

What is Cognitive Computing? An Architecture and State of The Art

Samaa Elnagar^{1*}, Manoj A. Thomas², Kweku-Muata Osei-Bryson³

¹Howard University, ²University Of Sydney, ³Virginia Commonwealth University

Abstract

Cognitive Computing (COC) aims to build highly cognitive machines with low computational resources that respond in real-time. However, scholarly literature shows varying research areas and various interpretations of COC. This calls for a cohesive architecture that delineates the nature of COC. We argue that if Herbert Simon considered the design science is the science of artificial, cognitive systems are the products of cognitive science or “the newest science of the artificial”. Therefore, building a conceptual basis for COC is an essential step into prospective cognitive computing-based systems. This paper proposes an architecture of COC through analyzing the literature on COC using a myriad of statistical analysis methods. Then, we compare the statistical analysis results with previous qualitative analysis results to confirm our findings. The study also comprehensively surveys the recent research on COC to identify the state of the art and connect the advances in varied research disciplines in COC. The study found that there are three underlying computing paradigms, Von-Neuman, Neuromorphic Engineering and Quantum Computing, that comprehensively complement the structure of cognitive computation. The research discuss possible applications and open research directions under the COC umbrella.

Keywords: Cognitive Computing, Cognitive Systems, Neuromorphic Engineering, Artificial Intelligence, Applied logic, Quantum Computing, Quantum Cognition.

1 INTRODUCTION

Human cognition is considered the most exceptional phenomena in all living creatures. Cognitive Computing (COC) aims mimicking human cognition to solve complex problems and embed human intelligence to machines at scale [1]. Computing systems and technologies can be classified into the categories of imperative, autonomic, and cognitive computing [2]. Imperative computing is a passive and controlled behavior system [3]. Autonomic computing is goal-driven with limited reliance on instructive and procedural information [4]. Cognitive computing embodies natural intelligence behaviors of the mind such as inference and learning [5].

COC is not only cognitive software applications but also low power and fast behaving hardware. COC hardware extends traditionally computerized systems to brain-like machines [6]. Von Neumann systems have limitations is solving combinatorics computations and real-time AI. Other paradigms such as *Neuromorphic Engineering* and *Quantum Computing* have the potential to perform combinatorics and other probabilistic calculations much faster [7]. Brynjolfsson and McAfee [8] highlighted that organizations need cognitive systems that can handle complexity, make confidence-based predictions, learn actively and passively, act autonomously, and reflect a well-scoped purpose. Some organizations expect that COC would enhance decision making process and cut costs [9]. However, some researchers confound COC with AI but, AI is a subcomponent in the COC architecture [10]

Current AI Limitations and Objectives of COC

AI is not intended to mimic human cognition but to build the best possible algorithms to solve several problems. Current AI systems employ symbolic logic intelligence to perform a limited number of mental activities [11]. For example, cognitive visual recognition systems may mimic the human vision. Existing AI lacks robustness against changes in the input statistics and they are not robust to adversarial examples and domain adaptations [9]. In addition, current cognitive systems are confined by the architecture of the von Neumann platforms which separate memory from processing units and depends mainly on Boolean logic [12]. Russell and Cohn [13] summarized the challenges of current AI systems as the “Moravec’s

paradox, i.e., computers might exhibit adult level performance on intelligence, but it is difficult or impossible to give them the skills of a one-year-old when it comes to perception and mobility.” On the contrary, COC aims at maximizing the cognitive competences of machines while minimizing resources. COC introduces new hardware that offers more intelligence with less resources. COC aims to build scalable cognitive systems that employ human brain like processing mechanisms while maintaining reasonable consumption of resources.

1.1 Research problem

Research in COC is very diverse, different studies have linked articles that focus on AI, mathematics, and electronics to the body of knowledge of COC [14, 15]. This variety led to indistinct research agenda on the topic affecting many scientific fields such as Information Systems which find a disruption in the basic assumptions about how to employ COC [16]. To reach a comprehensive delineation of COC, attentive analysis of the existing literature is required. Most previous research used inductive approaches to reach a taxonomy of COC [17-19]. However, these inductive approaches followed mostly ad hoc qualitative methods that are intuitive in nature. Another issue with previous qualitative interpretations is that they lack systematically coupling the underlying elements to-from the interpretation. Thus, a theoretically grounded architecture of COC, that uses rigorous statistical techniques, is needed. This is not to say that the results of qualitative approaches are to be discounted. On the contrary, they should support the statistical findings to cement the explicit and implicit meanings within the data [20]. In other words, qualitative research results could be considered as a preliminary analysis or an initial premises that need to be further verified with quantitative analysis.

This paper aims to investigate the nomothetic nature of COC and proposes an architecture that explains its teleological structure (explaining the purpose COCS serve). This investigation uses different quantitative techniques to verify the nature of COC based on the categorization of published literature. The construction of a unified architecture will shed light on how diverse research areas under the COC umbrella may come together to address emergent areas of related research. We believe Cognitive Computing has two new pillar paradigms that complement the limitation in current cognitive systems which are *Neuromorphic Engineering and Quantum Computing* [21]. The study thus comprehensively explores the state of the art in COC development and recommends future research directions.

2 SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS OF COGNITIVE COMPUTING

The early foundation of COC was introduced in the early 1960s when Simon [22] published the book - “*Cognitive Science, the new science of the artificial*”. Cognitive Science aims to analyze human intelligence in information processing context and sets intelligence as its main objective. As Simon mentioned “Artificial Intelligence and Cognitive Psychology are two channels of communication that were largely confined to their separate disciplines. Only with the establishment of *Cognitive Science*, a channel was created that cut squarely across the disciplinary boundaries”.

On the same venue, Intelligence Science is an interdisciplinary science dedicated to joint research on basic theory and technology of intelligence. Intelligence science cares about applying abstract intelligence to machines [23]. Intelligence is intangible and is not a substance that can be processed but Intelligence are *symbols* and it can be represented in symbolic structures. Intelligence feeds on knowledge to survive [24]. Newell [25] pointed out that symbol-level systems and knowledge-level systems are the necessary general structures to obtain general intelligent behavior.

According to Pinker [26], to understand the human mind, it is necessary to understand the principles of many natural sciences such as *Cognitive Neuroscience, Cognitive Psychology, and Brain Science*. However, to apply intelligence to artificial systems, it is necessary to integrate *Computer Science* and

Information Science with natural sciences to create applied intelligence science such as *Cognitive Science* and *Intelligence Science* as shown in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1: The Scientific Basis of Cognitive Computing.

3 METHODOLOGY

Since there are several distinct research disciplines in cognitive computing, we searched beyond the current technologies listed as COC, to find out how these different research disciplines contribute towards COC. To reach saturated evidence about the architecture of COC, we employed a combination of inductive and deductive approaches using different statistical methods as discussed in the following sections. Then, the findings of this research are compared with the findings of the previous research. The analysis performed in the study is an extension of the preliminary thematic analysis conducted in [27]. However, the focus of this research is to conduct further statistical analysis to reinforce or undermine the findings of the previous qualitative analysis.

The systematic literature review (SLR) methodology used to analyze the COC literature could be summarized as in Fig. 2. Starting from the left, the *methodology* used could be summarized in following steps: defining the SLR scope and boundaries, searching for relevant literature, analyzing relevant corpus, and finally discussing the results of analysis. In each step, essential *processes* are performed. For example, in the “defining the scope” step, research goals and literature review methodology is defined. Each process requires using different tools. For example, NVivo 12 and EndNote were used in performing the qualitative analysis process. Moreover, each process produces different outputs. For example: the output of the EndNote is a reference library. Finally, different outputs are integrated to propose the architecture of COC on the right side.




Fig. 2: Research Methodology, Tools, and Outputs.

3.1 Prior Research

[27] performed a systematic literature review (SLR) analysis on COC using qualitative analysis methods and a *Phenomenological Reflexives* approach [28]. We reused the output references of their SLR. Then, we conducted the same four search rounds to search for newer references. In the first round we used the same keywords. However, some research claimed quantum computing as one of paradigms under COC. So, in the second round, we added “quantum cognition, quantum cognitive computing” to search keywords. We recalled the same forward and backward search and the same inclusion and exclusion criteria to filter articles, but we also included Quantum hardware along with Neuromorphic hardware in the search processes.

3.2 Search Process Findings

By accumulating and synthesizing evidence from published literature, The SLR process included 283 articles and books from 55 journals, and 53 conferences, details in the appendix ¹. The qualitative analysis was similarly performed using Nvivo 12 for thematic analysis. The thematic analysis was consistent with Elnagar findings and there are four distinct, yet integrated research lines of COC related to the basics of intelligence, hardware that mimics the brain (brain-like hardware), software algorithms, and cognitive systems.

4 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF COC LITERATURE

To categorize varied topics in COC research and converge them into cohesively related themes. We followed the scientific methodology developed by Nickerson, Varshney and Muntermann [29]) for developing literature taxonomy. Then, we investigated how this taxonomy correlate with qualitative analysis findings. According to the methodology, three important stages should be followed: defining the purpose of the taxonomy, identifying the meta-characteristics, and specifying the ending conditions to stop the taxonomy development.

Th purpose of the taxonomy is to use different statistical methods to automatically categorize topics in COC literature with minimal human intervention. We aim at finding the most concise number of topics that represent the architecture of COC. After building the taxonomy, we aim to find the relations *between* topics and *within* each topic, Then, the developed taxonomy are used to develop the architecture of COC.

4.1 Meta- Characteristics Specification

Meta-characteristics are the most comprehensive characteristics that will serve as the basis for the taxonomy [30]. Two main questions related to the taxonomy would be answered in this stage:

What are the optimal number of topics that best classify COC architecture?

What are the salient concepts within each topic?

The programming toolset used in developing the taxonomy includes Python 3.7, Natural Language Processing (NLP) libraries for corpus preprocessing, and Knowledge Graphs generators. The analysis is conducted using Google Collaboratory² and IBM Watson Studio³. NLP libraries used are Spacy, Sklearn, NLTK, Gensim, matplotlib, and Pandas. For corpus preprocessing, a local python code was built running on a Mac Pro machine with Corei7 processor, and 16 GB Ram (with no GPUs).

4.2 Ending conditions

The ending conditions determine when to terminate the analysis, so taxonomy dimensions are mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive. The objective here is to search for topics that are unique and well

¹ [Literature Review Appendix](#)

² <https://colab.research.google.com/notebooks/intro.ipynb>

³ <https://www.ibm.com/cloud/watson-studio>

separated (maximizing gaps between topics while maintaining substantive cohesion within topics). According to Nickerson, Varshney and Muntermann [29]) each cell in a taxonomy must be unique and is not repeated (i.e., there is no cell duplication). Moreover, the topics should be concise and explanatory which means to reach a meaningful architecture without being unwieldy or overwhelming.

4.3 Topic Modeling Analysis

The first statistical analysis performed is Topic modeling (TM) to identify the themes or topics in the COC literature [31]. TM techniques cluster similar words into topics and discovers each document's balance of topics [32]. Specifically, we used different TM techniques to select the most accurate topics representing the taxonomy. In our experiments, we used - Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) [33], Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI) [33], and Bigram LDA, [34], and the Hierarchical Dirichlet Process (HDP) [35]. However, the main question is what the optimal number of topics to be specified a priori? So, it is necessary to find the optimal number of topics.

4.4 Topic Modeling Evaluation

To compare the performance of different topic modeling techniques, we set an objective measure to evaluate and assess the strength and the quality of a topic. Traditionally, human judgment or “eyeballing” has been used by observing the Top N words. However, recently perplexity and topic coherence are used widely in TM evaluation.

Perplexity is an intrinsic evaluation metric. It measures the novelty of the analyzed data to the topic model. Perplexity is simply the exponentiated average per-word log-likelihood [36]. However, perplexity or predictive likelihood and human judgment are often anti-correlated [37]. So, optimizing perplexity might produce irrational topics. A lower perplexity corresponds to less confusion or equivalently implies a better generative model. Another salient measure is produced which is topic coherence.

Topic coherence measures the degree of semantic similarity between high scoring words in the topic [38]. Thus, a main goal of performing TM analysis is to select the model with the best topic coherence [39]. The mathematical formula for measuring topic coherence is:

$$Coherence = \sum_{i < j} score(w_i, w_j)$$

Where w_1, \dots, w_n are pairwise scores on the words used to describe the topic, usually the top n words by frequency $p(w|k)$, which can be viewed as the sum of all edges on the complete graph. Topic coherence has intrinsic and extrinsic measures. The mostly used measure is C_v which applies a sliding window and the cosine similarity to find normalized pointwise mutual information (NPMI) [40]:

4.5 Topic Modeling Experiments

The experiments were conducted on the Google Collaboratory cloud platform. The entire modeling process could be divided into four main phases: 1) corpus preprocessing, 2) corpus formatting, 3) topic modeling and 4) relationships extraction as shown in Fig. 3.

4.6 Corpus Preprocessing

We followed Brust, Breidbach, Antons and Salge [41]) to pre-process the text corpus for analysis. The textual data corpus is synthesized from the abstracts of the of the systematic literature review papers. First, a python code was developed to automatically select and save the manuscript abstracts to an excel file for ease of analysis. However, we converted the research files from pdf to MS word format to avoid errors in reading pdfs. Then, each file's abstract is stored in one excel cell. The abstract usually holds concise information about the research problem and the contributions of the study. Afterwards, case-normalization was conducted, and special characters were removed. In addition, citations, and publishers related information were also removed at this step. Examples of the words removed include “journal, international, springer, article, page, paper, publication, research, chapter, user, editor, university, arxiv, etc.”

4.6.1 First iteration

Topic modeling was performed through three iterations. In each iteration, LDA, Bi-LDA, and HDP were performed using Gensim. Separately, LSI, LDA, and Bi-LDA were also performed using the Sklearn. The purpose of using many different NLP libraries and topic modeling algorithms is to maximize the likelihood of identifying the best model in terms of explanatory power, coherence score, and perplexity.

In the first iteration, an arbitrary number of topics ($k=10$) was chosen to monitor the precision of analysis and to observe the performance of different models. Experiments were conducted using Genism and Sklearn on Google Collaboratory and IBM knowledge studios.

Results: After the first iteration of topic modeling, some irrelevant temporal and location terms need elimination such as “February, year, London,.etc”. In addition, terms such “article, research” found to be in the top 30 terms, but these terms are usually mentioned in the abstract and introduction and caused deviation in results.

The analysis of results also found that LDA and Bi-LDA using Sklearn gave more interpretable topics than LSI, and HDP. Results of the first round are shown in (Fig. A1.1, A1.2, A1.3) in the Appendix. Another observation was that the results of IBM topic models took longer time and turned out irrelevant because the topic models is shared and trained by many users’ domains. Therefore, IBM topic models were excluded from the next iteration of experiments.




Fig. 3: Topic Modeling Experiment Phases

4.6.2 Second iteration

In the second iteration, topic modeling was repeated using the same parameters to make sure no other extraneous concepts were identified by the topic models. In addition, *coherence* score and *perplexity* were calculated for each topic model to decide which topic model was most cohesive and interpretable. The higher is the *coherence*, the better is the model, but the lower is *perplexity*, the more human readable is the topic. We chose to give priority to the highest *coherence* score which could then be used to calculate the optimal number of topics.

Results: The best coherence score and lowest perplexity were the LDA topic model algorithms, followed by HDP, BI-LDA, LSI, and TVSD as shown in Fig. 4 and Table 1. Moreover, it was also determined that *Sklearn* python library provided better results than Gensim in terms of coherence score and human readability of topics. As we can see from table 1, LDA in general performed better than LSI and HDP.

4.6.3 Third iteration

To find what is the optimal number of topics, we build *Algorithm 1* that picks the model that of highest coherence value. According to the taxonomy ending condition, choosing the K , number of topics, with the first highest coherence score marks the beginning of a rapid growth of topic coherence and offers meaningful topics. So, we selected the first K that gives the highest coherence to ensure a concise and yet representative number of topics [39] as shown in Table 2.

The was changed from 2 to 15 to calculate the first highest coherence scores of all topic models. Results are shown in Table 2. The algorithm developed to calculate the optimal number of topics is in Algorithm 1.

Results: To find the first K that gives the highest coherence score, we plotted different models coherence scores and perplexity with different values of K as in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6. The optimal number of topics is four topics and the best coherence score given was 0.451 for Bi-LDA-Sklearn then Bi-LDA-Gensim.

4.6.4 Fourth Iteration

The criteria to guide our judgment about resulted topics that each topic should exclusively has number of salient terms - if the same terms are repeated in multiple topics, that means the chosen ' K ' or number of topics is high [42]. In the fourth iteration, we found that, when LDA and pyLDAvis are used in default parameters, every topic is represented using 30 concepts which resulted in overlapping concepts or terms between different topics. Therefore, we limit the number of concepts to distinct 10 per topic. We used the measures of term saliency and term relevancy to prioritize the top selected 10 concepts.

Saliency is the measure of how much the term tells you about the topic [43, 44]

$$saliency(w) = frequency(w) * [sum_t p(\frac{t}{w}) * log(p(\frac{t}{w}) / p(t))]$$

where $p(\frac{t}{w})$ is the conditional probability of word w from a vocabulary $V = \{1, \dots, v\}$ that was generated by latent topic $t \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, V denotes the number of terms in the vocabulary, and $p(t)$ denotes the marginal probability or the likelihood that any randomly-selected word w' as generated by topic t .

Relevance is the weighted average of the probability of a word given the topic normalized by the probability of the topic [45]. For the weight parameter λ , where λ determines the weight given to the probability of *term* w under topic t relative to its *lift*. The *lift* is defined as the ratio of a term's probability within a topic to its marginal probability across the corpus [46]. The setting of $\lambda = 1$ result in the ranking of terms in decreasing order of topic-specific probability, and the setting $\lambda = 0$ ranks terms solely by their *lift*. The relevance of a term w to certain topic t is:

$$Relevance(w | topic t) = \lambda * p(w | t) + (1 - \lambda) * p(\frac{w}{t}) / p(w)$$

We reordered the concepts in descending order of salience score and then we selected the highest 10 relevance, while adjusting $\lambda = 0.33$ as recommended by Sievert and Shirley [45]).

Results: the output of LDA based models such as LDA, HDP, and BI-LDA was visualized using the python inter-topic distance maps library *pyLDAvis* as show in Fig. 6.a and 6.b. However, the analysis revealed that the best model was the Sklearn LDA in its BI-LDA format at $K=4$. It is also the most interpretable and cohesive. In the next step, the BI-LDA model results were interpreted as shown in Fig. 6.c.

Table 1: Model evaluation using different topic models and number of topics

Topic Model	$K=10$	
	Coherence	Perplexity
LSI	.343	-13.789
LDA- Gensim	.413	-14.967
LDA- Sklearn	.425	-19.869
Bi-LDA- Sklearn	.398	-19.789
Bi-LDA- Gensim	.381	-15.789
HDP	.392	-15.489




Fig. 4: Coherence Scores of TM Models at K=10.




Fig. 5.a: Number of Topics Along with Coherence Score.




Fig. 5.b: Number of Topics along with Perplexity.

Table 2: Model evaluation using different LDA models and number of topics

Topic Model	K=2		K=4		K=15	
	Coherence	Perplexity	Coherence	Perplexity	Coherence	Perplexity
LDA- Sklearn	0.354	-8.760	0.312	-7.897	0.414	-8.685
LDA- Gensim	0.294	-7.600	0.292	-7.662	0.391	-7.725
Bi-LDA-Sklearn	0.317	-8.738	0.451	-8.589	0.423	-7.986
Bi-LDA-Gensim	0.334	-7.623	0.449	-7.7205	0.405	-7.833
HDP	0.438	-7.943	0.440	-7.679	0.439	-9.157
LSI	0.385	-7.203	0.373	-6.220	0.339	-7.512

Let

TA be the set of topic modeling algorithms,

TR be a set of available python libraries of these algorithms,

k be the initial test value for the number of topics,

K_{Explr} be set that list the number of topics that will be further explored,

$k_{(Best-Coher)}$ be the best of the explored values for the number of topics

Algorithm 1

Input TA, TR, m, K_{Explr}

Illustration

$TA = \{LDA, BI-LDA, HDP, LSI\}[47];$

$TR = \{LDA_{Sklearn}, LDA_{Gensim}, BI-LDA_{Sklearn}, BI-LDA_{Gensim}, HDP, LSI\}$ where $LDA_{Sklearn} \leftrightarrow LDA$ via Sklearn;

$k = 10$; and

$K_{Explr} = \{k: 2 \leq k \leq 15\}$

Output $k_{(Best-Coher)}$

Step	Description	
1	For each $tr_j \in TR$ Generate a topic model that involves k topics, and record its <i>coherence</i> score.	Results are reported in Table 1.
	Determine the tr_j that provided the best <i>coherence</i> scores. Let the corresponding topic modeling algorithms be referred to as $ta_{j(Max1-Coher)} \in TA$.	From Table 1: $LDA_{Sklearn}$ & LDA_{Gensim} provide the best coherence scores Since LDA is the associated algorithm then $ta_{j(Max1-Coher)} = LDA$.
	Select from $TR_{Focus} \subset TR$ as the subset of software implementations that are associated with topic modeling algorithm $ta_{j(Max1-Coher)}$.	Since $ta_{j(Max1-Coher)} = LDA$ then $TR_{Focus} = \{LDA_{Sklearn} \& LDA_{Gensim}\}$
2	For each $tr_j \in TR$ and for each $k \in K_{Explr}$. Generate a topic model that involves k topics, and record its <i>coherence</i> score.	Results are reported in Table 2 and Fig. 5.
	Determine the tr_j and k that provided the best of these <i>coherence</i> scores. Let associated best k be referred to as $k_{(Best-Coher)}$ and the associated topic model be referred to as $tm_{(Best-Coher)}$.	From Table 2 and Fig. 5: $LDA_{Sklearn}$ provides the best of the coherence scores $tm_{(Best-Coher)}$, and the associated $k_{(Best-Coher)} = 4$.

4.7 Model Interpretations

Interpreting the *pyLDAvis* Fig.s below, a coherent representative topic model will have fairly larger size - the larger the topic circle, the more prevalent is that topic [45]. In addition, non-overlapping topics refers to their distinctness. The greater the inter-topic distance, the more representative is the model. The four topics shown in Fig. 6.c are exclusively located in the four quarters and they are well separated. The size of each topic is fairly large. Concepts within topics are human friendly and representative of the terms found in the corpus. Analysis indicates that LDA generally performed better than other TM approaches (HDP, LSI). Generally, LDA performs well when the underlying topics are geometrically concentrated and well-separated or when documents are associated with small sub-sets of topics [36].




Fig. 6.a. Visualized LDA model using pyLDAvis libraries at K=4 using Gensim

Fig. 6.b. Visualized LDA model using pyLDAvis libraries K=4 using Sklearn




Fig. 6.c. Visualized BI-LDA model using Sklearn and pyLDAvis libraries at $\lambda = 0.33$ and $K=4$.

4.8 Comparing Statistical Analysis with Qualitative Analysis

The main four topics resulted from the analysis are shown in Table 3. In each topic, the most expressive 10 concepts according to their saliency and relevancy are listed. However, to further check the rationality of the TM findings, previous qualitative research findings are also presented to compare and contrast the findings.

Table 3. Comparison of Top 10 Concepts based on Statistical Findings and Qualitative Findings

Topic	Statistical Analysis Findings	Qualitative Analysis Findings
Topic 0	Intelligence, cognitive informatics, logical, symbol, psychology, mind, model, theory, mathematical, reason.	Intelligence, cognitive informatics, theory, cognitive science, mathematics, logic, reasoning, psychology, symbolic, inference.
Topic 1	neuron, spike, neuromorphic, power, memory, synopsis, analog, circuit, spin, von-Neuman.	neuromorphic, spikes, synapses, Memory, memristors, parallel, core.
Topic 2	language, process, AI, neural network, learn, machine learn, algorithm, inference, Watson, question answer, fuzzy.	AI, neural network, learn, machine learn, algorithm, spike, deep learn.
Topic 3	agent, service, Watson, organizations, quality, task, communicate, strategy, behavior, collaboration, business.	cognitive systems, organizations, business, agents, analytics, inference, adaptation, evolution, quality, communication.

If qualitative analysis themes are consistent with statistical topic modeling results, this will reinforce the proposed COC architecture. Each topic represents a distinct research area. To measure the similarity between concepts generated from the topic modeling experiments and the themes coded from the thematic analysis, we used the popular *Jaccard similarity* measure to calculate the similarity between the statistical analysis findings and qualitative analysis findings. *Jaccard similarity* calculates the ratio between the intersection and union of the two sets of items.

The Jaccard similarity measures the similarity between finite sample sets and is defined as the cardinality of the intersection of sets divided by the cardinality of the union of the sample sets. For two sets A and B, Jaccard similarity is the ratio of cardinality of $A \cap B$ and $A \cup B$ as mentioned below [48].

$$\text{Jaccard similarity } J(A, B) = |(A \cap B) / (A \cup B)|$$

By applying the Jaccard similarity $J_k(A, B)$ on each topic $k \{1 \dots n\}$ repeatedly for $n = 4$ number for topics, the total J is the average Jaccard similarity of the n number of topics.

Before applying Jaccard similarity, each concept was represented by its lemma or its root form using NLP Lemmatization to ensures efficient similarity measure . For example, ran and running was represented as “run”. Jaccard similarity found an average of 88% similarity between the statistical and qualitative analysis. In other words, Jaccard similarity indicated 88% similarity between the concepts developed by topic modeling and those developed from the themes of qualitative analysis.

4.8.1 Relationships between Concepts

The TM process identified four foundational topics of the COC architecture, where each topic is presented by the most salient 10 concepts. If there are four diverse topics that represent COC that are verified by both statistical and qualitative analysis, there should be a relation or dependency between these topics. One of the approaches that gained popularity in find relationships between concepts is Knowledge Graphs (KG). A knowledge graph is a structured representation of facts, consisting of entities, relationships and semantic descriptions [49].

KG encodes structured information of entities and their relations into a graphical form or a directed graph $G = (C, R)$, where C is the set of vertices and R is the set of edges that symbolizes a relationship between two concepts in a graph [50]. KGs visualize the nodes and the links between nodes to represent the information network and semantic relationships between concepts [51].

To build a KG, the corpus is first split to sentences. Then, for each salient concept, the sentences that contain that concept are extracted. Afterwards, a cross topic relationship extraction is performed, so we search for the relationship between a concept a in *topic1* with the rest of concepts in *topic2 to topic4*. For example, to extract the relationship between concept a in *topic 1* and concept b in *topic 2*, each sentence that contains concept a is checked if it includes concept b . If found, we extract the verb in the sentence as the relationship between the concepts a and b . The algorithm describing the KG generation is represented in Algorithm 2.

Let

$T_{c_j,k} = \{tc_{1,1}, \dots, tc_{4,10}\}$ be the list of the top 10 concepts in each of the $k=4$ topics

C be the corpus in the form of sentences.

G be the Edge list.

G_v be a knowledge graph.

Relation be the verb between two terms in a sentence.

Algorithm 2

Input: $T_{c_j,k}, C$

Output: Edge list G , knowledge graph(KG) G_v .

For each concept tc in T_c

Sentences = *Getsentences(tc)*

 For each *Sentence* in *Sentences*

 For each concept tj in T_c

 if tc is not tj

 if *Sentence* contains tj

relation=*Getrelation(sentence, tc , tj)*

G.Add(tc, relation, tj)

Plot $G_v = G$

Return G_v, G

Illustration

$T_{c_j,k} = \{tc_{1,1}, \dots, tc_{4,10}\};$

$G = (node, relation, edge)$

retrieve the sentences containing the node concept tc

iterate through each *Sentence*

iterate through each concept (tj) other than tc from the concepts list T_c

perform cross relation to find sentences contain tj and T_c

extract the relation (verb) between tc and tj

add a new triple to the KG using tc as node and tj as

edge

plot the KG




Fig. 7: Knowledge Graphs Representing Relationships between Concepts Based on Their Weight (Circular Mode).

Performing cross topic relationships resulted in more than eight thousand relationships. This was unreadable when visualized in a graph. Notably, most nodes and edges pairs (pair of concepts) are repeated. Therefore, we reduced the edge list by creating a *weight* attribute which represents how often a pair of concepts appeared in the edge list. The weight is visualized as the thickness of the line between a node and an edge - the thicker the relation line, the stronger is the relation between two concepts. The reduction algorithm resulted in 613 pairs of relationships along with their *weight*. The reduction process is represented in Algorithm 3 and the resulting knowledge graph is visualized in Fig. 7. The figure was plotted using *networkx*, a python library for plotting knowledge graphs in the form of nodes and edges [52]. As shown in the Figure., there are a total of 40 concepts (four topics with 10 concepts each). Moreover, the degree of color shading of the node represents how often it has relations in the knowledge graph - the darker the node, the more relations it has.

Let

- G be the tuples or edge list.
- G_w be the weighted Edge list.
- G_{vw} be a new weighted knowledge graph.
- Relation* be the verb between two terms in a sentence.

Algorithm 3

Input: Edge list G .

Output: weighted Edge list G_w ,
knowledge graph G_{vw} .

$L_{seen} = [node, edge]$

$L_w = [tuple, weight]$

For each tuple t in G

Illustration

$G = (node, relation, edge)$

$G_w = (node, weight, edge)$

create a list L_{seen} for each node and edge found in the edge list G

if t is not L_{seen}	create a list Lw that store each pair of tuples, along with the tuple frequency or weight Lw
$L_{seen}.add(t)$	
else	iterate through each tuple
Index= $Lw.find(t)$	if a pair of concepts is not repeated, add to the L_{seen} list
$Oldweight = Lw[Index][weight]$	else, search for a pair of concepts and their index in Lw
$NewWeight = Oldweight + 1$	if a pair of concepts is repeated, add +1 to their weight and
$update(Lw[Index], NewWeight)$	update the pair record in Lw
Foreach tuple L in Lw	Create a new edge list Gw from the list Lw that have tuples in
$Gw.add(L[node], L[edge], L[weight])$	the form of $(node, weight, edge)$
Plot $Gw = Gvw$	Plot the new edge list Gw
Return Gw, Gvw	

4.8.2 Interpreting Concept Relationships

Finding the embodied relationships between different concepts help exploring the connection between topics that form the COC architecture. For example, the concept “mathematics” is a salient concept in Topic 0 and is also strongly related with the concepts of “mind” and “analog” found in Topic 1 and “neural networks and AI” found in Topic 2. Fig. 8 below represents the relationships using the *kamada_kawai_layout*, a visualization format that is considered as a system of springs. Every pair of nodes, which is connected by edge, is connected by spring, where the shortest path is representative of strongest relations [53]. This visualization process is repeated for each salient concept to find the strong concepts related to it.




Fig. 8: Knowledge Graph of “Mathematics” Concept and the Relationship with other Concepts.

4.8.3 Foundational Topics of COC architecture

By summarizing the concepts in Topic 0, we can observe that they characterize human cognitive functions and mental models in mathematical symbolic format. Topic 0 captures the core scientific knowledge archived in mathematical forms [54]. In most cases, the cognitive functions are derived from brain sciences such as neuroscience to form mathematical versions of brain models [55]. The mental models adopt a spatiotemporal computation approach [56], and the quantum probabilities to handle uncertainty beyond the limitations of the binary and bounded probabilities [57].

Usually, special hardware is needed to execute such complex mathematical models. Topic 1 addresses the neural hardware required to perform cognitive activities that simulate brain-like functions. For example, advances in neuromorphic chips now enable the recognition of events and patterns, not just the processing of data such as encoded sounds and videos. Neuromorphic chips [58] co-locate memory and computation, and use spikes as the method of communication [59]. Moreover, Concepts such as qubits and

entanglement are strongly related to quantum computing hardware. Quantum qubits are different than spikes and bits and hold infinite [60] number of values in what is called superposition.

In the long term, there is a prospect of using neuromorphic technology to integrate energy-efficient intelligent cognitive functions into a wide range of software algorithms. Prospects also point to the brain-like hardware that may enable quantum memory, and processing architecture to handle uncertainty and conflict resolution [61].

Topic 2 encompasses concepts related software, applied algorithms, machine learning, and neural networks. Topic 2 is strongly related to Topic 1 represented in the concepts of “machine learn”, “learn”, “process” and “algorithm”. This is not surprising as software algorithms are strongly dependent on the underlying hardware. New salient terms were spike and Quantum neural networks [62]. spike neural networks run on Neuromorphic hardware and can be trained at tremendous speed [63].

Topic 3 is positioned towards systems, agents, services that are capable of providing decision-support and reach optimal solutions rapidly [64]. Concepts such as D-wave, IBM were salient as such systems are built using the new forms of mathematical models representing human cognitive functions, brain-like hardware and cognitive algorithms. These systems overcome the limitations of current computational systems by introducing new logic and hardware.

5 COGNITIVE COMPUTING ARCHITECTURE

Based on the analysis findings, we can conclude that the structural architecture of Cognitive Computing could be divided into four dependent sections: *Representation of Intelligence*, *Brain-like hardware*, *Cognitive Algorithms and Software*, and *Cognitive Systems* as shown in Fig. 9. The pyramid structure depicts the *dependency* of each section on the previous sections in the pyramid. So, the development in any of the four sections is counting towards the development in COC. To develop a cognitive system, a bottom-up approach should be followed using the pyramid-like structure. The architecture represents a blueprint that embodies the logic, hardware and software needed for learning, adaptation, and evolution of cognitive systems.




Fig. 9: Cognitive Computing Architecture.

At first, intelligence must be encoded into symbolic form as a universal representation of the human mental activities to be easily applied to hardware and software. This section of the COC research is committed to

the *Representation of Intelligence*. The *Brain-like hardware* section is representing the electronics that mimic the nervous system of the brain in terms of memory, processing, and communication channels. This new hardware also requires new programming languages to build software that run on the *Brain-like hardware*. At the top of the pyramid, *Cognitive Systems* are developed using the underlying software, hardware and logic. Thus, research in COC integrates these four different yet related research areas. It is important for researchers to understand the big picture and connect the four research areas while conducting research on cognitive computing. In the following section, the state of the art in COC research is discussed in detail.

6 COGNITIVE COMPUTING: STATE OF THE ART

In this section, we present the state of the art in COC research by tracking the progress in each of the four sections of the COC architecture. We follow a bottom-up approach to present how the advances in each of the four sections helped the development of the sections above. Thus, research on cognitive systems at the top of the pyramid is dependent upon the research progress in the underlying sections. Next, the state of the art in each section is presented in detail.

6.1 Representation of Intelligence

At the foundational level of COC pyramid architecture, the representation of intelligence as mathematical format ensures consistent performance across different hardware or software platforms. Among the two categories of applied mathematics, i.e., analytical mathematics and denotational mathematics, the latter is more suited for representation of intelligence [65]. Denotational mathematics (DM) is a form of abstract algebra that aims at formalizing mathematical objects (called denotations) to describe the meanings of language expressions and system behavior with abstract concepts and dynamic processes [65]. Notable progress has been achieved in denotational mathematics such as the development of *Concept Algebra*, *System Algebra*, *Real-Time Process Algebra (RTPA)*, *Visual Semantic Algebra (VSA)*, and *Inference Algebra* [66]. Without DM, machines reuse developed knowledge to identify similarities in new problems nor cognition identify others delineations of sentences [67].

One of the leading DM applications in COC is the algebraic topological logic "*spatiotemporal logic*" which emerged as a solution to real-time computation problems. Research on algebraic topological logic stems from the philosophical studies of Charles Sanders [68], which asserts how mental activities are strongly related to time and place of occurrence. DM is also needed to formally describe and manipulate software and instructional behaviors in terms of operational logic, timing, and memory manipulation [69].

6.1.1 Basics of Cognitive Functions and Brain Modeling

Understanding how the brain works is the key to encoding cognitive functions [70]. Cognitive science has developed computational models that decompose cognition into functional components. Based on abstract intelligence theories and the logical models of the brain, a comprehensive set of cognitive behaviors were identified as the *Layered Reference Model of the Brain (LRMB)*. LRMB consists of six layers sensation, memory, perception, action, metacognitive, and higher cognitive layers, from bottom to top [71]. However, only quantum theories were able to explain complex cognitive functions such as consciousness, metacognition and perception [72].

6.1.2 Quantum Cognition

One of the prevalent challenges to current cognitive systems is handling uncertainty and resolving conflicts in decision making specially combinatorics problems. *Combinatorics* optimize the way in which items are arranged, and as the number of items grows, the number of possible permutations grows exponentially

[73]. Due to its success in explaining the paradoxical empirical findings in cognitive science, Quantum cognition is used primarily to improve combinatorics calculations [74].

To understand the underlying process of cognition, similar ontological models are needed for cognitive systems. *Quantum cognition (QC)* is a new field in psychology, which is characterized by the application of quantum probability theory to human judgment and decision-making behavior [75]. QC is a theoretical framework for constructing cognitive models based on the mathematical principles of quantum theory such as *superposition and entanglements* [76].

Cognitive Informatics (CI)

Cognitive Informatics (CI) is a transdisciplinary enquiry of computer science, information sciences, cognitive science, and neuroscience that investigates the internal information processing mechanisms and processes of the brain and natural intelligence, as well as their engineering applications in cognitive computing [77]. CI encompasses theories, symbolic logic, and denotational mathematics. Recent advances in CI places emphasis on external information processing based on the notion that human brain is the source and final destination of information [78].

6.2 Brain-like Hardware

Despite the fact that many cognitive systems are classical Von Neumann computers, they suffer many challenges such as “intellectual bottleneck”, deficiency in real time decision, high power consumption, and slow performance [6]. Traditional computers separate memory from computation, requiring information to shuffle between the memory and the CPU via a bus which slows down processing. In addition, the processing power needed increases as the communication rate (clock frequency) increases [79]. This led to calls for brain-like information processing hardware that consume low power, respond at real time, and can be easily scaled. So, this hardware could be widely embedded to robotics and Internet of Things (IoT) [80].

6.2.1 Neuromorphic Engineering

Neuromorphic Engineering (NE) or Neuromorphic Computing aims to build circuits that emulate the neurobiological architectures of the human nervous system [81]. Neuromorphic computing integrate memory-and-computing and can perform low precision and stochastic computation [82]. In addition, while von Neumann computers encode information as numerical binary values, neuromorphic computers use spikes as input and outputs. Spikes, hybrid analog-digital signals in a hybrid-encoding scheme, transmit events rather than data, known as action potentials [6]. They convey information similar to biological neurons, so, spikes hold not only values but also the associated time at which they occur, their magnitude and their shape [83].

NE processors use tremendously parallel replicated units called Neurosynaptic cores similar to brain neurons and synapses. These synapses are connected in *parallel*, allowing all the NE processor to simultaneously perform memory, computation, reasoning, and calculation at low power and relatively simple structure compared to the parallelized Von Neumann systems [84, 85]. This feature allows NE chips to be inherently *scalable* as adding an additional chip entail increasing the number of neurons and synapses that could be treated as a single large neuromorphic implementation. NE uses an *Adaptive Analog Technology* that maximizes perception and learning [58].

Memory in NE is also different. Memory is not managed as separated storage units but distributed and co-located, “co-localized” or associated with the computational units. So, NE circuits could overcome the bottleneck of classical systems [86]. The most prominent development in *Brian-like hardware* has been the nanoscale *Memristor*, a promising solution that emulates biological synapses in capacity, nanoscale, and low energy consumption [87]. Another type of Neuromorphic electronics is the *Spintronics* (spin transport electronics) which use the spin of electrons to transport data [88]. So, rather than sending information more frequently, relative timing alignments across channels expand the coding capacity with arbitrarily low activity level and minimal complexity [89]. NE hardware are usually integrated with Von-Neuman hardware. It was

also used to solve combinatorics problems similar to Quantum hardware. Research shows that spintronic devices with their stochastic switching at non-zero temperatures can potentially serve as the building block to “stochastic bits” of such probabilistic hardware platforms [47]

6.2.2 Quantum Hardware

To reach the quantum state of atoms that produces the superposition and entanglements phenomena, special hardware and conditions must be established. Many different approaches are used generate quantum atoms (*Qubits*) that are used for quantum computation [90]. *Qubits* simply hold infinite number of values, and each value has a certain probability. Also, a quantum memristor acts on quantum states that are coupled to the environment by a measurement process [91]. However, current QC hardware is highly complex requiring special cooling environments. Most current systems are susceptible to noise and decoherence. They also require special cooling and adaptation systems to simulate superposition states. Common Quantum hardware approaches are *Nuclear Magnetic Resonance* [92], *Trapped Ion* [93], *Majorana Fermions* [94]. *Super-conducting Chip* is the most popular method [95], *Diamond Nitrogen Vacancy-Center* [96], *Neutral atom* [97] and *Photonics* [98].

6.3 Cognitive Algorithms and Software

Cognitive Computing is expected to follow all the three schools of artificial intelligence: *connectionism*, *symbolism*, and *behaviorism*. [24]. AI in COC is distinguished by attribute-efficient learning algorithms and tractable learning. Traditional Neural Network (NN) is limited to understand syntax and symbols. While *Deep Neural Networks (DNNs)* have significantly expanded the inference and unsupervised learning capabilities of machine learning techniques, they are computationally complex and exhaustive [99]. Recently, more research is dedicated to developing AI algorithms to *Neuromorphic* and *Quantum* hardware.

6.3.1 Neuromorphic Algorithms

The emergence of spikes was due to the limitations in conventional Von Neumann neural networks as they must iteratively update all the network’s state variables. Without spikes, they cannot prioritize more active neurons over less active neurons. Computing with spikes can be extremely efficient on neuromorphic hardware even when the problem being solved is mathematically formulated in terms of activity rates [62]. Moreover, output gates recognize predicates that are comparable to predicate calculus mechanisms.

Spiking Neural Networks (SNN) [100] utilize spiking neuron models such as the integrate-and-fire neurons and McCulloch-Pitts. Spiking neurons don’t have direct differentiable activation functions (rather they use a threshold function). SNNs work in spatiotemporal domains, which requires a bit-programmable memory of historical membrane-potential and spike patterns within a certain duration [101].

There are notable advances in research in spike-based NE Algorithms such as *Spiking Feed-Forward Networks*, *Spiking Recurrent Networks*, *Spiking Deep Neural Networks* [102, 103]. Rather than sending information more frequently, NE neural networks use relative timing alignments across channels to greatly expand the coding capacity with arbitrarily low activity level and minimal complexity for servicing each spike. NE neural networks can *map* a pre-trained Von Neumann deep neural network. This approach performed near state-of-the-art performance with potential for substantial energy reduction. The underlying architecture of a NE algorithms is *directed graph* that map graphs into networks (that is, nodes to neurons and edges to synapses).

SNN allows *white box AI* as the *Reservoir computing* approach does not require any training of the SNN component and also includes a readout mechanism, such as a linear regression, that is trained to recognize the output of the reservoir. *Reservoir computing* in SNNs uses the sparse and recurrent connections with synaptic delays in networks of spiking neurons to cast the input to a spatially and temporally higher dimensional space [104]. However, Challenges to apply NNs to NE circuits include resolving incompatibility between backpropagations. This problem arises from using continuous-output neuron weights in Von-Neuman networks and using discrete spiking neurons (a discrete mix of analog and digital signals) [105].

For programming languages under NE, the *Corelet programming* was developed for the programming of complex algorithms on Truenorth chips [106]. The *Corelet* programming consists of (a) a Corelet that represents a network of neurosynaptic except for external inputs and outputs; (b) an object-oriented Corelet Language; (c) and a Corelet Library that acts as an ever-growing repository of reusable corelets from which programmers compose new Corelets [107, 108]. Lava is another software framework to integrate neuromorphic programming with conventional Von-Neuman systems. There are also many Python and Julia libraries that support neuromorphic hardware [109].

6.3.2 Quantum Algorithms

Using quantum hardware requires special pre-processing for data to generate uniform superpositions for all possible states into a quantum register [110]. An essential paradigm for developing QC algorithms is using Oracles (subroutines realizing hidden functions), which are critical for cryptography and security purposes. Bernstein-Vazirani and Deutsch-Josza are two popular algorithms to obtain information from Oracles. The Basic idea with Oracles that qubits get very complicated with lots of states, but many of them cancelled each other and reach an optimized solution [111]. Grover's search algorithm (GSA) is another popular quantum algorithm that can serve as an alternative to classical linear search algorithms [112]. For AI, Quantum neural networks (QNN), in particular, Boltzmann machines, Hopfield machines, outperform the classical approaches in solving many knowing problems [113].

For Quantum programming, There are many quantum programming languages, such as Q#, quantum assembly languages OpenQASM, There are also libraries that are embedded into non-quantum programming languages, such as Qiskit or Forest in Python [114].

6.4 Cognitive Systems

Cognitive systems are at the top level of the pyramid-like architecture of COC. Cognitive systems could be in the form of applications, agents, services, and APIs that align with the pyramid like architecture including representation of intelligence, brain like-hardware and software algorithms. The hallmark of a cognitive system is its abilities to function effectively in circumstances that were not planned explicitly when the system was designed [16, 115]. According to Pylyshyn [116]) cognitive systems take two approaches: the first is the symbolic information processing systems approach which uses cognitive codes to determine the operations of the system. The second combines connectionist, dynamical, and enactive systems under the general approach of emergent systems.

6.4.1 Cognitive Von-Neuman Systems

Early cognitive systems such as ACT-R, Soar, and EPIC [117] were developed to exploit the symbolic representations of knowledge. These systems use incremental approaches to learn pattern matching mechanisms to select relevant knowledge elements. For example, memory in Soar is represented as a symbolic graph structure [115]. Data in Von-Neuman Systems are stored in form of bits and most computation is data driven. The cheap cost of classical systems and their established returns as stand-alone multi-purpose, put classical cognitive systems as top cognitive solutions.

6.4.2 Cognitive Neuromorphic Systems

Neuromorphic chips such as SpiNNake, Truenorth and Loihi leverage are usually integrated with classical computer and used primarily in event-driven computation and temporally sparse activities [118]. So, Neuromorphic chips are used as co-processor for certain types of problems where classical systems fail to fulfill such as real-time AI. The underlying architecture of a neuromorphic computer is a directed graph which give it an advantage of simplicity and transparency [109]. Spikes hold data and not clock driven, so computation is not subnational nor asynchronous. Also, NE hardware allow *Stochastic* computation [47], and they proved enhancement in the real time response of self- driving vehicles and security application

[119]. NE chips are highly scalable and adding new NE chips will automatically extend the computation power of NE systems.

6.4.3 Cognitive Quantum Systems

Quantum Systems are known as special processor for certain applications such as annealing and optimization [120]. For example: D-Wave processor is used as a superconducting integrated circuit designed for a special-purpose quantum annealing, an optimization process for finding the global minimum of a given objective function over a given set of candidate solutions [121]. Quantum Systems use qubits to hold data and quantum computation is both data driven and event driven systems depending on the nature of the problem [122]. The Universal gate-model quantum computers are still in infancy such as IBM Q and Quantinuum [123]. The complexity of their hardware structure limits the physical attainment of quantum hardware. On the other hand, Quantum systems are offered as billed services by cloud services. PASQAL is quantum computer based on neutral-atom technology that would serve as universal quantum computer [124].

To summarize the state-of-the-art findings, there are three paradigms that comprehend Cognitive Computing systems: Von-Neumann systems, Neuromorphic systems, and Quantum systems. Each paradigm has its scope of applications, strength, and weaknesses. A comparison between the three paradigm is presented in Table 4.

7 DISCUSSION

Previous research defining what is COC depended merely on researchers' opinions without apt justification. The main contribution of this study is to explore the nature of COC by statistically analyzing the COC literature and comparing it with previous research findings. The study also proposed an architecture for COC as shown in Fig. 9 and discussed the state of the art in COC research. There is main three computing paradigms that encompass the complex human mind cognitive functions which are: *Von-Neumann computing*, *Neuromorphic computing*, and *Quantum computing*. Each paradigm has its own strengths and applications under the COC umbrella.

Table 4. A comparison between Von-Neumann systems, Neuromorphic systems, and Quantum systems.

Aspect	Von-Neumann systems	Neuromorphic systems	Quantum systems
Signal Used	Digital	Analog/Digital	Analog/Digital
Data Format	Bits	Spikes	Qubits
Conductors	Electrons	Artificial neurons and synapses	Trapped ions/ Photons/ Molecules
Memory	Separate	Co-located	Separate / Co-located
Application Focus	Mathematical computations	AI/ Neural networks	Combinatorics, optimization, AI
Strength	Stable, low cost, wide-spectrum applications	Simple Parallelization, Scalability, Low Power, Stochasticity, Graph AI	Quantum Parallelism, Optimization speed, Stochasticity
Stand-Alone systems	Yes	No	Yes
Scalability	Vertical/ Horizontal	Horizontal	Horizontal
Weaknesses	High-resource consumption, Slow	Narrow-focused, Complexity	Costly, Narrow-focused, Decoherence
Purpose	Multi-Purpose	Narrow-Focused	Narrow-Focused
Computation trigger	Data Driven	Event Driven	Both

The pyramid architecture for COC can be summarized as: a *Representation of Intelligence layer* that is responsible for encoding complex cognitive functions. Different cognitive functions require different types of representations. So, cognitive cognition functions require encoding different that Neuro related ones. The next layer is the *Brain-Like Hardware layer* at which different types of hardware are necessary to run the special encodings of intelligence. The following layer discusses the special programming languages, AI and software algorithms suitable for the brain-like hardware. So, the third layer that aims to develop the software that could communicate with both the underlying hardware and classical Von-Neumann Systems. At the top level of the architecture is the cognitive systems layer that are built using the layers below.




Fig. 10: State of The Art in Cognitive Computing.

To summarize the state of the art of COC, research has taken three directions as shown in Fig. 10 depending on the hardware used. Currently, most of the cognitive systems use conventional Von-Neumann hardware with conventional sequential programming. The other direction is using NE-based-electronics that consist of neurosynaptic cores and communicate using spikes. NE cores need special programming languages such as Corelet programming and new AI algorithms such as spike-based deep learning algorithms. NE based cognitive systems are expected to use both symbolism and connectionist intelligence. The third is Quantum Computing paradigm to solve the deficiency in decision making and uncertainty in solving complex probabilistic problems.

Thus, the ultimate goal of COC is to develop cognitive systems that mimic the cognitive abilities of humans. However, research in representation of intelligence, hardware, or software that contributes to building cognitive systems is considered a COC research contribution. Although cognitive systems based on NE

and Quantum circuits are still under research, they are expected to surpass the conventional hardware in terms of adaptation, cognition, speed, memory, and power consumption [125].

To help unify research goals, we recommend that NE and Quantum researchers include COC as a main keyword in developing NE or Quantum hardware/software. Our analysis found that most research in NE or QC do not include COC as keyword. Nevertheless, we believe that the next decade we will find notable improvements in *Cognitive Algorithms and Software* and *Cognitive Systems*.

8 LESSONS LEARNED

The notable lesson we can conclude is that what shapes the cognitive computation is the difference between the old and new logic and the old and new hardware. Moreover, Cognitive computing is extending of being a brain-like-computing paradigm to a strategic technology. In the following sections, we are discussing the findings in each of the new computing paradigms

8.1 Neuromorphic Applications

Neuromorphic chips are used primarily for building spike neural networks. Their physical neural network structure offers low power with extremely efficient parallel computing and short training times. While GPUs accelerated deep learning training and testing, they lack the physical structure of neurons which dissimilarities cause a lot of inefficiencies, such as excessive power consumption. The speed of communication between synapses in neuromorphic chips reach real time performance and solve the delay in applications that require real-time response such as electric vehicle [5, 126]. However, NE circuits are used now as artificial intelligence accelerators and the artificial intelligence accelerators and co-processors rather than independent Turing machines.

Neuromorphic chips such as Tianjic [127], allow multiple cognitive tasks such as speech recognition and object detection concurrently and using one chip. The low power consumption and simple structure of neural networks in neuromorphic chips, will open new venues for internet of things and robotic applications to run cognitive tasks at real time with modest consumption of resources. NE will be used primarily for simulations, optimization, and graph algorithms tasks to solve NP-hard problems. Moreover, using neuromorphic chips with IoTs will provide efficient and simple computation [119]

8.2 Quantum Applications

Classical cognitive theories assume that the human behavior is reasonable and predictable. However, the human decision-making process according to the quantum cognition is often unreasonable. For example, QC predictions were consistent with explaining human behavior in pedestrian street crossing, while classical computer failed [73]. Quantum cognition algorithms outperform classical algorithms for probabilistic and decision-making problems by reducing the number of steps required significantly. The power of quantum hardware is the ability to handle infinite probabilities at incredible speed. QC shows great potential for simulating complex processes such as drug discovery. As the number of molecules grows, the number of possible arrangements grows exponentially. Without the need to iterate each permutation, QC cancels weak arrangements and identify which is the best at achieving the goal [7]. However, QC could find the best molecules combinations in significantly less time where qubits that hold conflicting signs will eventually cancel each other, and only high probability qubits will remain.

QC is also widely used in Machine learning by Identifying patterns in data to train ML algorithms. This could accelerate the training process considerably. Most of Cryptography algorithms depend on finding the prime factors of a number, and QC is highly accelerating this process by reducing it from an exponential complexity to a polynomial one. So, most of encryption standards would be compromised. This calls for Quantum-Safe Encryption methods. However, QC machines are problem- focused and are they are used primarily as co-processors. QC hardware also is very expensive and sensitive to noise and heat require. Therefore, they are offered as integrated cloud platform services.

8.3 Open Research Issues

In this section, we are presenting long term vision on future research and challenges.

Scalability: Many if not virtually all current use of quantum computing is proof of concept projects or research. However, neuromorphic chips are not produced at scale that allows applying them in industrial and domestic applications. QC remains out of reach for classical computers for the foreseeable future: Large-scale, combinatorics calculations.

Most of research on quantum computing is purely theoretical. So, quantum algorithms that tackle real-world problems cannot run on a scale because of the limited development of efficient quantum hardware to apply quantum algorithms. QC and NE algorithms must move from the narrow scientific application to commercial applications. Despite the notable development in QC algorithms such as Grover's algorithm, QC is ill-suited for large-scale search applications, such as querying of databases [128]. On the other hand, while NE hardware is inherently scalable, they need massive scalability (millions of neurons) to perform reliably.

Integration with Classical computing: Research on integrating Von-Neumann computers with NE and QC focuses on the invocations of NE and Quantum circuit in workflows to ease their orchestration with classical applications. NE or QC machines are more of a specialized coprocessor than general-purpose computers. A general-purpose quantum Turing machine (QTM) or Neuromorphic machine are still under research. Moreover, a comprehensive machine that encompass the three paradigms is still in infancy. Similar to human mind, different cognitive tasks require different logic running on different hardware similar to brain parts. So, how to choose the task-based hardware is still new area of research. Issues such as workflow modeling, scheduling, pre and postprocessing tasks, latency, compatibility, information transfer and storage are challenges to consolidative computer [120].

Neuromorphic computing is not as ubiquitous as classical counterparts because a large knowledge base of neural computation is required. Scientific tools are needed for scientist to facilitate mapping classical computing algorithms for QC and NE circuits. the convergence of neuromorphic engineering with brain science and mainstream AI is tantalizing for all three branches of science/engineering.

Decoherence: QC requires complicated hardware special and environmental condition to generate quantum states (entanglement and coherence). So, photons/ neurons are sensitive to noise and lose their coherence state with slight change in the environment. This issue is one of the main challenges against scaling QC for business and industrial use. Generating with Quantum hardware that could operate in room temperature and resistant to noise and environment is going to create a leap in Cognitive Computation.

Programming languages and libraries: the lack of programming languages for QC an NE paradigms is limiting the development of cognitive systems beyond the research purposes. Moreover, the lack of programming libraries that facilitate the communication between classical computing and other paradigms are still wide areas of research.

Quantum-Safe Encryption: Until a Quantum circuit with thousands of qubits is available, most of current encryption systems would be compromised. This calls for immediate research on post-quantum cryptography methods that is Quantum-Safe or cannot be compromised easily using Quantum machines. Lattice-based cryptography and Hash-based cryptography are two actively research approaches [129].

Versatile AI: There are a computer-science-oriented, Quantum-oriented and a neuroscience-oriented approaches for developing AI. There are fundamental differences in their formulations and coding schemes, and they rely on incompatible platforms. Developing hybrid synergistic platforms that combine the three approaches and integrate different AI formulations orientation to allow simultaneous processing of versatile algorithms and models is another open research issue.

Strategic Cognitive Computing: cognitive computing specially QC has potential to change the cryptography and decision-making games. The strategic dimensions of COC are strongly tight to security, productivity, operations management, and proactive innovation. So, COC has many strategic dimensions,

and the development of new COC hardware/software is creating competitive advantage for countries both outwardly and inwardly.

9 CONCLUSION

Defining what is cognitive computing has been a subject of deliberation. Cognitive Computing is the emergent transformation in computing paradigms that aims to transfer human cognition to machines. Human cognition entails three different computing paradigms (Von-Neumann, Neuromorphic computing, and Quantum computing). However, none of them could explain human cognition fully but together they orchestrate different complex cognitive tasks. We conducted a systematic literature review to trace the structure and state of art in Cognitive Computing research. We used different statistical analysis techniques to analyze the COC literature that resulted in a pyramid-like architecture with four sections of *Representation of intelligence, Brain-like Hardware, Cognitive Algorithms and Software, and Cognitive Systems*. In the last decade, significant advancements in AI and *Brain-like Hardware* fields have catapulted COC development. However, the development in NE and Quantum hardware has a long way to go to ultimately complement the COC architecture. One of the gaps in defining COC that NE and quantum hardware and software research don't consider COC as an umbrella of development or an important goal to deem. The research summarized the lessons learned from the literature reviews and suggested future research issues.

10 REFERENCES

- [1] Sreedevi, A., Harshitha, T. N., Sugumaran, V. and Shankar, P. Application of cognitive computing in healthcare, cybersecurity, big data and IoT: A literature review. *Information Processing & Management*, 59, 2 (2022), 102888.
- [2] Wang, Y. Cognitive robots. *IEEE robotics & automation magazine*, 17, 4 (2010), 54-62.
- [3] Wang, Y., Zhang, D. and Tsumoto, S. Preface: Cognitive Informatics, Cognitive Computing, and Their Denotational Mathematical Foundations (I). *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 90, 3 (2009), i-vii.
- [4] Pescovitz, D. Helping computers help themselves. *IEEE Spectrum*, 39, 9 (2002), 49-53.
- [5] Wang, W., Deng, X., Ding, L. and Zhang, L. *Neural Cognitive Computing Mechanisms*. Springer, City, 2020.
- [6] Indiveri, G., Chicca, E. and Douglas, R. J. Artificial cognitive systems: From VLSI networks of spiking neurons to neuromorphic cognition. *Cognitive Computation*, 1, 2 (2009), 119-127.
- [7] Schinazi, R. B. *Combinatorics*. Springer, City, 2022.
- [8] Brynjolfsson, E. and McAfee, A. *Race against the machine: How the digital revolution is accelerating innovation, driving productivity, and irreversibly transforming employment and the economy*. Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2012.
- [9] Sinz, F. H., Pitkow, X., Reimer, J., Bethge, M. and Tolias, A. S. Engineering a less artificial intelligence. *Neuron*, 103, 6 (2019), 967-979.
- [10] Semantic-Web, C. Introducing Semantic AI, Ingredients for a sustainable Enterprise AI Strategy. *White paper* (2019).
- [11] Hrnjica, B. and Mehr, A. D. *Energy Demand Forecasting Using Deep Learning*. Springer, City, 2020.
- [12] Chen, Z. and Yang, Z. Graph Neural Reasoning May Fail in Proving Boolean Unsatisfiability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.11588* (2019).
- [13] Russell, J. and Cohn, R. Moravec's Paradox. *Book on Demand*, 15 (2012).
- [14] Wang, Y. On abstract intelligence and brain informatics: Mapping cognitive functions of the brain onto its neural structures. *International Journal of Cognitive Informatics and Natural Intelligence (IJCINI)*, 6, 4 (2012), 54-80.
- [15] Shah, H. *Turing's misunderstood imitation game and IBM's Watson success*. City, 2011.
- [16] Schuetz, S. and Venkatesh, V. Research Perspectives: The Rise of Human Machines: How Cognitive Computing Systems Challenge Assumptions of User-System Interaction. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 21, 2 (2020), 2.
- [17] Chen, M., Herrera, F. and Hwang, K. Cognitive Computing: Architecture, Technologies and Intelligent Applications. *IEEE Access*, 6 (2018), 19774-19783.
- [18] Chen, M., Hao, Y., Gharavi, H. and Leung, V. C. Cognitive information measurements: A new perspective. *Information Sciences*, 505 (2019), 487-497.
- [19] Ray, A., Bala, P. K. and Dasgupta, S. A. Role of authenticity and perceived benefits of online courses on technology based career choice in India: A modified technology adoption model based on career theory. *International Journal of Information Management*, 47 (2019), 140-151.
- [20] Braun, V. and Clarke, V. Thematic analysis (2012).
- [21] Wang, N., Guo, G., Wang, B. and Wang, C. Traffic clustering algorithm of urban data brain based on a hybrid-augmented architecture of quantum annealing and brain-inspired cognitive computing. *Tsinghua Science and Technology*, 25, 6 (2020), 813-825.
- [22] Simon, H. A. Cognitive science: The newest science of the artificial. *Cognitive science*, 4, 1 (1980), 33-46.
- [23] Mohamadnejad, M., Gholami, R. and Ataei, M. Comparison of intelligence science techniques and empirical methods for prediction of blasting vibrations. *Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology*, 28 (2012), 238-244.
- [24] Garnelo, M. and Shanahan, M. Reconciling deep learning with symbolic artificial intelligence: representing objects and relations. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 29 (2019/10/01/ 2019), 17-23.
- [25] Newell, A. *Unified theories of cognition*. Harvard University Press, 1994.
- [26] Pinker, S. How the mind works. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 882, 1 (1999), 119-127.
- [27] Elnagar, S. and Thomas, M. *Explaining Cognitive Computing Through the Information Systems Lens*. AIS, City, 2020.

- [28] Wisse, P. The Constitutional Force of Perspective Phenomenology: Philosophical Unification in Information Systems. *AMCIS 2003 Proceedings* (2003), 363.
- [29] Nickerson, R. C., Varshney, U. and Muntermann, J. A method for taxonomy development and its application in information systems. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 22, 3 (2013), 336-359.
- [30] Goguen, J. A. and Linde, C. *Techniques for requirements elicitation*. IEEE, City, 1993.
- [31] Wallach, H. M. *Topic modeling: beyond bag-of-words*. ACM, City, 2006.
- [32] Wang, C. and Blei, D. M. *Collaborative topic modeling for recommending scientific articles*. ACM, City, 2011.
- [33] Blei, D. M., Ng, A. Y. and Jordan, M. I. Latent dirichlet allocation. *Journal of machine Learning research*, 3, Jan (2003), 993-1022.
- [34] Wei, H., Gao, G. and Su, X. *LDA-based word image representation for keyword spotting on historical Mongolian documents*. Springer, City, 2016.
- [35] Wang, C., Paisley, J. and Blei, D. *Online variational inference for the hierarchical Dirichlet process*. City, 2011.
- [36] Tang, J., Meng, Z., Nguyen, X., Mei, Q. and Zhang, M. *Understanding the limiting factors of topic modeling via posterior contraction analysis*. City, 2014.
- [37] Mimno, D., Wallach, H. M., Naradowsky, J., Smith, D. A. and McCallum, A. *Polylingual topic models*. Association for Computational Linguistics, City, 2009.
- [38] Newman, D., Lau, J. H., Grieser, K. and Baldwin, T. *Automatic evaluation of topic coherence*. Association for Computational Linguistics, City, 2010.
- [39] Lau, J. H. and Baldwin, T. *The sensitivity of topic coherence evaluation to topic cardinality*. City, 2016.
- [40] Bianchi, F., Terragni, S. and Hovy, D. Pre-training is a hot topic: Contextualized document embeddings improve topic coherence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.03974* (2020).
- [41] Brust, L., Breidbach, C., Antons, D. and Salge, T.-O. Service-Dominant Logic and Information Systems Research: A Review and Analysis Using Topic Modeling (2017).
- [42] Mohammed, S. H. and Al-augby, S. LSA & LDA Topic Modeling Classification: Comparison study on E-books. *Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science*, 19, 1 (2020).
- [43] Chuang, J., Manning, C. D. and Heer, J. *Termite: Visualization techniques for assessing textual topic models*. City, 2012.
- [44] Chuang, J., Ramage, D., Manning, C. and Heer, J. *Interpretation and trust: Designing model-driven visualizations for text analysis*. City, 2012.
- [45] Sievert, C. and Shirley, K. *LDavis: A method for visualizing and interpreting topics*. City, 2014.
- [46] Taddy, M. *On estimation and selection for topic models*. City, 2012.
- [47] Roy, K., Sengupta, A. and Shim, Y. Perspective: Stochastic magnetic devices for cognitive computing. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 123, 21 (2018), 210901.
- [48] Niwattanakul, S., Singthongchai, J., Naenudorn, E. and Wanapu, S. *Using of Jaccard coefficient for keywords similarity*. City, 2013.
- [49] Ji, S., Pan, S., Cambria, E., Martinen, P. and Yu, P. S. A survey on knowledge graphs: Representation, acquisition and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.00388* (2020).
- [50] Elnagar, S., Yoon, V. and Thomas, M. *An Automatic Ontology Generation Framework with An Organizational Perspective*. City, 2020.
- [51] West, D. B. *Introduction to graph theory*. Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1996.
- [52] Platt, E. L. *Network Science with Python and NetworkX Quick Start Guide: Explore and Visualize Network Data Effectively*. Packt Publishing Ltd, 2019.
- [53] Pospisil, L., Hasal, M., Nowakova, J. and Platos, J. *Computation of Kamada-Kawai Algorithm Using Barzilai-Borwein Method*. IEEE, City, 2015.
- [54] Valiant, L. G. A neuroidal architecture for cognitive computation. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 47, 5 (2000), 854-882.
- [55] Boden, M. A. Computer models of creativity. *AI Magazine*, 30, 3 (2009), 23-23.
- [56] Izhikevich, E. M. Polychronization: computation with spikes. *Neural computation*, 18, 2 (2006), 245-282.
- [57] Fisher, M. P. Quantum cognition: The possibility of processing with nuclear spins in the brain. *Annals of Physics*, 362 (2015), 593-602.
- [58] Aghnout, S. and Karimi, G. Modeling triplet spike timing dependent plasticity using a hybrid TFT-memristor neuromorphic synapse. *Integration*, 64 (2019), 184-191.
- [59] Zahedinejad, M., Awad, A. A., Muralidhar, S., Khymyn, R., Fulara, H., Mazraati, H., Dvornik, M. and Åkerman, J. Two-dimensional mutually synchronized spin Hall nano-oscillator arrays for neuromorphic computing. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 15, 1 (2020), 47-52.
- [60] Ahmed, H., Intaravanne, Y., Ming, Y., Ansari, M. A., Buller, G. S., Zentgraf, T. and Chen, X. Multichannel superposition of grafted perfect vortex beams. *Advanced Materials* (2022), 2203044.
- [61] Lv, Z., Wang, Y., Chen, J., Wang, J., Zhou, Y. and Han, S.-T. Semiconductor Quantum Dots for Memories and Neuromorphic Computing Systems. *Chemical Reviews* (2020/03/23 2020).
- [62] Lee, C., Sarwar, S. S., Panda, P., Srinivasan, G. and Roy, K. Enabling Spike-Based Backpropagation for Training Deep Neural Network Architectures. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 14 (2020).
- [63] Stratton, P. Convolutionary, Evolutionary, Revolutionary: What's next for Bodies, Brains and AI? (2019).
- [64] Miller, S. AI: Augmentation, more so than automation (2018).
- [65] Wang, Y. *Basic theories for neuroinformatics and neurocomputing*. IEEE, City, 2013.
- [66] Wang, Y. In search of denotational mathematics: Novel mathematical means for contemporary intelligence, brain, and knowledge sciences. *Journal of Advanced Mathematics and Applications*, 1, 1 (2012), 4-26.
- [67] Moschovakis, Y. N. Sense and denotation as algorithm and value. *Lecture notes in logic*, 2 (1994), 210-249.
- [68] Kunii, T. L. *Autonomic and trusted computing for ubiquitous intelligence*. Springer, City, 2007.
- [69] Wang, Y., Zadeh, L. A., Widrow, B., Howard, N., Beaufays, F., Baci, G., Hsu, D. F., Luo, G., Mizoguchi, F. and Patel, S. *Abstract intelligence: Embodying and enabling cognitive systems by mathematical engineering*. IGI Global, City, 2020.
- [70] Taplin, W. L. Six general principles of intelligence. *International Journal of Intelligence and Counter Intelligence*, 3, 4 (1989), 475-491.
- [71] Wang, Y., Wang, Y., Patel, S. and Patel, D. A layered reference model of the brain (LRMB). *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)*, 36, 2 (2006), 124-133.
- [72] Khrennikov, A. Y. and Haven, E. Quantum mechanics and violations of the sure-thing principle: The use of probability interference and other concepts. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 53, 5 (2009), 378-388.
- [73] Song, Q., Wang, W., Fu, W., Sun, Y., Wang, D. and Gao, Z. Research on quantum cognition in autonomous driving. *Scientific reports*, 12, 1 (2022), 1-16.

- [74] Gao, S. Are Human Brains Quantum Computers? Why Quantum Cognition Says Yes (2019).
- [75] Busemeyer, J. R. and Wang, Z. Primer on quantum cognition. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 22 (2019).
- [76] Khrennikov, A. and Asano, M. A Quantum-Like Model of Information Processing in the Brain. *Applied Sciences*, 10, 2 (2020), 707.
- [77] Targowski, A. Cognitive informatics and wisdom development: Interdisciplinary approaches. *Additive Manufacturing*, 2021 (2020), 949.
- [78] Wang, Y. Discoveries and breakthroughs in cognitive informatics and natural intelligence. *Technology* (2020), 354.
- [79] Heinis, T. and Schmuker, M. *Neuromorphic Hardware As Database Co-Processors: Potential and Limitations*. City, 2019.
- [80] Horio, Y. *A brainmorphic computing hardware paradigm through complex nonlinear dynamics*. Springer, City, 2019.
- [81] Mead, C. Neuromorphic electronic systems. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 78, 10 (1990), 1629-1636.
- [82] Markovic, D., Mizrahi, A., Querlioz, D. and Grollier, J. Physics for Neuromorphic Computing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04711* (2020).
- [83] Indiveri, G., Linares-Barranco, B., Legenstein, R., Deligeorgis, G. and Prodromakis, T. Integration of nanoscale memristor synapses in neuromorphic computing architectures. *Nanotechnology*, 24, 38 (2013), 384010.
- [84] Pfeil, T., Grübl, A., Jeltsch, S., Müller, E., Müller, P., Petrovici, M. A., Schmuker, M., Brüderle, D., Schemmel, J. and Meier, K. Six networks on a universal neuromorphic computing substrate. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 7 (2013), 11.
- [85] Nahmias, M. A., Shastri, B. J., Tait, A. N. and Prucnal, P. R. J. I. j. o. s. t. i. q. e. A leaky integrate-and-fire laser neuron for ultrafast cognitive computing, 19, 5 (2013), 1-12.
- [86] Indiveri, G. and Liu, S.-C. Memory and information processing in neuromorphic systems. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 103, 8 (2015), 1379-1397.
- [87] Jo, S. H., Chang, T., Ebong, I., Bhadviya, B. B., Mazumder, P. and Lu, W. Nanoscale memristor device as synapse in neuromorphic systems. *Nano letters*, 10, 4 (2010), 1297-1301.
- [88] Bhatti, S., Sbiaa, R., Hirohata, A., Ohno, H., Fukami, S. and Piramanayagam, S. Spintronics based random access memory: a review. *Materials Today*, 20, 9 (2017), 530-548.
- [89] Zhang, Y., Wang, Z., Zhu, J., Yang, Y., Rao, M., Song, W., Zhuo, Y., Zhang, X., Cui, M. and Shen, L. Brain-inspired computing with memristors: Challenges in devices, circuits, and systems. *Applied Physics Reviews*, 7, 1 (2020), 011308.
- [90] Williams, H. J. *Versatile neutral atoms take on quantum circuits*. Nature Publishing Group, City, 2022.
- [91] Spagnolo, M., Morris, J., Piacentini, S., Antesberger, M., Massa, F., Crespi, A., Ceccarelli, F., Osellame, R. and Walther, P. Experimental photonic quantum memristor. *Nature Photonics* (2022), 1-6.
- [92] Hore, P. J. *Nuclear magnetic resonance*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2015.
- [93] Pino, J. M., Dreiling, J. M., Figgatt, C., Gaebler, J. P., Moses, S. A., Allman, M., Baldwin, C., Foss-Feig, M., Hayes, D. and Mayer, K. Demonstration of the trapped-ion quantum CCD computer architecture. *Nature*, 592, 7853 (2021), 209-213.
- [94] Frolov, S. *Quantum computing's reproducibility crisis: Majorana fermions*. Nature Publishing Group, City, 2021.
- [95] Riel, H. *Quantum Computing Technology*. IEEE, City, 2021.
- [96] Henriot, L., Beguin, L., Signoles, A., Lahaye, T., Browaeys, A., Raymond, G.-O. and Jurczak, C. Quantum computing with neutral atoms. *Quantum*, 4 (2020), 327.
- [97] Picken, C., Legaie, R., McDonnell, K. and Pritchard, J. Entanglement of neutral-atom qubits with long ground-Rydberg coherence times. *Quantum Science and Technology*, 4, 1 (2018), 015011.
- [98] Pelucchi, E., Fagas, G., Aharonovich, I., Englund, D., Figueroa, E., Gong, Q., Hannes, H., Liu, J., Lu, C.-Y. and Matsuda, N. The potential and global outlook of integrated photonics for quantum technologies. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 4, 3 (2022), 194-208.
- [99] Mordvintsev, A., Olah, C. and Tyka, M. Inceptionism: Going deeper into neural networks (2015).
- [100] Lobo, J. L., Del Ser, J., Bifet, A. and Kasabov, N. Spiking neural networks and online learning: An overview and perspectives. *Neural Networks*, 121 (2020), 88-100.
- [101] Pei, J., Deng, L., Song, S., Zhao, M., Zhang, Y., Wu, S., Wang, G., Zou, Z., Wu, Z. and He, W. Towards artificial general intelligence with hybrid Tianjic chip architecture. *Nature*, 572, 7767 (2019), 106-111.
- [102] Cao, Y., Chen, Y. and Khosla, D. Spiking deep convolutional neural networks for energy-efficient object recognition. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 113, 1 (2015), 54-66.
- [103] Ang, C. H., Jin, C., Leong, P. H. and van Schaik, A. *Spiking neural network-based auto-associative memory using FPGA interconnect delays*. IEEE, City, 2011.
- [104] Milano, G., Pedretti, G., Montano, K., Ricci, S., Hashemkhani, S., Boarino, L., Ielmini, D. and Ricciardi, C. In materia reservoir computing with a fully memristive architecture based on self-organizing nanowire networks. *Nature Materials*, 21, 2 (2022), 195-202.
- [105] Esser, S. K., Appuswamy, R., Merolla, P., Arthur, J. V. and Modha, D. S. *Backpropagation for energy-efficient neuromorphic computing*. City, 2015.
- [106] Hill, A. *SNL Fuguo to IBM's TrueNorth Corelet Programming Environment Transcompiler*. Sandia National Lab.(SNL-NM), Albuquerque, NM (United States), 2020.
- [107] Jin, H. Data processing model and performance analysis of cognitive computing based on machine learning in Internet environment. *Soft Computing*, 23, 19 (2019), 9141-9151.
- [108] Amir, A., Datta, P., Risk, W. P., Cassidy, A. S., Kusnitz, J. A., Esser, S. K., Andreopoulos, A., Wong, T. M., Flickner, M. and Alvarez-Icaza, R. *Cognitive computing programming paradigm: a corelet language for composing networks of neurosynaptic cores*. IEEE, City, 2013.
- [109] Davies, M. Benchmarks for progress in neuromorphic computing. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1, 9 (2019), 386-388.
- [110] Pronin, C. B. and Ostroukh, A. V. Developing Mathematical Oracle Functions for Grover Quantum Search Algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.05921* (2021).
- [111] Xie, H. and Yang, L. A quantum related-key attack based on the Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm. *Quantum Information Processing*, 19, 8 (2020), 1-20.
- [112] Combarro, E. F., Piñera-Nicolás, A., Ranilla, J. and Rúa, I. F. An explanation of the Bernstein-Vazirani and Deutsch-Josza algorithms with the quantum stabilizer formalism. *Computational and Mathematical Methods*, 3, 6 (2021), e1120.
- [113] Diep, D. N. Some quantum neural networks. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 59, 4 (2020), 1179-1187.
- [114] Heim, B., Soeken, M., Marshall, S., Granade, C., Roetteler, M., Geller, A., Troyer, M. and Svore, K. Quantum programming languages. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 2, 12 (2020), 709-722.
- [115] Vernon, D., Metta, G. and Sandini, G. A survey of artificial cognitive systems: Implications for the autonomous development of mental capabilities in computational agents. *IEEE transactions on evolutionary computation*, 11, 2 (2007), 151-180.
- [116] Pylyshyn, Z. W. *Computation and cognition*. MIT press Cambridge, MA, 1984.
- [117] Laird, J. E., Newell, A. and Rosenbloom, P. S. Soar: An architecture for general intelligence. *Artificial intelligence*, 33, 1 (1987), 1-64.

- [118] Huynh, P. K., Varshika, M. L., Paul, A., Isik, M., Balaji, A. and Das, A. Implementing spiking neural networks on neuromorphic architectures: A review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.08897* (2022).
- [119] Schuman, C. D., Kulkarni, S. R., Parsa, M., Mitchell, J. P. and Kay, B. Opportunities for neuromorphic computing algorithms and applications. *Nature Computational Science*, 2, 1 (2022), 10-19.
- [120] Weder, B., Breitenbücher, U., Leymann, F. and Wild, K. *Integrating quantum computing into workflow modeling and execution*. IEEE, City, 2020.
- [121] Dixit, V., Selvarajan, R., Alam, M. A., Humble, T. S. and Kais, S. Training restricted boltzmann machines with a d-wave quantum annealer. *Front. Phys.* (2021).
- [122] Licata, I. and Chiatti, L. Event-based quantum mechanics: A context for the emergence of classical information. *Symmetry*, 11, 2 (2019), 181.
- [123] Chhangte, L. and Chakrabarty, A. Mapping Quantum Circuits in IBM Q Devices Using Progressive Qubit Assignment for Global Ordering. *New Generation Computing*, 40, 1 (2022), 311-338.
- [124] Hiscott, L. Quantum companies merge to form Quantinuum. *Physics World*, 35, 1 (2022), 11ii.
- [125] Kendall, J. D. and Kumar, S. The building blocks of a brain-inspired computer. *Applied Physics Reviews*, 7, 1 (2020), 011305.
- [126] Browne, A. *Neural network perspectives on cognition and adaptive robotics*. CRC Press, 1997.
- [127] Wu, Y., Zhao, R., Zhu, J., Chen, F., Xu, M., Li, G., Song, S., Deng, L., Wang, G. and Zheng, H. Brain-inspired global-local learning incorporated with neuromorphic computing. *Nature Communications*, 13, 1 (2022), 1-14.
- [128] Mukherjee, S. A grover search-based algorithm for the list coloring problem. *IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering*, 3 (2022), 1-8.
- [129] Bernstein, D. J. and Lange, T. Post-quantum cryptography. *Nature*, 549, 7671 (2017), 188-194.