International Journal of
Science, Technology and Management
https://www.ioro.org/ijstm

Seven Names, One Life: A Lexicon Biography of Satish Gajawada (IIT Roorkee Alumnus)

Satish Gajawada [1,*]

[1] *Independent Researcher, India; Alumnus (Integrated Dual Degree, B.Tech + M.Tech, 2012), Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, Roorkee, Uttarakhand, India*

* **Corresponding author:** satish.gajawada.iit@gmail.com

Article history: Received 24 October 2026; Received in revised form XX Month 2026; Accepted XX Month 2026; Available online XX Month 2026

Abstract

Biographies usually follow a life forward in time, and independent researchers who work outside institutions are rarely documented in a structured way. This article addresses the lack of critically labelled biographical accounts of independent artificial intelligence researchers by studying Satish Gajawada, a 2012 graduate of the Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee whose fourteen years of independent work are distinguished by the coining of names for research fields, algorithms, a society, a title and a family of "theories of everything". The purpose is to read this life through its vocabulary and to separate what has been named from what has been validated. The study uses a lexicon method: five source documents supplied by the subject were analysed, and seven terms were treated as biographical entries, each examined as an event, a method and a question for assessment. Every factual statement was labelled as documented, self-reported or interpretive. The principal results show a recurring "self and others" grammar that links philosophy to optimisation; an expanding programme of proposed fields; a large catalogue of themed swarm algorithms without reported comparative evaluation; a 2026 turn toward family-based ethics; and a growing practice of disclosure, including a small reproducible fairness test in which a penalty term reduced a demographic-parity gap from about 0.12 to 0.016 at a cost of about 1.9 percentage points of accuracy. The article concludes that the most defensible contribution is a consistent human-centred vocabulary for artificial intelligence, that adoption and independent validation remain unreported, and that the subject's growing candour about the limits of his claims is the most significant recent development.

Keywords: biography; independent research; artificial intelligence; particle swarm optimisation; value-aligned artificial intelligence; research ethics

1. Introduction

Scientific biography has traditionally been written around institutions: the laboratory, the supervisor, the department and the grant. Researchers who work outside such structures leave a different kind of record, made of preprints, society newsletters and small open-access journals, and they are seldom the subject of structured study. Satish Gajawada, a graduate of the Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, is one such researcher. His public work since 2012 is organised less by employers than by names: for fields, algorithms, a society, a personal title and a family of propositions called "theories of everything".

The technical background of that work is well established. Particle swarm optimisation was introduced by Kennedy and Eberhart [1] and refined through the inertia weight of Shi and Eberhart [2], the stability analysis

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by IORO Publications. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited, a link to the license is provided, and any changes are indicated.

of Clerc and Kennedy [3] and later overviews [4, 5]. Evolutionary multi-objective search is represented by the elitist genetic algorithm of Deb *et al*., [6]. Alongside this literature runs a critique of naming practice: Sörensen [7] has warned that metaphor-driven names for optimisation methods can obscure whether a method is genuinely new. That critique is directly relevant to a body of work in which naming is the most visible activity.

The human-value themes in the subject's writing also have a scholarly context. Theories of motivation and well-being, such as those of Maslow [8], Diener [9], Ryan and Deci [10] and Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi [11], offer established ways of asking why people act. In artificial intelligence, the alignment of systems with human values has been analysed by Gabriel [12], while Jobin *et al*., [13] and Floridi and Cowls [14] have mapped ethics principles across organisations. Hagendorff [15] has argued that such guidelines are often weakly connected to practice. Fairness is treated formally by Dwork *et al*., [16] and surveyed by Mehrabi *et al*., [17]. The subject's recent papers touch each of these areas, and they are published in the International Journal of Philosophy, Ethics and Humanities [18-20].

Despite this context, no structured account of Gajawada's career exists that separates documented institutional facts from self-reported claims and from interpretation, and no account examines how far his coined vocabulary has been matched by testing or adoption. The only biographical material available is self-authored or derived from self-published sources. The significance of closing this gap extends beyond one individual: independent researchers are a growing part of the AI landscape, and a transparent method for describing them, one that labels the evidential status of every statement, can be reused for other cases.

The objective of this article is therefore to read the life and work of Satish Gajawada through seven vocabulary entries, to label every factual statement by evidential status, and to assess critically what has been named, what has been demonstrated and what remains untested.

2. Methodology

2.1. Sources and Scope

This article is based on five documents supplied by the subject: three articles published in the International Journal of Philosophy, Ethics and Humanities in 2026, which are an autobiographical story, a devotional essay and a framework article [18-20]; a preprint titled *Ten Plus Theories of Everything – Version 1*; and the subject's curriculum vitae. The preprint and the curriculum vitae are unpublished and are therefore cited in the text only. No interviews were conducted, no archival records were consulted and no external databases were searched. The article cannot go beyond what these documents say.

2.2. The Lexicon Method

A chronology of Gajawada's career would be short on external events: one graduation, followed by fourteen years of self-directed work. What fills those years is a sequence of words, each introduced with a definition, an acronym and often a companion algorithm. A lexicon is therefore the natural form for his biography. Seven terms were selected: *Roorkee*, *Independent*, *Theory of Everything*, *VHAAI/EAI/OBAI*, *Swarm*, *Parents* and *Disclosure*. Each entry begins with a definition, states what the sources document about the term, and closes with a reading that asks what the term reveals about the person who made it. Table 1 summarises the entries.

Table 1. The seven lexicon entries and their biographical function

Entry	Period	Biographical function
Roorkee	2007–2012	The institutional anchor and technical training
Independent	2012–present	A deliberate departure from institutional research
Theory of Everything	2012–2026	A recurring structure of thought
VHAAI, EAI, OBAI	2024–2026	An expanding map of proposed fields
Swarm	2025–2026	A playful algorithmic engine that carries the ideas
Parents	2026	A turn from named algorithms to named obligations
Disclosure	2026	A growing habit of stating what a claim is worth

2.3. Evidential Labels

Because the sources are self-authored or derived from self-published material, each factual statement carries one of three labels.

1. **[Documented]** is stated consistently in the supplied sources, including institutional facts such as degree and year.
2. **[Self-reported]** is a claim, honour or description that originates in the subject's own writing and has not been independently confirmed.
3. **[Interpretive]** is a judgement by this article, offered for the reader to accept or reject.

The approach borrows its spirit from the subject's own recent practice of separating scriptural, traditional and reflective claims, which is discussed in Section 3.7. It also follows the wider movement toward structured documentation of how artefacts are made, as seen in model cards [21] and datasheets for datasets [22].

3. Results

3.1. Entry One: Roorkee (2007–2012)

Definition. The institutional anchor of the biography.

Gajawada completed an Integrated Dual Degree in Computer Science and Engineering, with a specialisation in Information Technology, at the Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, graduating in 2012 **[Documented]**. The degree is a five-year programme at an institution founded in 1847 **[Documented]**. His later materials describe the period at Roorkee as four years of a longer research journey that he counts as sixteen years in total **[Self-reported]**; the same materials elsewhere speak of a fourteen-year independent career, a difference that reflects what each phrase counts rather than a contradiction.

Reading the entry. Nearly every later document places the words "IIT Roorkee Alumnus" directly beneath his name. The affiliation functions as an identity, not an employer. **[Interpretive]** It tells readers where the technical training took place while making clear that nothing that follows was done under an institution's roof. In this sense the first entry is also the last institutional one.

3.2. Entry Two: Independent (2012–Present)

Definition. Working without a laboratory, advisor, department or corporate sponsor.

The sources describe a researcher who chose the independent path and then built his own infrastructure: a society, a recurring publication series and a vocabulary of fields **[Documented]**. His outputs appear on ResearchGate, SSRN, EasyChair, small open-access journals and, in 2026, the International Journal of Philosophy, Ethics and Humanities **[Documented]**. Output was most intense between 2024 and 2026 **[Documented]**.

The independence is not only organisational but stylistic. Institutional research tends to compress its vocabulary toward established terms; independent research can expand it. Gajawada expanded it. **[Interpretive]** The practical consequence is a body of work that is easy to recognise and hard to place: it is discoverable by its coined terms, yet it sits outside the citation conversations through which new fields usually earn recognition.

A related feature is the title *Independent Doctor of Philosophy Plus Plus (IPhD++)*. His own materials state clearly that this is a personal designation and not a conferred degree **[Self-reported]**. This article records it as an expression of how he understands independent work, and it does not treat it as a qualification.

3.3. Entry Three: Theory of Everything (2012–2026)

Definition. A proposition that purports to explain why people do what they do, borrowing the phrase from physics as metaphor.

The earliest item the sources attribute to him is a 2012 piece, "Smile Theory of Everything" **[Self-reported]**. The phrase returns in 2026 in three forms, and the progression is instructive.

1. **A catalogue.** The preprint *Ten Plus Theories of Everything – Version 1* states thirteen propositions, each in the form "whatever you do, ultimately it is to attain X and help others attain X", with X ranging over happiness, kindness, peace, money, health, technology, love, satisfaction, excellence, respect, intelligence, GOD and parents. The paper sets the propositions against Aristotle, Bentham, Maslow [8], Kant and modern psychology, groups them into five families, and discusses how they might be made falsifiable. It is explicitly provisional: the title's "plus" promises further versions.
2. **A metaphysics.** In *Six Reflections on Shri Rama* [19], the phrase is borrowed only as a figure of speech for a devotional question about ultimate reality.
3. **A family theory.** The Parents Theory narrows the happiness proposition to "be happy and make your parents happy" and becomes the centrepiece of a 2026 series on service to parents.

Reading the entry. The "theory of everything" is Gajawada's most durable structural idea: a two-part sentence with a self-directed half and an other-directed half. **[Interpretive]** The structure is notable because it builds generosity into the grammar. Even the Money and Technology theories require that one helps others earn and build. The same grammar reappears in his algorithms, where a particle is pulled both by its own best position and by the group's. The self-and-others pairing is in this sense a unifying pattern of the whole body of work, from philosophy to optimisation.

The 2026 catalogue is also candid about its limits. It concedes that a proposition that can absorb any counterexample has little empirical content, and it proposes experience-sampling and cross-cultural ranking studies as ways forward **[Documented]**. Such studies have not, according to the supplied sources, been carried out. The proposed studies would sit within the established empirical tradition on well-being and motivation [9, 10].

3.4. Entry Four: VHAAI, EAI and OBAI (2024–2026)

Definition. Umbrella names for human-value-centred and "out of the box" artificial intelligence.

Three acronyms organise the programme **[Documented]**.

1. **OBAI, Out of the Box Artificial Intelligence,** the widest umbrella, covering unconventional ideas such as Artificial Human Optimization, Artificial Heart Neural Networks, Artificial Satisfaction and AI++.
2. **VHAAI, Very Highly Advanced Artificial Intelligence,** introduced in an article of July 2024 that folded earlier ideas into one field, together with Data Science++ (2024).
3. **EAI, Excellent Artificial Intelligence,** introduced on SSRN on 10 January 2026 as a bundle of five articles.

In October 2024 he proposed the International Society for Very Highly Advanced Artificial Intelligence (ISVHAAI), with the stated mission of improving and applying VHAAI to solve problems **[Documented]**. The society is, per the sources, a self-sustained platform and not a membership body with independent governance **[Documented]**.

Reading the entry. The sequence OBAI, VHAAI, EAI shows a habit of consolidation: each new umbrella gathers earlier work under a more ambitious banner. **[Interpretive]** Two observations follow. First, the names are rhetorical as well as descriptive: "Excellent" and "Very Highly Advanced" announce an aspiration, and a reader will reasonably ask for the criteria by which a system would qualify. Second, the sources do not report adoption of these terms by other research groups. Naming a field is an act that precedes, and does not substitute for, the community uptake that makes a field real. The honest biographical statement is that Gajawada has proposed these fields, not that they have been established.

3.5. Entry Five: Swarm (2025–2026)

Definition. The algorithmic family that carries his ideas: particle swarm optimisation re-read through human values and everyday life.

Particle swarm optimisation updates each particle by combining momentum, personal memory and the group's best-known position [1, 2], a structure described in the subject's 2026 framework article [20] as resembling a child growing up within a family. From that observation grows a catalogue of named variants **[Documented]**, summarised in Table 2.

Table 2. Named swarm-based algorithms in the sources, grouped by theme

Theme	Examples in the sources
Human values	Kindness and Excellence PSO (KEPSO), Love PSO, Money PSO, Happiness and Health PSO
Human relationships	Friendship Human Swarm Optimization (FdHSO), Vehicles Human Swarm Optimization, PGBGSGAIA (modelled on the author and his parents)
Daily life and play	Summer Season Energy Drink PSO (SSEDPSO), Cricket Match Runs Algorithm, Rice Bags Sales Algorithm
Popular culture	Artificial Cartoon Popeye and Chhota Bheem algorithms
Relationships as AI	TBSFMFAIA, KLSPEMHRIHAIA, AIRAv1

Many appeared as numbered "ISVHAAI AI Society Letters" in July and August 2025, a short-form genre that favours frequency over length **[Documented]**.

Reading the entry. The catalogue's distinguishing feature is its vocabulary, not its mathematics. **[Interpretive]** A conventional particle swarm paper would justify a variant by benchmark performance [4]. The Letters, as described in the sources, justify them by theme. That is both their charm and the main limit on their scientific reach: without comparative evaluation, the reader cannot tell whether "Kindness" in KEPSO changes the optimiser's behaviour or only its label. This is the concern that Sörensen [7] raised about metaphor-based methods in general. The gap is one the 2026 framework article partly addresses, as the next entries show.

3.6. Entry Six: Parents (2026)

Definition. The turn from named algorithms to named obligations.

In 2026 the sources record a distinct series of personal and philosophical works: "Son Serving Parents (SSP) – A New Professional Title", "Service to Parents Is Equivalent to Service to All Beings", the Parents Theory of Everything (April 2026) and TBSFMFAIA, compiled into the preprint *Thank You Parents for Everything* **[Documented]**. His PSO-based algorithm PGBGSGAIA is built around himself and his parents, Prabhakar Gajawada and Bhagyamma Gajawada **[Documented]**. The Acknowledgements section he attaches to his papers extends gratitude to "everyone and everything" that shaped him.

The parental theme reaches the technical papers as well. The framework article [20] proposes *Parents-Inspired AI*, in which those who build AI remain accountable for what it does, as parents are for a child, and in which autonomy is extended progressively as reliability is shown **[Documented]**.

Reading the entry. Here the biography's subject and its themes coincide. **[Interpretive]** A researcher whose lifelong grammar pairs "be X" with "make others X" ends by applying that grammar to the people who raised him. The Parents entry also shows the most useful translation in his work: from family ethics to design principles such as accountability for creators, explanation of boundaries, staged deployment and inheritance of verified safe behaviours. Whether or not one accepts the framing, those principles are recognisable to AI-governance readers [13, 14].

3.7. Entry Seven: Disclosure (2026)

Definition. The practice of stating, plainly, how a work was made and what it does not claim.

The most striking development in the 2026 sources is not a new algorithm but a new discipline. Four moves stand out **[Documented]**.

1. **Epistemic registers.** *Six Reflections on Shri Rama* [19] sorts every claim into scriptural, traditional or reflective, and closes each reflection with an "Epistemic Status" subsection. It states that faith claims are not offered as empirically demonstrated.
2. **Honest scoping.** The framework article [20] calls its mappings "metaphorical and heuristic", says it makes no claim about the historical origin of the algorithms, and notes that GA, PSO and neural-network pioneers cited biology and physics, not scripture.
3. **A small, reproducible test.** It embeds a fairness-type penalty in the fitness function of a genetic algorithm and of PSO on 2,000 synthetic records, using ten seeds per setting. With penalty weight 1, the demographic-parity gap fell from about 0.12 to 0.016, roughly 87%, for about 1.9 percentage points of accuracy; at weights of 2 and above, results were worse on both criteria. The paper's own caveats are that the data are synthetic, the model has three parameters, and a single criterion stands in for nine values.

4. **AI disclosure and self-limiting claims.** Each paper states how generative AI was used. The earlier biography [18] labels its own facts as unverified and describes self-styled titles as such. The theories preprint warns readers to verify its references.

Reading the entry. This is the entry most relevant to the wider research community. **[Interpretive]** Gajawada's earlier public persona rested on bold naming; his 2026 papers pair the boldness with explicit limits. A researcher who writes "this is not a degree", "this is a metaphor" and "this cannot be tested by this paper" is practising a form of integrity that is in short supply in speculative writing. The fairness experiment is small, but it does something the Letters did not: it lets a value term be tested against a measurable cost, in the spirit of formal fairness criteria [16, 17], and it reports a failure mode, over-correction, alongside the success. That experiment is, on the evidence supplied, the strongest bridge between his vocabulary and verifiable results. The AI-use statements likewise match the position of journals that generative systems cannot be authors [23] and the cautions raised about large language models [24].

4. Discussion

4.1. Self-Reported Distinctions

The sources list several honours and descriptions. None could be confirmed here, and Table 3 records their status.

Table 3. Self-reported distinctions and their status in this article

Claim	Origin	Status in this article
Acknowledgement from IEEE figure Dr. Sattar B. Sadkhan	Subject's writings	Self-reported; not verified
Research project indexed by NASA's Astrophysics Data System	Subject's writings	Self-reported; not verified
Project partially supported by an IBM Shared University Research Award	Subject's writings	Self-reported; not verified
Early contributor to "Artificial Human Optimization"	Subject's accounts of peers' views	Self-reported; not verified
"Independent Doctor of Philosophy Plus Plus"	Self-adopted	A personal designation, not a degree
"The Indian John McCarthy"	Self-description	Not an external recognition; reproduced only to illustrate self-conception

4.2. Contribution

On the evidence of the sources, four contributions can be defended. **[Interpretive]**

1. A consistent, human-centred vocabulary for AI that links optimisation to values and relationships.
2. The "self and others" grammar of the theories of everything, which offers a compact way to express prosocial motives.
3. A culturally grounded set of design archetypes (Parents-Inspired AI, Krishna AI, Rama AI) that translate narrative traditions into governance-style principles, with stated risks of over-reliance and rigidity.

4. A transparent example of AI-assisted writing in which tools, purposes and responsibilities are disclosed.

4.3. Limits

Three limits should be stated plainly. First, the field names are proposals without demonstrated uptake. Second, most named algorithms are described in short self-published items whose comparative performance is not reported in the supplied material. Third, much of the written work is acknowledged to have been drafted with generative AI, which makes the documented human contribution chiefly one of conception, direction and review. These limits do not diminish the sincerity or consistency of the project, but they bound what can responsibly be claimed for it.

4.4. Questions for Future Biographers

A fuller study would need to ask what happened in the years between 2012 and 2024 that the sources describe only in summary; whether any independent group has used, cited or tested his algorithms; how the society evolves if it takes on members or governance beyond its founder; and whether the planned empirical studies of the theories of everything are carried out.

5. Conclusions

Seven names, read in order, trace one life: an institutional beginning (*Roorkee*); a deliberate departure (*Independent*); a recurring structure of thought (*Theory of Everything*); an expanding map of proposed fields (*VHAAI*, *EAI*, *OBAI*); a playful engine that carries the ideas (*Swarm*); a turn toward gratitude and responsibility (*Parents*); and a growing habit of telling readers exactly what a claim is worth (*Disclosure*). In response to the objective, the article finds that the most defensible contribution is a consistent human-centred vocabulary, that adoption and comparative testing are not reported in the supplied sources, and that the 2026 disclosure practices, together with the small fairness experiment, are the strongest link between naming and verification.

The portrait that emerges is of a researcher who treats naming as a creative act and who, in his most recent work, has begun to pair that act with the scholarly norms of scope, evidence and honesty. The measure of the project will not be its names but whether others adopt, test and improve them. Few biographies can end on an open invitation; this one can.

Acknowledgement

The subject's source documents were the only biographical materials used. This research was not funded by any grant.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest

The subject of the biography is also its author of record: he commissioned the article and is the source of its materials. This non-financial interest is disclosed here. There were no funders, and therefore no funder role in the design of the study, in the collection, analyses or interpretation of data, in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

Data Availability Statement

No datasets were generated or analysed. All statements are drawn from the five supplied documents.

AI Disclosure Statement

This article was generated by the large language model Claude Sonnet 5.5 (Anthropic), accessed in October 2026, in response to a request from Satish Gajawada, who supplied five source documents and the instruction to create a professional, original biography. The AI system selected the lexicon structure, drafted the text and proposed the evidential labels. It conducted no external research for the biographical content, interviewed no one and added no biographical sources beyond those supplied. For formatting to the journal template, the AI system also added background references in the Introduction, Methodology and Discussion sections, and these should be verified by the author. The AI system is not an author and cannot take responsibility for the work. Responsibility for reviewing, correcting and deciding to submit or publish the content rests with the human who submits it. Because the subject of the biography is also the person who commissioned it, readers should treat the article as a commissioned, subject-guided work and not as an independent biography.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, S.G.; resources, S.G.; writing—review and editing, S.G. The manuscript text was drafted by a generative AI system from source documents supplied by S.G., as detailed in the AI Disclosure Statement. The AI system is not an author. Responsibility for reviewing and submitting the work rests with S.G.

Disclaimer

This biography is based solely on five documents supplied by the subject, most of which are self-authored or derived from self-published and preprint material. No fact, date, title, affiliation, honour, publication or achievement described here has been independently verified. Readers should verify the content, including all names, dates, publication details and claims of recognition, with primary and independent sources before relying on it. The article is an interpretive compilation and not an authoritative or fact-checked record.

References

[1] Kennedy, J., & Eberhart, R. (1995). Particle swarm optimization. In *Proceedings of ICNN'95 – International Conference on Neural Networks* (Vol. 4, pp. 1942–1948). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICNN.1995.488968.

[2] Shi, Y., & Eberhart, R. (1998). A modified particle swarm optimizer. In *1998 IEEE International Conference on Evolutionary Computation Proceedings* (pp. 69–73). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICEC.1998.699146.

[3] Clerc, M., & Kennedy, J. (2002). The particle swarm—explosion, stability, and convergence in a multidimensional complex space. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, *6*(1), 58–73. https://doi.org/10.1109/4235.985692.

[4] Poli, R., Kennedy, J., & Blackwell, T. (2007). Particle swarm optimization: An overview. *Swarm Intelligence*, *1*(1), 33–57. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11721-007-0002-0.

[5] Eberhart, R. C., & Shi, Y. (2001). Particle swarm optimization: Developments, applications and resources. In *Proceedings of the 2001 Congress on Evolutionary Computation* (Vol. 1, pp. 81–86). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/CEC.2001.934374.

[6] Deb, K., Pratap, A., Agarwal, S., & Meyarivan, T. (2002). A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: NSGA-II. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, *6*(2), 182–197. https://doi.org/10.1109/4235.996017.

[7] Sörensen, K. (2015). Metaheuristics—the metaphor exposed. *International Transactions in Operational Research*, *22*(1), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/itor.12001.

[8] Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50*(4), 370–396. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346.

[9] Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, *95*(3), 542–575. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542.

[10] Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68.

[11] Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5.

[12] Gabriel, I. (2020). Artificial intelligence, values, and alignment. *Minds and Machines*, *30*(3), 411–437. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09539-2.

[13] Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, *1*(9), 389–399. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2.

[14] Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1.

[15] Hagendorff, T. (2020). The ethics of AI ethics: An evaluation of guidelines. *Minds and Machines*, *30*(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09517-8.

[16] Dwork, C., Hardt, M., Pitassi, T., Reingold, O., & Zemel, R. (2012). Fairness through awareness. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference* (pp. 214–226). ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/2090236.2090255.

[17] Mehrabi, N., Morstatter, F., Saxena, N., Lerman, K., & Galstyan, A. (2021). A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys*, *54*(6), Article 115. https://doi.org/10.1145/3457607.

[18] Gajawada, S. (2026). Out of the box – The Satish Gajawada story. *International Journal of Philosophy, Ethics and Humanities*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.64823/ijpeh.2601007.

[19] Gajawada, S. (2026). Six reflections on Shri Rama: A devotional and interpretive essay. *International Journal of Philosophy, Ethics and Humanities*, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.64823/ijpeh.2602002.

[20] Gajawada, S. (2026). Divine, familial, and human-value inspirations for artificial intelligence. *International Journal of Philosophy, Ethics and Humanities*, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.64823/ijpeh.2602003.

[21] Mitchell, M., Wu, S., Zaldivar, A., Barnes, P., Vasserman, L., Hutchinson, B., Spitzer, E., Raji, I. D., & Gebru, T. (2019). Model cards for model reporting. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 220–229). ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287596.

[22] Gebru, T., Morgenstern, J., Vecchione, B., Vaughan, J. W., Wallach, H., Daumé III, H., & Crawford, K. (2021). Datasheets for datasets. *Communications of the ACM*, *64*(12), 86–92. https://doi.org/10.1145/3458723.

[23] Thorp, H. H. (2023). ChatGPT is fun, but not an author. *Science*, *379*(6630), 313. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adg7879.

[24] Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610–623). ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922.