MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH INSTITUTE INDIA

Multidisciplinary Journal of Research in Engineering and Technology

ISSN: 2348-6953

Volume 13 Issue 2s (2026) | Pages: 261-265

AI-Driven Smart Cities: Examining Real-World Use, Governance Gaps, and the Road to Inclusive Urban Sustainability

Yash Talathi[1], Shravan Bagade[2], Swanand Joshi[3], Om Patil[4], Ashutosh Chandgude[5]

[1,2,3,4,5]Department of Artificial Intelligence & Data Science Dr. D. Y. Patil College of Engineering & Innovation Varale, Talegaon, India

Peer Review Information

***Type**: Article*
***Received**: 30 March 2026*
***Revised**: 17 April 2026*
***Accepted**: 29 May 2026*
***Published**: 26 June 2026*

Abstract

Managing urban centers today is a completely different challenge compared to just twenty years ago. With people flocking to cities at unprecedented rates, planners are struggling to keep basic public services afloat, which naturally drives them to look for tech-based lifelines. Artificial intelligence happens to be one of the loudest buzzwords in this arena. Why? Mostly because it can chew through massive piles of data, catch subtle trends that a human analyst might miss entirely, and help officials make snap decisions. In this paper, we stitch together insights from four distinct review articles to paint a realistic picture of where AI actually sits in the current smart city ecosystem. We explore a few main areas: traffic control, healthcare, energy grids, environmental monitoring, and digital government. But we don't stop at the benefits. We also dive deep into the roadblocks holding AI back—things like messy data laws, the digital divide, and the simple fact that many local governments lack the technical expertise to manage these tools properly. Our bottom line is straightforward: AI brings undeniable perks to the table, but those perks won't mean much to the average citizen unless we start treating city policy and governance with the same enthusiasm we give to the software.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Urban Governance; Smart Cities; Sustainable Growth; Machine Learning; IoT; Digital Divide; City AI

How to Cite This Article

Talathi, Y., Bagade, S., Joshi, S., Patil, O., & Chandgude, A. (2026). AI-driven smart cities: Examining real-world use, governance gaps, and the road to inclusive urban sustainability. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Research in Engineering and Technology,* 13(2s), 261–265.

Introduction

Cities are living things. They expand, shrink, break down, and reinvent themselves constantly. But the sheer velocity and scale of urban expansion we are witnessing today is off the charts. Based on United Nations estimates, a staggering

68 to 70 percent of the global population will call a city ”home” by 2050 [6]. We aren’t just talking about a minor shift in demographics. This means billions of additional people will be leaning on power grids, water systems, hospitals, and transit networks that were originally built for a fraction of that capacity. Something has got to give.

So, how do governments respond? They are leaning heavily into the concept of the ”smart city.” The underlying premise is pretty straightforward: cities already spit out mountains of data every single day—from traffic cameras and water meters to hospital beds and power consumption. If we can use smart software to read and act on that data, the city should run a lot smoother. AI enters the chat here because it can digest this information at lightning speed, spotting trends hidden deep inside massive spreadsheets that no human team could realistically sift through.

Let’s be clear, though—the phrase” smart city” gets thrown around so much that it almost loses its meaning. For the sake of our discussion, we define it as urban spaces that inten-tionally weave digital tools (like sensors, internet-connected devices, and especially AI) into their everyday management. This could look like an algorithm adjusting traffic lights on the fly to clear up a jam, or a machine learning model predicting a spike in water contamination before it actually reaches someone’s kitchen sink. The possibilities are huge.

The COVID-19 pandemic actually gave researchers a rare opportunity: a live, high-stakes stress test for these very systems. Looking at the window between 2020 and 2022, mu-nicipalities that had already poured money into AI diagnostic tools, connected health databases, and smart surveillance han-dled the chaos noticeably better than those caught flat-footed [1]. Take certain cities in South Korea, Singapore, and China, for example. They managed to deploy contact tracing and resource-matching software in a matter of weeks—projects that would normally take years of bureaucratic red tape. That serves as a pretty solid proof of concept.

But we can’t ignore the flip side. The pandemic also put a giant spotlight on the inequalities baked into these systems. Poorer cities, and even marginalized neighborhoods within wealthy cities, were left entirely out of the loop. It wasn’t because the AI was kept from them on purpose; the basic plumbing just wasn’t there. You can’t run AI without sensors, reliable internet, or city officials who know how to use the dashboards. In many ways, this stark digital divide is the most pressing hurdle the smart city movement faces right now.

Through the lens of four separate academic reviews, this paper aims to figure out where urban AI currently stands. We want to cut through the marketing hype and look at the hard evidence. What has actually worked? Where are the dead ends? We’ll walk through the existing literature, examine how these studies were put together, break down their core findings, and figure out what it all means for the future of our cities.

Literature Review

Starting with a Broad Overview

The first major piece of the puzzle comes from a 2022 study by Herath and Mittal, published in the *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights* [1]. What makes this paper stand out is that it doesn’t just treat the COVID-19 pandemic as a footnote. Instead, it uses the crisis as a magnifying glass to see how AI-enabled cities hold up when everything goes wrong. Because of this framing, their conclusions feel incredibly grounded and real, rather than just academic guesswork.

They break their analysis down into five chunks: urban mobility, health and safety, economic activity, environment, and governance. To keep things objective, they ground their work in the Smart City Index 2021. It’s no coincidence that the cities dominating the top of that list (like Oslo, Zurich, and Singapore) also happen to have the most deeply embedded AI in their public services. It doesn’t strictly prove cause and effect, but it’s a massive hint.

When talking about healthcare, the authors point out how convolutional neural networks (CNNs) stepped up to screen chest CT scans for COVID-19. Some of the more advanced models actually combined these scans with patient histories to hit diagnostic accuracies that rivaled human specialists. The paper also touches on smart hospital logistics and predictive platforms for viral spread. Basically, what this tells us is that AI’s true power in a health emergency isn’t about one shiny app; it’s about having a web of interconnected systems talking to each other.

Mapping Applications Across Six City Dimensions

Our second pillar is a 2024 systematic review by Zawadzki et al. [2]. This team took a much more rigid approach. They scraped Scopus for papers published between 2021 and 2024 and sorted everything using Boyd Cohen’s Smart City Wheel. If you aren’t familiar, this wheel splits city life into six slices (living, economy, people, governance, mobility, and environment). We like this

framework because it forces researchers to look at the human and social elements, not just the flashy hardware.

In the mobility sector, the paper highlights stuff that is actually becoming pretty standard: predictive maintenance for buses, self-driving vehicle coordination, and AI-timed traffic lights. They specifically call out reinforcement learning as a perfect match for traffic control because it learns what clears traffic fastest through trial and error. Cities like Tokyo and Amsterdam are already running these systems way past the experimental phase.

But when the review shifts to governance, the tone gets sharply critical. Sure, AI can make government paperwork a breeze. But the authors highlight a massive red flag: the ”black box” problem. When local governments buy proprietary algorithms from private tech firms to decide who gets public housing or where police patrols should go, transparency dies. If a machine makes a life-altering decision for a citizen and nobody outside the tech company can explain the math behind it, we have a major democratic crisis on our hands.

Getting Technical: AI Models in Specific City Subsystems

Next up is a 2022 IEEE conference paper by Vijayalakshmi and her team [3]. This piece is shorter and much more heavily focused on the technical plumbing compared to our other sources. It essentially serves as a map, pointing out exactly which AI algorithms are being plugged into specific city systems.

One detail that really caught our eye was their breakdown of water quality management. They talk about using machine learning to predict Trihalomethane (THM) contamination in local water supplies. Since THMs are toxic by-products of water chlorination, having a system that warns officials about a spike before the water reaches someone’s faucet is a huge win. It might not grab headlines like autonomous flying taxis, but it makes an immediate, tangible difference in people’s lives. They also dig into deep learning for stabilizing smart grids—an area where AI is already saving utility companies millions of dollars.

The Policy Perspective: OECD Analysis and a Systematic Sustainability Review

For our final perspective, we merged insights from two highly related pieces: a policy deep-dive by Kergroach et al. for the OECD [4], and a 2024 systematic review on sustainable smart cities by dos Santos and colleagues [5]. Together, these texts give us the policy-level reality check that the technical papers tend to gloss over.

The OECD document introduces the concept of “Urban AI,” arguing that the best AI for a city is one trained specifically on that city’s own quirky datasets. They also drop a jarring statistic: local governments in OECD nations handle about 38.3% of public spending, yet they only bring in around 29.7% of public tax revenues. That financial gap is a massive reality check. Meanwhile, the dos Santos paper goes all-in on methodology, analyzing 46 peer-reviewed articles to map out the real-world operational and environmental gains of smart city tech.

Methodology

Before we go further, we need to acknowledge that our four primary sources are totally different beasts in terms of how they were researched. We don’t see this as a flaw. Actually, pulling evidence from entirely different methodologies gives us a more well-rounded perspective. When wildly different studies point to the same conclusion, you know you’re onto something real.

Herath and Mittal lean on a narrative review style, anchoring their thoughts with real data from the pandemic. You get to see how tech performs under brutal urgency—things you can never fake in a lab. On the flip side, Zawadzki et al. are incredibly rigid, using strict filters on Scopus to look at a very specific timeframe. Organizing everything into the Smart City Wheel was a clever move because it stopped them from getting distracted by cool tech and forced them to look at the civic impacts too.

The IEEE paper by Vijayalakshmi is less of an analytical deep-dive and more of a technical catalog. Finally, the OECD piece isn’t academic research in the traditional sense; it’s a policy playbook built on case studies. The dos Santos review counters this by being the most academically hardcore of the bunch, running strict Boolean searches to boil the ocean down to 46 high-quality papers.

Despite these different approaches, every source agrees on the basic AI workflow in a city: sensors grab the data, servers clean it up, an algorithm trains on it, and finally, the city uses it to make a call. The problem dictates the tool.

Key Findings and Discussion

Healthcare: Where the Evidence is Strongest

If you want hard proof that urban AI works, look at hospitals. The evidence here is rock solid, largely because the pandemic forced everyone’s hand and gave researchers a mountain of real-time performance data to study.

When COVID-19 hit, cities with good digital backbones rolled out AI contact tracing, PPE supply chain optimizers, and deep learning

CT scanners in mere weeks. As mentioned earlier, some of the diagnostic tools were going toe-to-toe with actual human specialists. It proves these tools aren't just a gimmick to save time; they are legitimately accurate under pressure. Moving past the pandemic, we're seeing algorithms track chronic illnesses and manage telemedicine platforms, making a massive difference in daily urban life.

Transport: Mature Technology, Real Gains

The other area where AI has undeniably graduated from" cool concept" to" daily reality" is transportation. Every single study we looked at agrees that mobility tech is highly mature. AI-driven traffic management has slashed urban congestion by anywhere from 15 to 20 percent in active deployments [1] [2]. Traffic jams waste billions of dollars and pump endless smog into the air, so shaving off a fifth of that is a huge win.

We also have to give a special shoutout to digital twins. A digital twin is basically a highly detailed digital replica of a real town, fed by live GPS and IoT data. It lets city planners test out what happens if they add a bike lane or tweak a bus route in the virtual world before they spend millions pouring concrete in the real world.

Energy and the Environment

Let's be honest: energy is one of the fastest-moving AI sectors because it directly impacts the bottom line. Utilities are saving massive amounts of money by using AI to balance grid loads and predict energy demands. Because the financial payoff is so obvious, energy companies haven't hesitated to adopt the tech.

On the broader environmental front, the financial incentives are smaller, but the ecological value is huge. However, the OECD report brings up a highly ironic point: AI requires a ridiculous amount of electricity to run. Training massive neural networks uses a lot of power. If a city is installing AI to become" greener," they really need to make sure the algorithm isn't burning more energy than it actually saves.

Governance: Promise and Genuine Risk

When we look at city governance, things get thorny. Yes, AI has done wonders for clearing out bureaucratic backlogs. Chatbots are answering citizen questions at 3 AM, and predic-tive tools are helping mayors figure out where to spend their budgets more effectively.

But the risks are deeply concerning. What happens when a black-box algorithm decides who gets welfare? If the city bought that software from a private vendor who refuses to explain how the math works, accountability is totally dead. The MDPI review [2] hits hard on this point. We've already seen real-world examples where these algorithms end up being racially or economically biased.

Challenges and Critical Analysis

Privacy: A Tension That Doesn't Go Away

You can't run a smart city without tracking people. The algorithms need to know what you buy, how you commute, and sometimes even your health status. This operational necessity crashes head-first into basic privacy rights, and to be frank, the literature points this out but doesn't offer a magic fix. Tracking shoppers through transit hubs creates a corporate goldmine of behavioral data that nobody really consented to giving up.

The Digital Divide: Who Actually Benefits

This is the barrier that worries us the most. All four studies highlight that smart city perks are wildly uneven. Wealthy cities with modern infrastructure can plug-and-play AI systems effortlessly. But cities drowning under rapid urbanization in parts of Latin America, South Asia, and Sub-Saharan Africa are left completely in the dark.

You see the exact same thing happening inside wealthy cities too. Lower-income neighborhoods with patchy internet get bypassed by these digital upgrades. As Kergroach et al. [4] pointed out, the massive funding gap facing local governments means this isn't a problem tech can solve on its own. It's a money problem.

Institutional Capacity: The Hidden Bottleneck

It might not grab the headlines, but a lack of in-house talent is arguably the biggest roadblock of all. Rolling out AI at a municipal level requires a team that actually understands data architecture, vendor contracts, and tech ethics. The harsh reality is that most city halls don't have those people. Because they lack the expertise, governments end up buying off-the-shelf software from tech giants. Without the internal know-how to test if the system actually works fairly, cities are flying blind.

Conclusion and Future Directions

The goal of this review was to figure out what AI is actually doing in our cities today—stripping away the utopian marketing and the dystopian doom-saying. What we found is a remarkably nuanced picture.

AI has absolutely moved the needle on urban operations. It's untangling traffic jams, spotting diseases with incredible accuracy, optimizing power grids, and keeping public services running smoothly. That 15 to 20 percent drop in traffic conges-tion might not sound like a revolution, but at a metropolitan scale, it saves an immense amount of money and cuts a massive amount of carbon emissions.

But let's not kid ourselves: these perks aren't guaranteed, and they certainly aren't democratic yet. They rely heavily on solid infrastructure, smart politicians, and a lot of funding. An algorithm that makes life a breeze for the rich while ignoring the poor isn't "sustainable" by any stretch of the imagination. And software that governs people without explaining its logic is a failure of democracy.

The biggest takeaway here is that a smart city isn't just a tech project; it's a governance project. The question shouldn't be "What can this software do?" It should be "What rules do we need in place to make sure it treats everyone fairly?" To answer that, we need to stop just asking software engineers. We need ethicists, public health experts, lawyers, and normal citizens at the planning table. Closing the gap between rapidly evolving tech and slow-moving governance is the most critical task on the urban agenda today.

Acknowledgment

We'd like to give a massive thank you to our guide, Mr. Ashutosh Chandgude, for his endless patience and direction while we put this paper together. We also owe a huge debt of gratitude to the original researchers whose heavy lifting made our synthesis possible—especially the authors of the open-access studies who keep knowledge free and accessible for students like us.

References

1. H. M. K. K. M. B. Herath and M. Mittal," Adoption of artificial intelligence in smart cities: A comprehensive review," *Int. J. Inf. Manag. Data Insights*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 100076, 2022.
2. P. Zawadzki et al.," Artificial intelligence in smart cities — applications, barriers, and future directions: a review," *Smart Cities*, vol. 7, no. 3, p. 57, 2024.
3. S. Vijayalakshmi et al.," Artificial intelligence in smart city applications: an overview," in *Proc. 6th Int. Conf. Intell. Comput. Control Syst. (ICICCS 2022)*, IEEE, 2022.
4. S. Kergroach et al., *Artificial Intelligence for Advancing Smart Cities*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025.
5. S. C. dos Santos et al.," Artificial intelligence in sustainable smart cities: a systematic study on applications, benefits, challenges, and solutions," *Sustainability*, vol. 16, no. 4, p. 1672, 2024.
6. United Nations, *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2018 Revision*. New York: UN DESA, 2019.