

Federated Recommender Systems for Privacy-Preserving Personalized Nutritional Peptide Intervention

Julie-Anne A. Heggarty

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA.

heggarty1972@ku.edu

Wendelin Junken

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV, USA.

junkenwendelin@unr.edu

Mikolaj Waluk

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO, USA.

mikolajwaluk01@missouri.edu

Abstract

Personalized nutritional peptide interventions promise to align dietary bioactive compounds with individual metabolic, immunological, and aging-related health trajectories. Yet the data required for such personalization are intimate, longitudinal, and clinically sensitive, ranging from dietary logs and wearable signals to biomarker panels and gastrointestinal symptoms. Centralized recommender architectures create privacy, regulatory, and trust liabilities that are difficult to reconcile with precision nutrition. This paper examines federated recommender systems as a socio-technical infrastructure for privacy-preserving personalized nutritional peptide intervention. It argues that federated learning alone is insufficient; practical systems require secure aggregation, differential privacy, robust personalization, human oversight, and governance across clinical, commercial, and consumer domains. The analysis develops a system-level architecture that distributes model training across households, clinics, wearable ecosystems, and peptide knowledge bases while keeping raw data local. It then evaluates structural trade-offs among privacy, accuracy, latency, fairness, explainability, and sustainability. Particular attention is given to non-identical data distributions, sparse peptide-outcome evidence, adversarial manipulation, equity gaps, and the policy implications of treating nutrition as a quasi-clinical intervention. The paper concludes that federated recommender systems can support credible peptide personalization only when technical privacy mechanisms are coupled with participatory governance, auditable evidence pipelines, edge-aware deployment, and fairness-aware evaluation. Such systems should be designed as adaptive public-interest infrastructures rather than opaque commercial engines, enabling responsible innovation in nutritional peptide interventions while preserving individual and community trust.

Keywords

federated learning; recommender systems; nutritional peptides; privacy-preserving personalization; precision nutrition; edge computing; fairness; governance.

1. Introduction

Personalized nutrition has moved from general dietary advice toward computationally mediated intervention, where individual physiology, behavior, and environment shape recommendations about foods, supplements, and bioactive compounds. Among the most promising but uncertain domains is nutritional peptide intervention. Food-derived and animal-derived peptides have been studied for antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, immunomodulatory, and metabolic effects, and recent reviews link peptide exposure to aging-related disease pathways [16]. At the same time, the evidence base remains heterogeneous, with variability in peptide bioavailability, dose, processing, host microbiome, and clinical endpoints. A recommender system that suggests peptide interventions must therefore reason under scientific uncertainty while handling highly sensitive personal data. This combination creates a distinctive systems problem: the recommendations are health-adjacent, the evidence is evolving, and the data are distributed across individuals, clinics, devices, and commercial platforms.

Centralized recommender systems have dominated personalization because they can aggregate large interaction datasets, train high-capacity models, and optimize engagement or satisfaction at scale [6], [7]. In nutrition, however, centralization raises concerns that go beyond conventional privacy. Dietary patterns can reveal religion, disease status, pregnancy, eating disorders, socioeconomic condition, and cultural identity. Peptide interventions may be used alongside medications, creating risks of interaction and liability. Users may be patients, consumers, athletes, or caregivers, each with different expectations of confidentiality. Regulations such as the General Data Protection Regulation impose obligations around consent, purpose limitation, data minimization, and cross-border transfer [18]. A system that collects raw dietary and biomarker data into a central repository inherits substantial legal and reputational risk.

Federated learning offers an alternative by training models across decentralized data sources without moving raw records to a central server [1], [2]. In a federated recommender system, each participant or institution computes local updates, which are aggregated into a shared model. This architecture can preserve locality of sensitive data while enabling collective learning. However, federated learning is not a complete privacy solution. Model updates can leak information, malicious participants can poison training, and non-identical data distributions can destabilize convergence [3], [5]. For nutritional peptide recommendation, these challenges are amplified by small samples, noisy self-reporting, and the need for explainable, clinically defensible outputs. This paper argues that federated recommender systems for peptide intervention must be treated as socio-technical infrastructures rather than model-centric experiments.

The paper contributes a system-level analysis of architecture, governance, deployment, sustainability, robustness, and policy. It does not propose a single algorithm or benchmark. Instead, it examines how federated recommendation can be structured to respect privacy while supporting personalization across heterogeneous populations. Section 2 reviews background on recommender systems, federated learning, and precision nutrition. Section 3 develops an architecture spanning local devices, clinics, peptide knowledge bases, and aggregation services. Section 4 analyzes privacy, security, and governance. Section 5 examines fairness, robustness, and clinical translation. Section 6 discusses infrastructure,

deployment, and sustainability. Section 7 considers policy implications and future directions, and Section 8 concludes.

2. Background and Related Work

Recommender systems have evolved from simple collaborative filtering to hybrid models that combine behavioral signals, content features, and contextual knowledge [6], [7], [8]. In nutritional contexts, recommendations are not merely preference predictions. They are interventions with possible biological consequences. A user may prefer a certain flavor profile, but the system must also respect allergen constraints, medication interactions, pregnancy status, and clinical goals. A peptide recommendation engine therefore requires layered objectives: palatability, adherence, safety, evidence strength, and expected health benefit. Conventional engagement metrics such as click-through rate are inadequate and potentially harmful if they reward consumption rather than health outcomes.

Federated learning was introduced to train models across decentralized data while keeping raw data local [1]. Subsequent research has clarified key challenges, including communication efficiency, heterogeneity, privacy accounting, and systems design [2], [3]. Secure aggregation allows a server to compute aggregate updates without observing individual contributions [4]. Differential privacy provides formal guarantees by limiting the influence of any single record on outputs [5]. Together, these mechanisms can reduce leakage risks, but they impose trade-offs in accuracy, bandwidth, and model stability. A peptide recommender cannot simply adopt these methods without considering the clinical and behavioral context in which recommendations are consumed.

Federated recommendation has emerged as a specialized area, adapting collaborative filtering and ranking models to decentralized settings [9], [10]. Early work addresses explicit feedback, implicit interactions, and privacy-preserving matrix factorization. However, most federated recommender research assumes relatively stable item catalogs and user-item interactions. Nutritional peptide intervention is different because the item space is dynamic, evidence is contested, and outcomes are delayed. A peptide may be recommended for joint health, metabolic regulation, or immune support, but its effect may take weeks to observe. The recommender must therefore model adherence, temporal effects, and uncertainty rather than only preference.

Healthcare applications of federated learning demonstrate both promise and complexity. Federated models have been explored for mobile keyboard prediction, clinical outcome prediction, and multi-institutional medical imaging [11], [12], [13], [14]. These cases show that federation can enable collaboration without pooling patient records, but they also reveal governance challenges around consent, audit, model ownership, and liability. In precision nutrition, personalized glycemic response prediction has shown that individual metabolic responses to food are highly variable [17]. Bioactive peptide research similarly suggests heterogeneity in bioavailability and effect [24], [25]. A federated recommender must therefore support subgroup models, contextual inference, and continual learning rather than a single global average.

The regulatory and ethical landscape further shapes design. Privacy law establishes principles of lawfulness, fairness, transparency, and accountability [18]. Fairness research warns that algorithmic systems can reproduce or amplify inequities when data are unevenly distributed [19]. Explainability work emphasizes that explanations must be meaningful to affected users and institutions, not merely technically plausible [20]. In nutritional peptide recommendation,

explainability is especially important because users may need to understand why a recommendation is made, what evidence supports it, and what uncertainties remain. These concerns cannot be deferred until after deployment.

3. System Architecture for Federated Nutritional Peptide Recommendation

A practical federated recommender for nutritional peptide intervention should be organized as a layered infrastructure. At the edge layer, personal devices, wearables, and home sensors collect dietary intake, sleep, activity, gastrointestinal symptoms, and adherence data. Clinics and research sites may contribute biomarkers, medication lists, and structured clinical outcomes. Commercial food databases and peptide knowledge bases provide item features, provenance, and evidence grading. A federation service coordinates training rounds, model versioning, and privacy accounting. Crucially, raw personal data remain within the local domain unless the user explicitly authorizes a specific disclosure. This architecture reflects the principle of data minimization while enabling collective model improvement [1], [18].

The local layer must support personalization under resource constraints. A smartphone or home hub cannot train the same model as a data center, so the system may use split learning, small local adapters, or federated personalization layers. Local models can capture individual taste preferences, meal timing, and physiological responses, while the global model learns population-level patterns about peptide effects and adherence. This hybrid structure recognizes that nutrition is simultaneously idiomatic and biological. A recommendation that ignores cultural food practices will fail, even if it is biochemically plausible. Conversely, a recommendation that ignores safety and evidence may be engaging but clinically irresponsible [7], [15].

The aggregation layer introduces difficult design choices. A central server can coordinate training, but it becomes a trust bottleneck and a potential target for attack. Alternative topologies include hierarchical federation, where clinics or regions aggregate within trusted boundaries before sharing broader updates, and peer-to-peer federation, where devices exchange updates through intermediaries. Hierarchical designs may fit healthcare systems because they align with existing institutional accountability. Peer-to-peer designs may better serve consumer wellness communities but complicate audit and liability. Secure aggregation can protect individual updates during aggregation, while differential privacy can limit inference from published models [4], [5]. The choice depends on the sensitivity of the data, the number of participants, and the regulatory environment.

The knowledge layer is often overlooked in federated recommendation. Peptide interventions require evidence about source, dosage, preparation, bioavailability, and contraindications. A federated system should not treat peptides as interchangeable products. It needs an auditable evidence graph that links peptide compounds to study quality, population, outcome, and uncertainty. This graph can be curated by expert panels and updated as new research appears, including narrative and systematic reviews [16], [25]. The recommender can then combine personalized predictions with evidence-aware constraints. If evidence is weak, the system should communicate uncertainty and avoid overconfident recommendations. This is a governance decision as much as a technical one.

The interaction layer must support informed choice. Users should be able to view why a peptide is recommended, which data contributed, how certain the system is, and what alternatives exist. They should also be able to decline data sharing without losing basic functionality. A tiered consent model may allow anonymous use, local-only personalization,

research participation, and clinical integration. Such tiers create different privacy and accuracy profiles. The system should make these trade-offs visible rather than hiding them in terms of service. Explainability mechanisms must be adapted to user roles: a clinician may need evidence provenance, a consumer may need simple risk language, and a regulator may need audit logs [20]. These requirements affect model design, because post hoc explanations may be insufficient if the underlying model is opaque and unstable.

4. Privacy, Security, and Governance

Privacy in federated peptide recommendation is not achieved by decentralization alone. Local updates can leak information through gradients, overfitting, or repeated participation. Differential privacy can bound leakage, but it may reduce accuracy for rare subgroups and can be difficult to calibrate in small cohorts [5]. Secure aggregation prevents the server from seeing individual updates, yet it does not prevent inference from aggregate patterns or collusion among participants [4]. A robust design should combine technical mechanisms with institutional controls, including access policies, audit trails, purpose limitation, and retention limits. Privacy must be treated as a lifecycle property spanning collection, training, deployment, and deletion [18].

Security threats include poisoning, backdoor insertion, model inversion, and adversarial manipulation of recommendations. A malicious participant could promote a harmful peptide or suppress a safe alternative. An attacker could manipulate dietary logs to shift recommendations toward unsafe supplements. Adversarial machine learning research shows that such threats are not hypothetical [23]. Mitigation requires robust aggregation, anomaly detection, reputation systems, and human review for high-risk recommendations. In clinical settings, a peptide recommendation that interacts with anticoagulants or immunosuppressants should trigger additional safeguards. Security is therefore inseparable from safety and clinical governance.

Governance must address ownership, accountability, and redress. Who owns the global model? Who is liable if a recommendation causes harm? How can a user contest a recommendation or request deletion? These questions exceed standard machine learning pipelines. A federated system may involve hospitals, device manufacturers, food companies, cloud providers, and research institutions. Each has different incentives. A multi-stakeholder governance body should define evidence thresholds, safety escalation procedures, and independent audits. Regulatory frameworks such as GDPR provide a baseline, but they do not resolve the specific challenges of distributed learning or nutritional intervention [18]. Governance must be adaptive because peptide science and personalization technologies will continue to evolve.

Consent is especially complex in federated systems. Users may consent to personalization but not to research, commercial product development, or insurance use. Dynamic consent interfaces can allow granular choices over time. However, consent fatigue is real, and many users cannot assess technical privacy risks. Governance should therefore include default protections, independent oversight, and transparency reports. A federated recommender should not shift all responsibility to individual consent when structural safeguards are possible. Strong defaults, such as local-only storage for sensitive biomarkers and privacy-preserving aggregation for model updates, can reduce the burden on users while preserving autonomy.

5. Personalization, Fairness, and Clinical Robustness

Fairness in nutritional peptide recommendation is multidimensional. Allocation fairness asks whether different populations receive comparable quality of recommendations. Performance fairness asks whether model accuracy is equitable across age, sex, ancestry, socioeconomic status, and health conditions. Representational fairness asks whether food cultures and dietary practices are treated with dignity. These dimensions interact. A model trained primarily on data from one region may recommend peptides and foods that are unavailable, culturally inappropriate, or prohibitively expensive elsewhere. Fairness research emphasizes that technical metrics alone cannot resolve normative questions [19]. The system must include participatory input from affected communities.

Clinical robustness requires handling uncertainty, missing data, and distribution shift. Peptide effects may depend on dosage, timing, food matrix, microbiome, and genetic variation [24], [25]. A recommendation model trained on one population may not transfer to another. Federated learning can improve coverage by including diverse sites, but heterogeneity can also destabilize training. Personalized adapters, meta-learning, and subgroup models can help, but they increase complexity and risk overfitting. The system should report confidence intervals in plain language and avoid recommending high-risk interventions when evidence is weak. A recent review of animal-derived peptides and aging-related diseases illustrates both the promise and the heterogeneity of this evidence base [16]. The recommender should integrate such reviews as inputs to evidence grading, not as definitive clinical protocols.

Human oversight is essential for high-stakes recommendations. A clinician should be able to review peptide suggestions for patients with complex conditions. A dietitian should be able to adjust recommendations for cultural and practical constraints. A user should be able to override preferences without penalty. The system should distinguish between wellness recommendations and clinical interventions, with different thresholds for evidence and oversight. Automation bias is a risk: users and clinicians may over-trust algorithmic outputs, especially when explanations appear precise. Interfaces should therefore communicate uncertainty, alternatives, and the limits of the model. Explainability must support contestability, not merely satisfaction [20].

Long-term evaluation should move beyond short-term engagement. Metrics should include adherence, nutritional adequacy, adverse events, user understanding, and health outcomes where appropriate. A/B testing on vulnerable populations requires ethical review. Federated systems can support privacy-preserving evaluation by computing aggregate metrics across sites. However, evaluation itself must be governed. If a system optimizes for peptide sales, it may recommend unnecessary supplements. If it optimizes for engagement, it may encourage obsessive tracking. The objective function is therefore a policy instrument, not a neutral technical choice.

6. Infrastructure, Deployment, and Sustainability

Deployment infrastructure must accommodate intermittent connectivity, heterogeneous devices, and clinical workflows. Edge computing can reduce latency and bandwidth by processing data near users [21]. In a federated peptide recommender, edge nodes can perform local feature extraction, adherence detection, and privacy filtering before updates are sent. Clinics may require on-premises aggregation to satisfy data protection rules. Consumer devices may use lightweight models and periodic synchronization. The architecture should be resilient to device loss, model drift, and network failure. It should also support rollback if a model update degrades safety or fairness.

Communication efficiency is a major constraint. Federated learning can consume significant bandwidth if models are large or training rounds are frequent [2], [3]. For nutritional peptides, update frequency may be moderate because biological outcomes unfold slowly. Yet personalization may require frequent local adaptation. A tiered update strategy can balance global learning and local responsiveness. Compression, quantization, and sparse updates can reduce cost, but they may introduce bias or reduce robustness. These trade-offs should be evaluated in real-world deployments, not only simulations.

Sustainability includes environmental and economic dimensions. Large-scale machine learning has a substantial carbon footprint, and federated systems can add communication energy to local computation energy [22]. Training a global peptide recommender may be less energy-intensive than continuous central data collection, but the comparison depends on device efficiency and network infrastructure. Economic sustainability requires equitable access. If personalized peptide intervention is available only through expensive wearables and private clinics, it may widen health disparities. Public and community health institutions should be involved in deployment to ensure that benefits are broadly distributed. Open standards for data exchange, evidence representation, and privacy auditing can reduce vendor lock-in and support long-term maintainability.

Operational sustainability also depends on maintenance and governance. Models degrade as food products change, peptide research advances, and user populations shift. A deployed recommender requires monitoring, retraining, and incident response. Who pays for this maintenance? Who is responsible when a model becomes outdated? These questions are often ignored in research prototypes but determine real-world viability. A sustainable system should have clear funding, stewardship, and accountability arrangements. It should also preserve the ability to cease operation and delete data if trust is lost.

7. Policy Implications and Future Directions

Policy for federated nutritional peptide recommendation must balance innovation, privacy, safety, and equity. Regulators may need to classify systems according to risk. A low-risk wellness recommender that suggests common foods differs from a clinical decision support tool that recommends bioactive peptides to older adults with comorbidities. Risk classification should consider the sensitivity of data, the vulnerability of users, the strength of evidence, and the potential for harm. Privacy regulation provides a foundation, but sector-specific guidance is needed for distributed health and nutrition data [18]. Policy should encourage privacy-enhancing technologies without treating them as a substitute for substantive oversight.

Standards and interoperability are critical. Without common formats for consent, evidence grading, and audit logs, federated systems will fragment into incompatible silos. Standards can also reduce compliance costs and enable independent evaluation. However, standards must not freeze a contested evidence base. They should support versioning, provenance, and uncertainty. Public research funding can support open benchmarks for federated nutrition recommendation that include fairness, safety, and privacy metrics. Such benchmarks should be designed with clinicians, dietitians, patients, and community representatives, not only machine learning researchers.

Future research should address several open problems. One is privacy-preserving causal inference: recommendations should ideally estimate individual treatment effects, not merely correlations. Another is federated evidence synthesis, where clinical trials, observational

studies, and real-world data are integrated without centralizing sensitive records. A third is adversarial robustness under heterogeneous participation. A fourth is equitable personalization for low-resource settings, including offline operation and culturally grounded food knowledge. A fifth is governance experimentation, such as data trusts, cooperative ownership, and public-interest auditing. These directions require interdisciplinary collaboration across computer science, nutrition, medicine, law, ethics, and social science.

It is also important to avoid technological solutionism. Federated learning can reduce some privacy risks, but it does not resolve power asymmetries between platforms and users. A peptide recommender could still be used to manipulate consumption, exploit health anxiety, or shift costs to individuals. Policy should therefore address market structure, advertising, and conflicts of interest alongside technical architecture. The goal should be a system that supports informed, equitable, and scientifically responsible nutritional peptide intervention, not merely one that complies with data protection rules.

8. Conclusion

Federated recommender systems offer a credible architecture for privacy-preserving personalized nutritional peptide intervention because they align learning with the distributed nature of dietary, clinical, and behavioral data. Yet decentralization alone is insufficient. A trustworthy system must combine secure aggregation, differential privacy, robust personalization, evidence-aware knowledge representation, human oversight, fairness evaluation, and adaptive governance. It must be deployable on edge devices and clinical infrastructure, sustainable in energy and economic terms, and accountable to users and communities. The peptide evidence base remains heterogeneous, as reviews of animal-derived peptides and aging-related diseases demonstrate [16], and this uncertainty must be represented rather than hidden. The most important design choice is not a single algorithm but the socio-technical contract that governs data, models, recommendations, and redress. If designed as a public-interest infrastructure, federated peptide recommendation can support personalization without sacrificing privacy or equity. If designed only as an optimization engine, it risks reproducing the harms of centralized surveillance under a more complex technical facade.

References

1. McMahan, B., Moore, E., Ramage, D., Hampson, S., & y Arcas, B. A. (2017). Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 1273–1282.
2. Kairouz, P., McMahan, H. B., Avent, B., Bellet, A., Bennis, M., Bhagoji, A. N., Bonawitz, K., Charles, Z., Cormode, G., Cummings, R., D'Oliveira, R. G. L., Eichner, H., El Rouayheb, S., Evans, D., Gardner, J., Garrett, Z., Gascón, A., Ghazi, B., Gibbons, P. B., ... Zhao, S. (2021). Advances and open problems in federated learning. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 14(1–2), 1–210. <https://doi.org/10.1561/22000000083>
3. Li, T., Sahu, A. K., Talwalkar, A., & Smith, V. (2020). Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 37(3), 50–60. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2020.2975749>
4. Bonawitz, K., Ivanov, V., Kreuter, B., Marcedone, A., McMahan, H. B., Patel, S., Ramage, D., Segal, A., & Seth, K. (2017). Practical secure aggregation for privacy-preserving

- machine learning. *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 1175–1191. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3133956.3133982>
5. Dwork, C., & Roth, A. (2014). The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3–4), 211–407. <https://doi.org/10.1561/04000000042>
 6. Resnick, P., & Varian, H. R. (1997). Recommender systems. *Communications of the ACM*, 40(3), 56–58. <https://doi.org/10.1145/245108.245121>
 7. Ricci, F., Rokach, L., & Shapira, B. (2015). Recommender systems: Introduction and challenges. In F. Ricci, L. Rokach, & B. Shapira (Eds.), *Recommender systems handbook* (2nd ed., pp. 1–34). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-7637-6_1
 8. Amatriain, X. (2013). Mining large streams of user data for personalized recommendations. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, 14(2), 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2481244.2481250>
 9. Lin, G., Liang, F., Pan, W., & Ming, Z. (2021). FedRec: Federated recommendation with explicit feedback. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 36(5), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MIS.2020.3017205>
 10. Yang, Q., Liu, Y., Chen, T., & Tong, Y. (2019). Federated machine learning: Concept and applications. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 10(2), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3298981>
 11. Hard, A., Rao, K., Mathews, R., Ramaswamy, S., Beaufays, F., Augenstein, S., Eichner, H., Kiddon, C., & Ramage, D. (2018). Federated learning for mobile keyboard prediction. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.03604>
 12. Rieke, N., Hancox, J., Li, W., Milletari, F., Roth, H. R., Albarqouni, S., Bakas, S., Galtier, M. N., Landman, B. A., Maier-Hein, K., Ourselin, S., Sheller, M., Trask, A., Xu, D., Baust, M., & Cardoso, M. J. (2020). The future of digital health with federated learning. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 3, 119. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-00323-1>
 13. Xu, J., Glicksberg, B. S., Su, C., Walker, P., Bian, J., & Wang, F. (2021). Federated learning for healthcare informatics. *Journal of Healthcare Informatics Research*, 5(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41666-020-00082-4>
 14. Dayan, I., Roth, H. R., Zhong, A., Harouni, A., Gentili, A., Abidin, A. Z., Liu, A., Costa, A. B., Wood, B. J., Tsai, C.-S., Wang, C.-H., Hsu, C.-N., Lee, C.-K., Ruan, C.-P., Xu, D., Wu, D., Huang, E., Kitamura, F. C., Lacey, G., ... Li, Q. (2021). Federated learning for predicting clinical outcomes in patients with COVID-19. *Nature Medicine*, 27(10), 1735–1743. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01506-3>
 15. Ordovas, J. M., Ferguson, L. R., Tai, E. S., Mathers, J. C., & Corella, D. (2018). Personalised nutrition and health. *BMJ*, 361, k2173. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.k2173>
 16. Liu, T., Song, X., Dai, X., Ma, H., Muhammad, A., He, Z., & Zhao, K. (2025). Effects of animal-derived peptides on aging-related diseases: a narrative review. *Aging Advances*, 2(4), 160–165.
 17. Zeevi, D., Korem, T., Zmora, N., Israeli, D., Rothschild, D., Weinberger, A., Ben-Yacov, O., Lador, D., Avnit-Sagi, T., Lotan-Pompan, M., Suez, J., Mahdi, J. A., Matot, E., Malka, G., Kosower, N., Rein, M., Zilberman-Schapira, G., Dohnalová, L., Pevsner-

- Fischer, M., ... Segal, E. (2015). Personalized nutrition by prediction of glycemic responses. *Cell*, 163(5), 1079–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2015.11.001>
18. Voigt, P., & von dem Bussche, A. (2017). *The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR): A practical guide*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57959-7>
 19. Barocas, S., Hardt, M., & Narayanan, A. (2019). *Fairness and machine learning: Limitations and opportunities*. fairmlbook.org.
 20. Mittelstadt, B., Russell, C., & Wachter, S. (2019). Explaining explanations in AI. *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 279–288. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287574>
 21. Shi, W., Cao, J., Zhang, Q., Li, Y., & Xu, L. (2016). Edge computing: Vision and challenges. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 3(5), 637–646. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JIOT.2016.2579198>
 22. Schwartz, R., Dodge, J., Smith, N. A., & Etzioni, O. (2020). Green AI. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(12), 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3381831>
 23. Biggio, B., & Roli, F. (2018). Wild patterns: Ten years after the rise of adversarial machine learning. *Pattern Recognition*, 84, 317–331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2018.07.023>
 24. Sánchez, A., & Vázquez, A. (2017). Bioactive peptides: A review. *Food Quality and Safety*, 1(1), 29–46. <https://doi.org/10.1093/fqsafe/fyx006>
 25. Chakrabarti, S., Guha, S., & Majumder, K. (2018). Food-derived bioactive peptides in human health: Challenges and opportunities. *Nutrients*, 10(11), 1738. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu10111738>