

Generalization in neural networks: a broad survey

Chris Rohlf

Columbia University Department of Electrical Engineering, Mudd 1310, 500 West 120th Street, New York, 10027-6623, NY, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

literature review
deep learning
modularity
biologically-inspired
abstraction
overfitting
domain adaptation
meta-learning
few-shot
semantic

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews concepts, modeling approaches, and recent findings along a spectrum of different levels of abstraction of neural network models including generalization across (1) Samples, (2) Distributions, (3) Domains, (4) Tasks, (5) Modalities, and (6) Scopes. Results on (1) sample generalization show that, in the case of ImageNet, nearly all the recent improvements reduced training error while overfitting stayed flat; with nearly all the training error eliminated, future progress will require a focus on reducing overfitting. Perspectives from statistics highlight how (2) distribution generalization can be viewed alternately as a change in sample weights or a change in the input-output relationship; thus, techniques that have been successful in domain generalization have the potential to be applied to difficult forms of sample or distribution generalization. Transfer learning approaches to (3) domain generalization are summarized, as are recent advances and the wealth of domain adaptation benchmark datasets available. Recent breakthroughs surveyed in (4) task generalization include few-shot meta-learning approaches and the BERT NLP engine, and recent (5) modality generalization studies are discussed that integrate image and text data and that apply a biologically-inspired network across olfactory, visual, and auditory modalities. Recent (6) scope generalization results are reviewed that embed knowledge graphs into deep NLP approaches. Additionally, concepts from neuroscience are discussed on the modular architecture of brains and the steps by which dopamine-driven conditioning leads to abstract thinking.

1. Introduction

Generalization is a fundamental objective of deep learning, and recent achievements in the field have expanded the ability of neural network models to consolidate relationships among variables into patterns that apply in other situations. Some such innovations improve the stability and consistency of model performance in a given domain—aims that researchers have emphasized relate directly to a model's ability to generalize (Bousquet and Elisseeff, 2002)—while other work specifically designs models to adapt to different domains or tasks.

This paper provides a broad overview of different forms of generalization in neural networks. Existing surveys discuss methods used in the literature to avoid overfitting (Bejani and Ghatee, 2021), to recognize when a category's definition is changing (Bayram et al., 2022), to stabilize performance across samples and populations (Liu et al., 2022; Lust and Condurache, 2021; Shen et al., 2021), to adapt a model to use an existing classification skill in a new context (Niu et al., 2020; Wang and Deng, 2021; Wang et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2022; Zhuang et al., 2021) or on a previously unseen category (Li et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2019c), and the development of knowledge bases to represent general principles (Davis, 2017; Ji et al., 2022). Studies in the neuroscience literature also discuss methods of abstraction used by biological brains (Devineni and Scaplen, 2022; Mansouri et al., 2020; Meunier et al., 2009). The primary aim of this study is to supplement these detailed reviews with an intuitive and concept-driven description of how these types of generalization relate to one another, what strategies seem to work in what circumstances, and potential next steps

toward the levels of abstraction accomplished by humans and animals.

Figure 1 presents a schematic of different ways in which a model can be generalized. The left-hand column of icons depicts the practice of deploying the model on a previously seen training case. The trained model is some functional relationship that receives input data and outputs a projected classification or action. There is some means of assessing the accuracy of that output—*e.g.*, comparing the classification with a human-provided label. For this situation in which no generalization is required, the model was originally designed and calibrated to maximize this metric, and we can expect its performance to be high.

Moving from left to right, the degree of specificity of the application declines, and the level of generality increases. These forms of generalization describe the application of a model across:

1. *Samples*: Test cases drawn from the same population as in training
2. *Distributions*: Test cases drawn from new populations
3. *Domains*: New contexts in which some aspects of the input-output relationship have changed
4. *Tasks*: New decision spaces
5. *Modalities*: New input data structures
6. *Scopes*: Complex applications requiring semantic understanding

In the top line of the diagram, these six types of generalization are consolidated into three broad categories. The first, stability, describes the ability of models to generalize across minor input perturbations. The second, knowledge transfer, encompasses generalization across domain, task, and modality. The third broad category includes the highest levels of generalization and is placed under the heading

car2228@columbia.edu (C. Rohlf)

ORCID(s): 0000-0001-7714-9231 (C. Rohlf)




Figure 1: Types of Generalization

of abstraction. Authors have used some of these terms in differing ways in the literature. Nevertheless, in the absence of a universally accepted lexicon, the categories presented in Figure 1 offer a concise taxonomy that captures many of the important ways in which generalization is performed.

The four rows of icons in Figure 1 illustrate the different types of changes that occur in the course of generalizing a model. Across these levels of generality, the nature of inputs and outputs vary, and the process of abstracting components of the model to new settings is expected to degrade its performance. The nature of generalization requires, however, that the essential components of the model are fixed. While some refitting or reconfiguration may occur, it is the model that is intended to remain stable and to perform with some degree of consistency in the face of changing input feeds and output requirements. In the broadest form of generalization depicted in the diagram however, the details are discarded, leaving only abstract principles.

Sample and distribution generalization involve input data that closely resemble those used in training, although drawing the data from a new population in distribution generalization may affect the relative importance of specific features or sensitivities. In domain generalization, cases are presented in a new situation with modified rules for mapping input features to output classes—for instance, identifying objects from cartoons rather than photos or classifying documents written in Icelandic rather than English. Task generalization involves a change in the possible output classes—e.g., training an image classifier on a new set of object types or adapting a text summarization model to answer questions. Modality generalization reconfigures a model developed in one medium to process data of an entirely different type—say, applying components of a text-based model to provide information about images. Finally, in scope

generalization, the model is distilled into core principles that inform complex sequences of actions, potentially in conjunction with other concepts or data.

The discussion of sample generalization in Section 2 highlights an important deficiency in the field of deep learning that is illustrated with results on object identification in the ImageNet data. Since the earliest studies on the dataset, training accuracy is found to have risen by over 20 percentage points from below 75% to above 95% in state-of-the-art models. Across the same models, however, the performance gap between training data and unseen test cases (distinct from the provided validation set) remained roughly constant at just under 30 percentage points. Thus, for this important and popular application, the problem of fitting the training data is largely solved, and for researchers to make substantive progress in the future, it will necessarily involve reducing the amount of overfitting.

Section 3 presents views on the problem of out-of-distribution generalization from the fields of deep learning, statistics, econometrics, and neuroscience, highlighting how the reweighting of observations that is caused by distributional change gradually alters the input-output relationship to that of a new domain. The commonalities among sample, distribution, and domain generalization are suggestive of possible research directions. Researchers have found success applying different forms of transfer learning to problems of domain adaptation—such approaches could have potential for addressing sample and distribution generalization as well.

Section 4 describes key elements of transfer learning approaches for domain generalization, including feature embeddings and parameter sharing, recent progress in the area, and the diversity of problems and datasets available for learning adaptation across domains. The Photo-Art-Cartoon-Sketch (PACS) visual classification exercise—in which the

network is trained to recognize the same objects in different visual vernaculars—is used as a motivating example. Section 5 describes exciting recent developments in the learning of task generalization, including few-shot meta-learning strategies, through which a network learns to recognize new classes from only a few examples, as well as the Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT), a new and disruptive innovation in the Natural Language Processing (NLP) sphere.

Generalization across modalities remains a part of the field with substantial room for growth, and section 6 describes some recent innovative studies in the literature that generalize models across widely different problems and data types. Section 7 on generalization across scopes reviews knowledge graphs and their use to facilitate network-based semantic understanding. Next, Section 8 reviews neuroscience research on the modular and dopamine-driven means by which abstraction occurs in animal brains. This biological perspective provides insights into modular elements of existing artificial neural networks as well as potential directions in which artificial systems might generalize more effectively. Section 9 concludes.

2. Sample Generalization


One key variant of generalization that is used with nearly all deep learning models is the application of a trained model to new test cases. Across many areas of empirical research, models are known to forecast more accurately among *in-sample* observations used in the fitting process than on previously unseen *out-of-sample* observations, and the issue is particularly severe among complex models with large numbers of estimated parameters. This phenomenon is illustrated in Figure 2a, which is modified slightly from Hastie et al. (2009). Training error, shown in blue, declines steadily with the number of model parameters, while test error, shown in red, declines at first but then rises at higher levels of complexity; hence, a model that is selected to minimize in-sample error is likely to be overly complex relative to a model that minimizes the error from out-of-sample forecasting.

In order to better understand how this issue applies in the deep learning literature, Figure 2b and Table 1 present the performance across samples of twelve different established neural networks. While it is not common in the literature to present rates of accuracy from training, the existence of pretrained parameters from these models in PyTorch makes it possible to reproduce this statistic for a variety of important networks. The number of parameters in each of the twelve models is plotted along the horizontal axis of the graph. Plotted along the vertical axis are the error rates of these models when deployed on different samples. The model names appear next to their levels of performance in the training data. In each case, the task is to correctly identify the category of object shown in one of the ImageNet 2012 pictures from a set of 1,000 possible categories. Each pre-trained model's performance


is evaluated on a 1% sample of the training data and the full validation set provided as part of the ImageNet challenge. Additionally, Recht et al. (2019) observe that, for datasets that are commonly used in the literature and for which researchers have access to the validation samples, there tends to be overfitting to these datasets as well. In order to evaluate the extent of that overfitting, the authors construct a new test 10,000-observation ImageNet sample following the same conventions for data construction as in the original case—so that model performance can be evaluated based upon a testing sample that was not available to the researchers at the time the models were developed and trained. The red “New Test” line in the figure uses those authors’ supplemental dataset and performs a similar exercise to what appears in that paper. These results from Figure 2b are also presented in Table 1. The models are sorted in decreasing order of performance but with different specifications of the same model grouped together. For each of these models, the source is provided together with a brief description of the novel elements introduced by that network. The Training - Validation column illustrates the percentage point difference between training and validation—a conventional measure of overfitting that is analogous to the difference between the red and the blue curves in the example in Figure 2a. The Validation -New Test column represents the additional amount of overfitting relative to the Recht et al. (2019) sample, also measured in percentage points, and Training -New Test is the sum of the prior two columns.

The key findings from Figure 2b and Table 1 are that the amount of overfitting is substantial, and there are not easily discernible patterns in its variance across models like there are in simulated data in Figure 2a. The results from the figure and table show considerable overfitting for all twelve networks, both in the training sample relative to the validation sample and also in the validation sample relative to the new test sample. Across these twelve cases, accuracy in the training sample is 7.7-19.1 percentage points higher than in the validation sample, and accuracy in the validation sample is 11.8-13.6 percentage points higher than in the new test sample. Thus, overfitting during training is more variable than overfitting during validation, but the two biases have comparable magnitudes. The overall amount of overfitting ranges from 19.6 to 32.6 percentage points. As can be seen in Figure 2b, the accuracy rates across the three samples move roughly in parallel, so that the same models tend to perform the best in training, validation, and testing. Among the networks considered here, there is no discernible relationship between model complexity and overfitting, and relatively high amounts of overfitting can be seen in both the best and the worst performing models.

Over the years of development in performance on the ImageNet data that Figure 2b and Table 1 illustrate, the increase in classification accuracy for training cases increased from 73.3% with AlexNet to 95.7% with ResNeXt-101-32x8d, a rise in 22.4 percentage points. Between the same two models, classification accuracy on new test cases rose from 43.5% to 67.5%, an increase in 24.0 percentage



(a) Simulated Data



(b) Common Neural Networks

Notes: These two graphs show training and test error rates and their relationship to model complexity. Figure 2a is reproduced from Hastie et al. (2009); it was originally constructed for illustrative purposes applying LASSO regression to simulated data. Figure 2b presents the same results as appear in Table 1. Training, Validation, and New Test errors are defined as one minus 1/100 times the accuracy rates shown in the table, with the numbers of model parameters plotted along the horizontal axis.

Figure 2: Illustration of Overfitting in Simulated Data and in Artificial Neural Networks

Model	Source	# Parameters (MM)	Key Design Elements	% Accuracy of Top-1 Selection			Training -Validation	Validation -New Test	Training -New Test
				Training	Validation	New Test			
ResNeXt-101-32x8d	Xie et al. (2017)	89	Modular structure with repeated use of common transformation architecture	95.5%	79.3%	67.5%	16.3%	11.8%	28.2%
Wide ResNet 101-2	Zagoruyko and Komodakis (2017)	127	Feedback, width	96.3%	78.8%	66.5%	17.6%	12.3%	29.9%
EfficientNet-b0	Tan and Le (2020)	5.3	Coordinated scaling of width, depth, and resolution	90.6%	77.7%	65.7%	13.6%	11.9%	25.5%
EfficientNet-b7		66		84.2%	73.9%	61.8%	10.0%	12.2%	22.2%
ResNet-101	He et al. (2015)	45	Feedback, depth	90.0%	77.4%	65.6%	13.0%	11.8%	24.8%
DenseNet-201	Huang et al. (2017)	20	Dense connectivity across non-adjacent layers	89.5%	76.9%	64.7%	12.9%	12.2%	25.1%
VGG-19-bn	Simonyan and Zisserman (2015)	144	Increased depth with small convolutional filters	84.7%	74.2%	61.9%	10.5%	12.3%	22.9%
MobileNet v3 large	Howard et al. (2019)	5.5	Network architecture search	92.9%	74.1%	60.5%	19.1%	13.6%	32.6%
MobileNet v3 small		2.5		79.7%	67.7%	54.7%	12.2%	13.0%	25.1%
GoogLeNet	Szegedy et al. (2015a)	13	Parallelism, increased depth and width	77.1%	69.8%	57.9%	7.7%	11.9%	19.6%
Inception v3	Szegedy et al. (2015b)	27	Parallelism, expanded convolution and regularization	80.9%	69.5%	57.6%	11.7%	12.0%	23.7%
AlexNet	Krizhevsky (2014)	61	Computational parallelism	73.2%	56.6%	43.5%	16.7%	13.1%	29.8%

Notes: For each of these models, the pre-trained weights were obtained from PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019) and are applied to the training and validation samples from the ImageNet ILSVRC-2012 dataset (Russakovsky et al. (2015) as well as from a new set of test images provided by Rechi et al. (2019) that were not available to the researchers at the time of validation. Accuracy rates reflect ability to correctly identify the image class from 1,000 possible categories (Top-1). For the training, validation, and new test datasets, the full 1,281,167-, 50,000-, and 10,000-observation datasets are used. Of the three new test datasets provided by Rechi et al. (2019), the "matched frequency" one is used so that the proportions in each category are the same as in the original data. Following the PyTorch documentation, a standard set of transformations is applied to the images: each is first resized to 256, then center-cropped to 224, then normalized with RGB channel-specific means of 0.45, 0.456, and 0.406 and standard deviations of 0.229, 0.224, and 0.225.

Table 1
Sample Generalization of Commonly Used Classifiers on the ImageNet Dataset

points. Nearly all of the improvement in accuracy illustrated in the table is tied directly to a reduction in training error. The total amount of overfitting, measured by the Training - New Test column on the far right, is similar between the two models—at 29.8% for AlexNet and 28.2% for ResNeXt-101-32x8d. Thus, on balance, the innovations that produced the current state-of-the-art performance were the low-hanging fruit. If out-of-sample performance on the ImageNet data is to improve in the years to come, the bulk of that improvement will have to be through reductions in the sorts of errors that cannot be detected in training—the stubborn sorts of errors that years of development have not succeed in reducing. While some of the models in Figure 2b and Table 1 exhibit lower rates of overfitting than others—e.g., GoogLeNet, EfficientNet-b7, and VGG-18-bn—it is not clear what model features differentiate those networks from the others.

3. Distribution Generalization

One potential risk generated by overfitting is that, as the distribution of test cases changes over time, the performance of the network will decline without the user being aware. A well-known early example of this instability is Google Flu Trends. The project, first announced in 2008, produced a highly effective predictor of flu patterns in the United States based upon Google users' search activity, but the performance of the model degraded in successive flu seasons as search activity changed (Lazer et al., 2014). Henriksson et al. (2021) note that, for some applications, performance degradation of this form poses safety concerns. The authors test a framework in which a supervisor monitors the classification probabilities generated by a trained neural network and alerts the user if they indicate an increase in the rate of outliers or a change in the distribution of test cases

being evaluated. The authors find that the supervisor's ability to identify distributional changes generally improves with the training accuracy of the model but is inconsistent, varying widely across training epochs. Similarly, Rohlf (2022) finds among a sampling of neural networks that the models' self-assessments of classification confidence are effective proxies for accuracy among in-distribution test cases; however, when given low-resolution variants of those images, the classifiers' performance declines, and the models are overconfident in their classifications.

Given the high amounts of overfitting that persist in artificial neural networks, it is useful to consider what factors cause it to occur. In the linear regression context, Rohlf (2023b) separates the difference between training and test performance into two sources. The first *forbidden knowledge* component arises because the forecast is constructed in a formulaic way from the actual training sample outcomes—so that the forecast co-moves with unobserved drivers of training variable outcomes; thus, in the training sample, comparing the forecasts to the actuals overstates the explanatory power of the model. The second *specialized training* component arises because the model is most accurate at explaining the types of movements in predictors that it has previously encountered.

Beyond these sources of overfitting, an additional factor applies when the populations differ. The generalizability of estimates across populations is known to statisticians as *external validity* (Campbell and Stanley, 1963; Cook and Campbell, 1979). In econometrics, such cross-population differences are often modeled as random variation across observations in the true values of parameters that are assumed in the model to be constant (Athey and Imbens, 2019; Imbens and Angrist, 1994; Card, 2001; Heckman and Vytlacil, 2005). As with the outcome variable, differences across observations in their values for a given model parameter β are not entirely explicable but may be correlated with model predictors or with other observable factors.

Deep neural networks include numerous interactions across model predictors that may help to capture some of this inter-population variation. Even with these complex interaction effects, however, there continues to be substantial room to improve the stability of artificial networks across populations. In the deep learning spirit of using data-driven methods to capture complex relationships, efforts in this direction might benefit from validation of non-random holdout samples used explicitly to test model generalizability. Some explorations along these lines consider potential distributions of test data and train model parameters to guarantee a minimum level of performance in worst-case scenarios, an approach sometimes described as Distributionally Robust Optimization (DRO). Shen et al. (2021) note in a useful summary that explicit distribution-aware optimization strategies of this form have been found to be impractical due to their high computational demands and sensitivity to underlying assumptions about the potential distributions. A survey by Lust and Condurache (2021) highlights the use of adversarial examples as a promising means of identifying

the limits of a model to generalize out-of-distribution, with different types of adversarial cases generated to trace out the “generalization envelope” describing the scope of distributions over which the model can be expected to perform consistently.

Given this statistical and econometric perspective on external validity, where the parameters vary in systematic but unknown ways across cases in the population, the categories of sample generalization, distribution generalization, and domain generalization can be viewed as a continuum. At the extreme of domain generalization, whether some combination of features indicates that an image is a cartoon or a photograph impacts the manner in which features map to labels; there is one complex, nonlinear relationship if the image is a cartoon, and another one if it is a photograph. For cases of sample and distribution generalization, the changes are less severe, but factors are changing that impact the nature of the feature-to-label relationship.

As the analysis in Section 2 illustrates, researchers have had difficulties producing classifiers whose accuracy in training translates into stable and consistent performance in other samples. The parallels between sample, distribution, and domain generalization are important, because an approach that works for one of those forms of generalization has the potential to be effective in another. As the discussion in Section 4 shows, the field has made tremendous progress in recent years identifying methods in transfer learning that enable the adaptation of learned skills across domains. There is reason to believe that the types of feature transformations that work in that sphere could help to address the problems of overfitting that plague researchers who are attempting more mundane forms of generalization.

The importance of interactions across predictors in generalization is paradoxical. The linkage posited in Figure 1 between generalizability and abstraction and the relationship shown in Figure 2a between model complexity and overfitting both suggest that the ability to generalize should increase as parameters are subtracted from the model. Taking account of additional interaction effects across predictors would push model complexity in the opposite direction.

Findings from the neuroscience literature may help to resolve this apparent contradiction. In reviewing the determinants of mental and behavioral flexibility in *Drosophila*, Devineni and Scaplen (2022) describe a particular interaction effect that provides a helpful motivating example. Fruit flies have an innate aversion to the smell of carbon dioxide, which is a warning signal emitted by other flies. In situations of extreme hunger, however, the brain releases chemical signals that cause this response to shift; flies seek out the odor, because it raises a possibility of food that outweighs the risk. Hence, the modulation of priorities across different contexts is handled by a system that operates at a global level and is distinct from the mechanisms that process innate and learned responses. In this case, the modulation is straightforward; food has become a higher priority, and the chemical signals tilt decision-making to reflect this preference.

Category	Model or Problem Attribute	Description
Domain Visibility	Concept Drift	Contexts or relationships change in a continuous and unpredictable way
	Features	Unlabeled cases from the new domain are observed in training
	Unseen	No information on excluded domain
Generalization Model	Transductive	Explicit cross-domain translation
	Inductive	Domain-agnostic model
Adaptation Strategy	Label Adjustment	Domain-specific probability thresholds for labeling
	Instance Mapping	Cases resembling those in the target domain given greater weight
	Feature Mapping	Input features transformed to feed into domain-agnostic model
	Parameter Sharing	Domain-specific models with sharing or restrictions across parameters
	Ensemble Weighting	Aggregation of model outputs across domains

Notes: Taxonomy of different types of transfer learning for domain generalization. Categories adapted from Gulrakani and Lopez-Paz (2020); Bayram et al. (2022); Niu et al. (2020); Wang and Deng (2021); Wang et al. (2023); Zhou et al. (2022), and Zhuang et al. (2021).

Table 2
Types of Transfer Learning


While the effects of context are not always so straightforward, this example from fruit flies highlights one way in which priorities can shift in response to context while keeping the essential structure of a decision-making process intact. An analogous design in a deep learning setting might respond to changing environments by incorporating context-sensitive hyperparameters such as activation thresholds; approaches along such lines are discussed in the next section.

4. Domain Generalization

The generalization of a trained network to perform in different domains is known in the literature as *transfer learning*. A change in domain might involve introducing noise or distracting elements into an image, audio recording, or passage of text or moving to a new environment in which many features of the input data distribution are dramatically altered, but the key elements of the input-output relationship that the classifier is meant to learn are preserved. Examples could include a change in the identity of the speaker for a speech recognition machine or alternation among sketched drawings and photographs of similar objects in an image classification task.

Table 2 summarizes the variety of transfer learning problems and models that have been used to solve them in the literature. For greater detail on these distinctions and the many combinations of these problems and models that have been examined, Gulrakani and Lopez-Paz (2020); Niu et al. (2020); Wang and Deng (2021); Wang et al. (2023); Zhou et al. (2022), and Zhuang et al. (2021) provide extensive and useful reviews, and many of the categories presented here are adapted from the ones used in those surveys. The first distinction listed in the table is among different forms of domain-specific data that are presented to the classifiers.

In “concept drift” problems, domain varies continuously—as in the case of images that are rotated or distorted. In the continuum of specificity versus generality depicted previously in Figure 1, cases from new populations or in new contexts fall into an overlapping region between distribution generalization and domain generalization. In these cases,



Notes: Illustration of a case of concept drift, adapted from diagrams in Bayram et al. (2022). The case shown here is one in which observations are represented by two features, X_1 and X_2 , and classification is achieved through a nonlinear boundary, as in Support Vector Machines. Drift is occurring in the data in that new values of the violet triangles tend to have lower values of X_2 than previous values do.

Figure 3: Concept Drift

the features differ from the training data in a way that might not impact the labels that a human would apply to the cases—so that many ways of representing the true input-output relationship would be unaffected. As the findings from Section 3 illustrate, however, the input-output relationships represented by artificial classifiers depend crucially upon the set of cases used in training. Hence, while the true input-output relationship that the model seeks to represent might be unchanged, this shift in the distribution of test cases is likely to impact the input-output relationship represented by the model and its trained parameters. This category of generalization in which features and contexts vary in continuous ways relative to training is sometimes described as concept drift.

An example of concept drift is illustrated in Figure 3, which is adapted from Bayram et al. (2022), who provide a useful review of studies of concept drift and its varying definitions in the literature. In the example, there is some boundary between the green circles and the violet triangles that was learned from training data. Drift occurs in that, among new test cases from the triangle class, the values of the second predictor X_2 tend to be lower than seen in training. In some cases of concept drift, researchers aim to determine when a substantive change in domain has occurred so that the model should be reconfigured before further use. Other drift-based approaches aim to develop classifiers that are robust to such continuous domain variation. Bayram et al. (2022) note that, when attempting to measure whether drift has occurred, performance-based tests of changes in distribution and domain have a tendency to raise false alarms, because performance may degrade for reasons such as data quality that would not be solved through reconfigurations to the model.¹

¹ In a related survey, Yang et al. (2021) discuss the problem of detecting if a case falls outside of the trained distribution. Similarly to Bayram et al. (2022), the authors find a diversity of terminology and propose a unified framework for considering such situations.




Notes: CAPTCHA-style text written in a manner that presents difficulties for automated character recognition approaches. Image taken from a CAPTCHA-inspired font by Rogers (2014).

Figure 4: CAPTCHA-type Characters

CAPTCHA problems constitute one everyday setting to which researchers have applied tools to recognize and adapt to concept drift. CAPTCHA tests that are used to secure computer systems against automated attacks constitute a compelling category of problems—and one that has been studied extensively—in which context and feature distributions vary continuously. Many CAPTCHAs rely upon the recognition of abstract features—*e.g.*, distinguishing letters that are deformed, overlapping, or have distracting elements such as noise or ancillary lines. A set of characters written in this deformed and overlapping style is illustrated in Figure 4. Optical character recognition (OCR) approaches typically distinguish text in a sequential manner, first determining boundaries to isolate individual characters and then determining which letter or number each of those characters represents. While it does not cause great difficulty for humans, the overlapping of characters in the image confounds the automated approach.

The design of a variety of CAPTCHA-style problems by researchers and technology firms helps to provide the deep learning community with an extensive amount of human-labeled data that helps to illustrate what features define different classes of objects and what features can be altered without causing their labels to change. Xu et al. (2020) review a variety of deep learning approaches to construct and to decrypt such problems. The decryption strategies—which the authors refer to as “attacks” on CAPTCHA problems—generally employ human assistance to reframe specific CAPTCHA tasks into formats that are tractable by existing classification models. For example, George et al. (2017) replace the standard sequential approach to OCR with an iterative one in which character boundaries and what letters or numbers they represent are determined in a coordinated fashion. The iterative model is domain-invariant—so that the method of transfer is inductive. The feature space is



Notes: Sample images from the Photo, Art, Cartoon, Sketch (PACS) dataset. Domains from top to bottom are art painting, cartoon, sketch, and photo. Classes from left to right are horse, person, house, guitar, and giraffe. Reproduced from Xu et al. (2019).

Figure 5: Illustration of images in the PACS dataset for Domain Adaptation

expanded to include contours of the entire sequence of letters rather than individual characters, and having access to the contours enables the classifier to decipher sequences of text are overlapping or distorted.

When adapting to changes in domain that are discrete and known, the researcher has access to labeled training data in which the same task is performed in one or more domains. The goal of domain transfer is to use data from the training domains to produce a model that can effectively perform the task on a new domain whose labels were not available in training. In one class of problems labeled “features” in Table 2, the model has access during training to unlabeled cases from the new domain. In other cases, the new domain is entirely unseen.

Figure 5 illustrates one compelling dataset that researchers have used to train neural networks to adapt knowledge to an unseen domain. The images in the PACS data represent objects from seven classes including horse, person, house, guitar, and giraffe, as depicted in the figure, as well as dog and elephant. The four rows of images illustrate the four domains in which these different classes of objects are represented: artistic paintings, cartoons, sketches, and photographs. A neural network is trained to identify these different object types using data from three of the four domains, and it is then tested on its ability to perform the same task in the new domain.

This question of the visibility of features from the new domain is connected to the distinction in the next section of Table 2 between *transductive* domain adaptation models that transfer knowledge to a specific domain and *inductive* models that are developed for use in any arbitrary domain. Cases in which the features from the new domain are visible during training can be transductive or inductive, but cases

in which the new domain is entirely unseen are typically inductive.

Beyond these categories of domain visibility and form of generalization, the third and largest category in Table 2 describes different approaches for comparison across domains. For situations in which the change in domain is gradual, it may be possible to adapt by simply modifying the probability thresholds according to which cases are assigned to classes. A case of this form was illustrated earlier in Figure 3. Wang et al. (2018) find that, when domain change occurs in a continuous fashion, as in the case of concept drift, much of the degradation in performance reflects changes in the likelihoods of different classes—and can effectively be addressed by monitoring those probabilities and adjusting the corresponding thresholds.

The next strategy, instance mapping, describes another approach to accommodate relatively gradual changes in domain. In cases of concept drift, the training data often have some examples that resemble the test cases from the new domain. Instance mapping employs a strategy similar to the distributionally robust approach described in Section 3, but instead of considering a worst case target distribution, there is a known target distribution. Some characteristics of the target domain are observed—*e.g.*, the distributions of features or classes, and the training data fed into the classifier are reweighted to reflect the distributions of features or classes observed in the new domain.

The next approach, feature mapping, can be applied in transductive or inductive generalization. An inductive variant is illustrated in Figure 6a. In feature mapping approaches, there is a learned transformation function that processes input features from a given domain so that they can be consumed by a classifier from another domain or a domain invariant classifier, as in the diagram. The top of the figure shows pictures of elephants from three domains: cartoons, sketches, and photographs, all from the PACS data. Each domain has its own transformation function that converts the input into the format expected by the classifier. The transformation often expands the input space, so that the generalized representation shown in the diagram is not necessarily viewable as an image. All domain-specific computation is performed on the features, and the remaining components of the classifier are shared across two or more domains. In some cases, researchers use feature transformation to supplement the training process for the domain-specific classifiers. Shankar et al. (2018), for instance, employ generative adversarial learning in which transformed cases from other domains are used to create adversarial examples to refine the classification and domain-identification components of the network.

The next domain adaptation strategy listed in Table 2, parameter sharing, is illustrated in Figure 6b. As with Figure 6a, the example presented in the graph involves inductive transfer. As Figure 6b illustrates, the parameter sharing approach involves a separate network-based classifier for each domain. Optimization proceeds in a simultaneous fashion, with restrictions applied to the parameters to ensure

Model	Unseen Domain				
	Art Painting	Cartoon	Photo	Sketch	Average
Ensemble of Averages (Arpit et al., 2022)	94.1%	96.3%	99.5%	93.3%	95.8%
Proxy-based Contrastive Learning (Yao et al., 2022)	90.2%	83.9%	98.1%	82.6%	88.7%
DBADG (Li et al., 2017)	62.9%	67.0%	89.5%	57.5%	69.2%

Notes: See notes to Figure 5. This table shows the % of PACS images from an unseen domain that were correctly classified, separately by unseen domain. Results are presented for two recent models as well as the original model with which the dataset was introduced.

Table 3


Performance of Three Models on PACS Domain Adaptation

that the domain-specific classifiers are sufficiently similar to the domain invariant one. This approach can also be applied transductively, in which case there is no domain invariant model, but parameter restrictions are applied to maintain similarity between the domain-specific models.

In the final adaptation approach from Table 2, ensemble weighting, multiple neural networks are developed during the training process: one for each of the domains that is available during training, with no domain invariant model. When test cases are observed from the unseen domain, they are run through each of these trained models, some decision rule such as majority rule or averaging of probabilities is used to aggregate these domain-specific projections into a final classification.

Gulrakani and Lopez-Paz (2020) provide a brief survey of domain adaptation approaches and datasets, such as those used by the original Li et al. (2017) on PACS, and the authors provide a set of associated algorithms and datasets in their DomainBed package for use with PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019). As an alternative to sharing model parameters in a weighted fashion, some studies use ensemble-based approaches that involve separate domain-specific trained models. Arpit et al. (2022), for instance, use an “Ensemble of Averages” approach that averages classification scores across domains and across model iterations with each domain. Researchers have also examined feature transformations—whereby there is a domain-invariant classifier that consumes transformed features as inputs, where the transformation function varies across domains (Arjovsky et al., 2019; Shankar et al., 2018; Yao et al., 2022). In addition to modifying the approach by which information is shared across domains, some networks focus on classification differences. Yao et al. (2022) develop a model in which the loss function in training depends explicitly upon contrasts between the individual projections and those of a domain-agnostic proxy classifier. Shankar et al. (2018) employ generative adversarial learning, with separate adversarial examples to refine the classification and domain-identification components of their network.

The ability of artificial neural networks to successfully identify PACS classes in a new domain—as measured by % correctly classified—is shown in Table 3. Results are shown separately by domain, and the average across the four appears in the last column. The first two rows report results from two state-of-the-art networks. The first, used by Arpit et al. (2022), involves ensemble-based weighting. The second, by Yao et al. (2022) uses feature transformation together with “contrastive learning,” a variant on parameter sharing



Notes: Figure 6a illustrates an inductive transfer framework in which there is a single domain invariant neural network. There is a separate feature transformer for each domain that converts features from cases in the cartoon, sketch, and photo domains into the structure consumed by the invariant classifier. Figure 6b illustrates an alternative inductive transfer approach in which there are separate neural networks for each domain plus a distinct domain invariant classifier. Similarity between the domain-specific classifiers and the domain-invariant one is maintained through parameter sharing or restrictions.

Figure 6: Illustration of Forms of Transfer Learning

that optimizes cross-domain similarity in the transformed features across cases from the same class. For comparison, the third row shows the level of performance of the original paper that introduced the problem, which employed an inductive transfer model with parameter sharing. These three examples are selected in part because, among the relevant studies, they are ones that illustrate how performance varies depending upon which domain is unseen.

As can be seen from the last column of this third row, this original study accurately classified 69.2% of images from an unseen domain. As the top two rows show, more recent models have been able to perform the same task correctly in 88.7% and 95.8% of cases. Across all three networks, performance is consistently the best when the unseen domain is photographs, and it is consistently the worst when the unseen domain is sketches.

The results in Table 3 help to illustrate the ability with which modern classifiers can adapt knowledge to new domains and the amount of progress that has been observed in the field in recent years. While PACS provides a useful motivating example, it is just one of a variety of datasets that researchers use to train and assess models that are constructed to adapt a classification skill from one domain to another.

Table 4 describes a sampling of this variety of datasets used for developing domain adaptive models. The four columns describe the input type (images or texts), the dataset name and source, the classes that are learned within a domain, and the different domains in which these classes are defined. The first eight datasets describe object identification problems that are similar in structure to that posed in PACS. The numbers of classes range from five to 345. Some


Medium	Dataset	Classes	Domains
Images	DomainNet (Peng et al., 2019)	345 categories of everyday items	Clipart, infographic, painting, quick drawing, photo, and sketch
	PACS (Li et al., 2017)	Dog, elephant, giraffe, guitar, house, horse, person	Art painting, cartoon, photo, and sketch
	VLCS (Fang et al., 2013)	Bird, car, chair, dog, person	Four different source datasets of photos
	ImageCLEF-DA (Caputo et al., 2014)	Plane, bike, bird, boat, wine, bus, car, dog, horse, motorcycle, computer, person	Three different source datasets of photos
	VisDA2017 (Peng et al., 2017)	Plane, bike, bus, car, horse, knife, motorcycle, person, plant, skateboard, train, truck	Synthetic and real-world images
	Office-Home (Venkateswara et al., 2017)	65 classes of everyday items	Art, clipart, product, and real world
	Office-31 (Saenko et al., 2010)	31 classes of office objects	Amazon product pictures, Webcam photos, DSLR photos
	Caltech Camera Traps (Beery et al., 2018)	17 types of animals, car, or no object	140 fixed camera locations
Texts	Reuters-21578 (Lewis, 1997)	Newswire article subjects	Categories of article subjects: Exchanges, Organizations, People, Places, Other
	Enron Emails (Klimt and Yang, 2004)	User-defined folders	Email users
	Multi-domain Sentiment Dataset (Blitzer et al., 2007)	Amazon product ratings based on review texts	Books, Kitchen, Electronics, and DVDs

Notes: Common datasets used to learn to adapt an image or text classifier across domains. The "Classes" column describes the classification task that is performed within a domain, and the "Domains" column describes the different domains in which the classification task is performed.

Table 4

Datasets commonly used for Learning Domain Adaptation for Classification Tasks

of the datasets like PACS have diverse sets of domains to learn, while in other cases, the domains are relatively similar, consisting of photographs taken from different image libraries. The text-based datasets present tasks of identifying the subjects of newswire articles (with domains consisting of different broad categories of subjects), sorting emails into folders for different users, and projecting the consumer rating based upon the review text for different types of Amazon products.



Notes: Figure 7a illustrates a diversity of images available to the classifier during training. Figure 7b shows the support and test data for a relatively easy classification task of distinguishing five arbitrary classes that were not seen in training. Figure 7c shows the support and test data for a more difficult classification task of distinguishing five dog breeds in the case that no dog breed classes were observed in training. For both the easy and the hard task, the classifier is given a small number of labeled cases of each of the new types (in this case two per class) and then must classify elements from the five classes in testing. Images taken from the mini-ImageNet dataset (Vinyals et al., 2016).

Figure 7: Few-Shot Learning Problems

5. Task Generalization


Moving further to the right in the specificity-generality continuum in Figure 1, the next higher level of abstraction is generalization across tasks. The most common form of task generalization considered in the literature is to train a classifier to identify one or more new categories. Early work approached the problem from the perspective of expanding the possible outcomes for an existing trained classifier; researchers observed a phenomenon of *catastrophic forgetting*, whereby acquiring a new skill reduced the system's ability at previously learned tasks, and a variety of memory-based strategies were developed to adapt (Kerg et al., 2020; Kirkpatrick et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2020; Rusu et al., 2016b,a; Schwarz et al., 2018; Zenke et al., 2017). Such strategies address the problem of forgetting skills, and work along these lines has contributed to progress in knowledge distillation (Gou et al., 2021), but the networks are difficult to scale due to their continually growing demands for computation and storage.

Exciting progress has been seen recently in a particular form of task generalization known as *few-shot learning*, a setup that is illustrated in Figure 7. The images in the figure are taken from the mini-ImageNet dataset and the structure of the two problems aligns with tests performed by Vinyals et al. (2016). The network has access to a large number of training cases of different types; examples are presented in Figure 7a. The images shown in the figure are all from different classes, but the data include multiple examples within each category. During the training period, there is a holdout set of classes, and the model is not allowed to view any of the cases from those classes. In testing, the model is given a set of new classes to distinguish. Figure 7b shows an example of a relatively easy five-way discrimination task in which the five classes are chosen from the dataset at large. The model is exposed to a small number of examples from each class (two in the example) through a process described as *tuning*, and it is then evaluated in testing on its ability to distinguish images from the five categories. Figure 7c shows a more difficult task in which all five classes are descended from

the broader set of dog breeds, so that object identification requires a finer level of distinction.

Some approaches to few-shot learning transfer skills from networks trained to perform more traditional image classification problems. (Vinyals et al., 2016), for instance, learn feature embeddings from ImageNet to enable distance-type comparisons of test versus support images. This approach is illustrated in Figure 8a; a common network is used to transform image features into the embeddings consumed by a pairwise distance function which is used to evaluate image similarity between support and test cases. Another popular strategy of *meta-learning*, as in the Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) approach of Finn et al. (2017), replicates in training the tuning and evaluation processes performed in testing using a variety of support and test sets constructed from a training set of images. As Figure 8b illustrates, training cases for this model consist of support-test combinations, and the output is a learner that can be tuned on new support cases. Approaches to few-shot learning are described in greater detail in surveys by Li et al. (2021); Wang et al. (2019c), and meta-learning is reviewed more broadly in Hospedales et al. (2022).

The levels of performance of three state-of-the-art few-shot learners are presented in Table 5. Two common datasets are used: the CIFAR-FS (Bertinetto et al., 2019) and Mini-ImageNet (Vinyals et al., 2016). Both have structures similar to that illustrated in Figure 7, and performance is evaluated here on the easy type of problem of discriminating across randomly selected holdout classes. These datasets are subsets of the CIFAR-100 (Krizhevsky, 2009) and ImageNet ILSVRC-2012 (Russakovsky et al., 2015) sets of images that have been configured for few-shot learning. Performance is evaluated by introducing the model to five new classes of images, giving it one or five examples of each, and testing its ability to accurately discriminate among test images from those five classes. The P>M>F model of Hu et al. (2022a) involves three steps of pre-training an image classification model, meta-learning the task generalization process, and fine-tuning to the support data for testing. Like Vinyals et al. (2016), the Self-Optimal Transport (SOT) approach of



Notes: Figure 8a illustrates the distance-to-embedding type of few-shot learning approaches. In these models, much of the network-based learning is of embeddings to represent the features from individual images. Discrimination across classes is performed by applying a metric with which to compute the distances between each of the test images and the support images. Features of the distance metric may be learned in the training process, but the training images do not include elements from the support classes considered in testing. Figure 8b illustrates the meta-learning type of few-shot models such as Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) (Finn et al., 2017). In that case, the cases presented in training are combinations of support and test images constructed from the training data. What is learned by the network is a generalization approach, as illustrated by the pink arrow. That approach itself consumes labeled support images as inputs and produces labels for test images as outputs. Competing generalization approaches are evaluated on the accuracy of their label assignments for the test cases. In testing and deployment, labeled support images and unlabeled test images are supplied as inputs, and the output is a mapping that labels the test images.

Figure 8: Models for Few-Shot Learning

Model	CIFAR-FS		Mini-ImageNet	
	1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot
P>M>F (Hu et al., 2022a)	84.3%	92.2%	95.3%	98.4%
SOT (Shalam and Korman, 2022)	89.9%	90.7%	92.8%	88.8%
PEMnE-BMS (Hu et al., 2022b)	88.4%	91.9%	85.5%	91.5%

Notes: This table shows the performance of three state-of-the-art few-shot classifiers applied to the CIFAR-FS (Bertinetto et al., 2019) and Mini-ImageNet (Vinyals et al., 2016) datasets. Results are shown in all cases for 5-way few-shot estimation.

Table 5

Performance of Few-Shot Classifiers on CIFAR-FS and Mini-ImageNet

Shalam and Korman (2022) involves the learning of feature embeddings for distance-based comparisons. The PEMnE-BMS strategy of Hu et al. (2022b) supplements feature transformation-based transfer learning with additional steps including boosting. As the table shows, these recent top-performing models execute this task with an rate of accuracy of 84.3% to 95.3% for one-shot and 88.8% to 98.4% for five-shot learning.

An additional area of task generalization in which exciting progress has been made in recent years is in the area of Natural Language Processing (NLP), and in particular, the Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) approach for language comprehension introduced by Devlin et al. (2019). The overall structure of the BERT model is depicted in Figure 9. Figure 9a illustrates the training process. The inputs are pairs of potentially related phrases with some words redacted. The features are transformed into vector representations. For each word, these embeddings capture context by characterizing distributions of words that tend to appear close to that word. As “bidirectional” in the model name implies, such nearby words are identified through forward and backward traversal of the phrase and consequently include words appearing both before and after the word being described. The embeddings are subsequently fed as inputs into two classifiers: one to determine the identity of the redacted words and one to determine if the phrases

Model	Test	Performance
Human Benchmark	GLUE (9 tests)	80%
DeBERTa (He et al., 2021)	(Wang et al., 2019b)	90.0%
ALBERT (Lan et al., 2020)		89.4%
Human Benchmark	SuperGLUE (8 tests)	89.8%
DeBERTa (He et al., 2021)	(Wang et al., 2019a)	90.3%

Notes: Performance of recent BERT-based NLP engines on the GLUE and SuperGLUE batteries of language comprehension tests, with typical human performance provided as a benchmark.

Table 6

Performance of BERT-based Approaches on Language Tests


appear one after the other in a document. The entire process is trained simultaneously.

Tuning and deployment of the BERT model is shown in Figure 9b. The model itself becomes a feature transformer, consuming phrases or pairs of phrases and outputting the intermediate embeddings, the probabilities for the masked words, and the sentence similarity measure. Subsets of this complete set of embeddings are used as inputs for specific applications such as sentiment analysis or rating the correctness of potential answers to supplied questions. Each of the applications is trained separately through a process described as fine-tuning.

Table 6 presents the results of two recent BERT-based networks, DeBERTa and ALBERT, on two batteries of phrase comprehension tests that are commonly used to evaluate NLP engines. The General Language Understanding Evaluation (GLUE) and SuperGLUE measures are averages across nine and eight tests, respectively, and NLP engines are assessed on their average performance. As the table illustrates, for both tests, state-of-the-art BERT-based methods outperform humans.

6. Modality Generalization

The literature on cross-modality transfer of network-based learning is not extensive, but Table 7 summarizes the



Notes: In training, the BERT learns numeric vector-based representations of pairs of sentences with masked words, and it is trained to perform two tasks: identify probability distributions for the masked words and determine whether the two sentences are related in the sense of occurring one after the other in a text. In testing and deployment, the embeddings, the distributions of likely words, and the classifications of sentence relatedness are combined into a broader set of embeddings that describe pairs of phrases. Subsets of those embeddings are used as inputs for task-specific classifiers; the training of those task-specific classifiers is described as tuning or fine-tuning.

Figure 9: Bidirectional Encoder Representation from Transformers (BERT)

findings from two innovative studies that help to illustrate possibilities in this area. Panel A presents results from the Deep Transfer Networks (DTN) approach of Shu et al. (2015), which builds upon a related non-network based classification approach by Qi et al. (2011). In that model, a feature transformation function is trained based upon web-based images together with accompanying text descriptions. A classifier is then trained to label the images based upon these text-enriched embeddings of the image data. In deployment, the transformer generates embeddings for images that do not contain text descriptions—essentially describing text that tends to accompany images similar to the current input—and those embeddings are fed as inputs into the classifier. The first line of the table presents the results of a baseline classifier using a Stacked Auto-Encoder that only includes data on images. The second line shows the classification results for the DTN model that incorporates the feature transformer trained with text descriptions. As the results show, the approach using embeddings substantially improves classification performance over the benchmark.²

Panel B of Table 7 describes a modality generalization approach that is inspired by the structure of animalian brains. Borthakur and Cleland (2019) begin with a biologically-inspired classifier with numbers of nodes, levels of connectivity, and other design features based upon that of the mammalian olfactory system. They then examine the extent to which a set of hyperparameters developed for one

²While not strictly modality generalization as described in this survey, some recent intriguing work combines image and text data to perform a variety of complex tasks such as labeling multiple objects in an image (cf. (Xu et al., 2022)), and Baevski et al. (2022) propose an approach for embedding data features that is designed to be common across speech, image, and text applications.

Panel A: Text-to-Image Translation			
Model	Modality	Classification Task	Performance
Deep Transfer Networks (Shu et al., 2015)	Images alone	Classify web images	70.66%
	Images with Text Embeddings	Classify web images	80.72%
Panel B: Mammalian Olfactory System Classifier			
Learning in the Wild (Borthakur and Cleland, 2019)	Olfaction	Odorants from gas sensor	96.0%
	Olfaction	Odorants from gas sensor with drift	91.1%
	Visual	Type of Japanese forest	88.4%
	Auditory	Species of frog or toad	93.3%

Notes: Panel A shows results of the Deep Transfer Networks (DTN) by Shu et al. (2015). The first line shows a benchmark result that classifies web-based images using only image data, and the second line shows the performance enhancement that is achieved when text-based embeddings are used. Results are shown from the authors' tests that include 10 training images per class. Panel B presents results from a multi-sensory generalization study by Borthakur and Cleland (2019).

Table 7

Performance of Cross-Modality Transfer Models

problem of classifying odorants can be applied to different problems with comparable effectiveness. They develop their Spiking Neural Network (SNN) to classify odorants from gas sensor data in an online learning context, and they then re-train the classifier on data from the same sensor after it has aged three years. In the language of Figure 1, this first test can be viewed as something between distribution and domain generalization, as in the case of concept drift. The authors then apply the same network structure with the same hyperparameters to the classification of different types of Japanese forests from satellite images and to the classification of frog and toad species based upon auditory information. They find that their SNN setup retains a high degree of accuracy in these widely different problems. While changing the context and problem degrades the performance somewhat, they find that similar accuracy as the original classifier can be achieved without hyperparameter re-tuning by increasing the number of training cases.




Notes: Taken by Matthew Bisanz; presented as in Davis and Marcus (2015) to illustrate the many types of inferences that humans draw from stimuli.

Figure 10: Julia Child's Kitchen

7. Scope Generalization

The distillation of facts into principles and the application of those principles to new areas of knowledge are challenges for artificial intelligence; nevertheless, substantial progress has been made to establish a base of facts and relationships among them as well as the tools necessary to expand upon that set of information. Davis and Marcus (2015) highlight the amount of semantic knowledge that humans regard as commonsense by considering the picture shown in Figure 10 of Julia Child's kitchen. A human viewer would naturally infer that four legs are holding up the tabletop and some sort of nail, hook, or adhesive is keeping the pictures on the cabinet doors—and that without them, they would all fall to the floor due to the force of gravity. While these thoughts might not occur to someone consciously, violations of such principles would be immediately noticeable. This example of the kitchen photograph helps to illustrate the many inferences that humans draw from stimuli and the depth of understanding required to replicate that process artificially.

The representation of facts about the world and logical relationships has in the field of artificial intelligence focused on the development of *knowledge graphs*, as illustrated by Figure 11. The diagram taken from the website of the ConceptNet open source database (Speer et al., 2017; Speer and Havasi, 2012), characterizes some key features about that particular database in its own lexicon. The directed graph consists of triplets of {subject, relationship, object} that represent abstract relationships such as “similar to” and “part of” between pairs of nouns. Much of the database is manually coded through crowdsourcing, an approach that has been found to produce less voluminous but more reliable data than those obtained through web crawling (Davis, 2017). ConceptNet and other knowledge graphs are frequently employed in the construction of vector-based embeddings for words, as in BERT or other transfer learning strategies, to enable the incorporation of these logical relationships into network learning approaches. Graph-based



Notes: Illustration of knowledge representation graphs and ConceptNet (Speer et al., 2017).

Figure 11: ConceptNet Graph-based Knowledge Database

representations of knowledge are used in a variety of commercial applications including web search and question answering tasks by Google (Dong et al., 2014).

For queries whose answers already appear as entries in the database, usage of the knowledge graph is straightforward. For cases in which the answer is not identical to an existing entry, strategies for applying knowledge graphs are similar in general to those required for expanding the databases. As Ji et al. (2022) note, some graph-based approaches expand their knowledge bases through logical inference from existing relationships; however, the high rate of exceptions to general logical rules hinders the automation of that task. Consequently, network-based learning approaches are used on their own or supplemented with human verification. These networks take as a starting point embeddings produced from the knowledge graph and employ separate classification approaches to detect relevant nouns, pairs of nouns to link, and relationships among them (Ji et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2017). A thorough review of network-based knowledge graph approaches appears in Ji et al. (2022); additional reviews discuss the construction and application of the graphs (Davis, 2017), the use of knowledge-enriched embeddings (Wang et al., 2017), and a quantitative comparison of approaches (Lin et al., 2018).

Competing approaches for representing semantic knowledge are evaluated annually in the SemEval competition; tasks include multilingual detection of idioms and social cues such as a condescending or sarcastic tone and the parsing of taxonomies that are assumed or implied in context (Emerson et al., 2022). One example question from a prior year describes an event in which people sat down in a sauna

Task	Example	Model	Performance
Plausible Clarifications (Roth et al., 2022)	Check ratings of different salons. Visit the salon's website. Call ____ and ask questions.	Human benchmark	79.4%
		X-PuDu - winning submission (Shang et al., 2022)	68.9%
		BERT Baseline (Devlin et al., 2019)	45.7%
Multilingual Named Entities (MultiCoNER) (Maimasi et al., 2022)	Patrick Gray, former director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation	DAMO-NLP - winning submission (Wang et al., 2020b)	85.3%
		ROBERTa Baseline (Conneau et al., 2020)	47.8%

Notes: Selected results (winner, baseline, and in one case, human benchmark) shown for tasks 7 and 11 from the SemEval-2022 competition to evaluate approaches for semantic language comprehension in artificial systems. Results are shown for the top performer and the baseline for each task. For the MultiCoNER task, results are shown for the multi-language version of the test.

Table 8

Performance on Selected Semantic Inference Tasks in SemEval-2022 Competition

and asks the artificial system whether they sat down on a bench or on the floor; the system is required to make this conclusion based upon outside knowledge of how a sauna is typically laid out. Highlights from the 2022 competition are described in Table 8; top outcomes from Task 7 (the winner for most innovative task) and Task 11 (including the winner for most innovative model) are shown. The first of the two tasks is a fill-in-the-blank exercise similar to that performed in the training of BERT; however, the masked word is not obvious from the sentence and must be inferred from the broader context of nearby sentences or from general knowledge, at times requiring understanding of subtle linguistic patterns such as metonymy. The human benchmark can complete the task with 79.4% accuracy. A BERT approach without supplemental knowledge performed at 45.7% accuracy. The winning approach by Shang et al. (2022) is an ensemble strategy that combines BERT-style network forecasting with the ERNIE knowledge graph-trained embeddings (Sun et al., 2021), which performs at 68.9%.

The second of the two tasks with results shown in Table 8 is to identify named entities from short snippets of text with little context—where the named entity might be a phrase such as “Inside Out” or “To Kill a Mockingbird” that also happens to be an artistic work. The learner must separately tag people, locations, corporations, other groups, products, and creative works and must do so in 11 different languages. The baseline BERT-based approach successfully completes the multilingual version of the task with 47.8% accuracy. The winning submission employs BERT-style embeddings together with a query-based knowledge retrieval approach, achieving 85.3% accuracy at the task.

8. Abstraction in Nature


As researchers endeavor to improve the ability of artificial networks to generalize and abstract, the structures of animal brains provide a valuable template. One distinguishing feature of biological neural networks is modularity. Neuroscientists have found that animal brains are segmented into well-defined components or modules that are specialized for the handling of specific tasks. In *Drosophila*, for instance, standardized innate responses are processed in the lateral horn, while learned responses and prioritization are handled

by a separate component known as the mushroom body (Aso and Rubin, 2016; Aso et al., 2014; Devineni and Scaplen, 2022; Rohlf, 2023a).

This modular structure is illustrated in a stylized form in Figure 12a. Each sensory input—described in the diagram as “new data” is routed by a dispatcher into one of three channels: innate response, learned response, and more data. The network of evolved pathways, with separate treatment for distinct forms of inputs, can be thought of as the dispatcher. Stimuli that have hard-wired reactions are often handled in a separate component of the brain. Modularity of this form has been observed in a variety of animals, with different parts of the brain activated during abstract tasks than concrete ones in humans (Gilead et al., 2014; Wurm and Lingnau, 2015; Vaidya et al., 2021), and lesions to the prefrontal cortex have been found to inhibit abstract thinking in primates (Mansouri et al., 2020). This processing is often viewed as hierarchical, with successively complex components of the brain handling successively sophisticated problems (Kaiser et al., 2010; S. J. Kiebel and Friston, 2009; Meunier et al., 2009, 2010).

The organization of the brain into specialized components helps it to maintain consistent performance across contexts. It helps to diversify risks by containing the overall system’s vulnerability to any one component’s errors. Because each module is used in a variety of applications and is informed by observations from those contexts, the trained structure is relatively insensitive to aberrations in any one domain of knowledge (Sinz et al., 2019). Stability is also maintained in the brain through system-wide limits on the potential influence of new information. Sadeh and Clopath (2021) describe the brain’s process of inhibitory stabilization, whereby a given component’s signal expression might be subdued by other parts of the brain that have a broader perspective on the priorities of the overall structure. In addition to this short-term regulation of signal strength, brains perform a process of controlled forgetting of longer-term information that is influenced by the rates at which new neurons are created (Akers et al., 2014). This gradual removal of outdated information enables the system to adjust to general trends that impact relationships and categories in the data without the thrashing from one decision rule to another that could emerge if updating were instantaneous (Richards and Frankland, 2017).

The routing process illustrated in Figure 12a takes into account the priorities of the organism according to multiple time scales. If recent events call for immediate action—e.g., flight—then chemical signals produce a temporary change in overall priorities at the system level (Devineni and Scaplen, 2022). Savin and Triesch (2014) find that, when a primate moves from one task to another, the change is evident through a shift in activity among large numbers of neurons in the prefrontal cortex—with urgent tasks causing larger numbers of cortical neurons to be repurposed. Also among primates, Froudish-Walsh et al. (2020) note that system-wide dopamine levels in the brain impact the performance of working memory—in some cases promoting recurrence



Notes: Figure 12a is a schematic interpretation the structures in animal brains through which data are routed to the appropriate type of response. Figure 12b describes how innate and learned responses differ in the ways in which the information is coded and stored.

Figure 12: Responses to Stimuli in Animal Brains


among the affected sets of neurons or blocking inhibitory signals from other cells. From a long-term perspective, system-wide priorities are embedded into the structure of the network, with receptors to important stimuli exercising more influence in the network. Connections that appear to reflect and to impact subjective valuations of past and prospective actions are distributed throughout the brain (Lee et al., 2012). Ji et al. (2020) find evidence of circuit-wide activity patterns such as mating, foraging, exploration, exploitation that influence behavioral state for multiple components of the brain in roundworms.

The first two types of responses in Figure 12a—innate and learned—are fundamentally different in the ways in which they develop and operate. These differences are summarized in Figure 12b. The third response, “more data,” reverts back to the top of the diagram, so that the responses described in Figure 12b are the absorbing states of the flow chart.

Like the overall modular design and routing process, innate responses are driven by structural characteristics—the overall layout of the neural network as well as key hard-wired responses—that are stable over the life of the organism. These rules are thus stored in DNA and originate and change slowly through the process of genetic evolution. Barabási and Barabási (2020) find that large patterns of synaptic connections—patterns that they call *bicliques*—are often shared across different animals of the same species. The authors propose that these similarities are innate, and they introduce a model to identify which portions of the connectome are coded by common genes. As Zador (2019) notes, the amount of information stored as innate responses is minuscule compared to the overall capacity of the brain: the human genome can encode at most about a gigabyte of information relative to the 500 terabytes of information contained in the human brain connectome.

“Learned,” the second response type in Figure 12, relates to memory and plasticity, which serve an important role in the modular approach to thinking. In the case of *Drosophila*, Vogt et al. (2014, 2016) find that the structure through which neural pathways group sensory inputs into categories is largely fixed and that a key building block to the formation of memories is the learning of positive and negative associations with those categories. Depending on the flies’ experiences, a given odor might attract some flies and repel others. The learned associations that are stored in memory are different, but the mental architecture mapping the stimulus to a response is similar. Knoblauch et al. (2010) characterize the first type of learning—the formation of positive or negative associations—as *synaptic* plasticity. A second and less common type of learning, which Knoblauch et al. (2010) refer to as *structural* plasticity, involves the modification of the categories with which associations are formed. In one example among fruit flies, Ueno et al. (2017) find a form of this plasticity that is a relatively sophisticated process that is only activated if both visual and olfactory sensory signals have been received—so that sensory input from one source serves to verify input from another source.

The grouping of stimuli in memory is a vital element of abstract thought. Neuroscientists find that the amount of abstraction and the level of complexity of these mappings are determined by the importance of such categories to the broader goals of the organism (Cortese et al., 2021; Stegmann et al., 2020; Timme et al., 2016). Rewards and penalties that are regarded as salient are connected to dopamine signals that drive animals to learn about causal relationships and the world around them. Animals acquire feedback from experience regarding the accuracy of the learned connections between stimuli and rewards or penalties—and the timing and intensity of neurons’ dopamine responses update and adjust accordingly (Kahnt and Tobler, 2016; Schultz et al., 1997; Schultz, 1998). A



Notes: The butterfly's body and right wing are occluded by the tree trunk, but the mind fills in the missing data based upon its stored mental image of a typical butterfly.

Figure 13: Perceptual Magnet Effect

variety of intricate associations are coded through this dopamine-guided learning process, operating on different time scales and accommodating uncertainty and context-dependence (Dayan and Abbott, 2001; Schultz, 2007). Robertson (2018) argues that the instability of specific memories serves an important role in this process of abstraction, enabling the translation of specific events into general rules.

This mapping of sensory inputs helps animal brains to produce archetypal examples that then interact with the experience of sensation. In experiments of vision in primates (DiCarlo, 2017; Min et al., 2020) and listening in humans (Feldman et al., 2009), the categories developed in memory have been found to influence how new stimuli are perceived. Gaps in sensory information are filled in based upon previously encountered examples from the same category, producing a *perceptual magnet effect*, which allows the brain to exploit existing trained skills and mental architecture that are built around these categories. These archetypes also assist in the perception of objects that are partially obscured, are placed in unusual contexts, or have distracting elements. DiCarlo (2017) notes that, for the first 100 milliseconds of object detection, artificial classifiers' facilities rival those of humans and primates. When faced with more difficult cases in which the solution takes additional time, however, the biological brains' advantage becomes more pronounced.

This perceptual magnet effect is illustrated in Figure 13. In the image, the viewer perceives the left wing of a butterfly, but the body and right wing are obscured by the tree trunk and consequently unseen. In perceiving the butterfly, the viewer's mind matches the visual data to a category in memory and fills in the missing information based upon an image stored in memory of what a typical case looks like. This form of information processing helps humans to easily solve CAPTCHA-type problems such as those discussed in Section 4 and illustrated in Figure 4.

While the brain may initially fill in gaps based upon archetypes, both synaptic and structural plasticity interact with the third response from Figure 12a, the collection of new data. The pursuit of new data for learning is online and curiosity-driven; biological systems select cases to learn based upon what is new, deviates from expectation, or fills specific gaps in understanding (Sinz et al., 2019). This targeted training helps animals to limit cognitive effort to cases that provide sufficiently high benefit. A certain training case might offer insights into one chunk of a tasks but not another; separating the information into chunks helps to identify what parts of a training example are new and to confine relearning and updates to those sub-problems for which the observation is relevant.

Research by Savin and Triesch (2014) suggests a practical set of principles for the organization of conceptual "chunks" in primates. Events are grouped into similar categories in working memory if they are connected to the same external stimulus, resulting motor response, or some combination of the two. Cohen et al. (2021) similarly argue that practice and repetition are performed in animals in order to achieve a consistent motor response. Additionally, research by Logiaco et al. (2019) suggests that animal brains may learn complex motor patterns by breaking them down into manageable "motor motifs."

Through this process, the construction of concepts and memories is driven by the same forces that motivate the organism more broadly. Nevertheless, the parts of the brain that are responsible for abstraction behave in many ways as distinct modules that operate on their own time scale. While the learning process is initially motivated by the pursuit of dopaminergic rewards, incentives and learning are distinct in the brain, and knowledge that is acquired in order to satisfy a previous need persists when priorities change (Berridge, 2012; Berridge and Robinson, 2016; Zhang et al., 2009). Hence, "motivational salience," which is malleable

Response Type	Feature	Description	Artificial Analogues
Modularity and Innate Responses	Specialized Components	Different anatomical components specialized to handle specific tasks	Transfer of feature transformations and embeddings (Sections 4 to 7), Evolutionary deep learning (Baymurzina et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2020a; Zhan et al., 2022)
	System-wide Prioritization	Domain adaptation and concept drift (Section 4), Chemical signals regulate entire system behavior based upon context	Inhibitory signals (Cao et al., 2018; Seung, 2018a,b), Multi-objective optimization (Kim et al., 2022; Qu et al., 2021)
Learning and Abstraction	Archetypes	Repeated responses saved to conserve computational resources	Feature embeddings (Sections 4 to 7), Knowledge Distillation (Gou et al., 2021; Ku et al., 2020), Neural architecture search (Baymurzina et al., 2022; Dokeroğlu et al., 2022; Jafra et al., 2019)
	Synaptic Plasticity	Prior experiences and responses associated with archetypes through conditioning	Feature embeddings (Sections 4 to 7), Meta-learning (Section 5)
	Structural Plasticity	Representations adapt over time based upon relevance	Meta-learning (Section 5), Concept drift and domain generalization (Section 4)
	Semantic Knowledge	Use of facts for deductive reasoning	Knowledge graphs (Section 7)
Data Collection	Selective Attention	Salient events receive more granular representations and more data collected	Replay and practice (Andrychowicz et al., 2017), Data Augmentation (Shorten and Khoshgofaar, 2019; Tian and Zhang, 2022), Adversarial training (Chen et al., 2020; Frolov et al., 2021; Lust and Condurache, 2021; Qiu et al., 2022), Self-paced or curriculum learning (Soviany et al., 2022)

Notes: Ways in which biological brains exhibit modularity and ways in which similar principles have been applied in artificial neural networks.

Table 9
Artificial Analogues to Biological Modularity

and based upon recent situational data, drives an animal's behavior; however, its actions are also informed by facts and understanding about the world that have been accumulated over its lifetime.

Once such concepts are established, an essential component of the ability to generalize is the identification of relationships among these categories. As a motivating example, Amidzic et al. (2001) find evidence of “chunking” in the neural activity of chess grandmasters. The authors observe that, when playing chess against a computer, grandmasters make less use than novices do of portions of the brain associated with analysis and recent memories, and they make greater use of parts of the brain associated with long-term memory. Thus the key difference in mental activity that the authors observe between experts and novices is not in the experts' use of faster or more powerful processors. The experts' brains employ principles that have been distilled and stored from previously encountered cases and tools for recognizing which principles apply when faced with a new situation.

Table 9 briefly summarizes some of the ways in which modularity can be seen in biological systems and analogous strategies used by artificial neural networks. Many of these approaches are discussed earlier in this paper. For artificial approaches that employ elements of modularity but do not relate directly to generalization and the scope of this paper, a few citations are included as pointers for the interested reader.

The first category of response types described in Table 9, “Modularity and Innate Responses,” is broken into two features and relate to the role of anatomy in the modular behavior of neural networks. As noted in the discussions of Figure 12 above, the routing of stimuli into innate and conditioned responses occurs through the use of components of the brain that are specialized for those tasks—whereby the innate responses emerge slowly through evolution while conditioned responses develop over the life of the organism. This distinction, in which different types of responses follow different training processes and timelines, resembles the use of feature transformations in transfer learning models

as well as in with pre-trained embeddings such as BERT and knowledge graphs that are developed in a general setting and then deployed for use on specific applications. Experimentation and variation based upon the principle of genetic recombination can also be seen in evolution-inspired processes for optimization of complex systems.

The second feature listed in the table, “System-wide Prioritization,” relates to the manner in which the full cognitive apparatus is equipped to respond to large scale events that impact the tradeoffs faced by individual components. Such behavior in artificial neural networks is discussed in Section 4 above on domain adaptation. Discussions in the literature on multi-objective optimization—and preferred methods for balancing different goals—offer another perspective on this prioritization problem. Additionally, some approaches simulate the strategy used in animal brains in which neurons send inhibitory and excitatory signals to regulate and balance the impacts of stimuli of different types.

The next category of response types, “Learning and Abstraction,” involves modularity in the grouping of combinations of stimuli into ideas. The use of archetypes in the brain is mimicked in artificial systems through the forms of generalization described in Sections 4 to 7, including the use of feature embeddings. Related work in artificial neural networks that does not explicitly generalize but performs some manner of abstraction involves knowledge distillation—through which smaller networks are trained to exhibit the same behavior as larger and more complex ones. The literature on neural architecture search involves a somewhat different take on abstraction, in which decisions about the structure of the network are assisted through explicit optimization, so that the classifier takes on some of the responsibility that is traditionally handled by the researcher.³

“Synaptic plasticity,” the learning of positive or negative associations with existing archetypes, is achieved in artificial systems both through feature embeddings and meta-learning, both of which take network structures developed in one setting and apply them to other problems. Strategies related to “structural plasticity,” the development and refinement of network-based architecture for learning such associations, involve meta-learning as well as transfer- and drift-based domain generalization approaches. Another key form of abstraction, “Semantic Knowledge,” relates to knowledge graphs and scope generalization, as discussed in Section 7.

In relation to the third type of biological response from Figure 12b, the selective collection of additional data, a variety of deep learning approaches augment existing datasets through regularization or adversarial approaches, and a recent area of growth known as self-paced or curriculum learning presents training examples to a network in increasing order of difficulty.

³Results from some search-based network classification approaches appear in the discussion of overfitting in Table 1.

9. Conclusion

This paper reviews concepts, modeling approaches, and recent findings along a spectrum of different levels of abstraction of neural network models including generalization across (1) Samples, (2) Distributions, (3) Domains, (4) Tasks, (5) Modalities, and (6) Scopes.

Results on (1) sample generalization show that, in the case of ImageNet, nearly all the recent improvements in accuracy have been achieved by reducing training error while the amount of overfitting has stayed the same. Substantial room remains for progress, but it will require a shift in focus away from training accuracy and toward a reduction in overfitting.

Views from statistics, econometrics, and neuroscience are introduced to illustrate how (2) distribution generalization can alternatively be viewed as a reweighting of cases in the data or as a change in the input-output relationship being represented. This similarity suggests transfer-based techniques as a potential avenue to explore to addressing difficult forms of sample and distribution generalization.

Influential frameworks on (3) domain generalization are summarized, including concept drift as well as transfer learning to adapt to a shift in domain. The Photo-Art-Cartoon-Sketch (PACS) dataset is presented as a motivating example; recent progress is discussed as are a variety of different domain adaptation datasets that are used as benchmarks in the literature. The importance of the transfer of feature embeddings is highlighted as a key strategy for generalization across domains and higher levels of abstraction.

Recent (4) task generalization breakthroughs are discussed in the areas of few-shot meta-learning—in which the skill of object identification is expanded by introducing new object classes to identify—and the multipurpose BERT approach to NLP.

Generalization across (5) modalities remains a relatively unexplored area, but recent innovations include the use of text-based embeddings in image classification and the transfer of a biologically-inspired network across olfactory, visual, and auditory modalities.

Exciting developments in (6) scope generalization involve supplementing NLP approaches with embeddings from knowledge graphs; state-of-the-art performance from the SemEval competition is discussed.

The later part of the survey explores neuroscience literature on how biological brains perform generalization and abstraction tasks, focusing on their modular structure as well as the dopamine-driven organization of learned ideas into conceptual “chunks.”

The recent rapid advances that have been seen in different forms of generalization—particularly across domains and tasks—help to underscore the many directions in which further developments can be expected in the coming years. At the same time, the seemingly more basic objective of generalizing model results from training to test samples has been elusive. Researchers are approaching the boundaries of what is possible with overfit models, and the demand

for improvements in model accuracy persists. As the neural network community explores ways to improve its framework for sample generalization, the progress that has been seen in broader levels of abstraction—and the insights that the field of neuroscience offers into analogous biological processes—both provide valuable blueprints of potential paths forward.

References

- Akers, K.G., Martı́n-Canabal, A., Restivo, L., Yiu, A.P., De Cristofaro, A., Hsiang, H., Wheeler, A.L., Guskjolen, A., Niibori, Y., Shoji, H., Ohira, K., Richards, B.A., Miyakawa, T., Joseelyn, S.A., Frankland, P.W., 2014. Hippocampal neurogenesis regulates forgetting during adulthood and infancy. *Science* 344, 598–602.
- Amidzic, O., Riehle, H.J., Fehr, T., Wienbruch, C., Elbert, T., 2001. Pattern of focal γ -bursts in chess players. *Nature* 412, 603.
- Andrychowicz, M., Wolski, F., Ray, A., Schneider, J., Fong, R., Welinder, P., McGrew, B., Tobin, J., Abbeel, P., Zaremba, W., 2017. Hindsight experience replay. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)* 31, 5055–65.
- Arjovsky, M., Bottou, L., Gulrajani, I., Lopez-Paz, D., 2019. Invariant risk minimization. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1907.02893.pdf>*.
- Arpit, D., Wang, H., Zhou, Y., Xiong, C., 2022. Ensemble of averages: improving model selection and boosting performance in domain generalization. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.10832>*.
- Aso, Y., Rubin, G.M., 2016. Domaminergic neurons write and update memories with cell-type-specific rules. *eLife*.
- Aso, Y., Sitaraman, D., Ichinose, T., Kaun, K.R., Vogt, K., Belliart-Guérin, G., Plaçais, P., Robie, A.A., Yamagata, N., Schnaitmann, C., Rowell, W.J., Johnston, R.M., Ngo, T.B., Chen, N., Korff, W., Nitabach, M.N., Heberlein, U., Preat, T., Branson, K.M., Tanimoto, H., Rubin, G.M., 2014. Mushroom body output neurons encode valence and guide memory-based action selection in *drosophila*. *eLife*.
- Athey, S., Imbens, G., 2019. Machine learning methods that economists should know about. *Annual Review of Economics* 11, 685–725.
- Baevski, A., Hsu, W., Xu, Q., Babu, A., Gu, J., Auli, M., 2022. data2vec: a general framework for self-supervised learning in speech, vision, and language. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research (PLMR)* 162, 1298–1312.
- Barabási, D.L., Barabási, A.L., 2020. A genetic model of the connectome. *Neuron* 105, 1–11.
- Baymurzina, D., Golikov, E., Burtsev, M., 2022. A review of neural architecture search. *Neurocomputing* 474, 82–93.
- Bayram, F., Ahmed, B.S., Kassler, A., 2022. From concept drift to model degradation: an overview on performance-aware drift detectors. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 245, 108632.
- Beery, S., van Horn, G., Perona, P., 2018. Recognition in terra incognita. *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 472–89.
- Bejani, M.M., Ghate, M., 2021. A systematic review on overfitting control in shallow and deep neural networks. *Artificial Intelligence Review* 54, 6391–438.
- Berridge, K.C., 2012. From prediction error to incentive salience: mesolimbic computation of reward motivation. *The European journal of neuroscience* 35, 1124–43.
- Berridge, K.C., Robinson, T.E., 2016. Liking, wanting, and the incentive-sensitization theory of addiction. *The American psychologist* 71, 670–9.
- Bertinetto, L., Henriques, J., Torr, P.H.S., Vedaldi, A., 2019. Meta-learning with differentiable closed form solvers. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Blitzer, J., Dredze, M., Pereira, F., 2007. Biographies, Bollywood, boom-boxes, and blenders: domain adaptation for sentiment classification. *Annual Meeting of the Association of Computational Linguistics* 45, 440–7.
- Borthakur, A., Cleland, T.A., 2019. Signal conditioning for learning in the wild. *Neuro-inspired Computational Elements Workshop (NICE)*.

- Bousquet, O., Elisseeff, A., 2002. Stability and generalization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 0, 499–526.
- Campbell, D.T., Stanley, J.C., 1963. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Rand McNally Publishing Company, Chicago.
- Cao, C., Huang, Y., Wang, Z., Wang, L., Xu, N., Tan, T., 2018. Lateral inhibition-inspired convolutional neural network for visual attention and saliency detection. *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 32, 6690–7.
- Caputo, B., Müller, H., Martinez-Gomez, J., Villegas, M., Acar, B., Patricia, N., Marvasti, N., Üsküdarlı, S., Paredas, R., Cazorla, M., Garcia-Varea, I., Morell, V., 2014. ImageCLEF 2014: overview and analysis of the results. *International Conference of the Cross-Language Forum for European Languages*, 192–211.
- Card, D., 2001. Estimating the return to schooling: progress on some persistent econometric problems. *Econometrica* 69, 1127–60.
- Chen, Y., Zhao, Y., Jia, W., Cao, L., Liu, X., 2020. Adversarial-learning-based image-to-image transformation: a survey. *Neurocomputing* 411, 468–86.
- Cohen, Y., Cvitanović, P., Solla, S.A., 2021. A novel approach to the empirical characterization of learning in biological systems. *bioRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.10.426118>*.
- Conneau, A., Khandelwal, K., Goyal, N., Chaudhary, V., Wenzek, G., Guzmán, F., Grave, E., Ott, M., Zettlemoyer, L., Stoyanov, V., 2020. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 58, 8440–51.
- Cook, T.D., Campbell, D.T., 1979. *Quasi-Experimentation: Design & Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Rand McNally Publishing Company, Chicago.
- Cortese, A., Yamamoto, A., Hashemzadeh, M., Sepulveda, P., Kawato, M., De Martino, B., 2021. Value signals guide abstraction during learning. *eLife* 10, e68943.
- Davis, E., 2017. Logical formalizations of commonsense reasoning: a survey. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 358, 793–6.
- Davis, E., Marcus, G., 2015. Commonsense reasoning and commonsense knowledge in artificial intelligence. *Communications of the ACM* 58(9), 92–103.
- Dayan, P., Abbott, L.F., 2001. *Theoretical neuroscience: computational and mathematical modeling of neural systems*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Devineni, A.V., Scaplen, K.M., 2022. Neural circuits underlying behavioral flexibility: insights from *Drosophila*. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience* 6, 2022.821.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M., Lee, K., Toutanova, K., 2019. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *North American Association for Computational Linguistics - Human Language Technologies*, 4171–86.
- DiCarlo, J., 2017. The science of natural intelligence: reverse engineering primate visual perception. *Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI) Symposium, Computational Principles of Natural and Artificial Intelligence*, https://cbmm.mit.edu/sites/default/files/documents/Dicarlo_AAAI17_SoI.pdf.
- Dokeroglu, T., Deniz, A., Kiziloz, H.E., 2022. A comprehensive survey on recent metaheuristics for feature selection. *Neurocomputing* 494, 269–96.
- Dong, X., Gabrilovich, E., Heitz, G., Horn, W., Lao, N., Murphy, K., Strohmman, T., Sun, S., Zhang, W., 2014. Knowledge vault: a web-scale approach to probabilistic knowledge fusion. *ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD)*, 601–10.
- Emerson, G., Schluter, N., Stanovsky, G., Kumar, R., Palmer, A., Schneider, N., Singh, S., Ratan, S., 2022. *Proceedings of the 16th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Seattle.
- Fang, C., Xu, Y., Rockmore, D.N., 2013. Unbiased metric learning: on the utilization of multiple datasets and web images for softening bias. *International Conference on Computer Vision*, 1657–64.
- Feldman, N.H., Griffiths, T.L., Morgan, J.L., 2009. The influence of categories on perception: explaining the perceptual magnet effect as optimal statistical inference. *Psychological Review* 116(4), 752–82.
- Finn, C., Abbeel, P., Levine, S., 2017. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research (PLMR)* 70, 1126–35.
- Frolov, S., Hinz, T., Raue, F., Hees, J., Dengel, A., 2021. Adversarial text-to-image synthesis: a review. *Neural Networks* 144, 187–209.
- Froudust-Walsh, S., Bliss, D.P., Ding, X., Jankovic-Rapan, L., Niu, M., Knoblauch, K., Zilles, K., Kennedy, H., Palomero-Gallagher, N., Wang, X., 2020. A dopamine gradient controls access to distributed working memory in monkey cortex. *bioRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.07.286500>*.
- George, D., Lehrach, W., Kansky, K., Lázaro-Gredilla, M., Laan, C., Marthi, B., Lou, X., Meng, Z., Liu, Y., Wang, H., Lavin, A., Phoenix, D.S., 2017. A generative vision model that trains with high data efficiency and breaks text-based CAPTCHAs. *Science* 358, 1271–9.
- Gilead, M., Liberman, N., Maril, A., 2014. From mind to matter: neural correlates of abstract and concrete mindsets. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience* 9(5), 638–45.
- Gou, J., Yu, B., Maybank, S.J., Tao, D., 2021. Knowledge distillation: a survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision* 129, 1789–819.
- Gulrakani, I., Lopez-Paz, D., 2020. In search of lost domain generalization. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Friedman, J., 2009. *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*, Second Edition. Springer, New York.
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., Sun, J., 2015. Deep residual learning for image recognition. *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 770–8.
- He, P., Liu, X., Gao, J., Chen, W., 2021. DeBERTa: decoding-enhanced BERT with disentangled attention. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Heckman, J.J., Vytlacil, E., 2005. Structural equations, treatment effects, and econometric policy evaluation. *Econometrica* 73, 669–738.
- Henriksson, J., Berger, C., Borg, M., Tornberg, L., Sathiamoorthy, S.R., Englund, C., 2021. Performance analysis of out-of-distribution detection on trained neural networks. *Information and Software Technology* 130, 106409.
- Hospedales, T., Antoniou, A., Micaelli, P., Storkey, A., 2022. Meta-learning in neural networks: a survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 44(9), 5149–69.
- Howard, A., Sandler, M., Chu, G., Chen, L., Chen, B., Tan, M., Wang, W., Zhu, Y., Pang, R., Vasudevan, V., Le, Q.V., Adam, H., 2019. Searching for MobileNetV3. *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 1314–24.
- Hu, S.X., Li, D., Stühmer, J., Kim, M., Hospedales, T.M., 2022a. Pushing the limits of simple pipelines for few-shot learning: external data and fine-tuning make a difference. *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 9068–77.
- Hu, Y., Pateux, S., Gripon, V., 2022b. Squeezing backbone feature distributions to the max for efficient few-shot learning. *Algorithms* 15, 147.
- Huang, G., Liu, Z., Van Der Maaten, L., Weinberger, K.Q., 2017. Densely connected convolutional networks. *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 4700–8.
- Imbens, G.W., Angrist, J.D., 1994. Identification and estimation of local average treatment effects. *Econometrica* 62, 467–75.
- Jaafar, Y., Laurent, J.L., Deruyver, A., Naceur, M.S., 2019. Reinforcement learning for neural architecture search: a review. *Image and Vision Computing* 89, 57–66.
- Ji, N., Madan, G.K., Fabre, G.I., Dayan, A., Baker, C.M., Nwabudike, I., Flavell, S.W., 2020. A neural circuit for flexible control of persistent behavioral states. *bioRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.04.934547>*.
- Ji, S., Pan, S., Cambria, E., Marttinen, P., Yu, P.S., 2022. A survey on knowledge graphs: representation, acquisition, and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 33(2), 494–514.
- Kahnt, T., Tobler, P.N., 2016. Dopamine regulates stimulus generalization in the human hippocampus. *eLife* 5, e12678.
- Kaiser, M., Hilgetag, C.C., Kötter, R., 2010. Hierarchy and dynamics of neural networks. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics* 4, 112.

- Kerg, G., Kanuparthi, B., Goyal, A., Goyette, K., Bengio, Y., Lajoie, G., 2020. Untangling tradeoffs between recurrence and self-attention in artificial neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)* 34.
- Kim, S., Kim, I., You, D., 2022. Multi-condition multi-objective optimization using deep reinforcement learning. *Journal of Computational Physics* 462, 111263.
- Kirkpatrick, J., Pascanu, R., Rabinowitz, N., Veness, J., Desjardins, G., Rusu, A.A., Milan, K., Quan, J., Ramalho, T., Grabska-Barwinska, A., Hassabis, D., Clopath, C., Kumaran, D., Hadsell, R., 2017. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *arXiv preprint DOI <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1612.00796v2>*.
- Klimt, B., Yang, Y., 2004. Introducing the Enron corpus. *Proceedings of the CEAS*.
- Knoblauch, A., Palm, G., Sommer, F.T., 2010. Memory capacities for synaptic and structural plasticity. *Neural Computation* 22, 289–341.
- Krizhevsky, A., 2009. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. Unpublished manuscript <https://www.cs.toronto.edu/~kriz/learning-features-2009-TR.pdf>.
- Krizhevsky, A., 2014. One weird trick for parallelizing convolutional neural networks. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.5997>*.
- Ku, J., Oh, J., Lee, Y., Pooniwalla, G., Lee, S., 2020. A selective survey on versatile knowledge distillation paradigm for neural network models. *arXiv preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.14554>*.
- Lan, Z., Chen, M., Goodman, S., Gimpel, K., Sharma, P., Soricut, R., 2020. ALBERT: a lite BERT for self-supervised learning of language representations. *International Conference on Learning Systems*.
- Lazer, D., Kennedy, R., King, G., Vespignani, A., 2014. The parable of google flu: traps in big data analysis. *Science* 343, 1203–5.
- Lee, D., Seo, H., Jung, M.W., 2012. Neural basis of reinforcement learning and decision making. *Annual Review of Neuroscience* 35, 287–308.
- Lewis, D.D., 1997. Neural complexity measures. Dataset available at: <http://www.daviddlewis.com/resources/testcollections/reuters21578/>.
- Li, D., Yang, Y., Song, Y., Hospedales, T.M., 2017. Deeper, broader, and artier domain generalization. *International Conference on Computer Vision*.
- Li, X., Sun, Z., Xue, J., Ma, Z., 2021. A concise review of recent few-shot meta-learning methods. *Neurocomputing* 456, 463–8.
- Lin, Y., Han, X., Xie, R., Liu, Z., Sun, M., 2018. Knowledge representation learning: a quantitative review. *arXiv preprint DOI <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1812.10901.pdf>*.
- Liu, L., Kuang, Z., Chen, Y., Xue, J., Yang, W., Zhang, W., 2020. Incdet: In defense of elastic weight consolidation for incremental object detection. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*.
- Liu, P., Wang, J., Zeng, Z., 2022. An overview of the stability analysis of recurrent neural networks with multiple equilibria. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* forthcoming.
- Logiaco, L., Abbott, L.F., Escola, S., 2019. A model of flexible motor sequencing through thalamic control of cortical dynamics. *bioRxiv preprint doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.17.880153>*.
- Lust, J., Condurache, A.P., 2021. A survey on assessing the generalization envelope of deep neural networks: predictive uncertainty, out-of-distribution and adversarial samples. *arXiv preprint: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2008.09381.pdf>*.
- Malmasi, S., Fang, A., Fetahu, B., Kar, S., Rohlenko, O., 2022. SemEval-2022 task 11: multilingual complex named entity recognition (multiconer). *International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval)* 16, 1412–37.
- Mansouri, F.A., Freedman, D.J., Buckley, M.J., 2020. Emergence of abstract rules in the primate brain. *Nature Reviews: Neuroscience* 21, 595–610.
- Meunier, D., Lambiotte, R., Bullmore, E.T., 2010. Modular and hierarchically modular organization of brain networks. *Frontiers in Neuroscience* 4, 200.
- Meunier, D., Lambiotte, R., Fornito, A., Ersche, K.D., Bullmore, E.T., 2009. Hierarchical modularity in human brain functional networks. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics* 3, 37.
- Min, B., Bliss, D.P., Sarma, A., Freedman, D.J., Wang, X., 2020. A neural circuit mechanism of categorical perception: top-down signaling in the primate cortex. *bioRxiv preprint doi: [doi:10.1101/2020.06.15.151506](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.151506)*.
- Niu, B., Wen, E., Ren, W., Zhang, X., Yang, L., Wang, S., Zhang, K., Cao, X., Shen, H., 2020. Single image super-resolution via a holistic attention network. *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 191–207.
- Paszke, A., Gross, S., Massa, F., Lerer, A., Bradbury, J., Chanan, G., Killeen, T., Lin, Z., Gimelshein, N., Antiga, L., Desmaison, A., Kopf, A., Yang, E., DeVito, Z., Raison, M., Tejani, A., Chilamkurthy, S., Steiner, B., Fang, L., Bai, J., Chintala, S., 2019. PyTorch: an imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Neural Information Processing Systems* 32, 8024–35.
- Peng, X., Bai, Q., Xia, X., Huang, Z., Saenko, K., Wang, B., 2019. Moment matching for multi-source domain adaptation. *International Conference on Computer Vision*, 1406–15.
- Peng, X., Usman, B., Kaushik, N., Hoffman, J., Wang, D., Saenko, K., 2017. VisDA: the visual domain adaptation challenge. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1710.06924v2.pdf>*.
- Qi, G., Aggarwal, C., Huang, T., 2011. Towards semantic knowledge propagation from text corpus to web images. *International Conference on World Wide Web* 20, 297–306.
- Qiu, S., Liu, Q., Zhou, S., Huang, W., 2022. Adversarial attack and defense technologies in natural language processing: a survey. *Neurocomputing* 492, 278–307.
- Qu, Y., Ma, Z., Clausen, A., Jørgensen, B.N., 2021. A comprehensive review of machine learning in multi-objective optimization. *International Conference on Big Data and Artificial Intelligence* 4, 7–14.
- Recht, B., Roelofs, R., Schmidt, L., Shankar, V., 2019. Do ImageNet classifiers generalize to ImageNet? *International Conference on Machine Learning* 97.
- Richards, B.A., Frankland, P.W., 2017. The persistence and transience of memory. *Neuron* 94, 1071–84.
- Robertson, E.M., 2018. Memory instability as a gateway to generalization. *PLOS Biology* 16(3), e2004633.
- Rogers, T., 2014. Captcha font. <http://cargocollective.com/tomrogers/CAPTCHA>.
- Rohlf, C., 2022. Problem-dependent attention and effort in neural networks with an application to image resolution. *arXiv preprint DOI <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2201.01415.pdf>*.
- Rohlf, C., 2023a. A descriptive analysis of olfactory sensation and memory in *Drosophila* and its relation to artificial neural networks. *Neurocomputing*.
- Rohlf, C., 2023b. Forbidden knowledge and specialized training: a versatile solution for the two main source of overfitting in linear regression. *The American Statistician*.
- Roth, M., Anthonio, T., Sauer, A., 2022. SemEval-2022 task 7: identifying plausible clarifications of implicit and underspecified phrases in instructional texts. *International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval)* 16, 1039–49.
- Russakovsky, O., Deng, J., Su, J., Krause, J., Satheesh, S., Ma, S., Huang, Z., Karpathy, A., Khosla, A., Bernstein, M., Berg, A.C., Fei-Fei, L., 2015. ImageNet large scale visual recognition challenge. *International Journal of Computer Vision* 115(3), 211–52.
- Rusu, A.A., Rabinowitz, N.C., Desjardins, G., Soyer, H., Kirkpatrick, J., Kavukcuoglu, K., Pascanu, R., Hadsell, R., 2016a. Progressive neural networks. *arXiv preprint DOI <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1606.04671>*.
- Rusu, A.A., Večerík, M., Rothörl, T., Heess, N., Pascanu, R., Hadsell, R., 2016b. Sim-to-real robot learning from pixels with progressive nets. *arXiv preprint DOI <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1610.04286v2>*.
- S. J. Kiebel, Daunizeau, J., Friston, K.J., 2009. Perception and hierarchical dynamics. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics* 3, 20.
- Sadeh, S., Clopath, C., 2021. Inhibitory stabilization and cortical computation. *Nature Reviews: Neuroscience* 22, 21–37.
- Saenko, K., Kulis, B., Fritz, M., Darrell, T., 2010. Adapting visual category models to new domains. *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 213–26.

- Savin, C., Triesch, J., 2014. Emergence of task-dependent representations in working memory circuits. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience* 8.
- Schultz, W., 1998. Predictive reward signal of dopamine neurons. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 80, 1–27.
- Schultz, W., 2007. Multiple dopamine functions at different time courses. *Annual Review of Neuroscience* 30, 259–88.
- Schultz, W., Dayan, P., Montague, P.R., 1997. A neural substrate of prediction and reward. *Science* 275, 1593–9.
- Schwarz, J., Luketina, J., Czarnecki, E.M., Grabska-Barwinska, A., Teh, Y.W., Pascanu, R., Hadsell, R., 2018. Progress & compress: a scalable framework for continual learning. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research (PMLR)* 80.
- Seung, H.S., 2018a. Two “correlation games” for a nonlinear network with Hebbian excitatory neurons and anti-Hebbian inhibitory neurons. *arXiv preprint DOI <https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.11937>*.
- Seung, H.S., 2018b. Unsupervised learning by a nonlinear network with Hebbian excitatory and anti-Hebbian inhibitory neurons. *arXiv preprint DOI <https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.11581>*.
- Shalam, D., Korman, S., 2022. The self-optimal-transport feature transform. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2204.03065v1.pdf>*.
- Shang, J., Wang, S., Sun, Y., Yu, Y., Zhou, Y., Xiang, L., Yang, G., 2022. X-PuDu at SemEval-2022 task 7: a replaced token detection task pre-trained model with pattern-aware ensembling for identifying plausible clarifications. *International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval)* 16, 1078–83.
- Shankar, S., Piratla, V., Chakrabarti, S., Chaudhuri, S., Jyothi, P., Sarawagi, S., 2018. Generalizing across domains via cross-gradient training. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Shen, Z., Liu, J., He, Y., Zhang, X., Xu, R., Yu, H., Cui, P., 2021. Towards out-of-distribution generalization: a survey. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.13624>*.
- Shorten, C., Khoshgoftaar, T.M., 2019. A survey on image data augmentation for deep learning. *Journal of Big Data* 6, 60.
- Shu, X., Qi, G., Tang, J., Wang, J., 2015. Weakly-shared deep transfer networks for heterogeneous-domain knowledge propagation. *ACM Multimedia Conference (MM)* 23, 35–44.
- Simonyan, K., Zisserman, A., 2015. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Sinz, F.H., Pitkow, X., Reimer, J., Bethge, M., Tolias, A.S., 2019. Engineering a less artificial intelligence. *Neuron* 103, 967–79.
- Soviany, P., Ionescu, R.T., Rota, P., Sebe, N., 2022. Curriculum learning: a survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision* 130, 1526–65.
- Speer, R., Chin, J., Havasi, C., 2017. Conceptnet 5.5: an open multilingual graph of general knowledge. *Proceedings of AAAI* 31.
- Speer, R., Havasi, C., 2012. Representation general relational knowledge in conceptnet 5. *Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC)*, 3679–86.
- Stegmann, Y., Ahrens, L., Pauli, P., Keil, A., Wieser, M.J., 2020. Social aversive generalization learning sharpens the tuning of visuocortical neurons to facial identity cues. *eLife* 9, e55204.
- Sun, Y., Wang, S., Feng, S., Ding, S., Pang, C., Shang, J., Liu, J., Chen, X., Zhao, Y., Lu, Y., Liu, W., Wu, Z., Gong, W., Liang, J., Shang, Z., Sun, P., Liu, W., Ouyang, X., Yu, D., Tian, H., Wu, H., Wang, H., 2021. ERNIE 3.0: large-scale knowledge enhanced pre-training for language understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.02137>*.
- Szegedy, C., Liu, W., Jia, Y., Sermanet, P., Reed, S., Anguelov, D., Erhan, D., Vanhoucke, V., Rabinovich, A., 2015a. Going deeper with convolutions. *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 1–9.
- Szegedy, C., Vanhoucke, V., Ioffe, S., Shlens, J., Wojna, Z., 2015b. Rethinking the inception architecture for computer vision. *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2818–26.
- Tan, M., Le, Q.V., 2020. EfficientNet: rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.11946>*.
- Tian, Y., Zhang, Y., 2022. A comprehensive survey on regularization strategies in machine learning. *Information Fusion* 80, 146–66.
- Timme, N.M., Marshall, N.J., Bennett, N., Ripp, M., Lautzenhiser, E., Beggs, J.M., 2016. Criticality maximizes complexity in neural tissue. *Frontiers in Physiology* 7, 425.
- Ueno, K., Suzuki, E., Naganos, S., Ofusa, K., Horiuchi, J., Saitoe, M., 2017. Coincident postsynaptic activity gates presynaptic dopamine release to induce plasticity in drosophila mushroom bodies. *eLife*.
- Vaidya, A.R., Jones, H.M., Castillo, J., Badre, D., 2021. Neural representation of abstract task structure during generalization. *eLife* 10, e63226.
- Venkateswara, H., Eusebio, J., Chakraborty, S., Panchanathan, S., 2017. Deep hashing network for unsupervised domain adaptation. *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 5018–27.
- Vinyals, O., Blundell, C., Lillicrap, T., Kavukcoglu, K., Wierstra, D., 2016. Matching networks for one shot learning. *Neural Information Processing Systems* 30.
- Vogt, K., Aso, Y., Hige, T., Knappek, S., Ichinose, T., Friedrich, A.B., Turner, G.C., Rubin, G.M., Tanimoto, H., 2016. Direct neural pathways convey distinct visual information to drosophila mushroom bodies. *eLife*.
- Vogt, K., Schnaitmann, C., Dylla, K.V., Knappek, S., Aso, Y., Rubin, G.M., Tanimoto, H., 2014. Shared mushroom body circuits underlie visual and olfactory memories of drosophila. *eLife*.
- Wang, A., Pruksachatkun, Y., Nangia, N., Singh, A., Michael, J., Hill, F., Levy, O., 2019a. SuperGLUE: a sticker benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems. *Neural Information Processing Systems* 34.
- Wang, A., Singh, A., Michael, J., Hill, F., Levy, O., Bowman, S.R., 2019b. GLUE: a multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. *International Conference on Learning Systems*.
- Wang, J., Lan, C., Liu, C., Ouyang, Y., Lu, W., Chen, Y., Zeng, W., Yu, P.S., 2023. Generalizing to unseen domains: a survey on domain generalization. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*.
- Wang, J., Su, Y., Lin, Q., Ma, L., Gong, D., Li, J., Ming, Z., 2020a. A survey of decomposition approaches in multiobjective evolutionary algorithms. *Neurocomputing* 408, 308–30.
- Wang, M., Deng, W., 2021. Deep face recognition: a survey. *Neurocomputing* 429, 215–44.
- Wang, Q., Mao, Z., Wang, B., Guo, L., 2017. Knowledge graph embedding: a survey of approaches and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 29(12), 2724–43.
- Wang, S., Minku, L.L., Yao, X., 2018. A semantic study of online class imbalance learning with concept drift. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 29(10), 4802–21.
- Wang, S., Yu, L., Li, C., Fu, C., Heng, P., 2020b. Learning from extrinsic and intrinsic supervisions for domain generalization. *European Conference on Computer Vision*.
- Wang, Y., Yao, Q., Kwok, J.T., Ni, L.M., 2019c. Generalizing from a few examples: a survey on few-shot learning. *ACM Computing Surveys* 53(3), 63.
- Wurm, M.F., Lingnau, A., 2015. Decoding actions at different levels of abstraction. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 35(20), 7727–35.
- Xie, S., Girshick, R., Dollár, P., Tu, Z., He, K., 2017. Aggregated residual transformations for deep neural networks. *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* 8, 1492–500.
- Xu, J., Xiao, L., López, A.M., 2019. Self-supervised domain adaptation for computer vision tasks. *IEEE Access* 7, 156694–706.
- Xu, S., Li, Y., Hsiao, J., Ho, C., Qi, Z., 2022. A dual modality approach for (zero-shot) multi-label classification. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2208.09562v1.pdf>*.
- Xu, X., Liu, L., Li, B., 2020. A survey of CAPTCHA technologies to distinguish between human and computer. *Neurocomputing* 408, 292–307.
- Yang, J., Zhou, K., Li, Y., Liu, Z., 2021. Generalized out-of-distribution detection: a survey. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.11334>*.

- Yao, X., Bai, Y., Zhang, X., Zhang, Y., Sun, Q., Chen, R., Li, R., Yu, B., 2022. PCL: proxy-based contrastive learning for domain generalization. *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 7097–107.
- Zador, A.M., 2019. A critique of pure learning and what artificial neural networks can learn from animal brains. *Nature Communications* 10, 3770.
- Zagoruyko, S., Komodakis, N., 2017. Wide residual networks. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/1605.07146>*.
- Zenke, F., Poole, B., Ganguli, S., 2017. Continual learning through synaptic intelligence. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research (PMLR)* 70.
- Zhan, Z., Li, J., Zhang, J., 2022. Evolutionary deep learning: a survey. *Neurocomputing* 483, 42–58.
- Zhang, J., Berridge, K.C., Tindell, A.J., Smith, K.S., Aldridge, J.W., 2009. A neural computational model of incentive salience. *PLoS Computational Biology* 5.
- Zhou, K., Liu, Z., Qiao, Y., Xiang, T., Loy, C.C., 2022. Domain generalization: a survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Recognition* 45(4), 4396–415.
- Zhuang, F., Qi, Z., Duan, K., Xi, D., Zhu, Y., Zhu, H., Xiong, H., He, Q., 2021. A comprehensive survey on transfer learning. *Proceedings of the IEEE* 109(1), 43–76.