Philosophy of Science and Nanotechnology: Epistemic Shifts, Responsible Innovation, and Sustainable Applications

Andrés Soto-Bubert[1] · Shanavas Shajahan[2] · Roberto Acevedo Llanos[1]

[1] Facultad de Ingeniería y Tecnología, Universidad San Sebastián, Bellavista 7, 8420524, Santiago, Chile
[2] Nano and Hybrid Materials Laboratory, Department of Physics, Periyar University, 636011, Salem, India

Abstract

Nanotechnology has become a paradigmatic case of contemporary technoscience: it is simultaneously a field of fundamental inquiry (nanoscience) and a platform for engineering intervention (nanotechnology) at dimensions where quantum, surface, and confinement effects dominate. This paper rewrites and substantially expands an earlier manuscript by reframing nanotechnology through key themes in the philosophy of science—observation and instrumentation, reductionism and emergence, model-based inference, and the role of values in research trajectories. We argue that nanoscale research intensifies classic epistemic problems (how we know, measure, and stabilize phenomena) because evidence is mediated by complex instruments and because "size" is inseparable from function. We further connect these epistemic features to governance: responsible innovation requires risk evaluation, transparency, and anticipatory engagement to handle uncertainty in environmental, health, and safety (EHS) impacts. Finally, we map how these philosophical and policy considerations shape several high-impact application domains, including sustainable energy conversion and storage, water purification and desalination, and selected opportunities in mineral processing and critical-materials recovery. The result is a synthetic agenda for nanotechnology that treats knowledge production, technological design, and societal stewardship as a single, coupled system.

Keywords: nanotechnoscience; epistemology; technoscience; responsible innovation; nanosafety; sustainable energy; water treatment; mineral processing

1. Introduction

Nanotechnology is commonly described as the manipulation of matter at the nanoscale, typically in the range of approximately 1–100 nm, to exploit size-dependent properties (ISO, 2024). Beyond this pragmatic definition, nanotechnology functions as an organizing interface between scientific explanation and technological construction: it recruits the conceptual resources of physics, chemistry, biology, and materials science, while transforming those resources into devices, processes, and engineered systems. In this sense, nanotechnology is not merely another applied science; it is a mature example of "technoscience," where the production of knowledge and the production of artifacts are mutually constitutive (Nordmann, 2019).

This updated article retains the original manuscript's core idea—that nanoscale research invites philosophical reflection on how science progresses—while (i) strengthening the epistemic analysis, (ii) integrating contemporary discussions on responsible research and innovation (RRI) and nanosafety, and (iii) updating and expanding the applications section with recent literature. The overarching claim is that nanotechnology pushes philosophy of science from abstract accounts of theory testing toward a more practice-centered perspective: what counts as evidence, explanation, and control becomes inseparable from instrumentation, modeling, and design.

2. Nanotechnoscience as a Philosophical Object

Philosophy of science traditionally focuses on the logical relations between hypotheses, predictions, and observations. Nanotechnoscience complicates this picture because observation is deeply entangled with intervention: atomic force microscopy (AFM), scanning tunneling microscopy (STM), transmission electron microscopy (TEM), and a suite of spectroscopies do not merely reveal pre-existing nanoscale entities; they often stabilize, perturb, and even co-produce the phenomena under study. The epistemic dependence on instrumentation makes "measurement" a matter of calibration chains, artifact control, and model-based reconstruction, rather than direct access to an object in the classical sense (Wiesner & Bottero, 2007).

In addition, nanoscale systems frequently exhibit property–structure coupling: a small change in size, morphology, surface chemistry, or defect population can reorganize electronic states, catalytic activity, optical absorption, or mechanical strength. As a result, the explanatory target is rarely a single material 'substance' but a family of engineered parameterizations. This amplifies the importance of reproducibility practices (metrology standards, reference materials, and reporting norms) and motivates a philosophy of science that treats standards as epistemic infrastructures rather than administrative add-ons (ISO, 2011/2024).

2.1. Reductionism, Emergence, and Scale-Dependent Explanation

Much of nanoscience is inspired by reductionist intuitions: by approaching atomic or molecular scales, one hopes to explain macroscopic behavior from micro-level constituents. Yet many nanosystems are better understood as emergent or mesoscopic: collective effects, interfaces, and non-equilibrium organization can dominate, and function becomes a consequence of architecture rather than composition alone. For example, catalytic performance is often driven by active sites at edges or defects; mechanical strength may depend on grain boundaries; and optical responses in quantum dots arise from confinement rather than bulk band structure. These features invite a pluralist stance on explanation: both micro-reductionist and systems-level models are needed, and their adequacy depends on the question posed and the scale of intervention (Serrano, Rus, & Garcia-Martinez, 2009).

2.2. Models, Simulation, and Data-Centric Inference

Nanotechnology is increasingly model-driven. First-principles calculations, molecular dynamics, mesoscale simulation, and finite-element models are used to bridge length scales and predict performance. More recently, materials informatics and autonomous experimentation have introduced a data-centric epistemology: machine-learning models can propose candidate materials, guide synthesis, and optimize processing conditions, while robotic platforms generate standardized datasets at high throughput (Tom et al., 2024). This shift raises philosophical questions about explanation versus prediction, model interpretability, and the status of 'knowledge' produced by black-box predictors. A defensible research program, we argue, should combine predictive performance with mechanistic hypotheses and uncertainty quantification, treating AI as a tool for discovery under epistemic humility rather than as a replacement for scientific understanding (Hysmith et al., 2024).

3. Responsible Innovation, Regulation, and Nano-EHS

The same nanoscale features that enable novel function—high surface area, altered reactivity, and translocation across biological barriers—also motivate concern about unintended impacts. Early nanosafety discussions emphasized the need for exposure metrics, validated toxicity assays, and life-cycle analysis (Maynard et al., 2006). Contemporary governance frameworks extend this into a responsible innovation approach that integrates anticipation, reflexivity, inclusion, and responsiveness in research and deployment (Stilgoe, Owen, & Macnaghten, 2013).

International standards provide concrete operational guidance. ISO/TR 13121 proposes a structured process for nanomaterial risk evaluation, emphasizing hazard identification, exposure assessment, risk characterization, and risk communication (ISO, 2011). In parallel, OECD programs have worked to align testing strategies and data quality for manufactured nanomaterials to support regulatory decision-making and comparability across jurisdictions (OECD, 2024).

From a philosophical standpoint, nano-EHS is a case study in decision-making under uncertainty: early evidence may be incomplete, effects may be context-dependent, and benefits and harms may be distributed unevenly. The practical implication is that 'safety' should not be treated as an after-the-fact constraint but as a design parameter—safety-by-design—where surface functionalization, encapsulation, greener synthesis routes, and end-of-life strategies are optimized alongside performance (Dabare et al., 2025).

4. Sustainable Application Domains

The application landscape of nanotechnology is vast. Here we focus on domains where (i) nanoscale effects are central to performance, (ii) societal value is high, and (iii) ethical and safety considerations are prominent: sustainable energy, water systems, and resource extraction/circularity.

4.1. Energy Conversion and Catalysis

Nanomaterials can enhance solar energy conversion by tailoring light absorption, charge transport, and interfacial recombination. Quantum dots and perovskite-related nanostructures provide tunable bandgaps and defect-engineering strategies that can raise device efficiency and broaden spectral harvesting (Hu et al., 2021; Aftab et al., 2024). In catalysis, nanostructured surfaces increase the density of active sites and enable compositional gradients or core–shell architectures that improve activity and durability, supporting processes such as water splitting, CO_2 reduction, and selective oxidation (Shi et al., 2024; Sahu et al., 2024). These advances illustrate an important epistemic lesson: 'material identity' is often better described by surface state and architecture than by bulk composition.

4.2. Energy Storage: Batteries and Supercapacitors

Energy storage technologies make the scale–function relationship especially visible. Nanoscale design can shorten diffusion lengths, stabilize interfaces, and accommodate volume changes during cycling. For lithium-ion systems, bio-inspired routes and biomass-derived structures have been explored to build silicon anodes with improved stability, pointing toward materials circularity as a design constraint (Liu et al., 2015). Solid-state lithium metal batteries likewise benefit from nanostructured electrolytes and interlayers that mitigate dendrite growth and interfacial resistance (Xin et al., 2017).

Supercapacitors reveal a complementary advantage: because capacitance scales with accessible surface area, nanostructured carbons and hierarchical porosity can increase power density and cycle life. Activated carbon architectures derived from natural precursors and processed through nanoscale engineering have shown promising performance, while motivating attention to precursor sustainability and process emissions (Wei et al., 2016). More broadly, graphene and other two-dimensional nanomaterials have been intensively studied as electrodes and conductive additives, offering high surface area and tunable functionalization (Pumera, 2011).

4.3. Water Purification, Desalination, and Environmental Remediation

Water systems are a natural testbed for environmental nanotechnology because they combine urgent societal need with complex exposure pathways. Nanocellulose and related bio-based nanomaterials provide high-surface-area platforms for adsorption, membrane fabrication, and antifouling strategies, enabling water treatment approaches that can be both effective and potentially more sustainable than petrochemical-based polymers when life-cycle impacts are addressed (Das et al., 2022).

In desalination and advanced separations, thin-film nanocomposite (TFNC) membranes incorporate nanoparticles or nanosheets to modulate hydrophilicity, permeability, and fouling resistance. Reviews emphasize that performance gains must be weighed against nanoparticle leaching, aging, and end-of-life considerations (Saleem et al., 2020). Graphene oxide-based membranes have attracted renewed interest for their tunable channels and chemical stability, though scalability and selectivity–permeability trade-offs remain active challenges (Tiwary et al., 2024).

In remediation, engineered nanomaterials can support adsorption of heavy metals and degradation of organic contaminants via photocatalysis or reactive oxygen species pathways. The promise is substantial, but the same reactivity that enables treatment can create ecotoxicity risks if materials are released without control; therefore, containment, immobilization, and rigorous monitoring are central to responsible deployment (Karnwal et al., 2024; Wiesner & Bottero, 2007).

4.4. Mineral Processing, Critical Materials, and Circularity

Mining and mineral processing represent an important but sometimes under-discussed arena for nanotechnology. At the front end of the value chain, nanoparticles can act as novel flotation collectors or modifiers, adsorbing onto mineral surfaces to tune hydrophobicity and selectivity. Early mechanistic work showed that hydrophobic nanoparticles can coat larger mineral particles and alter flotation behavior in ways not achievable with conventional molecular collectors (Yang et al., 2011). Recent reviews indicate growing interest in nanoparticle and nanobubble strategies for improving fine-particle recovery and reducing reagent consumption, while also noting the need for nano-EHS assessment in tailings and process waters (Sigauke, 2025).

At the back end of the value chain, nanomaterials support cleaner separations of critical elements from dilute streams. Magnetic nanohydrometallurgy, for instance, uses functionalized superparamagnetic nano-adsorbents to capture rare-earth ions and enable rapid magnetic separation, potentially reducing solvent use and improving reusability (Molina-Calderón et al., 2022). This line of work connects nanotechnology to circular-economy objectives by targeting secondary resources (tailings, waste streams, end-of-life products) and by designing separations around selectivity and reuse.

5. Discussion: Toward an Integrated Research Agenda

The preceding sections support three integrative claims. First, nanotechnology makes explicit that modern science is inseparable from instrumentation and engineered contexts. Philosophically, this argues for practice-based accounts of evidence where calibration, standardization, and material fabrication are part of what ‘observation’ means. Second, nanoscale research undermines the idea that there is a single privileged explanatory level: reductionist accounts are indispensable, but emergent architectures and interfaces often govern function. Third, because nanotechnology is an enabling platform with broad diffusion, ethical and regulatory issues are not peripheral—they are constitutive of the field's legitimacy and long-term success.

To translate these claims into action, we recommend a research agenda organized around: (i) metrology and reporting standards that support reproducibility; (ii) coupled modeling–experiment workflows with explicit uncertainty quantification; (iii) safety-by-design and life-cycle assessment as default engineering constraints; and (iv) participatory and anticipatory governance to manage societal trade-offs in emerging applications (Guston, 2014; Stilgoe et al., 2013).

6. Conclusions

This rewritten and updated paper positions nanotechnology as a decisive case for contemporary philosophy of science. At the nanoscale, knowledge is mediated by instruments that both observe and intervene; explanation is distributed across levels of organization; and innovation is inseparable from ethical responsibility. These features do not weaken nanotechnology—rather, they clarify what is required for durable progress: epistemic rigor, transparent standards, and governance structures that treat uncertainty as a design constraint. Future breakthroughs—in energy, water, health, and critical materials—will depend not only on new nanomaterials but also on the co-development of metrology, safety, and responsible innovation practices that allow society to benefit from nanoscale capabilities while minimizing harm.

Appendix A. Reference Updates Relative to the Original Manuscript

The original manuscript cited a duplicated handbook reference (Bhushan, 2010; Bhushan, 2017). In this updated version we cite the most recent edition (Bhushan, 2017) and complete missing bibliographic elements (for example, DOI information where available). We also add recent literature on (i) nanotechnology as technoscience, (ii) responsible innovation and risk evaluation standards, (iii) AI-enabled materials discovery, and (iv) contemporary application reviews in water treatment and mineral processing.

References

Aftab, S., et al. (2024). Nanoscale enhancements in perovskite-based photovoltaics: A review. Chemical Engineering Journal, 475, 146386. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2023.146386

Bhushan, B. (Ed.). (2017). Springer Handbook of Nanotechnology (4th ed.). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-54357-3

Dabare, A. L., et al. (2025). Responsible innovation in nanotechnology: A viewpoint. Nanoscale Advances, 7, 7424–7439. https://doi.org/10.1039/D5NA00586H

Das, R., et al. (2022). Nanocellulose for sustainable water purification. Chemical Reviews, 122(8), 7815–7860. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.1c00683

Elcock, D. (2007). Potential impacts of nanotechnology on energy transmission applications and needs (ANL/EVS/TM/08-3). Argonne National Laboratory.

Guston, D. H. (2014). Understanding 'anticipatory governance'. Social Studies of Science, 44(2), 218–242. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306312713508669

Hu, L., et al. (2021). Flexible and efficient perovskite quantum dot solar cells via modified ligand management. Nature Communications, 12, 466. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-20749-1

Hysmith, H., et al. (2024). The future of self-driving laboratories: From human in the loop to human on the loop. Digital Discovery, 3, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1039/D4DD00040D

ISO. (2011). Nanotechnologies—Nanomaterial risk evaluation (ISO/TR 13121:2011). International Organization for Standardization.

ISO. (2024). Nanotechnologies—Vocabulary (ISO 80004 series). International Organization for Standardization.

Karnwal, A., et al. (2024). Nano-revolution in heavy metal removal: Engineered nanomaterials for adsorption. Frontiers in Environmental Science, 12, 1393694. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2024.1393694

Liu, J., Kopold, P., van Aken, P. A., Maier, J., & Yu, Y. (2015). Energy storage materials from nature through nanotechnology: A sustainable route from reed plants to a silicon anode for lithium-ion batteries. Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 54(33), 9632–9636. https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201502918

Maynard, A. D., et al. (2006). Safe handling of nanotechnology. Nature, 444(7117), 267–269. https://doi.org/10.1038/444267a

Mazzola, L. (2003). Commercializing nanotechnology. Nature Biotechnology, 21(10), 1137–1143. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt1003-1137

Molina-Calderón, L., Basualto-Flores, C., Paredes-García, V., & Venegas-Yazigi, D. (2022). Advances of magnetic nanohydrometallurgy using superparamagnetic nanomaterials as rare earth ions adsorbents: A grand opportunity for sustainable rare earth recovery. Separation and Purification Technology, 299, 121708. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2022.121708

Nordmann, A. (2019). Nano-technoscience for philosophers of science. Philosophy of Science, 86(5), 1066–1076. https://doi.org/10.1086/705521

OECD. (2024). Working Party on Manufactured Nanomaterials (WPMN): Activities and outputs (overview portal). Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Pumera, M. (2011). Graphene-based nanomaterials for energy storage. Energy & Environmental Science, 4, 668–674. https://doi.org/10.1039/C0EE00295J

Sahu, P. K., et al. (2024). Design and development of nanostructured photocatalysts for hydrogen production: A review. Sustainable Energy & Fuels, 8, 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1039/D4SE00056K

Saleem, H., et al. (2020). Nanoparticles in reverse osmosis membranes for desalination: A review. Desalination, 475, 114209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.desal.2019.114209

Serrano, E., Rus, G., & Garcia-Martinez, J. (2009). Nanotechnology for sustainable energy. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 13(9), 2373–2384. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2009.06.003

Shi, G., et al. (2024). Nanostructured Pt–NiFe oxide catalyst for hydrogen evolution under alkaline conditions. ACS Catalysis, 14, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1021/acscatal.4c01685

Sigauke, T. (2025). Advancements in nanotechnology for the enhanced flotation of fine mineral particles: A review. SN Applied Sciences, 7, 6835. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-025-06835-3

Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research Policy, 42(9), 1568–1580. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.05.008

Tiwary, S. K., et al. (2024). Graphene oxide-based membranes for water desalination and purification. npj Clean Water, 7, 62. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41699-024-00462-z

Tom, G., et al. (2024). Self-driving laboratories for chemistry and materials science. Chemical Reviews, 124, 1–74. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.4c00055

Wei, L., Tian, K., Zhang, X., Jin, Y., Shi, T., & Guo, X. (2016). 3D porous hierarchical microspheres of activated carbon from nature through nanotechnology for electrochemical double-layer capacitors. ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering, 4(12), 6463–6472. https://doi.org/10.1021/acssuschemeng.6b01227

Wiesner, M. R., & Bottero, J.-Y. (2007). Environmental Nanotechnology: Applications and Impacts of Nanomaterials. McGraw-Hill Professional.

Yang, S., Pelton, R., & Duan, C. (2011). Nanoparticle flotation collectors: Mechanisms behind a new technology. Langmuir, 27(21), 12908–12916. https://doi.org/10.1021/la2016534

Xin, S., You, Y., Wang, S., Gao, H.-C., Yin, Y.-X., & Guo, Y.-G. (2017). Solid-state lithium metal batteries promoted by nanotechnology: Progress and prospects. ACS Energy Letters, 2(6), 1385–1394. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsenergylett.7b00128