International Journal of Engineering Research and Science & Technology

www.ijerst.org

ISSN : 2319-5991

Vol. 22 No. 1(s) (2026)

ijerst.editor@gmail.com

editor@ijerst.com

www.ijerst.com

Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal

Research Paper

Challenges and Limitations of Using Artificial Intelligence for Interpreting Physical Concepts

Dr. Sandesh Ramrao Bhitre
Department of Physics, Jijamata College of Science Arts, Bhende BK, Ahilyanagar, Maharashtra, India
*e-mail: sandesh.bhitre@gmail.com

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has significantly transformed scientific research, including data analysis, modeling, and simulation in physics. From machine learning–based particle detection to automated theorem discovery, AI systems increasingly contribute to interpreting complex physical phenomena. However, despite remarkable advancements, AI faces serious epistemological, methodological, and conceptual limitations when applied to interpreting foundational physical concepts such as space-time, causality, quantum indeterminacy, entropy, and relativity. This paper critically examines the challenges and limitations of using AI in interpreting physical concepts. It argues that while AI excels in pattern recognition and predictive modeling, it lacks intrinsic conceptual understanding, theoretical intentionality, and philosophical depth necessary for interpreting the meaning of physical laws. The study highlights issues of data dependency, model opacity, reductionism, bias, interpretability crisis, and ethical concerns. The paper concludes that AI should be treated as an augmentative tool rather than an autonomous interpreter in physics research.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Physics, Conceptual Interpretation, Machine Learning, Epistemology of Science, Explainable AI, Scientific Modeling

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become an essential component of modern scientific research, moving from general computational tasks to specialized scientific applications [1]. In physics, AI tools assist in large-scale data analysis, astrophysical simulations, particle detection, and computational modeling. Institutions such as CERN use machine learning algorithms to analyze collision data, while AI-assisted simulations support research in quantum systems and cosmology.

However, the use of AI in interpreting *physical concepts*—rather than merely processing data—raises philosophical and methodological concerns. Interpretation in physics involves understanding not only empirical results but also the conceptual foundations of theories. Concepts such as space-time in Albert Einstein's relativity, wave-particle duality in quantum mechanics, and entropy in thermodynamics require theoretical reasoning that goes beyond the statistical correlations identified by neural networks [2]. This paper critically evaluates the limitations of AI in interpreting such foundational concepts.

2. Literature Review

AI applications in physics have grown rapidly in recent decades. Deep learning techniques have been applied to quantum state recognition, cosmological simulations, and materials discovery. These successes often rely on the ability of AI to master complex patterns within large datasets [3]. Research institutions such as NASA utilize AI for analyzing astronomical data and predicting space weather.

Philosophers of science argue that scientific interpretation involves explanation, causality, and theoretical coherence. Karl Popper emphasized that scientific progress relies on falsifiability and rigorous testing of theories [4], while Thomas Kuhn highlighted that breakthroughs often require "paradigm shifts" that redefine the field [5]. AI systems, however, operate primarily through pattern recognition rather than theory formation [1].

Recent discussions in Explainable AI (XAI) research point toward the “black box problem,” where neural networks produce accurate predictions without transparent reasoning structures. This raises concerns about whether AI-generated outputs can truly be considered interpretations [1].

3. Conceptual Framework

3.1 Interpretation in Physics

Interpretation includes theoretical explanation and mathematical formalism linked with ontological meaning. For example, general relativity is a conceptual redefinition of gravity as the curvature of space-time, not just a predictive tool.

3.2 AI as Statistical Modeling

AI systems function primarily through data-driven learning and probabilistic modeling [2]. As outlined by Russell & Norvig, these systems are designed for rational action or optimization within defined environments rather than possessing intrinsic semantic understanding or philosophical intentionality [1].

4. Major Challenges and Limitations

Lack of Conceptual Understanding: AI identifies correlations but does not understand the underlying physical meaning [2]. It can predict quantum outcomes without engaging in interpretive debates such as the Copenhagen interpretation.

The Black Box Problem: Deep neural networks often lack transparency. In high-stakes scientific interpretation, this opacity undermines the epistemic trust required for scientific validation [1].

Data Dependency and Bias: AI requires extensive datasets to function effectively [2]. However, foundational physical theories often emerge from minimal but conceptually powerful principles (e.g., invariance principles), where data may be sparse but theoretical insight is essential.

Inability to Generate Paradigm Shifts: Historical breakthroughs require radical conceptual innovation. AI systems optimize within given frameworks; they rarely transcend established paradigms autonomously, as they are trained on existing data structures [5].

Reductionism: AI tends to reduce complex systems to statistical regularities, whereas physical concepts often involve abstract mathematical structures that exceed empirical datasets.

Ethical and Epistemological Concerns: Overreliance on AI may lead to automation bias, decline in theoretical reasoning skills and misinterpretation of computational outputs as conceptual truths

5. Case Illustrations

5.1 AI in Particle Physics

At CERN, AI assists in detecting Higgs boson signatures. While effective in classification, AI does not contribute to theoretical interpretation of symmetry breaking.

5.2 AI in Astrophysics

AI tools used by NASA classify galaxies and detect exoplanets. Yet conceptual understanding of dark matter and dark energy remains theoretical, not AI-derived.

6. Philosophical Implications

AI's limitations highlight an important distinction between prediction and explanation. Scientific knowledge is not merely an algorithmic output; it involves rational justification and conceptual synthesis—aspects that define the logic of scientific discovery [4].

7. Future Directions

To mitigate these limitations, researchers should focus on:

1. Development of Explainable AI (XAI) systems [1].
2. Hybrid human-AI collaborative models to combine computational power with theoretical depth.
3. Integration of the philosophy of science into AI research to address "paradigm shift" limitations [5].
4. Transparent algorithmic documentation

AI should serve as a cognitive extension rather than a replacement for theoretical reasoning.

8. Conclusion

AI has become indispensable in physics research, especially in data-intensive domains. However, significant limitations prevent it from independently interpreting foundational physical concepts. Interpretation requires conceptual depth and theoretical creativity—capacities currently beyond algorithmic systems. Therefore, AI should be integrated responsibly as a supportive analytical tool while preserving human epistemic authority in scientific interpretation.

References

1) Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach* (4th ed.). Pearson.
2) Bishop, C. M. (2006). *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Springer.
3) Silver, D., et al. (2016). Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 529, 484–489.
4) Popper, K. (1959). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. Hutchinson.
5) Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.