

Reinforcement Learning for Adaptive Recommendation of Bioactive Peptide Combinations in Healthy Aging

Peter-Michael Rorricht

Department of Computer Science, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL, USA.
petermichaelmail@ucf.edu

Gilda Jantsch

Department of Computer Science, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, USA.
gilda.jantsch@unh.edu

Qasim Keer

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA.
qasimkeer309@ku.edu

Benny Jakobsson

Department of Computer Science, University of North Texas, Denton, TX, USA.
jakobsson1987@unt.edu

Abstract

Healthy aging is increasingly framed as a systems problem in which nutrition, biology, behavior, clinical monitoring, and digital infrastructure interact over long time horizons. Bioactive peptides have attracted attention for their potential roles in metabolic regulation, immune modulation, musculoskeletal maintenance, and age-related disease risk reduction, yet the selection of peptide combinations remains difficult because effects are context-dependent, evidence is uneven, and individual responses vary. This paper examines reinforcement learning as an adaptive recommendation layer for bioactive peptide combinations in healthy aging. Rather than treating recommendation as a one-time classification task, the discussion positions reinforcement learning as a sequential decision system that can learn from longitudinal outcomes, safety constraints, and user context. The paper develops a system-level analysis of architecture, data infrastructure, reward design, robustness, fairness, governance, sustainability, and policy. It argues that the central challenge is not merely algorithmic performance but the construction of a socio-technical infrastructure capable of supporting safe, interpretable, continuously monitored, and equitable recommendations. Particular attention is given to structural trade-offs between personalization and population-level evidence, exploration and safety, automation and clinical oversight, and commercial deployment and public accountability. The paper concludes that adaptive peptide recommendation should be governed as a high-consequence health-adjacent system, with validated endpoints, auditability, human oversight, and lifecycle evaluation. If designed carefully, reinforcement learning could support more personalized and responsive healthy aging interventions; if designed poorly, it could amplify weak evidence, obscure uncertainty, and produce inequitable outcomes.

Keywords

reinforcement learning, bioactive peptides, healthy aging, recommender systems, adaptive intervention, fairness, governance, clinical translation, socio-technical systems, safety.

1. Introduction

Healthy aging has become a central concern for health systems, technology developers, and policy institutions because aging populations place sustained pressure on care delivery, chronic disease management, and long-term prevention. The traditional model of later-life intervention, which often begins after disease onset, is being supplemented by preventive and optimization-oriented approaches that seek to preserve function, resilience, and quality of life over decades. Within this shift, nutrition-derived compounds such as bioactive peptides have gained attention for their potential to influence metabolic, inflammatory, cardiovascular, and musculoskeletal processes. However, the translation of peptide evidence into practical recommendations is complicated by heterogeneity, incomplete mechanistic understanding, and the difficulty of evaluating combinations rather than isolated compounds. Static recommendation rules, such as fixed dietary advice or single-agent supplementation, cannot easily accommodate changing biomarkers, adherence patterns, polypharmacy, comorbidity, and personal goals.

Reinforcement learning offers a conceptual and technical framework for adaptive recommendation because it explicitly models sequential decision-making under uncertainty [1]. Instead of asking only what recommendation is best at one moment, reinforcement learning asks how a sequence of recommendations can improve long-term outcomes while respecting constraints [2]. This orientation is attractive for healthy aging, where the relevant horizon is months or years and where short-term signals such as adherence or tolerance may not align with long-term functional benefit. Yet the same orientation raises difficult questions about reward specification, exploration, safety, fairness, and governance. A recommender that adapts too aggressively may expose users to uncertain combinations; one that adapts too conservatively may fail to learn or may reproduce generic advice. A system that optimizes engagement may produce commercially attractive but clinically weak outcomes.

This paper argues that adaptive recommendation of bioactive peptide combinations should be understood as a socio-technical infrastructure rather than a standalone algorithm. The discussion is organized around the structural trade-offs that arise when reinforcement learning is embedded in healthy aging contexts. It considers how data are collected and validated, how rewards are designed, how safety envelopes are maintained, how fairness is evaluated, how governance and regulation shape deployment, and how sustainability and operational lifecycle concerns affect long-term viability. The paper draws on research in reinforcement learning, healthcare artificial intelligence, recommender systems, aging biology, bioactive peptides, algorithmic fairness, auditing, and AI ethics. The aim is not to propose a specific product or protocol but to clarify the architectural and institutional conditions under which adaptive peptide recommendation could be responsibly developed.

2. Healthy Aging, Bioactive Peptides, and the Limits of Static Recommendation

Healthy aging is not a single endpoint but a multidimensional process involving physical function, cognitive health, metabolic stability, immune resilience, psychological well-being, and social participation. Aging biology research has identified interconnected hallmarks such as genomic instability, epigenetic alterations, loss of proteostasis, mitochondrial dysfunction, cellular senescence, and chronic inflammation [15]. Geroscience extends these insights by linking aging processes to the onset and progression of chronic disease, suggesting that

interventions targeting fundamental aging mechanisms may have broad effects [16]. Within this framework, nutrition is not merely supportive care but a modifiable exposure that can influence multiple systems over time. Bioactive peptides, which are short sequences of amino acids released from food proteins or produced through enzymatic hydrolysis, have been studied for antioxidant, antihypertensive, immunomodulatory, antimicrobial, and metabolic activities [13]. Their effects are often modest, context-dependent, and mediated by bioavailability, digestion, absorption, and individual physiology [14].

A recent narrative review of animal-derived peptides and aging-related diseases indicates that peptide research spans cardiovascular disease, diabetes, neurodegenerative conditions, and inflammatory disorders, but also that evidence remains heterogeneous and translationally incomplete [12]. This is not a reason to dismiss peptide-based approaches, but it is a reason to avoid overconfident recommendation systems. Many studies focus on isolated peptides, animal models, or short-term biomarker changes, whereas healthy aging interventions require long-term human outcomes and attention to safety, adherence, and interactions with diet, medication, and lifestyle. Combination effects are especially uncertain because peptides may act synergistically, additively, or antagonistically, and the optimal combination may differ by genotype, phenotype, microbiome, inflammatory status, and disease risk profile.

Static recommendation approaches, including rule-based dietary guidance and fixed supplement schedules, struggle with this complexity. Recommender systems have traditionally been designed for domains such as media, retail, and information filtering, where preferences can be inferred from interactions and where errors are usually low-stakes [4]. Health-adjacent recommendation changes the stakes. A user may follow advice for months, may combine recommendations with prescribed therapies, and may interpret algorithmic personalization as clinical validation. The limits of static recommendation therefore become both epistemic and ethical: the system may lack sufficient evidence, may fail to detect changing risk, and may not explain why a combination was selected. Reinforcement learning enters this context as a possible adaptive layer, but it must be constrained by the recognition that healthy aging recommendations are not equivalent to entertainment recommendations.

3. Reinforcement Learning as an Adaptive Control Layer for Peptide Combination

Reinforcement learning is concerned with agents that learn policies by interacting with an environment and receiving rewards [2]. Deep reinforcement learning has demonstrated the capacity to learn complex control policies in high-dimensional domains, from video games to board games and robotic simulation [1][3]. In principle, an adaptive peptide recommender could be modeled as an agent that observes user state, selects a peptide combination or dosage schedule, and receives feedback in the form of biomarkers, symptoms, adherence, functional measures, or clinician assessments. The goal would be to maximize long-term healthy aging outcomes while minimizing adverse effects and preserving user autonomy. This framing allows the system to adapt over time, learn from individual responses, and adjust recommendations as circumstances change.

However, real-world reinforcement learning faces substantial challenges that are especially acute in health contexts [10]. Environments are partially observable, rewards are delayed and noisy, interventions are constrained, and exploration can be harmful. In healthcare, reinforcement learning has been explored for sepsis treatment, mechanical ventilation, and chronic disease management, but guidelines emphasize careful problem formulation, validation, and human oversight [11]. A peptide recommendation system would need to distinguish between learning from observational data and learning through active

recommendation. Offline reinforcement learning can use historical data, but such data may be biased by prior clinical practice or self-selection. Online learning can generate new evidence, but it also raises the possibility of experimenting on users. The design must therefore include safety envelopes, conservative exploration, clinician review, and clear boundaries between recommendation, education, and medical advice.

Another structural issue is the mismatch between reward signals and healthy aging goals. A system might optimize for adherence because it is measurable, or for biomarker improvement because it is timely, or for user satisfaction because it sustains engagement. None of these alone captures healthy aging. Adherence without benefit is not success; biomarker improvement without functional gain may be incomplete; satisfaction without safety may be harmful. Reinforcement learning requires a scalar reward in many formulations, but healthy aging is multi-objective. The system must either combine objectives in a transparent and revisable way or adopt multi-objective and constrained reinforcement learning approaches. This is not merely technical. Reward design encodes values, institutional priorities, and assumptions about what counts as a good outcome.

4. System Architecture and Data Infrastructure

A practical adaptive recommendation system for bioactive peptide combinations would require layered architecture. The sensing layer would collect self-reported outcomes, wearable data, laboratory biomarkers, dietary intake, medication use, and clinician assessments. The data layer would standardize, clean, link, and version these streams while preserving provenance. The modeling layer would maintain user state representations, peptide knowledge graphs, response models, safety classifiers, and reinforcement learning policies. The recommendation layer would generate candidate combinations, filter them through safety and eligibility rules, and present them with explanations and uncertainty. The oversight layer would support clinician review, user consent, audit trails, and regulatory reporting. The infrastructure layer would provide identity management, privacy-preserving computation, interoperability, monitoring, and deployment controls.

This architecture is not a single model but a pipeline of models and institutional processes. Recommender systems research has long shown that production recommendation involves data preparation, candidate generation, ranking, filtering, feedback loops, and evaluation [4]. Machine learning systems also accumulate hidden technical debt when data dependencies, configuration, and monitoring are not treated as first-class concerns [18]. In peptide recommendation, technical debt could manifest as outdated evidence tables, inconsistent biomarker units, undocumented inclusion criteria, or untracked changes in supplement formulations. Because bioactive peptides are not pharmaceuticals with fixed composition, the system must account for source material, hydrolysis method, purity, dose, and bioavailability. A recommendation that is safe for one product may not be safe for another with the same peptide name.

Data infrastructure must also address privacy, consent, and secondary use. Healthy aging data may include sensitive health information, genetic data, wearable traces, and behavioral patterns. A centralized repository offers convenience but creates concentrated risk and may discourage participation. Federated learning, differential privacy, and secure enclaves can reduce some risks, but they introduce complexity and may limit model performance or auditability. The system must decide what data are necessary, how long they are retained, who can access them, and how users can withdraw or correct information. Governance of data

is inseparable from governance of recommendations because the policy learned by the system depends on whose data are included and how outcomes are measured.

5. Reward Design, Safety Envelopes, and Robustness

Reward design is the normative core of any reinforcement learning recommendation system. In healthy aging, rewards might include improvements in inflammatory markers, glucose control, muscle strength, cognitive performance, sleep quality, or quality of life, while penalties might include adverse events, medication interactions, excessive cost, burden, or inequitable access. The system must avoid rewarding proxies that diverge from health, such as engagement time, purchase behavior, or repeated app use. It must also avoid rewarding short-term biomarker changes that do not translate into functional benefit. A robust reward model should be clinically informed, transparent to users and auditors, and revisable as evidence evolves. Where evidence is weak, the system should default to conservative recommendations and clearly communicate uncertainty.

Safety envelopes are essential because reinforcement learning agents may discover policies that maximize reward through unsafe or unintended pathways. In health applications, safety constraints can include maximum doses, exclusion criteria, contraindications, monitoring requirements, and stopping rules. These constraints should not be merely soft penalties if violations could cause harm; they should be hard boundaries enforced outside the learned policy. The system should also distinguish between recommendations that are educational, those that are clinician-approved, and those that are experimental. Experimental recommendation would require research ethics review, informed consent, and independent monitoring. The temptation to blur these categories for commercial speed would undermine trust and could expose users to avoidable risk.

Robustness requires attention to distribution shift, adversarial behavior, and model degradation. User populations, supplement markets, dietary patterns, and scientific evidence change over time. A policy trained on one cohort may perform poorly on another. An agent may overfit to users who engage frequently and under-serve those who do not. Bad actors may manipulate reviews, self-reported outcomes, or product data. Robustness also includes graceful failure: if data are missing, if a biomarker is out of range, or if a user reports a new medication, the system should fall back to safe guidance rather than continue with an inappropriate recommendation. Continual learning methods can help models adapt without forgetting prior knowledge, but they must be paired with validation and rollback mechanisms [17]. The system should be designed to detect when it no longer knows enough to recommend confidently.

6. Fairness, Personalization, and Population Heterogeneity

Personalization is a major promise of adaptive peptide recommendation, but it is also a source of fairness risk. Algorithms used in health management have been shown to produce racially biased estimates when they rely on cost as a proxy for need [8]. Similar risks arise when recommendation systems optimize for users with richer data, better access to laboratories, or higher digital literacy. If the training population underrepresents older adults with low income, limited digital access, or complex comorbidity, the learned policy may be less safe or less effective for them. Fairness in this context is not only about equal accuracy; it concerns equal access to benefit, equal protection from harm, and equal ability to contest or correct algorithmic decisions.

Population heterogeneity also complicates the very idea of a general peptide recommendation policy. Aging trajectories differ by genetics, environment, social determinants, medication burden, and lifestyle. A combination that supports metabolic health in one person may be irrelevant or risky in another. The system could address this through subgroup models, personalization layers, or contextual bandits that adapt recommendations to individual features. However, finer personalization can reduce statistical power and increase the risk of overfitting. It can also fragment evidence, making it difficult to determine what works at population scale. The governance challenge is to balance individual adaptation with collective learning, ensuring that personalization does not become an excuse for weak evidence or unequal standards.

Fairness must be evaluated across the lifecycle. At design time, teams should examine inclusion criteria, data provenance, and outcome definitions. At deployment time, they should monitor access, adherence, adverse events, and benefit across subgroups. At review time, they should assess whether the system widens or narrows health disparities. Participatory design with older adults, caregivers, clinicians, and community organizations can surface concerns that are not visible in model metrics. The system should also provide meaningful explanations and pathways for appeal. A recommendation that cannot be understood or challenged is difficult to trust, especially when it concerns health and aging.

7. Governance, Regulation, and Clinical Translation

Governance for adaptive peptide recommendation must navigate a complex boundary between wellness, nutrition, and medicine. If the system makes general dietary suggestions, it may fall under consumer product or food regulation. If it recommends doses, combinations, or monitoring schedules for disease risk reduction, it may be regulated as a medical device or clinical decision support tool. The distinction matters because it determines requirements for premarket evidence, postmarket surveillance, labeling, and liability. A system that adapts continuously may not fit traditional approval models, which often evaluate fixed products at a point in time. Regulators may need mechanisms for predetermined change control plans, algorithmic transparency, and real-world performance monitoring.

Clinical translation also requires integration with existing care pathways. Clinicians are unlikely to adopt a system that adds burden without clear benefit, and they may be skeptical of peptide recommendations given uneven evidence. The system should therefore support shared decision-making rather than replace it. It should present the rationale for a recommendation, the strength of evidence, potential interactions, and alternatives. It should allow clinicians to override or pause recommendations and should feed those overrides back into evaluation. In healthcare, artificial intelligence has been promoted as a transformative force, but implementation depends on trust, workflow fit, and accountability [6]. Ethical challenges such as informed consent, bias, privacy, and clinician responsibility must be addressed before deployment [7].

Accountability is central. Internal algorithmic auditing frameworks can help organizations document data, models, decisions, and impacts across the lifecycle [19]. External audit may be necessary for high-stakes claims, especially if the system is marketed as improving healthy aging outcomes. Audit should examine not only accuracy but also safety, fairness, explainability, consent, and commercial influence. If the recommender is tied to specific peptide products, conflicts of interest must be disclosed and managed. Governance should include multidisciplinary oversight, user representation, and clear channels for reporting harm. The ethical framework for AI in society emphasizes human dignity, fairness, transparency,

and responsibility [20], and these principles are directly relevant when algorithmic advice shapes aging interventions.

8. Sustainability, Deployment, and Operational Lifecycle

Sustainability in this context has two meanings. The first concerns environmental and economic sustainability: peptide production, packaging, shipping, and waste have resource implications. The second concerns operational sustainability: the system must remain effective, safe, and maintainable over years. A reinforcement learning recommender is not a one-time software release. It requires continuous data collection, model retraining, evidence updates, safety monitoring, user support, and regulatory compliance. These activities demand funding, expertise, and institutional commitment. If the system depends on volunteer participation or short-term grants, it may decay precisely when long-term learning is most valuable.

Deployment should be staged. A closed pilot with clinician oversight and limited peptide options can test feasibility, safety, and data quality. A broader observational phase can evaluate adherence and subgroup effects without active experimentation. Only after safety and evidence thresholds are met should adaptive recommendation be expanded. Each stage should have explicit criteria for progression, pause, and termination. The system should also support graceful decommissioning: users should be able to export data, transition to standard care, and receive clear information about why the service is ending. Sustainability is not only about keeping the system running but about ending it responsibly if evidence does not support continued use.

Economic sustainability raises questions about who pays and who benefits. If users pay directly, access may be limited to affluent consumers, potentially widening health disparities. If insurers or public payers fund the system, evidence of cost-effectiveness and long-term benefit becomes necessary. If product manufacturers fund it, conflicts of interest must be managed. A sustainable model may require blended financing, public research support, and transparent pricing. The system should also avoid creating dependency on proprietary algorithms or data silos that prevent independent evaluation. Long-term trust depends on whether the infrastructure serves users and public health, not only commercial returns.

9. Evaluation, Monitoring, and Continuous Learning

Evaluation of adaptive peptide recommendation cannot rely solely on offline model metrics. Offline evaluation may show that a policy performs well on historical data, but it cannot fully capture the effects of active recommendation, user adaptation, or safety events. Prospective evaluation should include randomized or quasi-experimental designs where feasible, as well as pragmatic trials that reflect real-world use. Outcome measures should span biomarkers, functional status, quality of life, adverse events, adherence, and healthcare utilization. Because healthy aging unfolds over years, surrogate endpoints must be justified and revisited. The system should report uncertainty and avoid overclaiming from early signals.

Monitoring should be continuous and independent of the model development team. It should track data drift, performance drift, safety signals, fairness metrics, and user complaints. It should also monitor the recommendation supply chain: peptide products, formulations, and evidence updates. If a product changes or a new interaction is discovered, the system must update quickly. Monitoring should include human review of anomalous cases and periodic external audit. The system should maintain an audit trail that records what was recommended,

why, to whom, and with what outcome. This record supports learning, accountability, and regulatory review.

Continuous learning must be balanced against stability. A system that updates too frequently may confuse users and clinicians, while one that updates too slowly may become outdated. Changes to the policy should be versioned, tested, and communicated. Rollback should be possible if a new policy produces unexpected harm. Continual learning research offers methods for retaining knowledge while adapting, but in health contexts, continual learning also requires institutional memory [17]. The organization must remember why previous policies were changed, what evidence supported them, and what concerns were raised. Without that memory, the system may repeat mistakes or lose trust.

10. Cross-Domain Comparative Perspectives and Policy Implications

Comparing adaptive peptide recommendation with other high-stakes adaptive systems clarifies both possibilities and limits. Clinical decision support has struggled with alert fatigue, workflow mismatch, and liability. Autonomous vehicles illustrate the difficulty of defining safety envelopes in open environments. Financial recommendation systems show how optimization can produce systemic risk when individual incentives are misaligned. Public health surveillance demonstrates the value of population-level monitoring but also the dangers of privacy invasion and stigmatization. Bioactive peptide recommendation sits at the intersection of consumer wellness, clinical prevention, and digital platform economics. It therefore requires a hybrid governance model that draws from food safety, medical device regulation, data protection, and platform accountability.

Policy implications include the need for standardized evidence tiers for peptide claims, clear rules for adaptive health recommendations, and mandatory reporting of adverse events. Regulators should require transparency about training data, reward functions, safety constraints, and performance across subgroups. They should support independent evaluation and discourage black-box claims that cannot be audited. Policymakers should also invest in digital and scientific literacy so that users can interpret recommendations critically. Public funding for longitudinal studies of peptide combinations could reduce reliance on industry-sponsored evidence and strengthen the knowledge base. Because healthy aging is a public concern, the benefits of adaptive recommendation should not be confined to those who can afford premium services.

Future research should address several open problems. These include methods for safe offline and online reinforcement learning in health-adjacent domains, reward elicitation with patients and clinicians, uncertainty quantification for combination recommendations, fairness-aware policy optimization, and human-centered explanation. Research is also needed on the biology of peptide combinations, including interactions, dose-response relationships, and long-term effects. Interdisciplinary work should connect computational modeling with nutrition science, gerontology, clinical trials, ethics, and law. The most important advance may not be a more powerful algorithm but a more accountable system that learns slowly enough to be safe and openly enough to be trusted.

11. Conclusion

Reinforcement learning offers a compelling framework for adaptive recommendation of bioactive peptide combinations in healthy aging because it can model sequential decisions, personalize over time, and learn from longitudinal feedback. However, the core challenges are not purely algorithmic. They are architectural, evidentiary, ethical, and institutional. A

responsible system must integrate validated data infrastructure, conservative exploration, safety envelopes, transparent reward design, fairness monitoring, clinician oversight, and robust governance. It must recognize that healthy aging is multi-objective and that peptide evidence remains uneven [12]. It must avoid optimizing engagement or commercial metrics at the expense of health. It must be sustainable over years and accountable to the people it serves.

The paper has argued for treating adaptive peptide recommendation as a socio-technical infrastructure rather than a product feature. Such an infrastructure would require staged deployment, continuous evaluation, independent audit, and policy frameworks that anticipate adaptation. It would also require humility: the system should know when it does not know and should default to safe, understandable guidance. If developed with these constraints, reinforcement learning could contribute to more personalized and responsive healthy aging support. If developed without them, it could scale weak evidence, obscure uncertainty, and deepen inequities. The decisive question is not whether reinforcement learning can recommend peptides, but whether institutions can build the governance and infrastructure needed to recommend them responsibly.

References

1. Mnih, V., Kavukcuoglu, K., Silver, D., Rusu, A. A., Veness, J., Bellemare, M. G., Graves, A., Riedmiller, M., Fidjeland, A. K., Ostrovski, G., Petersen, S., Beattie, C., Sadik, A., Antonoglou, I., King, H., Kumaran, D., Wierstra, D., Legg, S., & Hassabis, D. (2015). Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518(7540), 529-533.
2. Sutton, R. S., & Barto, A. G. (2018). *Reinforcement learning: An introduction* (2nd ed.). MIT Press.
3. Silver, D., Huang, A., Maddison, C. J., Guez, A., Sifre, L., van den Driessche, G., Schrittwieser, J., Antonoglou, I., Panneershelvam, V., Lanctot, M., Dieleman, S., Grewe, D., Nham, J., Kalchbrenner, N., Sutskever, I., Lillicrap, T., Leach, M., Kavukcuoglu, K., Graepel, T., & Hassabis, D. (2016). Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 529(7587), 484-489.
4. Ricci, F., Rokach, L., & Shapira, B. (2015). Recommender systems: Introduction and challenges. In F. Ricci, L. Rokach, & B. Shapira (Eds.), *Recommender systems handbook* (pp. 1-34). Springer.
5. Sallam, M. (2023). ChatGPT utility in healthcare education, research, and practice: Systematic review on the promising perspectives and valid concerns. *Healthcare*, 11(6), 887.
6. Topol, E. J. (2019). High-performance medicine: The convergence of human and artificial intelligence. *Nature Medicine*, 25(1), 44-56.
7. Char, D. S., Shah, N. H., & Magnus, D. (2018). Implementing machine learning in health care: Addressing ethical challenges. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 378(11), 981-983.
8. Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science*, 366(6464), 447-453.
9. Amodei, D., Olah, C., Steinhardt, J., Christiano, P., Schulman, J., & Mané, D. (2016). Concrete problems in AI safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06565*.

10. Dulac-Arnold, G., Levine, N., Mankowitz, D. J., Li, J., Paduraru, C., Gowal, S., & Hester, T. (2021). Challenges of real-world reinforcement learning: Definitions, benchmarks and analysis. *Machine Learning*, 110(9), 2419-2468.
11. Gottesman, O., Johansson, F., Komorowski, M., Faisal, A., Sontag, D., Doshi-Velez, F., & Celi, L. A. (2019). Guidelines for reinforcement learning in healthcare. *Nature Medicine*, 25(1), 16-18.
12. 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.
13. Udenigwe, C. C., & Aluko, R. E. (2012). Food protein-derived bioactive peptides: Production, processing, and potential health benefits. *Journal of Food Science*, 77(1), R11-R24.
14. Möller, N. P., Scholz-Ahrens, K. E., Roos, N., & Schrezenmeir, J. (2008). Bioactive peptides and proteins from foods: Indication for health effects. *European Journal of Nutrition*, 47(4), 171-182.
15. López-Otín, C., Blasco, M. A., Partridge, L., Serrano, M., & Kroemer, G. (2013). The hallmarks of aging. *Cell*, 153(6), 1194-1217.
16. Kennedy, B. K., Berger, S. L., Brunet, A., Campisi, J., Cuervo, A. M., Epel, E. S., Franceschi, C., Lithgow, G. J., Morimoto, R. I., Pessin, J. E., Rando, T. A., Richardson, A., Schadt, E. E., Wyss-Coray, T., & Sierra, F. (2014). Geroscience: Linking aging to chronic disease. *Cell*, 159(4), 709-713.
17. Kirkpatrick, J., Pascanu, R., Rabinowitz, N., Veness, J., Desjardins, G., Rusu, A. A., Milan, K., Quan, J., Ramalho, T., Grabska-Barwinska, A., Hassabis, D., Clopath, C., Kumaran, D., & Hadsell, R. (2017). Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(13), 3521-3526.
18. Sculley, D., Holt, G., Golovin, D., Davydov, E., Phillips, T., Ebner, D., Chaudhary, V., Young, M., Crespo, J.-F., & Dennison, D. (2015). Hidden technical debt in machine learning systems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2503-2511.
19. Raji, I. D., Smart, A., White, R. N., Mitchell, M., Gebru, T., Hutchinson, B., Smith-Loud, J., Theron, D., & Barnes, P. (2020). Closing the AI accountability gap: Defining an end-to-end framework for internal algorithmic auditing. *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 33-44.
20. Floridi, L., Cows, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People: An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689-707.