University of Puerto Rico
Mayagüez Campus
Mayagüez, Puerto Rico

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Natural or Artificial Intelligence?

by
Alex Demel Pacheco

Prof. J. Fernando Vega Riveros
Course: ICOM 5015, Section 001D
Date: February 21, 2024.

Natural or Artificial Intelligence?

Alex Demel Pacheco – ICOM5015

***Abstract*—*This study delves into the nuances of artificial intelligence (AI) and natural intelligence (NI), aiming to illuminate both the areas where they align and diverge. By examining AI's capability for adaptability, grasping abstract concepts, and its potential to achieve consciousness and a theory of mind, the research posits that AI could be on the verge of being considered functionally equivalent to NI. This proposition marks a significant shift in our foundational understanding of intelligence, challenging long-standing perceptions of human cognition and sparking a debate on the ethical, societal, and developmental implications of AI's rapid advancement. With AI systems already surpassing human performance in certain tasks, there is a growing consensus that the advent of general and superintelligent AI is not just possible but imminent.*

Keywords—Natural Intelligence, Theory of Mind, Artificial Intelligence, Artificial Superintelligence, Singularity

I. Introduction

In the evolving landscape of intelligence studies, the dichotomy between artificial intelligence (AI) and natural intelligence (NI) stands as a cornerstone of philosophical, technological, and scientific inquiry. The concept of natural intelligence, inherent in humans and other living creatures, proves to be elusive to define due to its complex and nuanced nature. Esteemed figures like Dr. Daeyeol Lee from Johns Hopkins University's Department of Neuroscience, highlight the subjective nature of intelligence, stating that intelligence can be "difficult to define", and "can mean different things to different people" [1]. Similarly, psychiatrist Neel Burton from the University of Oxford echoes this sentiment, asserting that "there is no agreed definition or model of intelligence" [2]. NI encompasses more than mere cognitive capabilities; it involves a sophisticated synergy of learning, comprehension, problem-solving, emotional insight, and an array of other faculties that vary widely across different species [1]. The very essence of NI is its fluidity and adaptability, characteristics that are profoundly influenced by biological, environmental, and experiential factors.

On the other side of the spectrum, AI attempts to replicate the multifaceted nature of NI through technological means, aiming to simulate cognitive processes such as learning, reasoning, and self-correction. John McCarthy, often regarded as one of the founding figures of AI, envisioned it as the creation of computer programs capable of performing tasks and achieving objectives in the world as competently as humans [3]. This vision underscores the ambition at the heart of AI research—to create machines that mirror human cognitive functions. With the emergence of groundbreaking AI technologies that sometimes surpass human performance, the previously clear distinction between artificial and natural intelligence is becoming increasingly blurred. This evolution is prompting a reassessment of our fundamental understanding of intelligence itself.

This investigation aims to demonstrate that if AI can achieve the same results as NI, they should be considered functionally equivalent. This stance not only challenges traditional perceptions of intelligence but also propels us to reconsider the criteria defining this concept. The significance of this inquiry lies not only in its philosophical implications but also in its practical ramifications, influencing the future trajectory of AI development, ethical considerations, and potential societal impacts.

The scope of this project is intentionally broad, encompassing various facets of AI and NI, yet mindful of its limitations due to the expansive nature of the subject matter. Rather than striving for an exhaustive analysis, this study aims to shed light on critical points of convergence and divergence between AI and NI, providing valuable insights into their functional parallels and distinctions. Through this examination, the project seeks to enrich the ongoing dialogue surrounding intelligence, enhancing our comprehension of what it signifies to possess intelligence in an era where the artificial and natural are increasingly merging.

II. Origins and Adaptability

The discourse on AI versus NI hinges on several core distinctions, primarily rooted in their origin, development process, and operational mechanisms. AI, being a product of human ingenuity, is designed, built, and improved upon by researchers and engineers. In contrast, NI, exemplified by human cognition, is the result of millions of years of evolution, shaped by natural selection and genetic adaptation [4]. This foundational difference influences their respective capabilities, learning processes, and adaptability.

AI systems are often highly specialized, designed to excel in specific tasks for which they were created, such as mastering the game of chess, translating languages, or identifying objects in images with precision. The learning mechanisms of these AI systems are fundamentally data-driven, relying on algorithms that require vast amounts of training data to learn, adapt, and enhance their performance. In contrast, NI embodies a more adaptive and generalist approach, with the ability to learn from a comparatively limited amount of information and to apply this knowledge across a wide array of contexts.

Dr. Alessandro Di Nuovo, a distinguished Professor of Machine Intelligence at Sheffield Hallam University's Department of Computing, highlights a disparity between the current capabilities of AI and the innate functions of the human brain. He notes that the human brain's natural proficiency in abstract thinking, its emotional intelligence, and its ability to navigate complex problems without explicit programming sets it apart from current AI technologies [5]. This distinction emphasizes the hurdles that AI must overcome to match the depth and versatility of human cognition.

Despite these challenges, Di Nuovo's research illuminates the field's rapid progress, showcasing the emergence of advanced cognitive models that push the boundaries of AI's capabilities. These models, though still under development, have shown a promising capacity for understanding higher-order abstract concepts, including the nuanced realms of social interactions and emotional intelligence [5]. Such advancements suggest a closing gap between AI and human-like cognitive abilities, hinting at a future where AI may not only emulate but also extend the complexities of human thought and emotional comprehension.

While current AI systems remain specialized and occasionally encounter difficulties with particular tasks, the landscape of AI research and development is undergoing a significant transformation. Recent advancements have given rise to AI models that exhibit an unprecedented ability to learn from a wide array of data types [6]. These models are not limited to performing tasks explicitly outlined in their initial instructions or training datasets. Instead, they have evolved into multimodal entities, capable of transferring and applying their acquired knowledge across a variety of contexts and domains.

This evolution marks a pivotal shift in the capabilities of AI systems, suggesting a move towards more generalized forms of intelligence. These developments point towards the emergence of AI models that not only excel in abstract thinking—a domain traditionally reserved for human cognition—but also demonstrate a nuanced understanding of emotional contexts [5][7]. Furthermore, these models show promise in tackling complex problems that span across different contexts, adapting their approach as needed without direct human intervention. These accomplishments reveal that, although not perfect, AI possesses a versatility akin to natural intelligence, highlighting its capacity to adapt and understand abstract ideas.

III. Conciousness and Theory of Mind

Another core distinction between AI and NI centers on consciousness and subjective experience. NI inherently involves awareness, sensations, and a rich tapestry of feelings—elements that remain elusive to the current capabilities of AI. Cognitive scientist David Chalmers stated that AI currently "lacks too many of the potential requisites for consciousness for us to believe that they actually experience the world" signaling a cautious stance on the immediate prospects of achieving conscious AI [8]. Nonetheless, Liad Mudrik, a neuroscientist at Tel Aviv University, highlights, "Consciousness poses a unique challenge in our attempts to study it, because it's hard to define. It's inherently subjective" [8]. This sentiment is echoed by the broader scientific community, which has made strides in understanding consciousness but still faces the enigmatic challenge of applying these insights to AI. As philosopher Daniel Dennett suggests, "not only don't we understand our own consciousness, but half the time our brains are actively fooling us" [9].

This raises an intriguing question: Could NI itself be a manifestation of highly sophisticated biological algorithms that give rise to sensations, feelings, and the illusion of awareness? Dennett further argues, "consciousness is something like the product of multiple, layered computer programs running on the hardware of the brain" [10]. This perspective challenges the clear-cut division between AI and NI, especially when considering the concept of consciousness. How can we measure or even define consciousness if its very nature eludes our full comprehension?

Moreover, as previously discussed, advancements in AI have led to models capable of processing and interpreting emotions, blurring the lines even further. For example, affective computing systems have been developed to recognize human emotions through facial expressions, voice intonations, and physiological signals, demonstrating a form of emotional understanding [11]. While these systems can recognize and react to emotions, the debate over whether they can 'feel' in a human sense remains contentious.

Another area of debate in comparing NI to AI involves the Theory of Mind—the ability to attribute mental states to oneself and others, and to understand that others have beliefs, desires, and intentions that are different from one's own [12]. This cognitive ability, crucial for empathy and social interactions and once considered exclusive to humans, is now being observed in AI advancements [13]. Notably, researchers at Stanford University have shown that cutting-edge AI, especially OpenAI's GPT-4, has reached a milestone in passing Theory of Mind tests, demonstrating an ability to predict others' actions with a proficiency akin to that of a 9-year-old child [14]. This progression marks a significant leap in AI's evolution, moving beyond superior performance in analytical tasks, such as Chess and Go, to mastering more nuanced, human-like skills such as inference and intuition. However, the authenticity of these Theory of Mind capabilities in AI remains a subject of contention. Critics point out that AI models exhibit confusion under minor alterations in testing conditions—a reaction uncharacteristic of entities possessing a genuine understanding of Theory of Mind [15]. Yet, given the swift advancements in the field of AI research, these errors could soon be relegated to history. In the foreseeable future, the replication of consciousness and the achievement of a true theory of mind by an AI system might indeed become possible. However, recognizing this milestone may prove challenging, as the nature of human consciousness itself remains a mystery to us.

IV. Mirroring Natural Intelligence

AI research has long been inspired by the complexity and versatility of NI, with a particular focus on replicating human cognitive functions, problem-solving abilities, and learning processes. Techniques such as neural networks and deep learning algorithms are heavily inspired by the human brain's architecture and operational mechanisms, enabling machines to analyze and interpret data across multiple layers in a manner that echoes neural signal processing [16]. Despite these advances, the human brain remains a marvel of complexity, housing approximately 86 billion neurons interconnected in a dense network of unparalleled processing capacity. While mirroring the brain's exhaustive neural connectivity presents a formidable challenge, some experts argue that achieving human-like intelligence may not necessitate the replication of every single neuron, suggesting a more feasible target for AI endeavors [17].

Another domain in which AI strives to mirror NI is the realm of creativity, challenging the long-held belief that it is a unique hallmark of human intelligence. Recent developments have seen AI models achieve remarkable feats, such as winning literary and artistic competitions [18][19], tasks that demand a high degree of originality and inventiveness. However, these achievements have sparked controversy among both researchers and the public. Critics contend that such creative feats by AI are underpinned by extensive training on thousands of copyrighted materials, thereby infringing upon intellectual property rights and denouncing the authenticity of AI-generated creativity [20][21]. They argue that these models merely replicate existing works rather than generating original creations. Conversely, it raises philosophical inquiries about the nature of creativity itself—when does drawing inspiration from existing works cross the line into mere replication? And if the output of AI models is unique and not pre-existing in their training datasets, can it not be deemed original [22]? These debates highlight the subjective and nuanced nature of creativity, suggesting that AI's capacity to produce novel and innovative outcomes may indeed blur the lines of what is traditionally considered the exclusive domain of natural intelligence.

A further topic of debate among scholars is the notion that the ability to replicate oneself is essential for true intelligence. Neuroscientist Daeyeol Lee from Johns Hopkins University has posited that genuine intelligence necessitates the presence of life, characterized fundamentally by the ability to self-replicate [1]. Lee maintains that achieving true intelligence in machines may be an insurmountable challenge or, at best, a goal for the far-off future. Contrasting with this viewpoint, a team of engineers from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) has made significant strides with the creation of a pioneering self-replicating robot [23]. Led by doctoral student Amira Abdel-Rahman at MIT's Centre for Bits and Atoms, this robot showcases the ability to independently construct a diverse range of structures, from vehicles and buildings to additional robots of varying sizes, employing artificial intelligence to oversee complex operations and direct swarms of smaller robots to complete tasks efficiently and without conflict. This development further bridges the gap between artificial and natural intelligence, challenging previous assumptions about the unique capabilities of biological intelligence.

V. Surpassing Natural Intelligence

Recent advancements in AI have not only matched but in several cases, significantly outstripped the capabilities of human intelligence across a diverse array of tasks. Pioneering AI models such as AlphaGo and AlphaStar have marked historical milestones by defeating world-class professional players in Go and StarCraft II, respectively [24][25]. These accomplishments underscore the ability of AI to master complex strategic thinking and in-depth planning, abilities once thought to be the sole preserve of humans. The significance of these victories lies not just in the realm of gaming but also highlights the broader potential of AI in tackling problems requiring intricate thought processes and strategic foresight.

Similarly, OpenAI's GPT-4 has exhibited remarkable proficiency across a spectrum of academic fields, achieving scores within the 90th percentile on the Uniform Bar Exam and securing top marks in Advanced Placement (AP) subjects such as Biology, Statistics, Psychology, Macroeconomics, among others [26]. This astonishing achievement is a testament to the versatility and adaptability of AI, showcasing its capability to match or even surpass human-level performance across a wide range of intellectual domains. The success of AI models in these areas not only points to their educational potential, but also challenges our understanding of the limits of AI in learning and problem-solving.

Moreover, in the domain of image recognition, AI's capabilities have soared to new heights. While AI models demonstrate exceptional proficiency in interpreting visual data, the transition from recognizing patterns to understanding the intricacies of the natural world presents a far more complex challenge. Nonetheless, modern computer vision models can now recognize and classify objects in images with a degree of accuracy that rivals, and in certain scenarios, surpasses that of humans [27]. This leap in performance not only signifies a step forward in our ability to automate and enhance tasks requiring visual identification but also demonstrates the potential for AI to exceed human performance, with far-reaching implications for industries ranging from security to healthcare.

Likewise, the field of natural sciences has also been particularly revolutionized by AI, with systems like AlphaFold leading the charge. This model addresses one of the most daunting challenges in biology, the ability to predict 3D protein structures with astonishing speed and accuracy [28]. Traditionally, such endeavors would necessitate elaborate, costly, and time-intensive experimental methods, reliant on the collaborative efforts of numerous researchers. Yet, this overwhelming task can be accelerated and simplified by AI without sacrificing accuracy. This groundbreaking development not only accelerates scientific discovery but also demonstrates that AI technologies are capable of achieving accurate results in a fraction of the time it would normally take humans.

Similarly, the field of drug discovery is also experiencing swift advancements thanks to AI, introducing a wave of innovation that's beginning to see tangible results with new compounds entering clinical trials [29]. Historically, the development of drug candidates has been a costly, inefficient process with a high failure rate—86% of candidates between 2000 and 2015 failed to meet their objectives [30]. Yet AI models have not only successfully managed to develop drugs that are now undergoing clinical trials but also show potential to surpass the achievements of traditional pharmaceutical researchers, promising to make drug discovery faster, more efficient, and capable of producing first-in-class compounds. All these accomplishments reinforce the notion that AI can match and, in many instances, exceed natural intelligence across a broad spectrum of tasks. Yet, this leads to the inquiry: could a single AI model ever surpass human intelligence universally, outshining humans in every conceivable task?

VI. Artificial Superintelligence

Recent advancements in technology and artificial intelligence have propelled the concept of technological singularity to the forefront of modern discussion. This event refers to a hypothetical future point at which technological growth becomes uncontrollable and irreversible, resulting in unforeseeable changes to human civilization [31]. This notion stirs both fascination and concern, especially regarding Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) or Artificial Superintelligence (ASI), where machines might not only equal, but swiftly exceed human intelligence across all areas [32]. Research conducted through surveys among AI experts suggests a shared expectation that the singularity could occur by 2060 [33]. However, predictions on the precise timing differ, influenced by factors such as the researchers' geographic locations and their professional backgrounds.

The path to AGI seems inevitable, given that human intelligence has remained relatively unchanged while AI's capabilities have quickly surged forward due to improvements in algorithms, processing power, and memory [33]. Furthermore, the advent of quantum computing presents a promising pathway that could hasten the development of AGI by significantly enhancing the efficiency of neural network training [32]. Leading figures in technology and AI have shared their perspectives on the singularity, revealing a wide spectrum of views.

Prominent leaders in the tech industry such as Satya Nadella, CEO of Microsoft, and Sundar Pichai, CEO of Google, embrace the idea of the technological singularity and the advent of AGI not with apprehension, but as avenues for propelling human progress forward [34][35]. They champion a future where AGI serves as a dynamic force for advancement, unlocking levels of innovation, efficiency, and problem-solving previously unattainable. These leaders underscore the necessity of guiding AGI's evolution responsibly and ethically, aiming to augment human capabilities and adhere to ethical principles, thus envisioning a future in which technology elevates rather than replaces human potential.

Contrasting with these optimistic viewpoints, notable intellectuals such as Stephen Hawking and Nick Bostrom cast a more cautionary stance on the implications of singularity. Hawking issued warnings about AI surpassing human evolutionary pace, posing the risk of making humanity redundant [35]. Likewise, Bostrom views the singularity as a critical juncture for humanity, comparing the advent of AGI to "children playing with a bomb", highlighting the precariousness of advancing into such powerful technologies without fully understanding the consequences [37]. This dichotomy of perspectives underscores the complex and multifaceted dialogue surrounding the potential of AGI, balancing the promise of technological breakthroughs against the ethical and existential considerations that accompany such profound advancements.

These perspectives, combined with the expert consensus on AGI and their forecasts about the singularity, highlight a robust conviction in the inevitable rise of AGI and ASI. They stress the vital necessity of addressing these advancements with utmost seriousness. While present AI models have yet to achieve general intelligence, numerous systems already outperform humans in specific tasks. Given the swift pace of advancements in the field, the advent of a superintelligent AI model could be significantly nearer than anticipated.

VII. Conclusion

In summary, this investigation underscores the formidability of AI in emulating, and potentially eclipsing, the competencies of NI in various domains, suggesting a reevaluation of our understanding of intelligence itself. By showcasing AI's capabilities in adapting, understanding abstract concepts, and possibly approaching consciousness and a theory of mind, we edge closer to recognizing AI as functionally equivalent to NI. This equivalence challenges not only long-held beliefs about the uniqueness of human cognition but also prompts a broader discussion on the ethical, societal, and developmental implications of AI's evolution.

Advancements in AI have already demonstrated a capacity to outperform humans in specific tasks, leading to expert consensus about the emergence of general and superintelligent AI systems. Such prospects raise important questions about the future coexistence of humans and AI, necessitating careful consideration of the ethical frameworks and governance structures that will guide this coexistence.

As we stand on the brink of potentially achieving AGI and ASI, the importance of this discourse cannot be overstated. It beckons us to prepare for the societal transformations that such technological advancements might bring, and for the ethical challenges inherent in these developments. Ultimately, the journey towards understanding and developing AI not only advances our technological capabilities but also offers us a mirror through which to reflect on the essence of our own intelligence and consciousness.

References

[1] A. Weder, "Q&A – what is intelligence?" Johns Hopkins Medicine,https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/news/articles/2020/10/qa--what-is-intelligence (accessed Feb. 17, 2024).

[2] N. Burton, "What is intelligence?," Psychology Today, https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/hide-and-seek/201811/what-is-intelligence (accessed Feb. 17, 2024).

[3] J. McCarthy, "What is artificial intelligence - formal reasoning group," Stanford University Computer Science Department, https://www-formal.stanford.edu/jmc/whatisai.pdf (accessed Feb. 17, 2024).

[4] Y. Sharma, "The Future of Intelligence: AI and human collaboration," Medium, https://medium.com/yogsblog/the-future-of-intelligence-ai-and-human-collaboration-26ed8390c063 (accessed Feb. 18, 2024).

[5] A. D. Nuovo and A. Cangelosi, "Abstract concept learning in cognitive robots - current robotics reports," SpringerLink, https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s43154-020-00038-x (accessed Feb. 18, 2024).

[6] S. Pichai, "Our next-generation model: Gemini 1.5," Google, https://blog.google/technology/ai/google-gemini-next-generation-model-february-2024/ (accessed Feb. 18, 2024).

[7] R. Smith, T. Parr, and K. J. Friston, "Simulating emotions: An active inference model of emotional state inference and emotion concept learning," Frontiers, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02844/full (accessed Feb. 18, 2024).

[8] G. Huckins, "Minds of machines: The Great Ai Consciousness Conundrum," MIT Technology Review, https://www.technologyreview.com/2023/10/16/1081149/ai-consciousness-conundrum/ (accessed Feb. 18, 2024).

[9] D. Dennett, "The illusion of consciousness," Dan Dennett: The illusion of consciousness | TED Talk, https://www.ted.com/talks/dan_dennett_the_illusion_of_consciousness?language=en (accessed Feb. 18, 2024).

[10] J. Rothman, "Daniel Dennett's science of the soul," The New Yorker, https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/03/27/daniel-dennetts-science-of-the-soul (accessed Feb. 18, 2024).

[11] M. Somers, "Emotion AI, explained," MIT Sloan, https://mitsloan.mit.edu/ideas-made-to-matter/emotion-ai-explained (accessed Feb. 18, 2024).

[12] M. Heith and J. Benson, "Theory of mind," Theory of Mind - an overview | ScienceDirect Topics, https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/neuroscience/theory-of-mind (accessed Feb. 18, 2024).

[13] M. Kosinski and M. Kosinski, "Theory of mind may have spontaneously emerged in large language models," Stanford Graduate School of Business, https://www.gsb.stanford.edu/faculty-research/working-papers/theory-mind-may-have-spontaneously-emerged-large-language-models (accessed Feb. 18, 2024).

[14] D. Orf, "Ai has suddenly evolved to achieve theory of mind," Popular Mechanics, https://www.popularmechanics.com/technology/robots/a42958546/artificial-intelligence-theory-of-mind-chatgpt/ (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[15] C. Cottier, "The Center for Brains, Minds & Machines," Have AI Language Models Achieved Theory of Mind? [Discover Magazine] | The Center for Brains, Minds & Machines, https://cbmm.mit.edu/news-events/news/have-ai-language-models-achieved-theory-mind-discover-magazine (accessed Feb. 18, 2024).

[16] L. Hardesty, "Explained: Neural networks," MIT News | Massachusetts Institute of Technology, https://news.mit.edu/2017/explained-neural-networks-deep-learning-0414 (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[17] A. B. Porto-Pazos et al., "Artificial astrocytes improve neural network performance," PLOS ONE, https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0019109#:~:text=Neural%20network%20performance%20does%20not,of%20neurons%20and%20different%20architectures. (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[18] K. Roose, "An a.i.-generated picture won an art prize. artists aren't happy.," The New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/09/02/technology/ai-artificial-intelligence-artists.html (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[19] G. Radauskas, "Japanese writer wins award, reveals she used chatgpt," Japanese writer wins award, reveals she used ChatGPT, https://cybernews.com/news/japan-novel-akutagawa-award-ai-chatgpt (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[20] G. Appel, "Generative AI has an intellectual property problem," Harvard Business Review, https://hbr.org/2023/04/generative-ai-has-an-intellectual-property-problem (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[21] J. E. Moreno, "Boom in A.I. prompts a test of copyright law," The New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2023/12/30/business/media/copyright-law-ai-media.html (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[22] Google, "Artificial Intelligence and Copyright," DocumentCloud, https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/24117935-google (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[23] A. Cuthbertson, "MIT invents self-replicating AI Robots," The Independent, https://www.independent.co.uk/tech/ai-self-replicating-robot-mit-b2234639.html (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[24] Google, "AlphaGo," Google DeepMind, https://deepmind.google/technologies/alphago/ (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[25] Google, "Alphastar: Mastering the real-time strategy game starcraft II," Google DeepMind, https://deepmind.google/discover/blog/alphastar-mastering-the-real-time-strategy-game-starcraft-ii/ (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[26] OpenAI, GPT-4, https://openai.com/research/gpt-4 (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[27] R. Gordon, "Image recognition accuracy: An unseen challenge confounding today's AI," MIT News | Massachusetts Institute of Technology, https://news.mit.edu/2023/image-recognition-accuracy-minimum-viewing-time-metric-1215 (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[28] J. Jumper et al., "Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold," Nature News, https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-021-03819-2 (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[29] C. Arnold, "Inside the nascent industry of AI-designed drugs," Nature News, https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-023-02361-0 (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[30] C. H. Wong, K. W. Siah, and A. W. Lo, "Estimation of clinical trial success rates and related parameters," OUP Academic, https://academic.oup.com/biostatistics/article/20/2/273/4817524?login=false (accessed Feb. 19, 2024).

[31] B. Becher, "What is technological singularity?," Built In, https://builtin.com/artificial-intelligence/technological-singularity (accessed Feb. 20, 2024).

[32] T. Mucci, "What is artificial-superintelligence?," IBM, https://www.ibm.com/topics/artificial-superintelligence (accessed Feb. 20, 2024).

[33] C. Dilmegani, "When will singularity happen? 1700 expert opinions of AGI [2024]," AIMultiple, https://research.aimultiple.com/artificial-general-intelligence-singularity-timing/ (accessed Feb. 20, 2024).

[34] S. Levy, "Microsoft's Satya Nadella is betting everything on ai," Wired, https://www.wired.com/story/microsofts-satya-nadella-is-betting-everything-on-ai/ (accessed Feb. 20, 2024).

[35] K. Roose, "Google C.E.O. Sundar Pichai on the A.I. Moment: 'you will see us be bold,'" The New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2023/03/31/technology/google-pichai-ai.html (accessed Feb. 20, 2024).

[36] R. Cellan-Jones, "Stephen Hawking warns artificial intelligence could end mankind," BBC News, https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-30290540 (accessed Feb. 20, 2024).

[37] T. Adams, "Nick Bostrom: 'we are like small children playing with a bomb,'" The Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/jun/12/nick-bostrom-artificial-intelligence-machine (accessed Feb. 20, 2024).