Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10845-022-02027-7

Enhancing wisdom manufacturing as industrial metaverse for industry and society 5.0

Xifan Yao[1] · Nanfeng Ma[1] · Jianming Zhang[2,3] · Kesai Wang[1] · Erfu Yang[4] · Maurizio Faccio[5]

Received: 9 April 2022 / Accepted: 14 September 2022

Abstract

Industry 4.0 focuses on the realization of smart manufacturing based on cyber-physical systems (CPS). However, emerging Industry 5.0 and Society 5.0 reaches beyond CPS and covers the entire value chain of manufacturing, and faces economic, environmental, and social challenges. To meet such challenges, we regard Industry 5.0 as a socio-technical revolution based on the socio-cyber-physical system (SCPS), and propose a socio-technically enhanced wisdom manufacturing architecture and framework beyond CPS-based Industry 4.0/smart manufacturing with especially concerning transition enabling technologies such as artificial intelligence, social Internet of Things (SIoT), big data, machine learning, edge computing, social computing, 3D printing, blockchains, digital twins, and cobots. Finally we address the roadmap to blockchainized value-added SCPS-based Industrial Metaverse for Industry/Society 5.0, which will achieve high utilization of resources and provide products and services to satisfy experience-driven individual needs via metamanufacturing cloud services towards smart, resilient, sustainable, and human-centric solutions.

Keywords Social-cyber-physical system · Wisdom manufacturing · Industrial Metaverse · Blockchain · Industry 5.0 · Society 5.0

Acronyms

AI	artificial intelligence
AM	additive manufacturing
CAD	computer aided design
CAE	computer aided engineering
CAM	computer aided manufacturing
CIM	computer integrated manufacturing
CPPS	cyber-physical production system
CPS	cyber-physical system
DT	digital twin
ERP	enterprise resource planning
GPU	graphics processing unit
HiL	human-in-the loop
HoL	human-on-the-Loop
HofL	human-out-of-the-Loop
ICT	information and communication technology
IbfP	Internet by and for people
IIoT	industrial IoT
IoCK	Internet of contents and knowledge
IoP	Internet of people
IoS	Internet of services
IoT	Internet of things
ML	machine learning
PDM	product data management
PLM	product lifecycle management
SCPPS	social-cyber-physical production system
SCPS	socio/social-cyber-physical system
SF	smart factory
SIoT	social Internet of things
SWSN	social wireless sensor networks
WM	wisdom (wise) manufacturing

✉ Xifan Yao
mexfyao@scut.edu.cn

1 South China University of Technology, 510640 Guangzhou, China

2 Quanzhou Institute of Equipment Manufacturing, Haixi Institutes, Chinese Academy of Sciences, 362200 Quanzhou, China

3 Fujian Provincial Key Laboratory of Intelligent Identification and Control of Complex Dynamic System, 362200 Jinjiang, China

4 University of Strathclyde, G1 1XJ Glasgow, UK

5 University of Padova, 36100 Vicenza, Italy

Published online: 01 November 2022

Introduction

The introduction of the Internet of Things (IoT) in manufacturing has initiated smart factories (Shrouf et al., 2014). The consequent technology-driven changes have triggered the industrial revolution referred to as "Industry 4.0" (Wikipedia, 2021). Today, the information and communication technology (ICT) including the cyber-physical system (CPS), the Internet of Services (IoS), and cloud computing are being integrated into Industry 4.0. Of these components of Industry 4.0, the CPS is identified as the most prominent and generic (Hermann et al., 2016), which drives smart manufacturing forward (Kang, et al., 2016) and has been identified as a key research area for industrial automation (Lee, 2015; Leitão et al., 2016). According to (Cohen et al., 2019), focusing on the design and management of digital manufacturing and assembly systems in the Industry 4.0, two main research directions can be defined:

(1) the definition of the new manufacturing and assembly paradigms with the aim of defining the new manufacturing and assembly concepts and principles; and (2) the definition of the enabling technologies for the development of Industry 4.0 paradigms with the aim of showing the state of the art and highlighting the novelty in the ICT development.

Since the first industrial revolution, most products have been made in mass production instead of craft production. Now, mass customization and personalization are beginning to emerge, gradually complementing mass production. As customized/ personalized products are closely linked to customer needs and wants, value creation is no longer to be implemented by a producer alone, since it needs a co-creation processing with consumers and designers in the manufacturing value chain. Thus, there is an increasing need to consider human factors in customization and personalization. Further, from the perspective of manufacturing systems, humans cannot be completely substituted, as they supervise and adjust the settings, being the sources of knowledge and competences, diagnose situations, take decisions and several other activities influencing manufacturing performances, and provide additional degrees of freedom to the systems overall (Fantini, et al., 2016). Such capabilities are enhanced in the context of cyber-physical systems (Romero, et al., 2016), which makes it imperative to take humans into account in Industry 4.0 as a socially sustainable manufacturing workforce. As such, in 2021 the European Union proposed Industry 5.0 to complement Industry 4.0 officially presented by Germen at the Hannover Messe fair 10 years ago in 2011, with further consideration of the role and contribution of industry to society by putting research and innovation at the service of the transition to a sustainable, human-centric and resilient industry (Breque et al., 2021). In fact, the concept of Industry 5.0 can date back to a few years ago (Demir and Ciciba, 2017; Ozdemir and Hekim, 2018).

Furthermore, in 2016 Japan government had proposed a similar but much broader concept, called Society 5.0, which follows the hunting society (Society 1.0), the agrarian society (Society 2.0), the industrial society (Society 3.0), and the information society (Society 4.0). Society 5.0 is a human-centered society that aims to improve human living (Shiroishi et al., 2018). For the implement of Society 5.0, the role of science, technology and innovation in Society 5.0 were studied (Fukuda, 2020). The importance of artificial intelligence (AI) was introduced (Shiroishi et al., 2019). In addition to new technologies, the impact of industrial revolutions on the transformation of society, which radically change the social productivity and human life, was also studied (Melnyk et al., 2019). And the way from industry 4.0 to Society 5.0 was investigated (Salimova, et al., 2019).

As such, there is a strong call in both Industry 5.0 and Society 5.0 to balance Industry 4.0, responsible economic development and resolution of social problems (Potocan et al., 2021; Zengin et al., 2021; Carayannis et al., 2021). Therefore, it is necessary to investigate the manufacturing systems from the perspective of socio-technical view for Industry 5.0/Society 5.0. As being socio-technical by nature, manufacturing should also be studied with the integration of the technical and social systems (Oborski, 2003). Such an example manufacturing model, called wisdom (wise) manufacturing (WM) (Yao et al., 2014, 2015, 2016), was proposed by introducing the Internet by and for People (IbfP, or Internet of People, IoP), Internet of Contents and Knowledge (IoCK), IoT, and IoS (Papadimitriou, 2009) in manufacturing. As a social-cyber-physical production system (SCPPS), WM takes account of both technical and human factors in production, but it still faces challenges such as decentralization, privacy, piracy, counterfeiting, safety, and security.

As the social system integrates humans with the physical devices and the cyber world, human-related data is collected and spread easily. Also, personal data (including physiological information, habits, and social relations) are recorded, which may cause unpredictable issues in privacy protect (Wu et al., 2014). Conversely, the open innovation, community sharing, makers, prosumers and open sources become part of manufacturing systems to facilitate product innovation for mass personalization.

While information, knowledge and thought can update at an unprecedented speed, piracy and counterfeiting cannot be neglected. The socialization of manufacturing resources endows the public with manufacturing capabilities, but also brings convenience for counterfeiting. What is worse, weapon manufacturing becomes hard to administer. For instance, weapons can be traded in digital files and then printed in distributed 3D printers. Thus, a new balance between open innovation and intellectual property protection should be established. Moreover, software, social media, and other technologies play an increasingly essential role in manufacturing, but also accompanied by threats, such as IT threats, that have not been taken into account by manufactures. As for the SCPS, threats are fatal as they can impact on manufacturing more deeply and broadly. Hence, more proactive approaches are required for safety and security (Tuptuk & Hailes, 2018).

In addition, the convergence of manufacturing, ICTs, and social technologies results in tasks performed in the SCPS context beyond the cognition of workers who were trained for traditional manufacturing with the division of labor. In order to cooperate in cyber, physical, and social worlds, workers are required to have an overall context to complete the interaction. Training and retraining of employees are inevitable.

Compared to other paradigms, the WM/SCPPS promotes the utilization of social information, absorbs collective intelligence through social media/social networking, and allows flexible control and management. Consequently, social problems such as population ageing have to be considered in the SCPS-based manufacturing. Due to the increasing number of older workers, the design of social media and other technologies need to consider the user habits of older workers. Besides, re-education and retraining of older workers are necessary to help them take the use of new tools and adapt to the new environment.

Before, we used to develop manufacturing systems efficiently centered on high productivity especially in the era of mass production. In fact, for developing manufacturing including Industry 4.0 (Zengin et al., 2021), we need a balance between the natural environment, economic development and social development. And such a balance has resulted in environment-oriented sustainable manufacturing and human-oriented inclusive manufacturing (Yao et al., 2019). Industry 5.0 is a new emerging manufacturing resultant paradigm of such a balance centered on humans (Breque et al., 2021).

Now many researchers have joined the research of Industry 5.0. For example, (Xu et al., 2021) addressed a comparative analysis of Industry 4.0 and Industry 5.0, mainly including its concepts and enabling technologies. (Carayannis and Morawska-Jancelewicz, 2022) conducted a detailed study of society 5.0 and Industry 5.0, and (Maddikunta, et al., 2022) conducted a more detailed and complete overview of the definition, concepts, characteristics, applications and enabling technologies of Industry 5.0. There is also a lot of research related to smart manufacturing, and the metaverse is emerging. However, there are very few discussions on



Fig. 1 Society transformation and industrial revolutions

such integration of Industry 5.0, smart manufacturing, especially wisdom manufacturing, and the metaverse.

To enhance SCPS-based wisdom manufacturing to meet such a need, this study develops a view of Industry 5.0 as a socio-technical revolution based on the SCPS, focusing on broadening Industry 4.0 from social aspects and the manufacturing value chain as well as Metaverse. First, we start from analyzing a socio-technically enhanced manufacturing system concerning the three key features of Industry 4.0 (vertical, horizontal, and end-to-end integration). Then, we develop an SCPS-based wisdom manufacturing framework and analyze its key enabling technologies, for a higher utilization of resources and for products and services that satisfy individual needs by manufacturing cloud services that dynamically self-organize socialized and service-oriented production resources. Finally, we enhance the wisdom manufacturing as Industrial Metaverse by borrowing the idea of Metaverse.

Revolution from technical to socio-technical

Socio-technical aspects hold that an organization is an integration of both social and technical systems. The social system cannot exist without the support of technical systems, and the changes of technical systems also cause great social influence. An investigation conducted by Trist (Fox, 1995), who has developed the concept of the socio-technical system, shows that most industry problems result from the lack of adequate attention to the social impact of technical systems. Further, the socio-technical approach had been developed to describe and manipulate human beings (Oborski, 2003). Thus, the study of Industry 4.0/5.0 should also be extended to include the social aspect.

The correspondence between the industrial and society transformation is shown as Fig. 1. In general, industrial revolutions bring changes to human society, provide the driving



Fig. 2 Internet evolution that influences the manufacturing value chain

force for society development, and accelerate the transformation of society. In Society 1.0 and 2.0, industry revolution did not happen yet, but social transformation had taken a long time. When the first industrial revolution occurred, the society moved to the third stage. After Industry 3.0, the society rapidly transformed into an information stage. The advances in ICTs such as IoT, IoS, and big data, as well as in new advanced manufacturing technologies such as 3D printing and reconfigurable manufacturing, enhance manufacturing productivity and flexibility greatly, resulting in Industry 4.0 in the form of CPS, which enables mass customization and even mass personalization. In fact, Industry 4.0 consists of a long-tail production with focus on mass customization and personalization (Yao et al., 2018) and needs collective intelligence and wisdom such as crowdsourcing, knowledge sharing, innovation, and co-design of products by both producers and customers or users. Industry 4.0 and 5.0 promote the society moving toward a super smart stage - Society 5.0, which we call wise society. Industry 5.0 or Society 5.0 is characterized by human-centric customization/personalization in the form of SCPS.

Modern manufacturing systems use the Internet as a tool to integrate data, information, and knowledge. Over the past decades, the Internet has dramatically transformed social technologies toward user-driven technologies (as shown in Fig. 2). As a result, users can tag, share, and generate contents through Internet (such as Wikipedia, YouTube, and Facebook). Global communities are established for users to learn and share knowledge together, and to publish their opinions. Thus, enterprises need to embrace the new technologies to listen to the voice of their customers and converse with them through social technologies. Moreover, platforms should be built for absorbing customer ideas, thoughts, creations and innovations.

In particular, with the rise of Web 2.0, social networking tools, IoT and cloud computing, Enterprise 2.0, crowdsourcing, open innovation, and cloud manufacturing were born. Later in Web 3.0, smart factories and Industrial Internet were emerging. Further, IoT is being extended to a social one (Atzori et al., 2012), resulting in big data linking the physical, cyber and social worlds together. Moreover, the Internet focus is shifting from information to value with the advent of blockchain technology that facilitates value-exchange peer-to-peer without the need for an intermediary. As the new industrial (r)evolution shifted from the previous focusing on technical aspects to one that emphasized both technical and social aspects, wisdom manufacturing in the form of SCPS came into being (Yao & Lin, 2016). Therefore, it is necessary to study Industry 4.0 as a socio-technical revolution based on the SCPS (Yao et al., 2019) instead of the CPS (Mosterman and Zander, 2016; Lee et al., 2015; Lu, 2017; Wang et al., 2015). To complement technology-driven Industry 4.0, going beyond producing goods and services for profit, Industry 5.0 is emerging to account for environmental and societal costs and benefits as well, with human-centricity, sustainability and resilience as its core elements, shifting from the shareholder value to the stakeholder value (Breque et al., 2021) and from technology-driven to value-driven (Xu et al., 2021). Such human-centric value-driven manufacturing will be enabled by the Industrial Metaverse as stated below.

From the technical revolution view, components of Industry 4.0 include IoT, CPS, IoS, and Smart Factory (SF) (Hermann et al., 2016). More specially, the IoT provides connectivity for anything from anytime, anyplace and anyone (Atzori et al., 2010); the CPS integrates the physical processing and computation into a whole; the IoS encapsulates resources as services and allows users dynamically to combine services in an ad hoc manner. Based on the IoT, CPS and IoS, the SF is realised as a factory that is flexible, transparent, efficient, and profitable (Wang et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2017). Such a view of Industry 4.0 focuses on the adoption of the CPS and related new technologies.

Industry 4.0 is characterized by features that inherently contain social attributes as shown in Fig. 3: (1) vertical integration that integrates systems at different hierarchical levels, (2) horizontal integration through value networks that integrates systems internal and external, and (3) end-to-end integration across products' entire value chain and incorporates customer needs (Kagermann, et al., 2013).

Vertical integration focuses on the integration of the various systems of a factory with different hierarchical levels (e.g. actuators, sensors, control, execution, production management and planning levels), which makes the overall system flexible, automatic and reconfigurable. In such an integrated factory, tasks of humans are moving from simple manual tasks to decision ones, and the abilities of employees are amplified in the context of a cyber-physical system (Romero, et al., 2016) and social networks (Moghaddam



Fig. 3 Manufacturing paradigm shifts along with the Internet evolution and emerging ICTs

& Nof, 2017). While most of the current researches aim to take the advantages of new-generation ICTs, for example, by using the computational, communication and control techniques to achieve a CPS, human factors also need to be studied to accommodate with the ever-increasing variability of production. Further, social networking inside a company can increase the involvement and promote employees to take advantages of their skills and experience.

Horizontal integration refers to the integration of the different stages of manufacturing and business planning processes through value networks that involve an exchange of materials, energy and information both inside and outside a company. In other words, modern manufacturing factories are becoming highly distributed but interconnected, driven by globalized economics and competitiveness (Moghaddam & Nof, 2017). Furthermore, with the emergence of personalized production, varied products are produced in low volume, arousing the need for enterprises to reorganize internal and external production resources to meet the diverse needs of customers. Thus, collaboration inside a company or among companies must be augmented. To build such collaboration, on one hand, the CPS, IoT, and IoS need to be introduced into modern manufacturing to connect the information islands of enterprises to achieve information exchange and servitization of resources, and form the cooperation cross-sectorial, cross-disciplinary, and cross-regional in a dynamic way. Thus, the social system must be taken into consideration as well to build a reliable relationship among departments, companies, organizations and individuals, and efficiently to interact based on resource networks and friendships. Thus, external resources can be organized efficiently based on social technologies. Furthermore, resources can aggregate and self-organize based on market and interest. Therefore, social attributes, which reflect the social relation of nodes, need to be added to enhance the system. Besides, social networks can be utilized for service advertisement, discovery, and assess. Thus, the socialization of resources by the emergence of new technologies, new value networks and new business models promotes the achievement of horizontal integration of Industry 4.0, and boosts the development of reliable, efficient and sustainable manufacture (Stock & Seliger, 2016).

End-to-end integration goes through the entire value chain of products and needs to cover every aspect from customer/client requirements to manufacture of the final products and services. Such integration means that customers can no longer only choose from a predefined range of products, but instead, they are able to take part in the full product life cycle to meet their individual needs or create their products. The value creation is no longer to be implemented by a company alone, since it is a co-creation process with consumers. Therefore, the information that customers put on Internet impacts the supply chain and manufacturing activities (Esmaeilian et al., 2016). Consumers in the manufacturing value chain becomes an indispensable part of the manufacturing process, as they can not only put forward personalized needs, but also provide individual data, and even personalized design for production. Moreover, the term "prosumer" is coined for a person who consumes and produces products. And even, products can be "designed and produced" by a consumer, and then sold to other consumers, so the maker culture motivated by fun and self-fulfilment is becoming popular (Anderson, 2012).

In summary, with the emergence of new technologies and evolution of manufacturing paradigm, the distance among humans or companies gets shrunk, the conventional



Fig. 4 Hypernetworked wisdom manufacturing

relationship between home and workplace gets further eroded, and the distinction between producers and consumers gets blurred. Therefore, CPS-based Industry 4.0 should be extended to SCPS-based to realize customer relationship management, and to absorb customer ideas, thoughts and innovations for mass personalization. In this sense, social media provide a novel way to support customers to involve in the full life cycle of products.

Customers can submit their needs and track the production process by using social media through the Internet, and then comment and share their experience or knowledge in their communities. Through social media, achievements, which are unimaginable for companies, have been made by the IoP such as Wikipedia and YouTube. Similarly, social media expand the source of business innovation, which provides a great potential for mass personalization. To better fulfill the key features of Industry 5.0, manufacturing systems should be developed from the point view of SCPS beyond CPS, to achieve an overall optimization of manufacture systems and satisfy human needs (Jing & Yao, 2019). At present, research has been undertaken on the socio-technical aspect in manufacturing. For example, Tortorella et al. (Tortorella et al., 2017) have developed an assessment method with regards to SE (socio-technical and ergonomics) practice adoption for improving the work environment of workers in lean manufacturing.

Enhancing wisdom manufacturing for industry/society 5.0

Wisdom manufacturing was firstly coined by combining the four networks (IoT, IoS, IbfP/IoP and IoCK) with manufacturing in 2014 (Yao et al., 2014), then as a socio-technical system or SCPPS to study (Yao et al., 2015; Jing & Yao, 2019). Wisdom manufacturing has been developing along with the development of new-generation ICT and AI (Ma et al., 2022), and used in big-data driven proactive manufacturing (Yao et al., 2017), inclusive manufacturing (Yao et al., 2019), and autonomous smart manufacturing (Yao et al., 2022). In fact, the wisdom manufacturing is a hypernetwork composed of a physical network (IoT), a cyber network (IoS), a social network (IoP) and a linking network (IoCK) as shown in Fig. 4.

Wisdom manufacturing reference architecture

Figure 5 illustrates a three-dimensional wisdom manufacturing reference architecture. In the Interoperability Layers dimension, there are six abstract layers: Asset, Communication, Data, Function, Business, and Users from bottom to top, which correspond to six organization semiotics levels: Physical, Empiric, Syntactic, Semantic, Pragmatic, and Social, respectively. The social cyber physical (production) system, shortened as SCP(P)S, is consisted of the six Interoperability Layers or Semiotics Levels, two layers/levels of which, in turn, consist of the physical, cyber and social (sub)systems, respectively. In the System Levels dimension, there are Production, Field Device, Station, Production Line, Enterprise, and Connected World. And there are Design, Production, Usage, and Recycle in the Product Life Cycle dimension.

There are two kinds of core technologies to enhance wisdom manufacturing for Industry 5.0/Society 5.0: AI and blockchain, as stated bellow. Enable technologies is addressed in next section.

Data-and-knowledge-driven SCPPS framework

To take advantages of new-generation AI, a data-and-knowledge-driven mechanism is necessary. On the one hand, data-driven methods represented by deep learning and big data can perform cognition, memory, and correlation analysis. However, data-driven methods lack the ability of inference, logical reasoning, and explanation, require a huge amount of data for training, and are unable to handle tasks with complex spatiotemporal relationship. On the other hand, while the knowledge-driven approach represented by symbolic.

representation can perform logical reasoning and inference, it is not suitable for processing unstructured data



Fig. 5 Wisdom manufacturing reference architecture

such as images and audio. Thus, in the complex manufacturing systems, it is necessary to combine both methods, and even further integrate reinforcement learning to form a deep reinforcement learning model that incorporates prior knowledge.

As mentioned, modern manufacturing systems are complex systems including social, economic, environmental, and other factors, which have moved from the computer integration system to the collaboration of human, machines and things, as shown in Fig. 6. In the SCPS architecture consisted of three-subsystems, the physical system with the smallest time scale realizes autonomous intelligence and multi-sensor perception intelligence (cross-media intelligence) through IoT and edge computing which involves moving part of the computing load to the edge of the network to take advantage of currently untapped computing power in edge nodes such as base stations, routers, and switches (Varghese et al., 2016); the cyber system with a moderate time scale implements deep learning and data intelligence, and provides cloud manufacturing services on demand through IoS and IoCK; and the social system with the largest time scale enables people to participate in product design/production and services anytime and anywhere through IoP. As such, the integration of people, knowledge and crowd intelligence is realized, and further collaborated with other levels to form hybrid enhanced intelligence. It can be seen that this reference architecture can not only embed a priori knowledge in a deep (enhanced) neural network in the form of graph representation making the AI model explainable, but also integrate emerging AI technologies such as autonomous intelligence, multi-sensor perception intelligence, data intelligence, crowd intelligence and hybrid enhanced intelligence into one, forming a human-machine-thing collaborative smart manufacturing system with multi-subject, multi-level, multi-scale, cross-domain, and hypernetworked.

Specifically, the mechanism of SCPS based new-generation AI can be depicted follow: In the physical system, data in production is collected by IoT and transformed to the cyber space where data-driven methods such as deep learning are used to extract rules and knowledge in the data. On the other hand, the knowledge of experts is converted into data for decision-making in production process. And knowledge-based methods are used for logical reasoning and inference. Such combination of data and knowledge makes the AI model explainable and realizes knowledge extraction automatically. In other words, the manufacturing system has the ability of learning, cognition and knowledge generation. Some decision-making processes, which are completed by humans traditionally, can be achieved by AI or the collaboration between AI and experts. Thus, manufacturing systems can deal with complexity and uncertainty, manufacture varied products flexibly, and satisfy personalized needs in Industry/Society 5.0.

Blockchainized wisdom manufacturing framework

A layered framework for wisdom manufacturing enhanced by big data, edge computing, and blockchains, is shown in Fig. 7. This framework forms an SCP(P)S that integrates social, cyber and physical systems as a whole. As such, an integrated manufacturing system evolves into a customer-centric, service-oriented, value added, blockchainized, and data-and-knowledge-driven system.



Fig. 6 Data- and-knowledge-driven wisdom manufacturing framework

The social system is composed of people, organizations, and communities, and linked by IoP with focus on human interaction,tacit human knowledge, collective intelligence, and social intelligence, as well as knowledge diffusion, innovation, social needs, culture, law, and value exchange. The physical system is composed of workshops, machines, sensors, and other equipment or resources, which are the executors of manufacturing tasks, and linked by IoT with focus on the connection and perception of heterogeneous resources in the real world to form an environmental intelligence. The cyber system is consisted of IoCK and IoS with focus on the processing and sharing of data and information, especially knowledge mined from big data, machine learning, and AI, and maps the real world (including physical and social systems) to the virtual world. The fusion of cyber and physical systems results in a CPS where the physical processing is synchronized with the computing processing, and the further integration of the social system forms an SCPS where machines/computers, things/environment and humans coordinate with one another.

IoP brings highly efficient interaction between humans, companies, as well as customers and companies based on social media and social networks, which provide great support for the design, decision and planning in the cyber system, and become an indispensable source of the knowledge and innovation for the IoCK. Heterogeneous resources in the real world are encapsulated as services in the cyberspace and used on demand by customers, thus crossing platforms, disciplines, and even areas through the IoS. This means that the IoS can break the boundaries among resources in the real world, reduce the cost of connection, increase the sharing rate of resources, and improve the utilization toward a sustainable development. For example, cloud computing shares



Fig. 7 Blockchainized wisdom manufacturing framework

its computing resources and data to others on demand. Conversely, IoCK provides enabling technol-.

ogies for dealing with large amount of data produced in the social, cyber and physical worlds. By connecting and perceiving things in the physical world, IoT transfers them into the cyber system. It lays a solid foundation for the implementation of CPS/SCPS. Moreover, human behaviors become appreciable with the introduction of smart phones and wearable devices, and social-media based social sensors (Kompatsiaris et al., 2013) of human beings reveal valuable insights, which usually is not possible with existing, limited, controlled, and laboratory-based datasets. The introduction of social attributes (Atzori et al., 2012) in IoT results in the so-called social-IoT (SIoT), which provides a connection for the SCPS, and widens the data sources of the cyber system. Furthermore, human beings, machines, and other resources can be modeled as smart agents with attitudes of belief, desire and intention (Jing & Yao, 2019).

Due to the integration of SCPS, disruptive changes have occurred in all aspects of the manufacturing system including design, manufacturing, assembly, distribution, and business model. Such an example is 3D printing, in which a complex part can be completed in one process without complex and time- consuming assembly processes, and at the same time the accuracy of parts can be improved to meet individual needs (Calì, et al., 2012). Unlike traditional scheduling for mass production, 3D printing focuses on the production for individual needs and deals with non-identical products in low volume and high variety. Although 3D printers are batch-processing machines, they are scheduled mainly on the basis of the equipment capacity being simplified to one-dimensional values like weight, volume, quantity or area, and corresponding resulted capacity cost for parts (Zhang et al., 2020). Faced with social manufacturing, scheduling in 3D printing needs to introduce irregular parts packing technologies to handle with varied parts for improving production efficiency and application promotion.

Key enabling technologies

As depicted in Fig. 8, Industry 4.0, which is studied usually as a CPS from a technical viewpoint, can be extended to a social-cyber-physical system from a socio-technical viewpoint. Such an SCPPS is customer-centric and service-oriented to meet customized/personalized needs. Resources

Fig. 8 CPS for Industry 4.0 being extended to SCPPS by the key enabling technologies



Table 1 Blockchains adding value to the SCPPS

Subsystem	Value added
Social	Decentralized transactions; Privacy protection; Crowdsourcing/Crowdfunding enabled; Trust improved; Time and costs reduced; Individually tailored customer experiences.
Cyber	Data integrity & Authenticity; Security; Supply chain auditing; Visibility/Transparency/Provenance improved; Piracy/Intellectual property protection;
Physical	Distributed/Decentralized decision-making; Automation enabled by smart contracts; Safety/Reliability enabled; Assets traced

in the SCPPS are distributed geographically and physically, but they can be flexibly reorganized on demand tightly when linked in the cyber system. Based on such a viewpoint, decentralized and distributed production, communication and management technologies, and high-performance computing processing power need to be addressed to support the development of complex and diversified SCPPS. For this purpose, this section investigates the cutting-edge enabling technologies for integration to the SCPPS.

IoT/SIoT/IIoT

As IoT provides connectivity for anything at anytime, anyplace and anyone (Atzori et al., 2010), focusing on supporting the interconnection between machines for sending data to each other and interaction, SIoT (Social Internet of Things) is proposed to further integrate the social network for supporting novel applications and networking services for the IoT in more effective and efficient ways (Atzori et al., 2012). Further, SIoT is also used for connecting with human and defining human behaviors (Jara et al., 2014). Besides, the application of IoT in industry has posed a large impact on manufacturing business models (Kiel et al., 2017), which has resulted in the so-called industrial IoT (IIoT), or the Industrial Internet.

By introducing social networking that establishes social links as humans do, SIoT allows objects to have their social networks. In addition, social wireless sensor networks (SWSN) were proposed to provide the sociality of the services over wireless sensor networks (Kim et al., 2016). As a result, SWSN can simplify the navigability in a dynamic network of billions of objects, promote robustness in the management of the trustworthiness of objects when providing information and services, and improve efficiency in the dynamic discovery of services and information. Furthermore, SIoT allows humans to impose rules to protect their privacy. Specifically, social attributes such as friendship and trust can be established among objects. Then objects can only have connection permission to their social network.

Conversely, to define human behaviors, social sensors have been developed to collect invaluable customer requirements, social context, and physical sensor data, and incorporated in the cyberspace (Ding & Jiang, 2016). For example, the use of smart phones and body sensors makes human status appreciable. Consequently, valuable insights that are not available previously can be obtained.

In short, as the social system is considered as an indivisible part of Industry 5.0, the introduction of SIoT to integrate social networks and perceive human states is necessary. Further, the social attributes are required to facilitate the communication between humans and objects.

Big data

Owing to the socialization, digitization, personalization, interconnection, and servitization of industry, big data is emerging in manufacturing systems. For example, as discussed, the introduction of IoP, IoT, and IoS in WM produces massive data with various unstructured types, which brings the challenges of 4 V (Volume, Velocity, Variety and Value) of big data to manufacturing enterprises. Specifically, massive humans-related unstructured data is produced by the IoP (including social networks and mobile Internet); Product-related data is produced during the design, emulation and simulation especially for the mass personalization, and digital tools such as CAD, CAM, CAE, PDM, and ERP are used; Data streams are continuously generated by sensors and smart objects in monitoring of production based on IoT/SIoT/IIoT. In effect, massive data exists at all stage of the entire life cycle of products, and throughout the manufacturing value chain. So, the use of such big data will be the basis for future competition and growth of manufacturing enterprises (Yao et al., 2017).

Data-intensive computing science, represented by big data, has been regarded as the fourth paradigm for scientific exploration after the first paradigm - empirical, the second paradigm - theoretical, and the third paradigm - computational (Hey et al., 2009). Nowadays, the dramatic increase in data quantity gives birth to an emerging paradigm of research - data exploration: data is collected through the experimental equipment or generated through simulations, and then meaningful information or knowledge is extracted and stored for researchers with the help of computers such that the empirical, theoretical and computational paradigms are integrated. This indicates that enterprises need to explore big data either from the view of the manufacturing development or the view of market requirement, along with the awareness of the big data importance in manufacture enterprises. In fact, the initial attempts have been conducted in varied segments such as equipment maintenance, production fault detection and classification, fault prediction and predictive manufacturing. However, this work is still in its infancy, and the data-driven manufacturing needs to be further expanded both in depth and in breadth, especially shifting focus on monitoring to optimization (Magoutas, et al., 2014).

As discussed by Kusiak, smart manufacturing must embrace big data (Kusiak, 2017). To achieve data-driven manufacturing, it is necessary to use the data as an input. Then, real-time feedback, production monitoring, simulation and business process optimization can be realized. In fact, big data exists in product lifecycle (Li et al., 2015), and its applications "span different fields such as customer need identification, risk management and decision-making, data-driven knowledge, product and service design, quality management, and opportunity recognition and creation" (Urbinati et al., 2019).

In short, big data can bring benefits to the entire value chain. To this end, big data must be processed adequately to support machines to learn and help users to make decision.

Machine learning

Just as Alpaydin described, stored data become useful only when they are analyzed and turned into information for application (Alpaydin, 2010). More specifically, the data-driven machine learning (Michalski et al., 2013), which can find highly complex and non-linear patterns by transforming raw data to features spaces, can be applied to prediction, detection, classification, regression, or forecasting (Wuest et al., 2016). Recently, the flourish of machine learning (specifically deep learning and reinforcement learning) provides a practicable way to deal with such large amount of data. Thus, the introduction of machine learning (ML) in manufacturing system would provide the following advantages:

1) ML can deal with high-dimensional data. As varied sensors and integration of SCPS in manufacturing generate a huge amount of data of high dimensions, it is difficult to understand or find a relationship by traditional data-mining methods.
2) ML has the ability to learn and adapt. As a manufacturing system faces external unpredictable events and internal complexity, the predefined model set by humans becomes powerless in dealing with uncertain events. So ML, which can learn from the data by itself, provides a feasible way to dynamically respond to such challenges.
3) ML is able to derive knowledge. While data available explodes in manufacturing systems, knowledge for decision-making does not grow synchronously. By learning from big data, knowledge can be derived from manufacturing systems that were data-rich but knowledge-sparse.

In short, wisdom manufacturing can be regarded as the integration of networked manufacturing and advanced AI, and the usability of ML approaches and the availability of raw data increase the applicability of AI in manufacturing. Consequently, the introduction of big data and ML makes manufacturing shift from reactive to proactive (Yao et al., 2017).

Edge computing

Big data processing requires not only an efficient model (e.g., deep learning) in software, but also computing power in hardware. Although centralized cloud computing with powerful computing power provides computing resources for users on-demand (Marston et al., 2011), the realization of cloud computing depends on the efficiency of network transmission. Long-distance transmission results in high delay and bandwidth consumption. This limits the development of CPS/SCPS where massive data is required to be processed in real-time (Yao et al., 2017). On the other hand, pervasive computing or IoT based on embedded computing provides a way to process real-time data in manufacturing. However, with the limitation of cost, volume and power of sensors or other smart devices, it is expensive and unrealistic to equip high computing power in each object. What is worse, as the frequency of use and the peak value of computing demand are varied, it is a waste of resources if every device is equipped with full computing power. Therefore, there is an urgent need to introduce edge computing in Industry 4.0/5.0 as there are innumerable and variable devices in the SCPPS. Edge computing can balance the conflict between computation offloading and real-time requirement and play a key role in a complex manufacturing environment.

In fact, edge computing is a model for enabling computation and storage resources at the proximity of subscribers to serve delay sensitive and context-aware applications (Shi et al., 2016; Ahmed and Ahmed, 2016). Such a computing example is a smartphone between body sensors and cloud, or a gateway in a smart factory. Edge computing can be viewed as a bridge between pervasive computing and cloud computing, to make up for the insufficiency of cloud computing and pervasive computing. Compared to a traditional central control node responsible for managing other nodes, edge computing is more like a collaborator that provides computing power and storage resources on demand. More specifically, edge computing brings the following benefits to the WM/SCPPS:

1) Manufacturing system's real-time responsiveness can be improved and transmission load can be lightened. With the expansion of Industry 4.0 based on CPS, the number of resources connects to manufacturing systems

are exploded. As enormous raw data will be produced continuously, thus real-time processing is required. As responsiveness plays a vital role in manufacturing to deal with abnormal events, distributed edge computing, which is closer to demand and cuts down the transmission time, provides a solid foundation. Besides the reduction of latency, computing in local instead of in cloud can save a huge expenditure for transmission and lighten the bandwidth load.

2) Edge computing can provide better security and privacy protection. As we introduce the social system into wisdom manufacturing, private-sensitive social data becomes a significant part of industrial big data (Yao et al., 2017). For example, in mass personalization individual data is not only the foundation for design, but also for company competitiveness. The security and privacy protect become more and more important. Conversely, data stored in the cloud may be indirectly analyzed by service providers. Further, data transmission to and for cloud increases the additional risk of data leakage. Local edge computing, on the other hand, avoids the leakage of information, remote attacks and other potential hazards by the use of local storage and computing. Besides, data pre-processing before upload in edge servers can remove private information from data and avoid a leakage during transmission.
3) Edge computing can provide personalized computing power. As a result of a wide range of manufacturing resources, the structures of manufacturing data are also varied. Therefore, before processed, data needs to be normalized for cloud computing. It is inefficient for a centralized cloud service to normalize varied data. Instead, edge computing can use a dedicated processor and processing model to achieve efficient data processing accordingly. For example, faced with an image processing scene, the use of dedicated GPU processors, can not only save computing costs, but also improve processing speed.

Thanks to edge computing pre-processing data, the reliability of data can be improved, and the unnecessary transmission and computation can be reduced.

Social computing

Except for the dramatically transition of engineering systems, technologies bring profound impacts to the social structure over last decades as well, resulting in a more dynamic, faster, and broader social system with openness and more interaction. In addition, as the vital part of a manufacturing system mentioned above, the social system changes the way of marketing, production and management of manufacturing enterprises, for example, changing employees' abilities and customer relationship. Hence, social computing, which aims at solving complicated problems by integrating social and computational systems together (optimization of both technical and social aspects), must be conducted for the WM/SCPPS to improve system performance. Although social computing has not yet had a unified definition, related-research mainly focuses on two aspects: one is centering on the use of computing technology to improve the quality and efficiency of social interaction, such as social media, social networks, wiki, blogs, etc.; the other is applying the sociology and anthropology knowledge to the computing process to analyze social problems, including prediction market, crowdsourcing, and collective intelligence (Wang et al., 2007; Parameswaran & Whinston, 2007). For example, information produced by a group of people is used to support the function of a system, as ranked based on user commentaries.

The introduction of social computing in the WM/SCPPS can avoid the social risk to achieve sustainable manufacturing, resulting in better use of new social technologies for the production process and management, and provides effective decision-making and technical support. In addition, the ways of enterprise innovation are broadened, and innovation ability is improved (Yao et al., 2015).

Additive manufacturing/3D printing

Additive manufacturing (AM) or 3D printing, used interchangeably, refers to the method of creating 3-dimensional objects from digital models layer-by-layer under computer control (ASTM, 2015), which is currently being lauded in the popular press as a potential socially transformative manufacturing technology. It opens up new opportunities for economy and society, which facilitates customized production and allows designs that are not feasible with traditional manufacturing techniques (Thomas & Gilbert, 2014). Based on the cost model (Hague & Ruffo, 2007; Ruffo et al., 2006), 3D printing shows unprecedented benefits and potential in low volume production.

Instead of tedious processes, 3D printing leads to free-form product design and fabricates directly based on digital models with the characteristic insensitive to the sophistication of geometric shapes. Thus, personalized production costs and the threshold of public participation are reduced. In this sense, 3D printing enables public participation in manufacturing with abilities to realize their ideas and provides a fundamental for social manufacturing. Manufacturing innovation is no longer just the privilege of professionals. Instead, everyone is capable of enjoying the progress of manufacturing. As a result, social manufacturing becomes a part of modern manufacturing.

Further, AM is technically a viable form of distributed manufacturing which can be deployed in distributed and shifts production closer to customers even in customers' home. Hence, inventory and transportation costs can be diminished by replacing logistics with the digital transmission and make-to-order strategies. In addition, AM has the potential to reduce the number of stages in the traditional supply chain (Huang et al., 2013).

Therefore, AM can be regarded as socialized manufacturing, which also shows a great potential benefits for the sustainable development of manufacturing industry from an ecological perspective (Kreiger & Pearce, 2013). Wang (Wang., 2012) has proposed a social manufacturing, in which customers can participate fully in the whole life cycle of production processes and realize personalized production, based on the combination of 3D printing manufacturing networks, social networks, Internet, and logistic networks. In such a social manufacturing system, the so-called prosumers or makers become a common part of the manufacturing system. An example is Shapeways, a 3D printing service provider, who transforms users' designs into products and create a marketplace for their designs. In such a new model, consumers evolve as prosumers, which blur the roles of producers and consumers. Further, a manufacturer is also becoming a developer platform and a marketplace for its prosumers.

Blockchain

Although social factors have been introducing into manufacturing systems, and manufacturing resources have been socialized, social interactions among manufactures, customers, and prosumers require extremely trust between each other. Without trust, social interactions are difficult to carry out. Further, social factors or socialized resources are unable to play their role. To build such a trust system always costs a lot of time and resources in traditional ways. Recently, the application in the cryptocurrency bitcoin, the first digital currency that is issued and backed by users rather than a central authority, shows the benefits of blockchains to build a transaction system without trust among users. The potential benefits of blockchains are more than just in economic (Swan, 2015). It offers a great opportunity to facilitate the development of WM/SCPPS in several ways:

Blockchain data is time stamped, jointly validated and recorded by consensus nodes, and cannot be tampered with or falsified, which ensures the reliability of peer-to-peer exchange. Therefore, blockchains facilitate machine-to-machine communication and secure data transmission in IoT (Yu et al., 2018), and what's more, make IoT cloud-centered architecture decentralized (Fernandez-Carames and Fraga-Lamas 2018). Blockchains can be applied in registering and protecting intellectual property in digital manufacturing. As prosumers become a part in manufacturing, an efficient way to register and protect intellectual property is required. For example, in 3D printing industry, digital models of products are easy to be copied and reproduced by users (Holland et al., 2017). Conversely, companies that produce varied no-identical products need new technical support to achieve full lifecycle tracking.

Digital twin

The first definition of the concept of digital twin (DT) was put forward by Michael Grieves in an industry presentation on product lifecycle management (PLM) in 2002 (Kritzinger et al., 2018). Although the DT has a history of nearly 20 years and there is still no unified definition, it has been widely studied and applied in academia and industry. However, the DT is generally considered to be an integrated digital representation of individual products, which presents the properties, conditions and behaviors of real-life objects with the assistance of models and data (Haag & Anderl, 2018). DT has potential application value in many aspects, such as analysis and evaluation, predictive diagnosis and performance optimization, showing its superiority over traditional solutions.

The core of Industry 4.0 is CPS, and the main challenge it faces is to connect physical space and virtual space. The emergence of DT provides exciting possibilities for real-time simulation of the entire product lifecycle. Through the interaction and collaboration of virtual model and physical object, the virtual model can be synchronized and optimized with the physical object, and the physical object can be dynamically adjusted according to the direct instructions of the virtual model. Therefore, DT is also regarded as an important driving force for the realization of the smart manufacturing paradigm (Tao et al., 2018).

Cobots

Industry 5.0 will completely change the definition of the word "robot". A robot is not only a programmable machine that can perform repetitive tasks, but will also become an ideal work and life companion for humans in some cases. Industry 5.0 will introduce the next generation of robots, commonly known as collaborative robots (cobots), which already know or can learn what to do soon, thus providing a human touch for the production of robots (Michaelis et al., 2020).

Human-machine smart collaboration is one of the most distinguishing features of the Industry 5.0 era, in which cobots play a pivotal role. Humans and machines are no longer a competitive relationship, but a cooperative relationship

(Nahavandi, 2019). Evolving from robots, cobots are a subdivision of robots that represent a breakthrough technology designed to enable high-level (e.g., collaborative) interactions between workers and machines, with the ability to be deployed flexibly in industries such as manufacturing (Michaelis et al., 2020). Just as today's new generation has inevitably more interaction with smartphones, which they see as part of their lives, future human-robot interactions may be similar to today's human-smartphone interactions, and it seems that human-robot cooperation will be an important part of future sociological research (Demir et al., 2019).

Although this study emphasizes the enabling technologies as discussed above, other technologies such as cloud and CPS are required too. As emerging edge/fog has limitations in data storage and computing power, edge/fog and cloud are likely to coexist and be complementary with each other to fulfill tasks (Pan and McElhannon, 2018). Their integration has the combined advantages of real-time, energy saving and security from fog and high computing power and large volume data storage capacity from cloud (Jing & Yao, 2019; Hashem et al., 2015), thus resulting in more effective big data processing capabilities for manufacturing (Georgakopoulos et al., 2016).

Towards industrial metaverse for industry/society 5.0

As shown in Fig. 7, the blockchainized SCPS includes three subparts: blockchainized IoT/blockchain-based IoT (Ali et al., 2018) or called IoTChain (Alphand et al., 2018), blockchain-based IoP/blockchainized IoP or blockchainized Internet of Minds (Wang et al., 2018), and blockchain-based cloud/ blockchainized IoS, resulting in such a socio-economic environment that allows a decentralized network of economic agents to agree about the true state of shared data, and resources can be organized or reorganized dynamically for production. As such, blockchains are not only used for transactions, but also used as a ledger or a registry and inventory management system for tracking, recording and monitoring all assets across the manufacturing value chain. Table 1 shows what value blockchains add to the three subsystems of SCPPS.

As illustrated in Fig. 3, along with the Internet evolution from Industry 3.0 to Industry 5.0, we shift from the computer integrated manufacturing (CIM) that intends to integrate data scattered in various enterprise application silos during the PC era, to networked manufacturing integrating all data in a central database, to service-oriented cloud manufacturing integrating all data at the cloud, and to human-computer-service-thing integrated manufacturing (HCSTIM) decentralizing all or part of cloud data to the edge (or fog) (Yao et al., 2019), which actually results in a distributed blockchainized SCPPS, where each smart device has its role and acts autonomously, and towards Industrial Metaverse, or metamanufacturing.

As shown in Fig. 9, machine intelligence (especially for the production line) due to technology advances has undergone profound changes from the naked machine without intelligence to the autonomous one of high intelligence, that is, from the past focusing on liberating workers' physical labor to the current focusing on liberating workers' mental labor, resulting in the so-called Operator 1.0 - Operator 4.0 (Romero, et al., 2016, 2016) and toward Operator 5.0 featured by the division of human-machine labor: monotonous, repetitive, non-ergonomic and less innovation tasks done by machines, and innovative, research and artistic tasks by humans with the cooperation of cobots. Meanwhile, enterprise innovation gradually moves from closed to open, embedded and global (Zhang and Yao, 2016), and design goes from linear to competitive, networking and collaborative (Świątek, 2018). And design and innovation will meet at Industrial Metaverse in the name of Metadesign and Global Innovation respectively. Thus, operators (producers) is gradually eliminated from the production line - the so called human-in-the loop (HiL), and gradually entering in the cyberspace - the so called human-on-the-Loop (HoL) and even in the social space - the so called human-out-of-the-Loop (HofL), while the stakeholders such as consumers and ex-enterprise innovators, in the reverse direction, gradually enter an enterprise from HofL to HoL and toward HiL.

Although machines (production lines) are of high of autonomy in Industry 4.0/5.0, in case of no HiL, there exist still humans in SCPPS, either in HoL or in HofL as shown in Fig. 6. In fact, the labor force shift from HiL to HoL to HofL just as from the primary industry (agriculture) to the secondary and service industries. For example, there will be Operator 5.0 in the loop (HiL) for interacting and collaborating with cobots in Industry 5.0. Besides, consumers/users participate the manufacturing for individual experiences.

A similar concept to Industry 4.0 is the Industrial Internet, which can be viewed as the result of "Industrial Revolution + Internet". Now the Internet is moving to the Metaverse (Park & Kim, 2022), so we have "Industrial Internet + Metaverse = Industrial Metaverse", as shown in Fig. 10. Before the emergence of the Internet, there existed "information islands" in manufacturing, and machines were not connected together. In the new industrial revolution, the rapid development and widespread use of the Internet has given rise to the Industrial Internet, i.e., IIoT, which is an interconnection of things, realizing the interconnection of humans, machines, things and the environment. Now with the rise of the Metaverse, the Industrial Internet will further develop into the Industrial Metaverse, where the real world and the



Fig. 9 Towards Industrial Metaverse for Industry/Society 5.0

virtual world (Metaverse) will have no obvious boundaries, influencing and evolving each other. The real world is connected by IoP and IoT, while the virtual world is connected by IoS and IoCK. That's to say, Industrial Metaverse is connected by IoP, IoT, IoS and IoCK as the wisdom manufacturing is.

Metaverse is a much larger and more complex concept than DT, and it is generally believed that DT is a subset



Fig. 10 From Industrial Revolution to Industrial Internet to Industrial Metaverse



Fig. 11 A schematic diagram of the evolutionary route of metaverse and DT

of Metaverse or one of the enabling technologies for Metaverse. Although Metaverse emerged about 10 years before the DT, its related technology system is still very incomplete and needs to be studied more deeply by academia and industry. The DT originated in the industrialization of complex product development and is moving toward socialization and globalization, while Metaverse originated in the gaming and entertainment industry and is expanding from globalization to socialization and industrialization. A schematic diagram of the evolutionary route of Metaverse and DT is shown in Fig. 11.

Although both Metaverse and DT are concerned with the connection and interaction between the real world and the virtual world, the essential difference between the two is that they have completely different starting points. Metaverse is directly oriented to humans, while the DT is first oriented to technology (things). However, both complement each other.

As such, wisdom manufacturing is enhanced as Industrial Metaverse (Metamanufacturing), still in the form of SCPPS, to integrate all stakeholders (including producers and consumers, ex-enterprise innovators and others), machines (including machine tools, and robots, cobot and other devices), and things (such as workpieces and materials) together with extensive participation in participatory design and building advantageous value chain (Świątek, 2018), as well as Global Innovation and supporting the growing diversity and individual needs of human beings in the future by absorbing the widest range of innovative and creative wisdom of the world's most talented people. Therefore, Industrial Metaverse will provide a vision of Industry 5.0 that aims beyond efficiency and productivity as the sole goals and reinforces the role and the contribution of industry to society, and enables smart, resilient, sustainable, and human-centric solutions to satisfy experience-driven individual needs, as shown in Fig. 12.

Conclusion

For the purpose of developing Industry 5.0 manufacturing to meet economic, environmental, and social challenges, a socio-technical revolution based on SCPS has been addressed. We have developed a socio-technically enhanced wisdom manufacturing architecture and a blockchainized SCPS-based decentralized framework, and discussed Industry 5.0 key enabling technologies and the roadmap to blockchainized value-added SCPS-based Industrial Metaverse for Industry 5.0.



Fig. 12 Enhancing wisdom manufacturing as Industrial Metaverse for Industry/Society 5.0

Such a proposed architecture/framework extends CPS-based Industry 4.0 to SCPS-based Industry 5.0 to integrate stakeholders' ideas, thoughts and innovations for mass personalization, and the resultant Industrial Metaverse can provide products and services that satisfy experience-driven individual needs. However, Industrial Metaverse is in the early stage of concept formation, and there are many details that need to be further studied.

Acknowledgements This work was supported by Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (2022A1515010095, 2021A1515010506), the National Natural Science Foundation of China and the Royal Society of Edinburgh (51911530245), and National Natural Science Foundation of China (51675186).

Declarations

Conflicts of interest The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Shrouf, F., Ordieres, J., & Miragliotta, G. (2014). Smart factories in Industry 4.0: A review of the concept and of energy management approached in production based on the Internet of Things paradigm. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management, Selangor, Malaysia, December 09–12 2014*. https://doi.org/10.1109/ieem.2014.7058728

Wikipedia (2021). *Industry 4.0*. Available: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Industry_4.0

Hermann, M., Pentek, T., & Otto, B. (2016). Design Principles for Industrie 4.0 Scenarios. In *2016 49th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS), Koloa, HI, USA, January 05–08 2016*.https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2016.488

Kang, H. S., et al. (2016). Smart manufacturing: Past research, present findings, and future directions. *International Journal of Precision Engineering and Manufacturing-Green Technology*, *3*(1), 111–128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40684-016-0015-5

Lee, E. A. (2015). The Past, Present and Future of Cyber-Physical Systems: A Focus on Models. *Sensors (Basel, Switzerland)*, *15*(3), 4837–4869. https://doi.org/10.3390/s150304837

Leitão, P., Colombo, A. W., & Karnouskos, S. (2016). Industrial automation based on cyber-physical systems technologies: Prototype implementations and challenges. *Computers in Industry*, *81*, 11–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2015.08.004

Cohen, Y., Faccio, M., Pilati, F., & Yao, X. (2019). Design and management of digital manufacturing and assembly systems in the Industry 4.0 era. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, *105*(9), 3565–3577. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-019-04595-0

Fantini, P., et al. (2016). Exploring the integration of the human as a flexibility factor in CPS enabled manufacturing environments: methodology and results. In *IECON 2016–42nd Annual Conference of the IEEE Industrial Electronics Society, Florence, Italy, October 23–26 2016*.https://doi.org/10.1109/IECON.2016.7793579

Romero, D., Bernus, P., Noran, O., & Stahre, J., & Å. Fast-Berglund. (2016). The Operator 4.0: Human Cyber-Physical Systems & Adaptive Automation towards Human-Automation Symbiosis Work Systems. In *APMS (Advances in Production Management Systems)*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51133-7_80

Breque, M., Nul, L. D., & Petridis, A. (2021). *Industry 5.0: Towards a sustainable, human-centric and resilient European industry*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/industry-50_en

K. A. Demir &H. Ciciba. Industry 5.0 and a critique of Industry 4.0. In *4th International Management Information Systems Conference "Industry 4.0", İstanbul, Turkey, October 17–20 2017*.http://www.innovation4.cn/library/r52700

V. Ozdemir, & N. Hekim. (2018). The Internet of Things" and Next-Generation Technology Policy. *Omics-a Journal of Integrative Biology*, *22*(1), 65–76. https://doi.org/10.1089/omi.2017.0194. Birth of Industry 5.0: Making Sense of Big Data with Artificial Intelligence

Shiroishi, Y., Uchiyama, K., & Suzuki, N. (2018). Society 5.0: For human security and well-being. *Computer*, *51*(7), 91–95. https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2018.3011041

Fukuda, K. (2020). Science, technology and innovation ecosystem transformation toward society 5.0. *International Journal of Production Economics*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2019.07.033. 220

Shiroishi, Y., Uchiyama, K., & Suzuki, N. (2019). Better Actions for Society 5.0: Using AI for Evidence-Based Policy Making That Keeps Humans in the Loop. *Computer*, *52*(11), 73–78. https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2019.2934592

Melnyk, L. H., Kubatko, O. V., Dehtyarova, I. B., Dehtiarova, I. B., Matsenko, O. M., & Rozhko, O. D. (2019). The effect of industrial revolutions on the transformation of social and economic systems. https://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/77259

Salimova, T., Guskova, N., & Krakovskaya, I., & E. Sirota. (2019). From industry 4.0 to Society 5.0: Challenges for sustainable competitiveness of Russian industry. In *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*(p. 012090). IOP Publishing

Potocan, V., Mulej, M., & Nedelko, Z. (2021). Society 5.0: balancing of Industry 4.0, economic advancement and social problems. *Kybernetes*, *50*(3), 794–811. https://doi.org/10.1108/k-12-2019-0858

Zengin, Y., Naktiyok, S., Kaygin, E., Kavak, O., & Topcuoglu, E. (2021). An Investigation upon Industry 4.0 and Society 5.0 within the Context of Sustainable Development Goals. *Sustainability*, *13*(5), 2682. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052682

Carayannis, E. G., Dezi, L., Gregori, G., & Calo, E. (2021). Smart Environments and Techno-centric and Human-Centric Innovations for Industry and Society 5.0: A Quintuple Helix Innovation System View Towards Smart, Sustainable, and Inclusive Solutions. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-021-00763-4

Oborski, P. (2003). Social-technical aspects in modern manufacturing. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, *22*(11–12), 848–854. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-003-1573-6

Yao, X. F., Lian, Z. T., Yang, Y., Zhang, Y., & Jin, H. (2014). Wisdom manufacturing: new humans-computers-things collaborative manufacturing model. *Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, *20*(6), 1490–1498. https://doi.org/10.13196/j.cims.2014.06.yaoxifan.1490.9.20140627

Yao, X., Jin, H., & Zhang, J. (2015). Towards a wisdom manufacturing vision. *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing*, *28*(12), 1291–1312. https://doi.org/10.1080/0951192x.2014.972462

Yao, X., Zhang, J., & Lin, Y. (2016). The basic theory and technical framework for wisdom manufacturing systems. *Systems Engineering - Theory & Practice*, *36*(10), 2699–2711. https://doi.org/10.12011/1000-6788(2016)10-2699-13

Papadimitriou, D. (2009). *Future Internet: The cross-ETP vision document*,. Available: http://www.future-internet.eu/fileadmin/documents/reports/Cross-ETPs_FI_Vision_Document_v1_0.pdf

Wu, J., Dong, M., Ota, K., Liang, L., & Zhou, Z. (2014). Securing distributed storage for Social Internet of Things using regenerating code and Blom key agreement. *Peer-to-Peer Networking and Applications*, *8*(6), 1133–1142. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12083-014-0286-y

Tuptuk, N. &S., & Hailes (2018). Security of smart manufacturing systems. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, *47*, 93–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2018.04.007

Yao, X., Jing, X., Zhou, J., & Lin, Y. (2019). Towards next generation sustainable manufacturing-inclusive manufacturing. *Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, *25*(10), 2419–2432. https://doi.org/10.13196/j.cims.2019.10.002

Xu, X., Lu, Y., Vogel-Heuser, B., & Wang, L. (2021). Industry 4.0 and Industry 5.0—Inception, conception and perception. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, *61*, 530–535. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2021.10.006

E. G. Carayannis &J. J. J. o. t. K. E. Morawska-Jancelewicz. The futures of Europe: Society 5.0 and Industry 5.0 as driving forces of future universities. 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-021-00854-2

Maddikunta, P. K. R., et al. (2022). Industry 5.0: A survey on enabling technologies and potential applications. 26,100257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jii.2021.100257

Fox, W. M. (1995). Sociotechnical system principles and guidelines: past and present. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *31*(1), 91–105. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886395311009

Yao, X., Zhang, J., Tao, T., Jiang, J., & Chen, X. (2018). From leagile manufacturing to long-tail production in Industry 4.0 for upgrading manufacturing. *Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, *24*(10), 2377–2387. https://doi.org/10.13196/j.cims.2018.10.001

Atzori, L., Iera, A., & Morabito, G.,M. Nitti (2012). The Social Internet of Things (SIoT) – When social networks meet the Internet of Things: Concept, architecture and network characterization. *Computer Networks*, *56*(16), 3594–3608. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2012.07.010

Yao, X., & Lin (2016). Emerging manufacturing paradigm shifts for the incoming industrial revolution. *International Journal of*

Advanced Manufacturing Technology, *85*(5), 1665–1676. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-015-8076-0

Yao, X., Zhou, J., Lin, Y., Li, Y., Yu, H., & Liu, Y. (2019). Smart manufacturing based on cyber-physical systems and beyond. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, *30*(8), 2805–2817. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10845-017-1384-5

P. J. Mosterman &J. Zander. (2016). Industry 4.0 as a Cyber-Physical System study.Software & Systems Modeling, 15(1),17–29. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10270-015-0493-x

Lee, J., Bagheri, B., & Hung-An, K. (2015). A cyber-physical systems architecture for Industry 4.0-based manufacturing systems. *Manufacturing Letter*, *3*, 18–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mfglet.2014.12.001

Lu, Y. (2017). Cyber Physical System (CPS)-Based Industry 4.0: A Survey. *Journal of Industrial Integration and Management*, *02*(03), 1750014. https://doi.org/10.1142/S2424862217500142

Wang, L., Törngren, M., & Onori, M. (2015). Current status and advancement of cyber-physical systems in manufacturing. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, *37*, 517–527. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2015.04.008

Atzori, L., Iera, A., & Morabito, G. (2010). The Internet of Things: A survey. *Computer Networks*, *54*(15), 2787–2805. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2010.05.010

Wang, S., Wan, J., Li, D., & Zhang, C. (2016). Implementing Smart Factory of Industrie 4.0: An Outlook. *International Journal of Distributed Sensor Networks*, *12*(1), 3159805. https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/3159805

Chen, B., Wan, J., Shu, L., Li, P., Mukherjee, M., & Yin, B. (2017). Smart Factory of Industry 4.0: Key Technologies, Application Case, and Challenges. *Ieee Access : Practical Innovations, Open Solutions*, *6*, 6505–6519. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2017.2783682

Kagermann, H., Wahlster, W., & J. Helbig. (2013). *Recommendations for implementing the strategic initiative INDUSTRIE 4.0*. Available: http://www.acatech.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Baumstruktur_nach_Website/Acatech/root/de/Material_fuer_Sonderseiten/Industrie_4.0/Final_report__Industrie_4.0_accessible.pdf

Moghaddam, M., & Nof, S. Y. (2017). The collaborative factory of the future. *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing*, *30*(1), 23–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/0951192X.2015.1066034

Stock, T., & Seliger, G. (2016). Opportunities of sustainable manufacturing in industry 4.0. *Procedia Cirp*, *40*, 536–541. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2016.01.129

Esmaeilian, B., Behdad, S., & Wang, B. (2016). The evolution and future of manufacturing: A review. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, *39*, 79–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2016.03.001

Anderson, C. (2012). *Makers: The New Industrial Revolution*. New York: Crown Business

Jing, X., & Yao, X. F. (2019). Towards Social Cyber-physical Production Systems. *Acta Automatica Sinica*, *45*(4), 637–656. https://doi.org/10.16383/j.aas.2018.c180274

Tortorella, G. L., Vergara, L. G. L., & Ferreira, E. P. (2017). Lean manufacturing implementation: an assessment method with regards to socio-technical and ergonomics practices adoption. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, *89*(9), 3407–3418. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-016-9227-7

Ma, N., Yao, X., & Wang, K. (2022). Current status and prospect of future Internet oriented wisdom manufacturing. *SCIENTIA SINICA Technologica*, *52*(1), 55–75. https://doi.org/10.1360/SST-2021-0232

Yao, X., Zhou, J., Zhang, C., & Liu, M. (2017). Proactive manufacturing - a big-data driven emerging manufacturing paradigm. *Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, *23*(1), 172–185. https://doi.org/10.13196/j.cims.2017.01.019

Yao, X., Huang, Y., Huang, Y., Mai, H., & Yang, E.,H. Yu (2022). Autonomous smart manufacturing: social-cyber-physical interaction, reference architecture and operation mechanism. *Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, *28*(2), 325–338. https://doi.org/10.13196/j.cims.2022.02.001

Varghese, B., Wang, N., Barbhuiya, S., Kilpatrick, P., & Nikolopoulos, D. S. (2016). Challenges and opportunities in edge computing. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Smart Cloud (SmartCloud), New York, NY, USA, November 18–20 2016*.https://doi.org/10.1109/SmartCloud.2016.18

Kompatsiaris, I., Gatica-Perez, D., Xie, X., & Luo, J. (2013). Special section on social media as sensors. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, *15*(6), 1229–1230. https://doi.org/10.1109/TMM.2013.2264232

Calì, J., et al. (2012). 3D-printing of non-assembly, articulated models. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, *31*(6), 130. https://doi.org/10.1145/2366145.2366149

Zhang, J., Yao, X., & Li, Y. (2020). Improved evolutionary algorithm for parallel batch processing machine scheduling in additive manufacturing. *International Journal of Production Research*, *58*(8), 2263–2282. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2019.1617447

Jara, A. J., Bocchi, Y., & Genoud, D. (2014). Social Internet of Things: The Potential of the Internet of Things for Defining Human Behaviours. 581–585. https://doi.org/10.1109/INCoS.2014.113

Kiel, D., Arnold, C., & Voigt, K. I. (2017). The influence of the Industrial Internet of Things on business models of established manufacturing companies A business level perspective. *Technovation*, *68*, 4–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2017.09.003

Kim, S., Yim, Y., Oh, S., & Kim, S. H. (2016). Social wireless sensor network toward device-to-device interactive Internet of Things services. *International Journal of Distributed Sensor Networks*, *12*(9), https://doi.org/10.1177/1550147716664251

Ding, K., & Jiang, P. (2016). Incorporating Social Sensors and CPS Nodes for Personalized Production under Social Manufacturing Environment. *Procedia CIRP*, *56*, 366–371. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2016.10.057

Hey, T., Tansley, S., & Tolle, K. M. (2009). *The fourth paradigm: data-intensive scientific discovery*. WA: Microsoft research Redmond

Magoutas, B., Stojanovic, N., Bousdekis, A., Apostolou, D., Mentzas, G., & Stojanovic, L. (2014). Anticipation-driven Architecture for Proactive Enterprise Decision Making. In *CAiSE (Forum/Doctoral Consortium)*(pp. 121–128)

Kusiak, A. (2017). Smart manufacturing must embrace big data. *Nature*, *544*, 23–25. https://doi.org/10.1038/544023a

Li, J., Tao, F., Cheng, Y., & Zhao, L. (2015). Big Data in product lifecycle management. *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, *81*(1–4), 667–684. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-015-7151-x

Urbinati, A., Bogers, M., Chiesa, V., & Frattini, F. (2019). Creating and capturing value from Big Data: A multiple-case study analysis of provider companies. *Technovation*, *84–85*, 21–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2018.07.004

Alpaydin, E. (2010). *Introduction to Machine Learning* (2nd ed.). Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning. The MIT Press

Michalski, R. S., Carbonell, J. G., & Mitchell, T. M. (2013). *Machine learning: An artificial intelligence approach*. Springer Science & Business Media

Wuest, T., Weimer, D., Irgens, C., & Thoben, K. D. (2016). Machine learning in manufacturing: advantages, challenges, and applications. *Production & Manufacturing Research*, *4*(1), 23–45. https://doi.org/10.1080/21693277.2016.1192517

Marston, S., Li, Z., Bandyopadhyay, S., Zhang, J., & Ghalsasi, A. (2011). Cloud computing — The business perspective. *Decision Support Systems*, *51*(1), 176–189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2010.12.006

Shi, W., Cao, J., Zhang, Q., Li, Y., & Xu, L. (2016). Edge computing: Vision and challenges. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, *3*(5), 637–646. https://doi.org/10.1109/JIOT.2016.2579198

A. Ahmed &E. Ahmed. A survey on mobile edge computing. In *Intelligent Systems and Control (ISCO), 10th International Conference on*(pp. 1–8). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCO.2016.7727082

Wang, F. Y., Carley, K. M., Zeng, D., & Mao, W. (2007). Social computing: From social informatics to social intelligence. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, *22*(2), 79–83. https://doi.org/10.1109/MIS.2007.41

Parameswaran, M., & Whinston, A. B. (2007). Social computing: An overview. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *19*(1), 37. https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.01937

ASTM. (2015). *"ISO/ASTM52900-15 Standard Terminology for Additive Manufacturing-General Principles-Terminology,"*. West Conshohocken: ASTM

Thomas, D. S., & Gilbert, S. W. (2014). Costs and cost effectiveness of additive manufacturing. *NIST Special Publication 1176*. https://doi.org/10.6028/nist.sp.1176

Hague, R., & Ruffo, M. (2007). Cost estimation for rapid manufacturing — simultaneous production of mixed components using laser sintering. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part B: Journal of Engineering Manufacture*, 221(11), 1585–1591. https://doi.org/10.1243/09544054jem894

Ruffo, M., Tuck, C., & Hague, R. (2006). Empirical laser sintering time estimator for Duraform PA. *International Journal of Production Research*, *44*(23), 5131–5146. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207540600622522

Huang, S. H., Liu, P., Mokasdar, A., & Hou, L. (2013). Additive manufacturing and its societal impact: a literature review. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, *67*(5), 1191–1203. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-012-4558-5

Kreiger, M., & Pearce, J. M. (2013). Environmental Life Cycle Analysis of Distributed Three-Dimensional Printing and Conventional Manufacturing of Polymer Products. *Acs Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering*, *1*(12), 1511–1519. https://doi.org/10.1021/sc400093k

Wang, F. (2012). From social computing to social manufacturing: the coming industrial revolution and new frontier in cyber-physical-social space. *Bulletin of chinese Academy of Sciences*, *6*(1), 658–669. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1000-3045.2012.06.002

Swan, M. (2015). *Blockchain: Blueprint for a new economy*. " O'Reilly Media, Inc."

Yu, B., Wright, J., Nepal, S., Zhu, L., Liu, J., & Ranjan, R. (2018). IoTChain: Establishing Trust in the Internet of Things Ecosystem Using Blockchain. *IEEE Cloud Computing*, *5*(4), 12–23. https://doi.org/10.1109/MCC.2018.043221010

Fraga-Lamas (2018). A Review on the Use of Blockchain for the Internet of Things. *IEEE Access*, 6, 32979–33001. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2842685

Holland, M., Nigischer, C., & Stjepandic, J. (2017). Copyright Protection in Additive Manufacturing with Blockchain Approach. In *24th ISPE Inc. International Conference on Transdisciplinary Engineering, Singapore.*https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-61499-779-5-914

Kritzinger, W., Karner, M., Traar, G., Henjes, J., & Sihn, W. J. I. P. (2018). Digital Twin in manufacturing: A categorical literature review and classification. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, *51*(11), 1016–1022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2018.08.474

Haag, S., & Anderl, R. J. M. L. (2018). Digital twin–Proof of concept. *Manufacturing Letters*, *15*, 64–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mfglet.2018.02.006

Tao, F., Zhang, H., Liu, A., J., A. Y. I. T. o. I. I., & Nee (2018). Digital twin in industry: State-of-the-art. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 15(4), 2405–2415. https://doi.org/10.1109/TII.2018.2873186

Michaelis, J. E., Siebert-Evenstone, A., & Shaffer, D. W. (2020). & B. Mutlu. Collaborative or simply uncaged? understanding human-cobot interactions in automation. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*(pp. 1–12). https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376547

Nahavandi, S. (2019). Industry 5.0-A Human-Centric Solution. *Sustainability*, *11*(16), 4371. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11164371

Demir, K. A., Doven, G., & Sezen, B. (2019). Industry 5.0 and Human-Robot Co-working. *Procedia Computer Science*, *158*, 688–695. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2019.09.104

Pan, J., & J. McElhannon. (2018). Future Edge Cloud and Edge Computing for Internet of Things Applications. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, *5*(1), 439–449. https://doi.org/10.1109/JIOT.2017.2767608

Jing, X., & Yao, X. (2019). Big Data Driven Cloud-Fog Manufacturing Architecture. *Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, *25*(9), 2119–2139. https://doi.org/10.13196/j.cims.2019.09.001

Hashem, I., Yaqoob, I., Anuar, N., Mokhtar, S., Gani, A., & Ullah Khan, S. (2015). The rise of "Big Data" on cloud computing: Review and open research issues. *Information Systems*, *47*, 98–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.is.2014.07.006

Georgakopoulos, D., Jayaraman, P. P., Fazia, M., Villari, M., & Ranjan, R. (2016). Internet of Things and Edge Cloud Computing Roadmap for Manufacturing. *IEEE Cloud Computing*, *3*(4), 66–73. https://doi.org/10.1109/MCC.2016.91

Ali, M. S., Vecchio, M., Pincheira, M., Dolui, K., Antonelli, F., & Rehmani, M. H. (2018). Applications of Blockchains in the Internet of Things: A Comprehensive Survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials*. https://doi.org/10.1109/COMST.2018.2886932

Alphand, O., et al. (2018). IoTChain: A blockchain security architecture for the Internet of Things. In *2018 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking* Conference, *WCNC* April 15, 2018 - April 18, 2018(pp. 1–6). Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc. https://doi.org/10.1109/WCNC.2018.8377385

Wang, F. Y., Yuan, Y., Zhang, J., Qin, R., & Smith, M. H. (2018). Blockchainized Internet of Minds: A New Opportunity for Cyber-Physical-Social Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, *5*(4), 897–906. https://doi.org/10.1109/TCSS.2018.2881344

Yao, X., Lei, Y., Ge, D., & Ye, J. (2019). On big data that drives manufacturing from "Internet Plus" to "AI Plus". *China Mechanical Engineering*, *30*(2), 134–142. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1004-132X.2019.02.002

Romero, D., et al. Towards an operator 4.0 typology: a human-centric perspective on the fourth industrial revolution technologies. In *proceedings of the international conference on computers and industrial engineering (CIE46), Tianjin, China*(pp. 29–31)

Zhang, C. & X. Yao (2016). Innovation in wisdom manufacturing. In *2016 Online International Conference on Green Engineering and Technologies (IC-GET), Coimbatore, India, November 19–19 2016.*https://doi.org/10.1109/GET.2016.7916702

Świątek, L. (2018). From industry 4.0 to nature 4.0–sustainable infrastructure evolution by design. In *International Conference on Applied Human Factors and Ergonomics*(pp. 438–447). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-94199-8_42

Park, S. M., & Kim, Y. G. (2022). A Metaverse: Taxonomy, Components, Applications, and Open Challenges. *Ieee Access : Practical Innovations, Open Solutions*, *10*, 4209–4251. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3140175

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.