100061. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbiosy.2022.100061
28. Walters, W. P., Barzilay, R., & Jaakkola, T. Applications of deep learning in molecule generation and molecular property prediction. Accounts of Chemical Research, 2018; 51(10): 2636-2645. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.accounts.8b00384
29. Richard, A. M., et al. ToxCast chemical landscape: Paving the road to 21st-century toxicology. Chemical Research in Toxicology, 2016; 29(8): 1225–1251. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrestox.6b00053
30. Meyer, P., et al. Explainable AI in toxicology: A call for interpretable models. Computational Toxicology, 2018; 9: 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comtox.2018.08.002
31. Vamathevan, J., et al. Applications of machine learning in drug discovery and development. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 2019; 18(6): 463–477. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41573-019-0024-5
32. Hartung, T., & Rovida, C. Chemical regulators have over-reached. Nature, 2009; 460(7252): 1080–1081. https://doi.org/10.1038/4601080a
33. Leung, M. K., Xiong, H. Y., Lee, L. J., & Frey, B. J. Machine learning in genomic medicine: A review of computational problems and data sets. Proceedings of the IEEE, 2020; 108(11): 1945-1961. https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2020.3015429
34. Miller, T. Explanation in artificial intelligence: Insights from the social sciences. Artificial Intelligence, 2019; 267: 1-38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2018.07.007
35. Walsh, T., et al. Data bias in AI toxicology: Challenges and solutions. Computational Toxicology, 2021; 17: 100150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comtox.2021.100150

36. Nielsen, F., et al. Interdisciplinary approaches to AI-driven toxicology: Bridging computation and biology. Frontiers in Toxicology, 2022; 4: 830201. https://doi.org/10.3389/ftox.2022.830201