There is no way to prove causality vs correlation. So what importance would it have to say that something is likely the ‘cause’ of another? Put in context of stock trading, what does one gain from saying that the drop or rise in one stock is the ‘cause’ of another when it may not be so? The benefit is in the level of confidence that one may attribute it to. Using baysian statistics for example, one may update the prior

It seems like it would be smart to use spiking neural networks in a similar fashion as convolutional neural networks

Also, look at how fourier CNNs work, and consider how they compare to how an eye works. (it may be useful to add ‘spots’ like ON or OFF center retinal groups, alongside the ‘wavelike’ groups that exist in the paper I have.

Also, a perfect test run for Spiking Neural Networks would be to try to train a fish