Review

Application Status and Evolutionary Logic of Artificial Intelligence in Smart City Construction and Social Governance

Yuying Zhao[1,*]

[1] Seoul School of Integrated Sciences and Technologies, Seoul, South Korea
* Correspondence: Yuying Zhao, Seoul School of Integrated Sciences and Technologies, Seoul, South Korea

Abstract: Artificial intelligence has transitioned from theoretical promise to operational infrastructure in smart city construction and social governance. This review synthesizes the current application status and underlying evolutionary logic of AI systems across urban domains---including transportation, energy management, public safety, and civic participation---by tracing how technical capabilities, institutional mandates, and socio-technical feedback loops co-shape deployment pathways. Rather than treating AI as a monolithic tool, the analysis distinguishes between reactive automation, adaptive coordination, and anticipatory governance modes, each anchored in distinct data architectures, decision-scope boundaries, and accountability frameworks. Historical progression reveals a shift from isolated pilot projects emphasizing efficiency gains toward integrated platforms prioritizing systemic resilience and equity responsiveness. Key tensions emerge at the intersection of real-time data assimilation and procedural legitimacy, algorithmic scalability and contextual granularity, and predictive modeling and democratic contestability. The evolutionary trajectory is not linear but dialectical: advances in model interpretability spur regulatory refinements, which in turn reshape training-data curation practices; similarly, citizen-led data cooperatives recalibrate municipal AI procurement priorities. Future viability hinges less on computational sophistication and more on the institutionalization of reflexive governance---where AI systems are designed not only to optimize outcomes but to expose, interrogate, and iteratively reconfigure their own normative assumptions. This paper provides a structural map of these dynamics, clarifying how technical evolution is inseparable from political economy, administrative culture, and civic epistemology.

Keywords: smart cities; AI governance; social governance; urban AI

Received: 02 June 2026
Revised: 21 July 2026
Accepted: 02 August 2026
Published: 05 August 2026

1. Introduction

1.1. Defining the Terrain: AI, Smart Cities, and Social Governance

This section delineates foundational conceptual boundaries. A smart city is not reducible to digital instrumentation but constitutes an infrastructural and institutional configuration integrating physical, digital, and social layers [1]. Social governance denotes the ensemble of formal and informal mechanisms---legal, participatory, normative, and algorithmic---that coordinate collective action beyond state-centric command hierarchies. Artificial intelligence functions not as a neutral tool but as a co-constitutive element: it reconfigures authority through automated decision protocols, reshapes visibility via real-time datafication of urban practices, and compresses temporal horizons by enabling anticipatory interventions [2]. These shifts demand analytical frameworks that treat AI as embedded within, rather than external to, the sociotechnical fabric of urban governance.

1.2. Scope and Analytical Orientation

This section delineates the paper's analytical scope, centering on two interwoven dimensions: first, the empirical mapping of AI applications across smart city domains---including adaptive traffic signal optimization, predictive welfare eligibility assessment, and digital participatory budgeting interfaces; second, the excavation of underlying evolutionary logics that shape their design, deployment, and institutional integration [3]. These logics operate at technical, organizational, and normative levels, reflecting path-dependent co-evolution rather than linear technological determinism. The analysis foregrounds how socio-technical feedback loops, regulatory affordances, and value-laden design choices jointly condition AI's functional articulation within urban governance ecosystems [4]. Emphasis is placed on contextual adaptation over universal scalability, and on institutional learning over algorithmic novelty [5, 6].

1.3. Structural Roadmap

This chapter traces the analytical arc across four interlocking dimensions [7]. First, it reconstructs the historical layering of AI applications in urban systems, distinguishing foundational infrastructure deployment from emergent adaptive governance functions [6]. Second, it thematically dissects functional domains---mobility optimization, environmental monitoring, public service delivery---and maps their embedded governance logics, including transparency requirements, accountability mechanisms, and equity thresholds [8]. Third, it conducts a comparative analysis of implementation tensions across institutional, technical, and socio-political registers, identifying friction points between algorithmic automation and human-centered decision-making [9]. Finally, it advances a forward-looking assessment grounded not in algorithmic novelty but in institutional plasticity---the capacity of governance architectures to iteratively absorb, reinterpret, and reconfigure AI capabilities within evolving civic mandates.

2. Historical Overview: From Instrumentation to Integration

2.1. Phase I: Sensor-Driven Efficiency (2008–2014)

This initial phase centered on deploying heterogeneous sensor networks to monitor urban infrastructure in real time, capturing granular data on traffic velocity, energy load distribution, and atmospheric particulate concentrations. Artificial intelligence functions were narrowly confined to statistical anomaly detection and rule-based alerting---triggering notifications when predefined thresholds were exceeded. Decision-making authority remained compartmentalized within engineering and operations units, with analytical outputs channeled into static visualization dashboards rather than adaptive governance workflows [10]. Policy formulation continued to rely on periodic manual review cycles, lacking feedback mechanisms that could translate sensor-derived insights into iterative regulatory adjustments [1, 11]. The architecture emphasized vertical instrumentation over horizontal interoperability, resulting in fragmented data streams and minimal cross-departmental integration. Computational resources were largely localized, limiting scalability and real-time responsiveness across municipal jurisdictions [12].

2.2. Phase II: Platform-Mediated Coordination (2015–2019)

This phase witnessed the institutionalization of centralized urban operating systems, designed to unify heterogeneous data streams from transportation, utilities, public safety, and environmental monitoring. Artificial intelligence transitioned from isolated analytics to cross-domain correlation---exemplified by dynamically adjusting emergency response routing in real time upon detection of transit delays. Scenario-based simulation capabilities matured, enabling planners to model infrastructure interventions under varying socioeconomic and climatic conditions [4]. Governance authority began migrating from siloed departmental leadership toward platform administrators, introducing structural tensions around data sovereignty, algorithmic transparency, and interoperability standards [6, 13]. Technical fragmentation persisted despite standardization efforts, as proprietary protocols hindered seamless integration across municipal subsystems [13]. The period laid foundational architecture for systemic coordination but exposed critical gaps in regulatory frameworks governing AI-mediated decision-making in urban governance.

2.3. Phase III: Reflexive Governance Infrastructures (2020–Present)

Phase III marks the emergence of reflexive governance infrastructures, characterized by bidirectional feedback architectures that enable real-time policy recalibration [8, 14]. Artificial intelligence systems now ingest heterogeneous inputs---including citizen-reported incidents, service interaction logs, and legislative corpora---to dynamically adjust administrative parameters. This shift reorients governance logic from static optimization toward adaptive calibration, where performance evaluation explicitly incorporates multidimensional equity indices, complaint resolution latency distributions, and participatory uptake rates across demographic strata. Algorithmic transparency mechanisms are embedded within decision pipelines to support auditability without compromising operational responsiveness [2, 15]. Infrastructure interoperability standards ensure cross-departmental data coherence while preserving jurisdictional autonomy [7]. The resulting governance ecosystem exhibits emergent properties: policy iteration cycles compress from quarterly to sub-daily intervals, and system-wide fairness constraints are enforced via constrained optimization frameworks. Such architectures institutionalize learning loops between civic input and administrative action, transforming cities into living laboratories of socio-technical co-evolution [10].

3. Core Theme a: Functional Domains and Technical Embedding

3.1. Urban Operations: Real-Time Adaptation Vs. Predictive Lock-In

AI deployment in urban operations manifests a fundamental tension between real-time adaptive control and long-horizon predictive modeling. In mobility systems, AI enables dynamic traffic light sequencing responsive to live vehicle density, operating within seconds-level latency constraints and reinforcing operational autonomy. Energy distribution networks rely on anomaly detection algorithms that tolerate minute-scale data delays, shifting decision authority toward budget allocation mechanisms [9, 14]. Waste management systems employ demand forecasting models requiring hour-scale temporal aggregation, thereby influencing regulatory standard setting across municipal service frameworks [10]. As detailed in Table 1, these domain-specific configurations reveal how technical design choices---particularly sensor fidelity, edge-computing architecture, and data latency tolerance---determine whether AI functions as a responsive regulator or an anticipatory planner. Short-horizon control preserves policy flexibility by anchoring decisions in observable present conditions, whereas long-horizon prediction embeds assumptions about land use patterns, demographic trajectories, and climate risk exposure that may constrain future governance options. The trade-off is not merely computational but epistemic: real-time adaptation privileges empirical immediacy, while predictive modeling codifies normative projections into infrastructural logic. Consequently, the functional role of AI in urban operations cannot be divorced from its embedded governance implications---each technical specification carries distinct delegation pathways for authority, accountability, and adaptability [2, 5]. This structural coupling necessitates deliberate calibration of AI's temporal horizon against democratic oversight capacity and institutional learning velocity.

Table 1. Technical Design Implications Across Urban Operational Domains

Domain	Primary AI Function	Data Latency Tolerance	Governance Impact
Mobility	Real-time Control	Seconds	Operational Autonomy
Energy Distribution	Anomaly Detection	Minutes	Budget Allocation Authority
Waste Management	Demand Forecasting	Hours	Regulatory Standard Setting

3.2. Public Service Delivery: Personalization Thresholds and Equity Boundaries

AI deployment in public service delivery operates within tightly bounded functional thresholds where algorithmic personalization transitions from adaptive support to structural gatekeeping. In social welfare allocation, historical training data often encodes legacy eligibility biases, leading AI systems to replicate exclusionary patterns unless actively corrected through human-in-the-loop review mechanisms. Public health triage models trained on real-time clinical interactions demonstrate greater responsiveness to emergent disparities but risk delayed intervention when fairness constraints remain static across demographic subgroups. Municipal licensing platforms, meanwhile, frequently obscure procedural logic behind opaque scoring functions, eroding citizen trust and contestability. As detailed in Table 2, these domain-specific vulnerabilities map directly to distinct mitigation pathways: Social Welfare confronts Eligibility Exclusion via Human-in-the-Loop Review; Public Health addresses Delayed Intervention through Dynamic Fairness Constraints that adapt to shifting population-level risk distributions; and Municipal Licensing counters Procedural Obscurity using Explainable Threshold Logic that renders decision boundaries transparent and auditable [15]. Critically, the provenance of training data---whether derived from archival administrative records or contemporaneous citizen engagements---determines whether AI functions as a corrective instrument or an amplification vector for systemic inequities [12]. The alignment between technical architecture and equity-sensitive design parameters must therefore be validated not only through statistical parity metrics but also through participatory governance protocols that embed frontline service workers and affected communities in model iteration cycles [12]. Without such co-design, even technically sound systems risk entrenching access hierarchies under the guise of efficiency gains.

Table 2. Equity-Sensitive Design Parameters in Public Service AI

Service Domain	Primary Risk Vector	Mitigation Mechanism
Social Welfare	Eligibility Exclusion	Human-in-the-Loop Review
Public Health	Delayed Intervention	Dynamic Fairness Constraints
Municipal Licensing	Procedural Obscurity	Explainable Threshold Logic

3.3. Civic Engagement: Interface Architecture and Deliberative Capacity

AI-mediated civic engagement tools operate across three functional strata: real-time policy consultation via conversational agents, computational analysis of unstructured public input, and generative distillation of deliberative forums [2]. Interface architecture critically mediates whether these systems function as conduits---preserving lexical fidelity, syntactic diversity, and contextual nuance of original contributions---or as curators---reconfiguring inputs into administratively legible formats such as sentiment scores, topic clusters, or priority-ranked summaries. Translation layers, multilingual NLP pipelines, and accessibility-oriented interaction models determine inclusion capacity for linguistically or technologically marginalized populations. Conversely, aggregation protocols that collapse heterogeneous expressions into scalar metrics risk epistemic flattening, substituting pluralistic discourse with statistically dominant patterns. The distinction between conduit and curator logic is not merely technical but normative: conduit designs prioritize representational integrity and deliberative authenticity, whereas curator architectures optimize for bureaucratic throughput and decisional efficiency. This tension manifests in trade-offs between interpretability and scalability, between preserving rhetorical complexity and enabling cross-contextual comparison. Generative summarization, while enhancing digestibility, may inadvertently suppress dissenting frames or minority-positioned arguments if training corpora lack structural diversity or if weighting algorithms privilege volume over semantic salience. Ultimately, interface design choices encode implicit theories of democratic participation---whether as a process of collective meaning-making or as an information-input channel for administrative refinement [12]. The evolutionary trajectory hinges on whether technical embedding reinforces participatory pluralism or converges toward homogenized, sentiment-anchored governance logics.

4. Core Theme B: Governance Logics and Institutional Mediation

4.1. Authority Architecture: Centralized Platforms Vs. Federated Nodes

The institutional architecture of AI governance in smart cities manifests a fundamental tension between systemic coherence and domain fidelity. Centralized platforms, typically administered by mayoral offices, prioritize cross-domain optimization through unified data ingestion, model training, and policy enforcement---enabling holistic urban analytics and resource allocation. However, this concentration of authority introduces a single point of failure, where strategic or technical misalignment at the apex can cascade across sectors. In contrast, federated nodes---operated autonomously by domain agencies such as transit authorities or housing commissions---embed deep operational knowledge and localized accountability into AI deployment, enhancing responsiveness to sector-specific equity imperatives. Yet their independence risks policy incoherence, inconsistent bias mitigation protocols, and interoperability gaps across service boundaries. As detailed in Table 3, the hybrid orchestrated model emerges as a third-order configuration, balancing top-down coordination with bottom-up adaptability; its primary strength lies in adaptive learning velocity, allowing rapid iteration of models in response to real-time feedback, while its principal vulnerability resides in coordination overhead---the administrative and technical burden of maintaining alignment across heterogeneous infrastructures [12]. Each architecture entails nontrivial trade-offs: centralized systems privilege efficiency over pluralism; federated systems elevate legitimacy at the cost of integration; hybrid designs seek dynamism but demand sustained institutional bandwidth [3]. The selection among them reflects not merely technical feasibility but foundational commitments to democratic accountability, epistemic diversity, and resilience under uncertainty.

Table 3. Institutional Trade-offs in AI Governance Architecture

Governance Model	Primary Strength	Primary Vulnerability
Centralized Platform	Cross-Domain Optimization	Single Point of Failure
Federated Nodes	Domain-Specific Accountability	Policy Incoherence
Hybrid Orchestrated	Adaptive Learning Velocity	Coordination Overhead

4.2. Accountability Regimes: Audit Trails, Redress Pathways, and Epistemic Legitimacy

Accountability in AI-driven smart city governance is operationalized through three interlocking mechanisms: immutable audit trails, standardized redress pathways, and civic epistemic validation cycles. Audit trails record model inputs, decision rationales, and temporal metadata with cryptographic integrity, ensuring traceability without retroactive alteration. Redress pathways establish protocol-governed workflows for contesting AI-mediated service denials---such as welfare eligibility or permit approvals---embedding time-bound response obligations, human-in-the-loop review, and documented justification requirements [11]. Crucially, epistemic legitimacy emerges not from statistical fidelity alone but from iterative civic validation cycles wherein algorithmic outputs are assessed against community-negotiated fairness criteria, including procedural transparency, distributive equity, and contextual responsiveness. These cycles involve participatory workshops, local indicator co-design, and periodic recalibration of performance thresholds aligned with evolving normative expectations [12]. Institutional mediation ensures that accountability regimes resist technocratic capture by mandating cross-sectoral oversight bodies with binding authority over model retraining, threshold adjustments, and exception handling protocols. The resulting architecture treats accountability as a dynamic, relational practice rather than a static compliance artifact---grounded in observable institutional behaviors, accessible documentation, and verifiable alignment between system outputs and locally embedded conceptions of justice. This shifts legitimacy from algorithmic accuracy to institutional legibility, where trust accrues through consistent, auditable adherence to collectively endorsed governance logics [1].

4.3. Data Sovereignty Models: Municipal Custodianship, Citizen Stewardship, and Third-Party Intermediation

Three distinct data sovereignty models structure AI development trajectories in smart city governance, each generating divergent institutional incentives and temporal logics [3, 6]. Municipal custodianship concentrates data control within local government entities, prioritizing operational efficiency through centralized infrastructure and standardized protocols; its temporal horizon is anchored in quarterly performance cycles aligned with administrative budgeting and service delivery metrics. Citizen stewardship decentralizes authority via data cooperatives where residents retain ownership rights and grant conditional usage permissions, fostering contextual relevance through participatory co-design mechanisms that unfold across iterative co-design sprints [3, 6]. Third-party intermediation delegates stewardship to private entities operating urban data trusts under legally enforceable fiduciary obligations, privileging market scalability and platform interoperability, with evolution governed by multi-year platform licensing agreements. As detailed in Table 4, these models are systematically differentiated along three axes: sovereignty locus, primary AI incentive, and temporal horizon. Municipal Custodianship maps to Operational Efficiency and Quarterly Performance Cycles; Citizen Stewardship corresponds to Contextual Relevance and Iterative Co-Design Sprints; Third-Party Intermediation aligns with Market Scalability and Multi-Year Platform Licensing. The interplay among these models reveals how data governance architecture does not merely enable AI deployment but actively constitutes its developmental tempo, epistemic orientation, and accountability framework. Institutional mediation thus functions less as a neutral conduit than as a generative constraint---shaping whether AI systems evolve toward bureaucratic optimization, democratic responsiveness, or commercial extensibility.

Table 4. Data Sovereignty Models and Their AI Development Implications

Sovereignty Model	Primary AI Incentive	Temporal Horizon
Municipal Custodianship	Operational Efficiency	Quarterly Performance Cycles
Citizen Stewardship	Contextual Relevance	Iterative Co-Design Sprints
Third-Party Intermediation	Market Scalability	Multi-Year Platform Licensing

5. Comparison & Challenges: Tensions at the Implementation Frontier

5.1. The Real-Time/Reflexivity Paradox

Contemporary smart city deployments confront a foundational tension: the real-time imperative of AI-driven responsiveness versus the reflexive necessity of contextual recalibration. High-frequency decision loops prioritize latency reduction, often marginalizing human judgment, participatory deliberation, and ethical oversight [12, 14]. Yet excessive deferral risks service degradation, equity erosion, or systemic fragility. This paradox manifests most acutely in dynamic governance domains---traffic optimization, emergency dispatch, welfare allocation---where temporal urgency collides with normative complexity [15]. To reconcile these demands, we propose embedded pause protocols: algorithmic triggers activated when predefined thresholds---such as $\Delta_{\text{equity}} > \tau$ or $H_{\text{uncertainty}} > \theta$ ---signal elevated stakeholder impact or epistemic ambiguity. These pauses initiate structured human-AI handoff mechanisms, preserving operational continuity while enabling contextual review, multi-stakeholder consultation, and adaptive policy alignment.

5.2. Scalability Vs. Situated Intelligence

Standardized AI models deployed across municipalities frequently encounter friction when confronting heterogeneous administrative traditions, linguistic heterogeneity, and embedded informal governance networks. Uniform replication proves ineffective because context-sensitive decision logic cannot be abstracted into portable modules without loss of fidelity. Successful scaling instead demands modular architecture:

core algorithmic components remain invariant, while interface protocols, fairness constraints, and feedback-trigger thresholds are locally parameterized [1, 8]. This design enables cross-jurisdictional coherence without sacrificing contextual responsiveness. Empirical evidence indicates that systems adopting such parameterized modularity achieve higher stakeholder trust and operational adaptability. The tension between scalability and situated intelligence thus resolves not through standardization but through structured flexibility---where architectural stability coexists with localized configurability. Such an approach redefines scalability as interoperable adaptation rather than identical deployment.

5.3. Legibility Vs. Contestability

The tension between legibility and contestability reveals a foundational misalignment in AI governance for smart cities. Legibility prioritizes transparency through post-hoc explanations, yet such disclosures often obscure underlying assumptions, data provenance, or model architecture choices. Contestability, by contrast, demands procedural infrastructure: standardized interfaces for querying decision logic, revising feature weights, submitting counter-evidence, and invoking human-in-the-loop override without bureaucratic friction. This shift reframes accountability not as retrospective justification but as prospective design---embedding audit trails, versioned training datasets, and modular policy layers that permit localized recalibration. Urban complexity necessitates systems where stakeholders can interrogate not only outputs but also the epistemic scaffolding sustaining them. Without such mechanisms, explainability risks becoming ceremonial rather than operational [14].

6. Future Perspectives: Institutionalizing Reflexive AI Governance

6.1. Beyond Algorithmic Improvement: Governance Infrastructure Investment

Next-generation progress in smart city AI deployment hinges less on incremental algorithmic refinement and more on deliberate investment in governance infrastructure. Standardized civic feedback ingestion protocols ensure systematic, equitable integration of community input into AI lifecycle decisions. Cross-departmental data ethics review boards---endowed with statutory authority---enable binding oversight across municipal silos, preventing fragmented or reactive policy responses. Municipal AI literacy programs must prioritize frontline public service staff, equipping them with operational fluency to interrogate AI outputs, recognize bias manifestations, and articulate domain-specific constraints. These institutional scaffolds collectively foster reflexive governance: a dynamic equilibrium where technical systems adapt responsively to evolving social norms, legal expectations, and democratic accountability mechanisms. Without such infrastructure, even high-accuracy models risk entrenching inequities or eroding public trust [11].

6.2. Emerging Institutional Forms: Urban AI Ombudsman and Civic Algorithm Auditors

Emerging institutional forms signal a paradigmatic shift toward embedded accountability in urban AI governance. Urban AI Ombudsman offices operate as independent, jurisdictionally empowered entities authorized to investigate citizen grievances, compel transparency disclosures, and mandate procedural revisions across municipal algorithmic systems. Complementing this, Civic Algorithm Auditor panels constitute rotating, community-embedded bodies trained in interpretability frameworks and locally negotiated justice criteria---evaluating model behavior not solely against statistical fairness metrics but against contextually grounded norms of equity, explainability, and redress. These institutions reject technocratic delegation, instead institutionalizing reflexive oversight through hybrid expertise, temporal rotation, and deliberative legitimacy [12]. Their design prioritizes epistemic pluralism, ensuring that technical assessments remain tethered to sociopolitical meaning-making rather than abstract optimization. Such mechanisms collectively advance governance beyond compliance toward co-constituted responsibility [6].

6.3. Long-Term Evolutionary Trajectory

The long-term evolutionary trajectory of AI in smart cities transcends optimization toward reflexive institutionalization [4]. Systems will be assessed not by predictive accuracy but by their capacity to expose latent social tensions, articulate concealed value trade-offs, and initiate structured renegotiation of urban social contracts. This entails a paradigm shift from resolution to collective governability of ambiguity---where algorithmic outputs function as deliberative catalysts rather than authoritative conclusions. Governance infrastructures must evolve to support iterative, multi-stakeholder sensemaking, embedding feedback loops that recalibrate normative assumptions alongside technical parameters. Technical architectures will prioritize interpretability over opacity, modularity over monolithicity, and contestability over consensus [1, 9]. Human-AI interaction protocols will formalize epistemic pluralism, ensuring diverse knowledge claims retain procedural legitimacy within decision pipelines. Such maturation demands co-evolution of legal frameworks, civic capacities, and computational design principles---anchoring AI not as a governance instrument, but as a medium for democratic renewal.

7. Conclusion

7.1. Synthesis of Evolutionary Logic

AI deployment in smart cities and social governance operates through a dialectical evolutionary logic rather than linear progression. Technical capability expansion enables new institutional configurations, which in turn generate emergent normative demands---such as transparency, equity, and accountability---that recalibrate technical design priorities. This feedback-driven cycle intensifies over time, with each iteration reinforcing interdependence between algorithmic architecture and governance frameworks. Institutional adaptation does not merely absorb technological change; it actively reshapes research agendas, data infrastructure standards, and operational protocols. Consequently, AI's functional scope is co-constituted by sociotechnical negotiation, where regulatory foresight and adaptive learning mechanisms become critical enablers. The resulting trajectory reflects recursive alignment rather than unidirectional optimization, demanding sustained interdisciplinary engagement to sustain legitimacy, efficacy, and resilience across evolving urban and societal contexts.

7.2. Final Reflection

Sustainable AI integration in smart cities demands a paradigmatic shift: from conceiving urban spaces as data-rich substrates for algorithmic optimization to recognizing them as living institutions whose intelligence arises dynamically through the interplay of code, policy, practice, and protest. This emergent intelligence resists reduction to technical metrics alone; it is co-constituted by civic contestation, institutional adaptation, and normative negotiation. Technical efficacy must therefore be continuously recalibrated against social legitimacy, procedural fairness, and adaptive governance capacity. The evolutionary logic of AI deployment thus lies not in incremental system upgrades but in deepening feedback loops between computational infrastructures and democratic practices. Without such reciprocity, even sophisticated models risk entrenching epistemic asymmetries or operationalizing narrow definitions of efficiency. Ultimately, urban AI's viability depends on its ability to sustain pluralistic meaning-making---not merely process information.

References

1. T. Yigitcanlar, K. C. Desouza, L. Butler, and F. Roozkhosh, "Contributions and risks of artificial intelligence (AI) in building smarter cities: Insights from a systematic review of the literature," *Energies*, vol. 13, no. 6, p. 1473, 2020.
2. G. Bosco, V. Riccardi, A. Sciarrone, R. D'Amore, and A. Visvizi, "AI-driven innovation in smart city governance: achieving human-centric and sustainable outcomes," *Transform. Gov.: People, Process, Policy*, 2024.
3. L. Dong and Y. Liu, "Frontiers of policy and governance research in a smart city and artificial intelligence: An advanced review based on natural language processing," *Front. Sustain. Cities*, vol. 5, p. 1199041, 2023.

4. S. A. A. Bokhari and S. Myeong, "The impact of AI applications on smart decision-making in smart cities as mediated by the Internet of Things and smart governance," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 120827–120844, 2023.
5. R. Wolniak and K. Stecuła, "Artificial intelligence in smart cities—applications, barriers, and future directions: a review," *Smart Cities*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 1346–1389, 2024.
6. E. Estevez, T. A. Pardo, and H. J. Scholl, *Smart Cities and Smart Governance*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021.
7. A. Luusua, J. Ylipulli, M. Foth, and A. Aurigi, "Urban AI: Understanding the emerging role of artificial intelligence in smart cities," *AI Soc.*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 1039–1044, 2023.
8. P. Mensah, "AI governance models in smart cities: Comparative analysis for strategic business integration and sustainable urban development," in *AI in Business Management*. Boca Raton, FL: Productivity Press, 2025, pp. 188–220.
9. S. Rasoulzadeh Aghdam, B. Bababeimorad, B. Ghasemzadeh, M. Irani, and A. Huovila, "Social smart city research: Interconnections between participatory governance, data privacy, artificial intelligence and ethical sustainable development," *Front. Sustain. Cities*, vol. 6, p. 1514040, 2025.
10. A. Raghav, B. Singh, R. Raghav, and K. D. Edina, "AI and robotics in smart city governance: Ethical and legal pathways for sustainable urbanization," in *Machine Learning and Robotics in Urban Planning and Management*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global Scientific Publishing, 2025, pp. 1–24.
11. S. Kumar, A. K. Verma, and A. Mirza, "Artificial intelligence-driven governance systems: Smart cities and smart governance," in *Digital Transformation, Artificial Intelligence and Society: Opportunities and Challenges*. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, 2024, pp. 73–90.
12. S. Mastrogiovanni, "AI-driven data governance for smart cities: Balancing privacy, efficiency, and public trust," *South Florida J. Dev.*, vol. 6, no. 9, p. e5810, 2025.
13. D. Lartey and K. M. Law, "Artificial intelligence adoption in urban planning governance: A systematic review of advancements in decision-making, and policy making," *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, vol. 258, p. 105337, 2025.
14. N. T. Cruz, "Participatory AI governance for smart cities and sustainable infrastructure," *Metascience*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 18–25, 2026.
15. A. F. Wijaya, A. A. Subiyakto, A. R. Julians, M. Lestari, and G. B. Warella, "An ambidextrous AI governance framework for smart cities to enhance IT governance and data security," *J. Teknol. dan Manaj. Ind. Terap.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 530–537, 2022.