Journal of Trends in Finance and Economics
Print ISSN: 3007-6951
Online ISSN: 3007-696X
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61784/jtfe3087

FROM GENERATED INFORMATION TO INTERNATIONALIZATION KNOWLEDGE: GENERATIVE AI, ABSORPTIVE CAPACITY AND SMES' MARKET ENTRY DECISIONS

Angelina Diachkova
ITMO University, Saint Petersburg 197198, Russia.

Abstract: Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) can reduce the cost of acquiring information about foreign markets and generating alternative strategies for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Greater information availability does not necessarily improve decision quality, however. This conceptual paper uses a narrative literature review and adopts absorptive capacity as its main theoretical perspective, alongside the Uppsala internationalization process model, to examine the role of experiential knowledge and business networks. The unit of analysis is a specific market entry decision involving a defined product, target market, and entry mode. The paper distinguishes information-processing efficiency, decision quality, and business performance. It proposes that generated content requires value recognition, evidence verification, and contextual integration to support a decision. Proportionate resource commitments and feedback from action may then support the development of reusable knowledge. These processes are connected through feedback rather than a fixed linear sequence. The strategic value of GenAI depends on the fit between the speed of information generation and organizational verification capacity, knowledge embedded in transaction relationships that is difficult to codify, and the incorporation of feedback into organizational routines. Three propositions address the review burden associated with information expansion, the need for direct market interaction, and the conditions under which retained records support organizational learning. The paper contributes to the discussion of AI-assisted internationalization by specifying mechanisms and observable processes for future empirical research. The propositions remain to be empirically tested.
Keywords: Generative artificial intelligence; Absorptive capacity; SME internationalization; Market entry decisions; Experiential knowledge; Organizational learning

1 INTRODUCTION

When entering foreign markets, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) need to assess both market attractiveness and their ability to carry out transactions under specific conditions. Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) can organize multilingual documents, summarize industry information, and rapidly generate lists of potential markets, allowing small teams to consider a wider set of candidates. Yet more generated content also means more facts, assumptions, and interpretations to evaluate. A firm may receive a comprehensive market report more quickly while remaining uncertain about why local customers would buy its products, whether potential partners would cooperate, or whether its delivery capabilities would be sufficient. The strategic problem is therefore how organizations turn additional information into knowledge that can support resource commitments as the cost of information generation falls.

This problem does not depend on the assumption that AI and internationalization have not been studied. Liu et al. examine AI orientation and firms' speed of internationalization in the context of knowledge management [1]; Aiudi et al. discuss the role of AI in international strategic decision-making by SMEs [2]; and Calheiros-Lobo et al. offer a conceptual framework for a foreign-market recommendation system [3]. These papers explore the relationship between technology use and internationalization but differ in technological scope, unit of analysis, and outcome variables. Firm-level internationalization, a system's ability to recommend markets, and the validity of key assumptions underlying a particular entry decision are distinct issues.

The research gap addressed here concerns the explanation of the organizational process. Across the studies examined, there remains an incomplete explanation of how organizations turn AI-generated candidate information into actionable knowledge for a specific market entry decision and learn from subsequent action. This paper uses absorptive capacity theory to explain the relationships among knowledge recognition, integration, and use in GenAI-assisted decisions. Internationalization process theory helps specify the boundary conditions. The unit of analysis is a specific market entry decision involving a defined product, target market, and entry mode. An individual interaction with a prompt or an individual's writing performance does not capture this unit of analysis.

This paper addresses three research questions. RQ1: How do organizations transform the additional candidate information made available through GenAI into actionable knowledge for market entry? RQ2: What limits this process when market uncertainty concerns experience and business relationships? RQ3: How do organizations turn feedback

© By the Author(s) 2026, under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0).

from actions following AI-assisted decisions into a capacity to make judgments in subsequent decisions? The following sections describe the research design and compare relevant literature before presenting the proposed mechanisms and propositions. The discussion returns to each research question and explains the theoretical and practical contributions.

2 RESEARCH DESIGN AND CONCEPTUAL DEFINITIONS

This paper develops a conceptual model through a theory-driven narrative literature review. Following Jaakkola's discussion of conceptual research design, it adopts a model-development approach: it identifies the phenomenon and concepts to be explained, then specifies the mechanisms, conditions, and outcomes connecting them [4]. Literature was selected for its relevance to the research problem, drawing on Snyder's distinctions among the purposes of different review approaches [5]. The search was updated through 24 October 2026 and covered publicly accessible academic sources from authors, publishers, universities, and other academic organizations.

The treatment of evidence maintains three distinctions: general AI versus GenAI, task performance versus business performance, and conceptual arguments versus empirical findings. When full texts were available, their conclusions were examined in relation to the research design. When access was limited to a publisher's abstract, the analysis used only information explicitly stated in that abstract. The review did not include an exhaustive search across commercial databases, a bibliometric analysis, or a pooling of effect estimates. It supports theoretical development rather than providing a comprehensive inventory of evidence. The mechanisms, propositions, and managerial illustrations form part of the paper's conceptual analysis; they are not findings from a firm-level survey.

The paper defines candidate information as generated content whose applicability and evidentiary basis remain to be established. Actionable knowledge refers to organizational understanding that specifies the conditions under which it applies, supports a particular choice, and remains open to revision. Decision quality is considered in terms of critical misjudgments, including factual errors, omitted decisive constraints, and misjudgments about the feasibility of available options. Report length, managerial confidence, and market entry speed are not used as measures of decision quality. Business performance is a more distal outcome that also depends on implementation, competition, and environmental changes. Absorptive capacity is examined through organizational processes such as the use of prior knowledge, cross-functional interpretation, and feedback. It cannot be inferred solely from favorable outcomes.

3 BRIEF LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONNECTIONS AMONG EXISTING EXPLANATIONS

3.1 From Task Efficiency to Internationalization Outcomes

Evidence on AI and task efficiency provides a basis for business applications, but its implications depend on the level at which outcomes are measured. Brynjolfsson et al. found that gains from GenAI-supported customer service varied with employee experience and skills [6]. This finding indicates the relevance of the organizational setting; it does not establish that firms automatically choose appropriate foreign markets. Feedback on market entry is usually slower, and assessing decision quality also raises counterfactual questions about markets not entered. Task efficiency therefore cannot be equated with strategic decision quality. For SMEs, downstream effects may depend on whether time saved in organizing information is allocated to further verification or to expanding the volume of unverified material.

The role of technology in the knowledge and organizational context of international business has already received attention. Using data from Chinese firms, Liu et al. examined the relationship between general AI orientation and the speed of internationalization [1]. Interviews with Italian manufacturing SMEs reported by Aiudi et al. highlighted resource and knowledge constraints in international strategic decision-making [2]. The former study emphasizes firm-level expansion outcomes, whereas the latter focuses on the decision process. Neither work constitutes a causal test of whether GenAI makes a specific market entry recommendation correct. The DEEPEIA market recommendation approach further illustrates technology's potential contribution to option generation [3].

3.2 From Technology Use to Knowledge Assimilation and Application

The literature on technology and knowledge extends beyond explanations based solely on greater information availability. Cohen and Levinthal emphasize a firm's ability to recognize, assimilate, and apply external knowledge, together with the importance of its existing knowledge base [7]. Zahra and George distinguish potential absorptive capacity, involving knowledge acquisition and knowledge assimilation, from realized absorptive capacity, involving knowledge transformation and knowledge exploitation [8]. These concepts help explain the organizational processes between exposure to information and knowledge application. GenAI lowers the cost of generating candidate content that may contain facts, inferences, and unverified information, making assessments of sources and applicability especially relevant to value recognition and assimilation. The present paper applies these capability processes to generated content. It does not introduce reliability assessment as a new dimension absent from absorptive capacity theory.

Studies of human–AI collaboration also indicate that human involvement alone does not ensure better outcomes. Raisch and Krakowski discuss the relationship between automation and augmentation [9]. In their review of evidence from collaborative tasks, Vaccaro et al. found that human–AI combinations did not necessarily outperform the better of humans or AI working alone [10]. Asgharinajib et al. identified differing understandings of GenAI among experts in business-to-business professional service exports [11]. These studies support attention to how organizations interpret

and organize technology use. Expert opinions and human approval nevertheless differ from independently verified entry decision quality. The conditional propositions developed here focus on information expansion, knowledge types, and the use of feedback within a specific entry decision. Choosing this unit of analysis refines an existing research problem without establishing a wholly new field.

3.3 From Entry Action to Experience Accumulation

Internationalization process research connects learning with relationship commitment. Johanson and Vahlne emphasize firms' positions in relevant business networks and the importance of learning through interaction with transaction partners [12]. Describing a network does not replace this interaction. In their study of digitalization in Portuguese firms, Gomes et al. found that changes in export activity did not necessarily correspond to changes in export learning [13]. The data were collected before the widespread adoption of GenAI, which limits their use as direct evidence about GenAI-assisted decisions. These studies nonetheless highlight the need to connect information processing, knowledge assimilation, and market interaction in an organizational explanation.

4 THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

4.1 Explaining Knowledge Transformation Through Absorptive Capacity

Absorptive capacity provides the main theoretical perspective for explaining how externally generated information informs a firm's decision. Prior knowledge helps managers interpret market terminology, understand how statistics were calculated, and assess the relevance of external information to organizational capabilities. Relevant knowledge extends beyond any individual's experience. Sales staff understand customer needs, production staff know delivery constraints, and finance staff understand payment terms. Bringing these forms of knowledge together can reveal constraints omitted from a market analysis. The paper therefore examines value recognition and contextual integration as mechanisms, rather than treating managerial seniority as a sufficient indicator of absorptive capacity.

The distinction between potential absorptive capacity and realized absorptive capacity helps explain why abundant material may fail to become actionable knowledge. These concepts do not imply a fixed sequence. Todorova and Durisin's revision of absorptive capacity emphasizes value recognition, power relationships, and feedback [14]. In the present framework, verification may prompt a revision of the target customer group, while market actions may change how existing material is understood. Who can raise objections, which information can influence a decision, and whether errors can be corrected therefore matter. The proposed relationships are recursive: feedback can lead organizations to revisit earlier interpretations and choices.

4.2 Defining Knowledge Boundaries Through the Internationalization Process

The Uppsala internationalization process model provides a contextual explanation of why certain kinds of market entry knowledge require interaction. Public statistics and industry rules can be organized in general terms, but partners' fulfillment of commitments, the allocation of after-sales responsibilities, and customers' acceptance of a new supplier depend on specific relationships. GenAI can help formulate questions and compare responses, but these analytical activities do not themselves confer a network position on a firm. The distinction draws on Johanson and Vahlne's account of learning and business networks [12]. It does not imply that every firm must internationalize gradually. Rather, resource commitments should be proportionate to the evidence available about critical uncertainties.

The proposed mechanism connects these processes. GenAI expands candidate information; organizations use value recognition, verification, and contextual integration to develop entry judgments. Proportionate resource commitments create opportunities to obtain feedback from action and revise decision rules for future use. Completion of one process does not guarantee the next, and feedback may return to the initial formulation of the problem. The dynamic capabilities perspective helps explain how learning may accumulate without serving as an additional general explanation for every part of the framework. Zollo and Winter distinguish experience accumulation, knowledge articulation, and knowledge codification [15]. Documentation must therefore be accompanied by the interpretation of discrepancies and the revision of rules if it is to support capability development (Table 1).

Table 1 Mechanisms, Observable Processes and Boundaries in the Conceptual Framework

Mechanism	Observable organizational processes	Limits to inference
Expansion of candidate information	Changes in comparison criteria, volume of material, and sources	More information does not necessarily mean more knowledge
Recognition, verification, and integration	Screening critical assumptions, checking independent sources, and cross-functional discussion	The presence of review procedures does not mean that all errors are eliminated
Commitment and market interaction	Ex ante conditions, partner feedback, and revisions to resource commitments	A single transaction outcome does not establish long-term market fit
Feedback entering organizational memory	Retaining original assumptions, interpreting discrepancies, and revising decision rules	Recording text does not by itself establish a capacity for learning

Note. The table presents the conceptual framework developed in this paper. Feedback connects the processes; the entries are not empirical measurements.

5 MECHANISMS AND RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS

5.1 Matching Information Expansion with Organizational Processing

By reducing the burden of initial searches and information organization, GenAI may bring previously overlooked markets or constraints into consideration. Additional candidate information also places demands on limited review time. Factual errors and unsupported inferences in AI outputs cannot be detected from linguistic form alone [16]. When information expands faster than organizations can verify it, firms may consider more markets while devoting less attention to each decisive assumption. The usefulness of the technology therefore depends on the fit between information expansion and organizational verification capacity, as well as on the use of the model itself.

This fit may be supported by ex ante cross-functional screening of assumptions. Organizations identify conditions whose failure would alter the market entry choice and organize verification around them. The purpose is to direct attention toward constraints that would change resource commitments, rather than merely obtain retrospective approval from each department. Prior experience may help identify constraints, but it may also reinforce existing preferences. The process should therefore allow employees in different roles to present disconfirming evidence. The paper does not equate adequate verification with a correct decision: screening is an observable antecedent, whereas decision-relevant factual errors in the final proposal are a separate outcome.

Proposition 1: Under comparable model conditions and decision difficulty, when the expansion of candidate information exceeds available verification capacity, firms that conduct ex ante cross-functional screening of assumptions are expected to experience a smaller increase in critical misjudgments in their final proposals than firms without such screening. This difference is expected to be more pronounced in decisions constrained by limited verification resources. The proposition concerns how screening may mitigate the adverse effects of information expansion; greater AI use does not necessarily reduce the total number of errors. Information expansion should be measured through the volume of market and proposal materials entering review, not the number of prompts. Critical misjudgments should be identified through independent checks against decisive facts and constraints specified ex ante. Generated word counts should not be used as a denominator. If firms without screening benefit as consistently as firms with screening, or if screening excludes important disconfirming evidence, alternative explanations for the observed outcomes should be considered.

5.2 Experiential and Relational Knowledge Limit Substitution by Desk Analysis

An entry proposal that has undergone preliminary verification may still depend on transaction relationships that are not yet in place. Consider a hypothetical manufacturer that identifies market demand using public information but requires local after-sales support for its products. A prospective service partner's willingness to accept this responsibility becomes a critical condition. Further macro-level market analysis may do less to reduce this uncertainty than direct engagement with potential partners. This illustration explains the argument; it does not report empirical firm-level evidence. GenAI can help organize interview questions and compare responses, but a partner profile does not guarantee a commitment to cooperate.

Proposition 2: When critical uncertainty in an entry decision depends mainly on partners' willingness to cooperate or local practices for fulfilling obligations, under comparable AI conditions and levels of analytical effort, reallocating some effort from desk analysis to direct interaction with potential counterparties is more likely than further AI analysis to reduce misjudgments about critical transaction conditions identifiable ex ante. The expected difference is smaller when the critical questions depend mainly on public, codifiable information. This comparison concerns the fit between knowledge sources and tasks; it does not imply that all human contact outperforms AI. Misjudgments should be assessed against information that could reasonably have been obtained at the time of the decision. Adjustments resulting from subsequent environmental changes or new opportunities should not be classified as errors, whereas avoidable rework caused by misjudgments may be examined as a subsequent outcome. Counterparties may provide information selectively, so interaction outcomes still require evaluation against costs, capabilities, and other knowledge sources.

The design of resource commitments connects knowledge with action. Firms can specify in advance what feedback would justify continuing, adjusting, or stopping, and structure initial investments to test critical transaction assumptions. In some sectors, small trial orders may not adequately represent long-term projects. The framework therefore does not assume that minimal investment can substitute for every necessary commitment. Unverified conditions should remain explicit so that an absence of negative evidence is not treated as an absence of risk. Proposition 2 applies to entry decisions involving identifiable transaction conditions and at least some opportunity for direct market interaction.

5.3 From a Single Instance of Feedback to Reusable Organizational Judgment

Market outcomes alone do not explain how errors arise. Failure to secure an order may result from judgments about demand, pricing, or delivery arrangements, or from external shocks. Without versions of generated material, managers' reasons for revisions, and expectations recorded before action, it is difficult to reconstruct the assumptions underlying a decision. Retaining this information provides a baseline for comparison. Collective interpretation remains necessary to distinguish recurring judgment errors from contextual changes that may have been difficult to foresee. This process connects knowledge articulation with knowledge codification, while recognizing that premature codification may entrench rules that do not suit new circumstances [15].

Proposition 3: With comparable initial relevant experience and numbers of market actions, organizations that connect ex ante assumptions, actual feedback, and the conditions under which that feedback applies are expected to experience fewer recurring critical misjudgments of the same types in subsequent comparable market entry decisions than organizations retaining only final AI outputs. The expected difference weakens when changing market conditions make historical cases no longer comparable, and continued reliance on existing rules may introduce new biases. Updating involves revising the scope within which market assumptions apply and the rules used to make judgments across markets, including when prior experience can be reused and when earlier explanations should be rejected. Future research should examine whether these rules influence subsequent decisions, rather than assess learning from the number of records retained. If records merely justify predetermined decisions or updated rules do not inform subsequent choices, the proposed feedback mechanism has not operated.

6 DISCUSSION

In response to RQ1, information transformation depends on identifying critical decision assumptions, verifying sources and measurement definitions, and connecting external descriptions with the firm's resource constraints. Absorptive capacity helps explain why firms with access to the same tool may reach different judgments. These processes can improve proposals, but expanding the volume of material may also strain limited review capacity. Proposition 1 expresses this mechanism as a conditional prediction, without assuming a monotonically positive relationship between AI use and decision quality.

For RQ2, the principal limits to transformation concern the nature of the knowledge and the task. GenAI-assisted analysis has greater potential when critical questions can be checked against independent sources. When questions concern willingness to cooperate or practices for fulfilling obligations in relationships that have not yet formed, organizations need direct interaction to supplement their knowledge. Proposition 2 explains why experiential learning and network position remain relevant in internationalization process theory despite falling text-generation costs. GenAI can change how firms prepare for and interpret interactions, but it cannot guarantee that relationships will form. General market attractiveness also cannot substitute for the conditions that allow a particular firm to operate in that market.

For RQ3, feedback can contribute to cumulative organizational learning only when it is connected to ex ante assumptions and the use of decision rules. Proposition 3 distinguishes the outcome of a single action from a reusable organizational capability. The contribution to the literature is an explanatory refinement. Alongside aggregate relationships between AI and internationalization speed, the paper examines conditions connecting information expansion, knowledge transformation, and feedback within specific decisions. It applies value recognition and contextual integration to generated content within an absorptive capacity perspective, and identifies a conditional risk for internationalization learning: more information may coexist with insufficient interpretation. The proposed relationships are theoretical expectations rather than established causal effects.

The mechanisms also need to be examined against alternative explanations. Better-resourced firms with more developed management practices may be more likely to adopt cross-functional review and retrospective learning procedures, so favorable outcomes may not be attributable to these procedures alone. Model quality, the availability of industry data, export experience, and the involvement of external advisers may affect both technology use and decision outcomes. Future research could trace successive entry decisions within the same firm, retain materials prepared before each decision, compare the reasons for accepting and rejecting recommendations, and test the propositions through independent factual verification. Such designs would address the research questions more directly than retrospective questions about whether managers found AI helpful.

The managerial implication is to allocate resources according to identified knowledge gaps. Firms should first identify the few constraints that determine an entry choice, then organize GenAI-assisted information processing, verification, and market interaction around them. Assessing total costs requires considering both time saved in drafting and additional review or rework. Decision records should retain assumptions, evidence dates, disagreements, and reasons for revisions, while reusable rules should be updated in response to feedback from action. When critical conditions are difficult to verify independently and require irreversible commitments, postponing further investment may be appropriate. Slower entry does not necessarily mean that the technology has failed to generate value.

7 CONCLUSION

Literature selection was constrained by public availability, language, and search coverage. Studies of general AI, GenAI, and digitalization also differ in technological scope and historical context. Limiting the inference drawn from each type of evidence reduces conflation but does not establish that similar mechanisms are absent from literature outside the review. This paper collected no new firm-level data, and the three propositions remain to be empirically tested. Market entry conditions also differ across industries. Digital services, manufacturing exports, and capital-intensive projects require different forms of experiential knowledge and levels of resource commitment. The framework should therefore not be treated as a universally applicable procedure.

GenAI changes how SMEs collect and organize market information, while its strategic value depends on how organizations recognize, use, and update that information. The explanation developed across the three research questions connects value recognition, verification, and contextual integration with entry judgments; matches market interaction to experiential and relational knowledge gaps; and links feedback to subsequent judgments through

comparison with explicit prior assumptions. These processes form a system of knowledge transformation connected by feedback. At any point, organizations may discover that their initial entry assumptions do not hold.

Evaluating AI-assisted internationalization therefore requires attention beyond the speed of report preparation and foreign expansion. It should consider whether the technology helps firms avoid critical misjudgments that affect entry choices and revise their decision rules for use in other contexts. The proposed conceptual framework provides an organizational process perspective for this evaluation.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

WRITING ASSISTANCE

Generative AI assisted with literature organization, argument checks, language revision, and translation from Chinese into English. The work drew on the scientific-writing, literature-review, and scientific-critical-thinking workflows in Scientific Agent Skills [17]. The library was used for writing assistance and does not serve as evidence for the management arguments in this paper.

REFERENCES

[1] Liu Y, Ying Z, Ying Y, et al. Artificial intelligence orientation and internationalization speed: A knowledge management perspective. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 2024, 205: 123517. DOI: 10.1016/j.techfore.2024.123517.

[2] Aiudi A, Francioni B, Kyrdoda Y, et al. The role of artificial intelligence in international strategic decision-making for SMEs. Journal of Strategy and Management, 2026, 19(2): 157-187. DOI: 10.1108/JSMA-06-2025-0207.

[3] Calheiros-Lobo N, Au-Yong-Oliveira M, Vasconcelos Ferreira J. DEEPEIA: Conceptualizing a Generative Deep Learning Foreign Market Recommender for SMEs. Information, 2025, 16(8): 636. DOI: 10.3390/info16080636.

[4] Jaakkola E. Designing conceptual articles: four approaches. AMS Review, 2020, 10(1-2): 18-26. DOI: 10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0.

[5] Snyder H. Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. Journal of Business Research, 2019, 104: 333-339. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039.

[6] Brynjolfsson E, Li D, Raymond L. Generative AI at Work. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 2025, 140(2): 889-942. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjae044.

[7] Cohen W M, Levinthal D A. Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1990, 35(1): 128-152. DOI: 10.2307/2393553.

[8] Zahra S A, George G. Absorptive Capacity: A Review, Reconceptualization, and Extension. The Academy of Management Review, 2002, 27(2): 185-203. DOI: 10.5465/amr.2002.6587995.

[9] Raisch S, Krakowski S. Artificial Intelligence and Management: The Automation-Augmentation Paradox. Academy of Management Review, 2021, 46(1): 192-210. DOI: 10.5465/amr.2018.0072.

[10] Vaccaro M, Almaatouq A, Malone T. When combinations of humans and AI are useful: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Nature Human Behaviour, 2024, 8(12): 2293-2303. DOI: 10.1038/s41562-024-02024-1.

[11] Asgharinajib M, Feiz D, Sorooshian S. Experts' Mindsets on Generative AI in Business-to-Business Professional Service Exports: A Q Methodology. Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research, 2026, 21(7): 210. DOI: 10.3390/jtaer21070210.

[12] Johanson J, Vahlne J-E. The Uppsala internationalization process model revisited: From liability of foreignness to liability of outsidership. Journal of International Business Studies, 2009, 40(9): 1411-1431. DOI: 10.1057/jibs.2009.24.

[13] Gomes E, Lehman D W, Vendrell-Herrero F. The dual effects of digitalization on SMEs: export gains and learning losses. Journal of International Business Studies, 2026, 57(8): 1261-1282. DOI: 10.1057/s41267-026-00879-2.

[14] Todorova G, Durisin B. Absorptive capacity: Valuing a reconceptualization. Academy of Management Review, 2007, 32(3): 774-786. DOI: 10.5465/amr.2007.25275513.

[15] Zollo M, Winter S G. Deliberate Learning and the Evolution of Dynamic Capabilities. Organization Science, 2002, 13(3): 339-351. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.13.3.339.2780.

[16] Ji Z, Lee N, Frieske R, et al. Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation. ACM Computing Surveys, 2023, 55(12): 248. DOI: 10.1145/3571730.

[17] Kassis T, Agarwal V, He Y, et al. Scientific Agent Skills: A Library of Procedural Knowledge for Research Agents. arXiv, 2026. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2609.00065.