Materials Research Proceedings 45 (2024) 258-266 https://doi.org/10.21741/9781644903315-30

Navigating AI Regulation: A Comparative Analysis of EU and US Legal Frameworks

KUZIOR Aleksandra[1,2,a *], SIRA Mariya[1,3,b], ZOZUĽAKOVÁ Viera[4,c] and HETENYI Martin[4,d]

[1]Department of Applied Social Sciences, Faculty of Organization and Management, Silesian University of Technology, 26 Roosevelt Street, 41-800 Zabrze, Poland

[2]Oleg Balatskyi Department of Management, Sumy State University, 40007 Sumy, Ukraine

[3]Joint Doctoral School, Silesian University of Technology, 44-100 Gliwice, Poland

[4]Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Slovakia

[a]aleksandra.kuzior@polsl.pl, [b]mariya.sira@polsl.pl, [c]zozulakova.viera@gmail.com, [d]mhetenyi@ukf.sk

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, AI Regulation, European Union, United States, AI Act, Executive Order on AI, AI Governance

Abstract. The rise of AI has led to significant changes in various industries, highlighting the need for strong regulations to ensure ethical and responsible AI development and implementation. This paper compares the European Union (EU) and the United States (US) regulatory strategies in addressing AI. As demonstrated by the comprehensive AI Act, the EU's proactive approach prioritizes transparency, accountability, and human-centered AI. At the same time, the US takes a more flexible approach by focusing on innovation through industry-specific guidelines and existing laws.

Introduction

The advent of AI has profoundly impacted various sectors and societies worldwide, leading to a significant transformation. With AI technologies becoming more integrated into daily life, the necessity for comprehensive regulations to oversee their creation and implementation has become increasingly vital [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. As major players in the global economy and technology sector, the EU and the US have taken different approaches to regulating AI. Stakeholders need to comprehend these approaches to effectively navigate the intricate realm of AI governance.

The European Union has adopted a proactive approach to regulating artificial intelligence, highlighting the importance of implementing strict measures to guarantee AI's ethical advancement and application [6]. Programs such as the AI Act aim to create a strong system that emphasizes transparency, responsibility, and AI centered around human values. This strategy mirrors the EU's overarching regulatory principles, which frequently prioritize precaution and thorough supervision to address possible risks linked to emerging technologies.

On the other hand, the United States has embraced a more hands-off strategy, prioritizing promoting innovation and economic development [7]. The regulatory landscape for artificial intelligence in the US is defined by its industry-specific directives and dependence on current laws rather than all-encompassing statutes [8]. This strategy seeks to find a middle ground between supporting technological progress and mitigating specific risks while avoiding excessive constraints on innovation [9, 10].

This study seeks to conduct a comparative assessment of the regulatory frameworks for AI in the European Union and the United States due to the identified criteria. By analyzing the fundamental principles, legislative measures, and practical consequences of each framework, we aim to provide insights into how these jurisdictions influence the trajectory of AI governance.

Results

The Artificial Intelligence Act (AI Act): the state of the art.

The European Union has recently reached a consensus on the AI Act, regarded as the inaugural comprehensive legislation on artificial intelligence worldwide. The AI Act introduced by the European Union will substantially influence individuals and industries that employ artificial intelligence. Establishing internal regulations encompassing ethical and legal dimensions of AI is imperative.

The AI Act, an EU regulation governing artificial intelligence, was endorsed by the EU Parliament in mid-June 2023 [11]. Consequently, implementing this legislation within the next 1-2 years will have jurisdiction over EU member states and establish a global benchmark [12]. The AI Act was formally adopted by the European Parliament on March 13, 2024, with a significant majority of 523-46 votes in support of the legislation [13]. In the most favorable scenario, prohibitions on specific applications of AI could potentially be implemented by the conclusion of the current year [14].

Key elements of the AI Act include risk-based classification, governance and enforcement, transparency and accountability, support for innovation and SMEs, and penalties for non-compliance [15].

The EU AI Act has been the subject of diverse criticisms following its introduction, with several contentious issues emerging as focal points of debate. The EU's initiative to establish a global benchmark through the AI Act could face limitations in its international impact. Skeptics suggest that other nations may develop comparable digital regulatory frameworks, reducing the EU's competitive advantage in this domain [16, 17]. There was also debate regarding the Brussels Effect, a phenomenon in which regulations set by the European Union establish global standards by default. Some argue that the AI Act may not garner the same worldwide impact as past regulations, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), citing its rigorous and intricate stipulations [17, 18]. The potential impact of stringent regulations, particularly on high-risk AI systems, is a topic of concern due to the potential for stifling innovation. Compliance costs and operational hurdles could pose significant challenges for companies, potentially impeding the advancement and utilization of AI technologies within and beyond the European Union [17, 19]. The AI Act's regulations have extraterritorial reach, applying to companies outside the EU that affect EU citizens with their AI systems. This expansive scope prompts inquiries into the feasibility of enforcing these rules globally and the potential challenges international corporations face [20, 21]. Critics, particularly human rights organizations, contend that the Act has various shortcomings. For example, the Act's inadequacy in completely prohibiting live facial recognition and the export of AI technologies with potential applications in social scoring have been identified as notable deficiencies, which could facilitate the misuse and exploitation of AI [20]. The Act categorizes AI systems based on risk levels, ranging from unacceptable to minimal risk, and the corresponding regulatory obligations are viewed as overly strict. Concerns have been raised regarding the lack of adaptability to the fast-paced advancement of AI technologies and their diverse uses [19].

Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence: the state of art.

In 2023, the integration of AI into the political discourse in the United States became prominent [22]. However, this phenomenon extended beyond mere deliberations and encompassed tangible initiatives, culminating in President Biden's executive order on AI in late October [23]. This comprehensive directive entailed the imperative of enhancing transparency and establishing novel benchmarks in the field.

As a result of this undertaking, a distinct American version of AI policy started to take shape. It is characterized by its supportive stance towards the AI industry, prioritizing the adoption of optimal methods, delegating the formulation of regulations to various governmental bodies, and adopting a nuanced approach to regulating different sectors of the economy.

The current year has the potential to capitalize on the progress achieved in 2023 with the implementation of numerous provisions outlined in President Biden's executive order. Additionally, considerable attention will be devoted to the forthcoming establishment of the US AI Safety Institute, an institution entrusted with implementing most of the policies stipulated in the order [23].

The casual conversation establishes the groundwork for a potentially significant legislative period regarding artificial intelligence, as there is increasing apprehension regarding its effects on employment, mental well-being, and democratic processes.

President Biden's Executive Order on Artificial Intelligence has been met with commendation and critique. The following is an overview of the primary points of contention. Detractors contend that the executive order introduces substantial regulatory hurdles for AI developers, potentially hindering innovation and placing a strain on federal agencies tasked with its enforcement [24]. The criticism of the order stems from concerns regarding its inadequate enforcement mechanisms, specifically the absence of clear procedures to ensure adherence to safety testing and data-sharing requirements. This lack of oversight raises doubts about the feasibility of achieving the objectives outlined in the order [25]. Organizations criticized the expansion of federal authority through the order for its perceived negative impact on innovation and the development of new businesses. The political and factional tensions within the AI policy landscape are navigated to accommodate the diverse interests of different factions, such as progressives, longtermists, and AI hawks. The order acknowledges the potential for AI to worsen discrimination and privacy concerns but has faced criticism for lacking stringent enforcement measures to effectively address these issues. Critics contend that more decisive actions are necessary to prevent the discriminatory use of AI algorithms and ensure comprehensive data privacy protection [25,26].

Legal Frameworks Comparison.

The AI Act and the Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence are pivotal in shaping the future landscape of AI governance. The focus is on key criteria. This comparison aims to highlight the similarities and distinctions between the two frameworks, providing a deeper understanding of how they approach these critical elements. The results are provided in Table 1.

Social and Industrial Influence

Strong regulations introduced in Europe can be seen as controversial. On the one hand, they strongly protect consumers and their rights from the unlimited greed of corporations; on the other hand, they very drastically limit the development of technology and, with very short adjustment times, are one of the main factors causing the loss of competitive advantage of the European industry compared to countries that do not introduce such regulations.

Regulations introduced reasonably in the technological area lead to the development of materials [28-30] and their refinement by applying special layers [31,32] to obtain the desired technological properties [33-35]. This is used in traditional energy [36,37] and renewable energy [38,39]. Thanks to increased structural strength [40] and fatigue strength [41], it allows for more efficient and longer-term use of manufactured structures, devices, and vehicles [42], and thus for reducing pollutants [43,44] emitted into the natural environment, which is socially beneficial. Thanks to advanced methods of process optimization [45-47] and data analysis [48], increasingly cost-effective solutions are made available to society, including energy-efficient buildings [49] while maintaining the profitability of enterprises [50].

Table 1. *Legal frameworks comparison*

Criteria	AI Act	Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence
1. Accountability	The AI Act requires organizations to take responsibility for overseeing and managing their AI systems, provide detailed documentation, and accept liability for any negative consequences caused by their AI applications, including legal and regulatory obligations.	Strategies for enforcing accountability among AI developers and organizations for the consequences of their AI technologies and operations.
2. Transparency	The AI Act mandates that companies must disclose comprehensive details about how their AI programs are developed and operated, including the data used for training, algorithms used, and decision-making processes. Companies must also report any significant incidents and energy usage associated with their AI systems.	AI companies must adhere to specific criteria to offer transparent and easily understandable details regarding their AI models' functionality and decision-making processes.
3. Quality	The law requires companies to ensure their AI systems are trained on high-quality, unbiased data. It emphasizes the need for thorough testing to maintain fairness, accuracy, and reliability in AI-generated results.	Criteria and protocols are established to guarantee the dependability, optimal functioning, and achievement of specific benchmarks for AI systems.
4. Security and privacy	To protect AI systems from cyber threats, companies must create thorough security protocols and prioritize safeguarding individuals' privacy by following GDPR regulations and securing sensitive data. It is also important for companies to report any major breaches that occur.	Strategies for safeguarding sensitive information and mitigating security risks presented by artificial intelligence systems.
5. Ethics	The AI Act addresses ethical considerations by recognizing the potential threats to individual rights and democratic values posed by AI technology. It includes ethical principles to guarantee that AI systems uphold human dignity, privacy, and liberties.	Guiding principles for the development and utilization of AI systems with a focus on equitable treatment, absence of bias, and upholding human rights.
6. Safety of AI systems	The legislation categorizes AI systems based on their risk level, prioritizing stricter regulations for high-risk systems that could impact health, safety, fundamental rights, and the environment. It requires regular evaluations of impact and safety, especially in critical sectors like insurance and banking.	Ensuring the safe operation of AI systems and mitigating potential harm to individuals and society.
7. Trustworthiness	The AI Act prioritizes building trust in AI systems by ensuring they are reliable, explainable, and auditable. It mandates regular assessments, certification processes, and adherence to set standards to ensure the safety and effectiveness of AI systems.	Establishing public confidence in artificial intelligence systems by demonstrating consistent performance, providing transparency, and adhering to ethical principles.
8. Biometric identification	The law sets strict rules for how law enforcement can use biometric recognition systems in public places, including measures to prevent abuse and ensure the technology is only used when necessary.	Regulations and principles governing the integration of artificial intelligence in biometric recognition systems, with an emphasis on safeguarding privacy and promoting ethical practices.

Criteria	AI Act	Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence
9. High-Risk AI systems	The law sets specific guidelines for identifying high-risk artificial intelligence systems and imposes strict requirements on them, including conducting assessments on how they may impact basic rights and continuous monitoring. These rules apply to industries where AI decision-making can greatly affect people, such as finance, healthcare, and public services.	The identification and regulation of artificial intelligence systems are classified as high-risk based on their potential implications for safety, privacy, and ethical concerns.
10. Energy consumption reporting	Organizations are mandated to reveal the energy usage of their AI systems, thereby advancing sustainability and fostering accountability in the realm of AI development and implementation.	In order to advance sustainability efforts and mitigate environmental consequences, it is imperative that AI companies adhere to regulations mandating the disclosure of energy consumption data related to their AI models.

(source: developed by authors based on resources [11, 13, 15, 27])

Summary

This study analyzes the regulatory structures for AI in the EU and the US, emphasizing their differing strategies for governing AI. The EU's recently approved AI Act imposes strict guidelines to promote ethical AI advancement, focusing on risk assessment, transparency, and accountability. It requires thorough documentation, compliance with rigorous data standards, and strong security and privacy measures. Critics question its potential to hinder innovation and its limited reach beyond the EU. On the other hand, the regulatory strategy in the US, as detailed in President Biden's Executive Order on AI, is marked by a more permissive approach that prioritizes fostering innovation. This approach is based on current regulations and industry-specific recommendations, with an emphasis on best practices, transparency, and ensuring safety. While this approach encourages progress in technology, it has been criticized for its perceived lack of rigorous enforcement and the possible imposition of regulatory hurdles.

The article focuses on essential factors, including accountability, transparency, quality, security, ethics, safety, trustworthiness, biometric identification, high-risk AI systems, and energy consumption disclosure, by conducting a comparative examination. The research offers an in-depth insight into how the regulatory frameworks of the EU and the US tackle these pivotal aspects, shaping the direction of AI governance on a worldwide scale.

References

[1] A. Kuzior, A. Kwilinski and V. Tkachenko, Sustainable development of organizations based on the combinatorial model of artificial intelligence, Entrepreneurship and Sustainability 7 (2019) 1353-1376. https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2019.7.2(39)

[2] A. Kuzior, A. Kwilinski, Cognitive Technologies and Artificial Intelligence in Social Perception, Management Systems in Production Engineering 30 (2022) 109-115. https://doi.org/10.2478/mspe-2022-0014

[3] H. Yarovenko, S. Lyeonov, K.A. Wojcieszek and Z. Szira, Do IT users behave responsibly in terms of cybercrime protection? Human Technology 19 (2023) 178-206. https://doi.org/10.14254/1795-6889.2023.19-2.3

[4] P. Sakiewicz, K. Piotrowski, J. Ober and J. Karwot, Innovative artificial neural network approach for integrated biogas – wastewater treatment system modelling: Effect of plant

operating parameters on process intensification, Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 124 (2020) 109784. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.109784

[5] I. Marszałek-Kotzur, Cognitive Technologies – Are We in Danger of Humanizing Machines and Dehumanizing Humans? Management Systems in Production Engineering 30 (2022) 269-275. https://doi.org/10.2478/mspe-2022-0034

[6] C. Rozen, J. Deutsch, Bloomberg – Are you a robot?, www.bloomberg.com. (2024). https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2024-03-13/regulate-ai-how-us-eu-and-china-are-going-about-it?embedded-checkout=true (accessed March 25, 2024).

[7] B. Whyman, AI Regulation is Coming – What is the Likely Outcome?, Www.csis.org. (2023). https://www.csis.org/blogs/strategic-technologies-blog/ai-regulation-coming-what-likely-outcome.

[8] A. Engler, The EU and U.S. diverge on AI regulation: A transatlantic comparison and steps to alignment, Brookings. (2023). https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-eu-and-us-diverge-on-ai-regulation-a-transatlantic-comparison-and-steps-to-alignment/.

[9] S. Bilan, P. Šuleř, O. Skrynnyk, E. Krajňáková and T. Vasilyeva, Systematic bibliometric review of artificial intelligence technology in organizational management, development, Change and Culture, Business: Theory and Practice 23 (2022) 1-13. https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2022.13204.

[10] M. Salman, T. Sherbin and A. Bauman, We know the risks of AI — here's how we can mitigate them, World Economic Forum (2023). https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2023/06/10c45559-5e47-4aea-9905-b87217a9cfd7/ (accessed October 24, 2023).

[11] Council of the EU, Artificial intelligence act: Council and Parliament strike a deal on the first rules for AI in the world, European Council. Council of the European Union. (2023). https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2023/12/09/artificial-intelligence-act-council-and-parliament-strike-a-deal-on-the-first-worldwide-rules-for-ai/.

[12] W. Karlstad, Understanding the EU's AI Act: regulation, ethics, and future impact, Www.tietoevry.com (2023). https://www.tietoevry.com/en/blog/2023/08/eu-data-act-how-should-ai-be-regulated/ (accessed December 17, 2023).

[13] European Parliament, Artificial Intelligence Act: MEPs adopt landmark law | News | European Parliament, Www.europarl.europa.eu. (2024). https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/press-room/20240308IPR19015/artificial-intelligence-act-meps-adopt-landmark-law.

[14] T. Ryan-Mosleyarchive, M. Heikkiläarchive and Z. Yangarchive, What's next for AI regulation in 2024?, MIT Technology Review. (2024). (accessed January 5, 2024). https://www.technologyreview.com/2024/01/05/1086203/whats-next-ai-regulation-2024/

[15] European Parliament, European Parliament P9_TA(2024)0138 Artificial Intelligence Act European Parliament legislative resolution of 13 March 2024 on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on laying down harmonized rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) and amending certain Union Legislative Acts (COM(2021)0206-C9-0146/2021-2021/0106(COD)) (Ordinary legislative procedure: first reading), 2019. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2024-0138_EN.pdf.

[16] A. Engler, The limited global impact of the EU AI Act, Brookings. (2022). https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-limited-global-impact-of-the-eu-ai-act/ (accessed October 12, 2023).

[17] A. Engler, The EU AI Act will have global impact, but a limited Brussels Effect, Brookings. (2022). https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-eu-ai-act-will-have-global-impact-but-a-limited-brussels-effect/.

[18] KPMG, Decoding the EU Artificial Intelligence Act, KPMG. (2024). (accessed June 9, 2024). https://kpmg.com/dp/en/home/insights/2024/03/decoding-the-eu-ai-act.html

[19] L.G. Paule, Milestone in AI regulation: EU secures world's first AI Act | Digital Skills and Jobs Platform, Digital-Skills-Jobs.europa.eu. (2023). (accessed June 9, 2024). https://digital-skills-jobs.europa.eu/en/latest/news/milestone-ai-regulation-eu-secures-worlds-first-ai-act

[20] Associated Press, EU Establishes World-Leading AI Rules, Could That Affect Everyone?, Voice of America. (2023). https://www.voanews.com/a/eu-establishes-world-leading-ai-rules-could-that-affect-everyone-/7393780.html (accessed December 18, 2023).

[21] A. Krasodomski, M. Buchser, The EU's new AI Act could have global impact, Chathamhouse. (2024). https://www.chathamhouse.org/2024/03/eus-new-ai-act-could-have-global-impact.

[22] N. Chilson, Testimony Before the United States Senate Committee on Rules and Administration Hearing: AI and the Future of our Elections The Integral Role of AI Tools in Modern Political Discourse, 2023. (accessed June 9, 2024). https://www.rules.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/chilson_testimony.pdf

[23] The White House, Fact Sheet: President Biden Issues Executive Order on Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence, The White House. (2023). https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/10/30/fact-sheet-president-biden-issues-executive-order-on-safe-secure-and-trustworthy-artificial-intelligence/.

[24] B. Bordelon, The politics of Biden's vast new AI order, Politico. (2023). https://www.politico.com/news/2023/10/30/bidens-executive-order-artificial-intelligence-00124395.

[25] S.S. Ali, Biden's AI Executive Order: Balancing Significance and Criticism, Www.ceuli.org. (n.d.). (accessed June 9, 2024). http://www.ceuli.org/content/bidens-ai-executive-order-balancing-significance-and-criticism

[26] W. Henshall, Why Biden's AI Executive Order Only Goes So Far, Www.cnas.org. (2023). https://www.cnas.org/press/in-the-news/why-bidens-ai-executive-order-only-goes-so-far (accessed June 9, 2024).

[27] T. Madiega, Artificial intelligence act, 2024. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2021/698792/EPRS_BRI(2021)698792_EN.pdf.

[28] D. Klimecka-Tatar, S. Borkowski and P. Sygut, The kinetics of Ti-1Al-1Mn alloy thermal oxidation and charcteristic of oxide layer, Arch. Metall. Mater. 60 (2015) 735-738. https://doi.org/10.1515/amm-2015-0199

[29] T. Lipiński, Modification of Al-11% Si alloy with Cl-based modifier, Manuf. Technol. 15 (2015) 581-587.

[30] T. Lipiński, R. Ulewicz, The effect of the impurities spaces on the quality of structural steel working at variable loads, Open Eng. 11 (2021) 233-238. https://doi.org/10.1515/eng-2021-0024

[31] N. Radek, J. Pietraszek and A. Szczotok, Technology and application of electro-spark deposited coatings, METAL 2017 – 26th Int. Conf. Metall. Mater. (2017) 1432-1437.

[32] N. Radek, J. Pietraszek, Ł.J. Orman, M. Szczepaniak, J. Świderski, M. Radek and D. Gontarski, The effect of laser treatment on operational properties of ESD coatings, METAL 2021 – 30th Int. Conf. Metall. Mater. (2021) 876-882. https://doi.org/10.37904/metal.2021.4212

[33] N. Radek, J. Pietraszek, A. Gądek-Moszczak, L.J. Orman and A. Szczotok, The morphology and mechanical properties of ESD coatings before and after laser beam machining, Materials 13 (2020) art. 2331. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma13102331

[34] N. Radek, J. Pietraszek, J. Bronček and P. Fabian, Properties of Steel Welded with CO2 Laser, Lecture Notes in Mechanical Engineering (2020) 571-580. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33146-7_65

[35] N. Radek, J. Pietraszek, M. Radek and O. Paraska, The influence of plasma cutting parameters on the geometric structure of cut surfaces, Mater. Res. Proc. 17 (2020) 132-137. https://doi.org/10.21741/9781644901038-20

[36] Ł.J. Orman, N. Radek, J. Pietraszek and D. Gontarski, Discussion of the heat flux calculation method during pool boiling on meshed heaters, System Safety: Human - Technical Facility - Environment 2 (2020) 247-252. https://doi.org/10.2478/czoto-2020-0030

[37] N. Radek, Ł.J. Orman, S. Honus and J. Pietraszek, Critical analysis of pool boiling correlations, System Safety: Human - Technical Facility - Environment 5 (2023) 258-265. https://doi.org/10.2478/czoto-2023-0028

[38] R. Ulewicz, D. Siwiec, A. Pacana, M. Tutak and J. Brodny, Multi-criteria method for the selection of renewable energy sources in the polish industrial sector, Energies 14 (2021) art. 2386. https://doi.org/10.3390/en14092386

[39] K.A. Bogdanowicz, S. Lalik, P. Ratajczak, A. Katrusiak, P. Krysiak, A.I. Pawłowska, M. Marzec and A. Iwan, A new look at imines and their mixture with PC71BM for organic, flexible photovoltaics, Sci. Rep. 13 (2023) art. 13240. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-38978-x

[40] M. Krynke, R. Ulewicz, Analysis of the influence of slewing bearing mounting on their static load capacity, Transportation Research Procedia 40 (2019) 745-750. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2019.07.105

[41] T. Lipiński, J. Pietraszek and A. Wach, Influence of oxygen content in medium carbon steel on bending fatigue strength, Engineering for Rural Development 21 (2022) 351-356. https://doi.org/10.22616/ERDev.2022.21.TF116

[42] K. Knop, E. Olejarz and R. Ulewicz, Evaluating and Improving the Effectiveness of Visual Inspection of Products from the Automotive Industry, Lecture Notes in Mechanical Engineering (2019) 231-243. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-17269-5_17

[43] M. Zenkiewicz, T. Zuk and J. Pietraszek, Modeling electrostatic separation of mixtures of poly(ϵ-caprolactone) with polyfvinyl chloride) or polyfethylene terephthalate), Przemysl Chemiczny 95 (2016) 1687-1692. https://doi.org/10.15199/62.2016.9.6

[44] M. Zenkiewicz, T. Zuk, J. Pietraszek, P. Rytlewski, K. Moraczewski and M. Stepczyńska, Electrostatic separation of binary mixtures of some biodegradable polymers and poly(vinyl

chloride) or poly(ethylene terephthalate), Polimery/Polymers 61 (2016) 835-843. https://doi.org/10.14314/polimery.2016.835

[45] J. Pietraszek, A. Gądek-Moszczak and T. Toruński, Modeling of errors counting system for PCB soldered in the wave soldering technology, Adv. Mater. Res. 874 (2014) 139-143. https://doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.874.139

[46] J. Pietraszek, L. Wojnar, The bootstrap approach to the statistical significance of parameters in RSM model, ECCOMAS Congress 2016 - Proc. 7th Europ. Congr. Comp. Methods in Appl. Sci. Eng. 1 (2016) 2003-2009. https://doi.org/10.7712/100016.1937.9138

[47] J. Pietraszek, N. Radek and A.V. Goroshko, Challenges for the DOE methodology related to the introduction of Industry 4.0, Prod. Eng. Arch. 26 (2020) 190-194. https://doi.org/10.30657/pea.2020.26.33

[48] B. Jasiewicz, J. Pietraszek, S. Duda, S. Pietrzak, B. Pruszczyński, T. Parol, T. Potaczek and A. Gądek-Moszczak, Inter-observer and intra-observer reliability in the radiographic measurements of paediatric forefoot alignment, Foot and Ankle Surgery 27 (2021) 371-376. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fas.2020.04.015

[49] J.M. Djoković, R.R. Nikolić, J. Bujnak, B. Hadzima, F. Pastorek, R. Dwornicka and R. Ulewicz, Selection of the Optimal Window Type and Orientation for the Two Cities in Serbia and One in Slovakia, Energies 15 (2022) art. 323. https://doi.org/10.3390/en15010323

[50] M. Ingaldi, D. Klimecka-Tatar, Digitization of the service provision process - Requirements and readiness of the small and medium-sized enterprise sector, Procedia Computer Science 200 (2022) 237-246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2022.01.222