

Mind Meets Space: Rethinking Agentic Spatial Intelligence from a Neuroscience-inspired Perspective

BUI DUC MANH*, School of EEE, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

SOUMYARATNA DEBNATH*, School of EEE, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

ZETONG ZHANG[†], Department of Civil Engineering, Tsinghua University, China

SHRIRAM DAMODARAN[†], Dr. B. R. Ambedkar National Institute of Technology, Jalandhar, India

ARVIND KUMAR, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden

YUEYI ZHANG, MiroMind, Singapore

LU MI, College of AI, Tsinghua University, China

ERIK CAMBRIA, CCDS, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

LIN WANG[‡], School of EEE, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Recent advances in agentic AI have led to systems capable of autonomous task execution and language-based reasoning, yet their spatial reasoning abilities remain limited and underexplored, largely constrained to symbolic and sequential processing. In contrast, human spatial intelligence, rooted in integrated multisensory perception, spatial memory, and cognitive maps, enables flexible, context-aware decision-making in unstructured environments. Therefore, bridging this gap is critical for advancing Agentic Spatial Intelligence toward better interaction with the physical 3D world. To this end, we first start from scrutinizing the spatial neural models as studied in computational neuroscience, and accordingly introduce a novel computational framework grounded in neuroscience principles. This framework maps core biological functions to six essential computation modules: bio-inspired multimodal sensing, multi-sensory integration, egocentric-alloentric conversion, an artificial cognitive map, spatial memory, and spatial reasoning. Together, these modules form a perspective landscape for agentic spatial reasoning capability across both virtual and physical environments. On top, we conduct a framework-guided analysis of recent methods, evaluating their relevance to each module and identifying critical gaps that hinder the development of more neuroscience-grounded spatial reasoning modules. We further examine emerging benchmarks and datasets and explore potential application domains ranging from virtual to embodied systems, such as robotics. Finally, we outline potential research directions, emphasizing the promising roadmap that can generalize spatial reasoning across dynamic or unstructured environments. We hope this work will benefit the research community with a neuroscience-grounded perspective and a structured pathway. Our project page can be found at [Github](#).

CCS Concepts: • **General and reference** → **Surveys and overviews**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Artificial intelligence**; **Machine learning**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Spatial Reasoning, Neuroscience-inspired AI, Agentic AI, Spatial Cognition

1 Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has recently achieved remarkable advances, evolving from passive and data-driven models to interactive autonomous systems with complex decision-making abilities [18].

*Equal contribution.

[†]Co-second author. Work done during internship at Nanyang Technological University.

[‡]Corresponding author.

Authors' Contact Information: Bui Duc Manh, ducmanh.bui@ntu.edu.sg, School of EEE, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore; Soumyaratna Debnath, soumyara004@e.ntu.edu.sg, School of EEE, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore; Zetong Zhang, zhangzt22@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn, Department of Civil Engineering, Tsinghua University, China; Shriram Damodaran, ds.ic.21@nitj.ac.in, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar National Institute of Technology, Jalandhar, India; Arvind Kumar, arkumar@kth.se, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden; Yueyi Zhang, yueyi.zhang@miromind.ai, MiroMind, Singapore; Lu Mi, milu@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn, College of AI, Tsinghua University, China; Erik Cambria, cambria@ntu.edu.sg, CCDS, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore; Lin Wang, linwang@ntu.edu.sg, School of EEE, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.




Fig. 1. Illustration of neuroscience-inspired Agentic Spatial Intelligence. As the core functions of human spatial reasoning lie in multimodal perception, cognitive mapping, memory systems, and spatial reasoning for decision-making, agents can be abstracted into corresponding AI modules that form a bio-inspired framework for enabling spatial reasoning and adaptive behavior. In our framework, these functions are mimicked through components, including bio-inspired multimodal sensing, multi-sensory integration, egocentric-alloentric conversion, cognitive map, spatial memory, and spatial reasoning for adaptive deployment.

This transformation marks the emergence of agentic AI, which is capable of reasoning and adaptively interacting in dynamic environments. For instance, OpenAI introduced ChatGPT Agent [149], an agentic system that leverages the GPT-based large language model (LLM) with reasoning abilities (e.g., OpenAI o3) to autonomously plan, execute, and refine multi-step tasks such as browsing, coding, and interacting with real-world tools. Also, Google presented Gemini CLI [66], an open-source agent that is capable of integrating with the command line interface to locally perform autonomous tasks, including content generation, problem solving, deep research, and task management. By employing LLM with language-based generalization, agentic systems have shown rapid advancement across both industry and academia. While these systems demonstrate robust capabilities in language-based reasoning and virtual task automation, their intelligence remains primarily symbolic and sequential [136]. Hence, although current agents excel at manipulating structured inputs, they often lack the ability to represent spatial structures, reason about spatial relationships, or decision-planning in spatial contexts, such as physical layouts, navigational environments, or abstract relational spaces [25].

This limitation contrasts sharply with the spatial intelligence in humans. Based on Dual Coding Theory (DCT) [152], alongside the verbal system (e.g., language, text), human intelligence is also grounded in a spatial system that encodes visual and spatial information, enabling individuals to perceive their surroundings, construct internal representations, and make context-aware decisions in complex environments [209]. Therefore, enhancing agents with spatial reasoning capabilities is essential for achieving better interaction with the physical 3D environments for both virtual and physical embodied agentic systems, such as robotics. However, recent approaches often explore spatial reasoning as static perception with task-specific planning, hindering the construction of internal spatial models that support generalizable, context-aware decision-making in space. **Bridging this gap requires rethinking agentic spatial reasoning not just as a computational problem but as a cognitive process** [129, 137].

In this work, we cross discipline boundaries by exploring the studies in neuroscience regarding how humans navigate and reason about space. Previous research reveals that the brain processes spatial information through a structured hierarchy, commencing from multisensory perception

and culminating in an internal representation of the world, commonly referred to as a cognitive map, which supports goal-directed spatial reasoning [17]. These processes are distributed across specialized brain regions including the posterior parietal cortex (PPC), hippocampus (HPC), and prefrontal cortex (PFC), forming a network that underlies flexible navigation and planning in real-world environments [145]. **Therefore, neuroscience presents a robust biologically-grounded baseline for spatial reasoning, yielding better interaction with physical 3D environments.**

Related Works: Following the emerging agentic AI, several surveys have extensively explored its capabilities, architectures, and emerging applications [44, 119, 125, 129, 166, 197]. Among them, [197] provides a comprehensive overview of agents powered by LLM, focusing on their architectural design, enhancement modules (such as memory, planning, and tool use), and diverse application domains. Following that, [44] surveys the broader landscape of agentic systems, with an emphasis on multimodal interaction capabilities that integrate vision, language, and action. It highlights recent architectural trends, training paradigms, and discusses the deployment of the agents across embodied settings. Additionally, [119] explores reasoning ability in LLM, focusing on examination and evaluation of core reasoning methods in representative models (e.g., OpenAI o1/o3, DeepSeek R1). Standing on neuroscience viewpoints, [125] provides a biological-inspired design for embodied agents, focusing on both definition and implementation that mimic human brain. The authors from [166] also survey brain-inspired approaches toward artificial general intelligence, bridging AI with cognitive neuroscience. It critiques token-centric LLM and highlights reasoning, memory, and multi-agent coordination as key components for embodied intelligence. Focusing more on reasoning, [129] explores general reasoning approaches in agentic AI by drawing on neuroscience foundations to examine multiple perspectives, including perceptual, dimensional, logical, and interactive reasoning. It further highlights the key gaps that prevent current AI methods from achieving these human-like reasoning capabilities. In summary, these works remain largely LLM-centric and language-based reasoning in symbolic and logical domains.

Challenges: Current spatial reasoning models still face fundamental challenges: (1) They remain heavily vision-centric, often relying on pre-trained vision-language models (VLM), such as GPT-4V and LLaVA, as their backbone. While this enables strong performance on perception-driven tasks, it largely overlooks the integration of multisensory inputs such as auditory, tactile, or motion cues, which are essential for embodied spatial intelligence in AI agents [125]. (2) The reliance on pre-trained models limits the development of a genuine internal world representation, a structured of the environment that can shift between egocentric and allocentric perspectives [208], akin to the cognitive maps formed in the human brain. (3) The memory systems of current AI agents face limitations as they depend heavily on the scale of large models rather than on mechanisms for retrieval, contextualization, and long-term adaptation, which are fundamental to how the human brain organizes and reuses past experience [125].

Contributions: Given the aforementioned challenges and the lack of representative works that provide a basic framework or theoretical foundation with detailed analysis, **the research and design of the AI spatial reasoning capable of mimicking human spatial cognition remain largely unexplored.** To address this problem, we introduce a **conceptual computational framework grounded in the neuroscience principle of human spatial cognition**, paving the way for the development of human-like spatial intelligence for AI agents. As described in Fig. 1, the design of human-like spatial intelligence can be viewed as a biological extension of human spatial cognition, emerging at the intersection of neuroscience, cognitive science, and machine learning. Just as humans rely on multimodal perception, integration, and memory to form cognitive maps that guide decision-making, agents require analogous components to operate effectively in complex environments. These include **bio-inspired multimodal sensing** for capturing diverse inputs, **multi-sensory integration** for fusing signals into coherent representations, and mechanisms for

egocentric–allocentric conversion that enable flexible spatial reasoning. At the core, an artificial **cognitive map** supported by **spatial memory** provides the internal model upon which **spatial reasoning and planning** can unfold, thereby forming the core components of our framework to facilitate spatial reasoning in dynamic environments. Together, these components form a conceptual roadmap for designing AI agents capable of human-like spatial reasoning and adaptive behavior.

By drawing inspiration from how the human brain reasons in space, our bio-inspired framework aims to provide a **perspective landscape** for the research community, highlighting the essential components required for agents to achieve better interaction with the physical 3D world. To reflect the biological view, we first establish the theoretical basis from neuroscience that can effectively function as the backbone for bio-inspired spatial reasoning (Sec. 2.1). Building on this foundation, we introduce a computational framework that outlines the key modules, highlights potential techniques for their implementation, and conceptualizes them as an integrated pipeline for spatial reasoning in agents (Sec. 2.2). On top of our framework, we comprehensively analyze existing works relevant to each module, highlight their potential contributions to the module’s function, and identify key gaps that must be addressed toward better spatial reasoning module design (Sec. 3.1). Then, we examine emerging benchmarks and datasets for spatial reasoning evaluation, followed by a discussion of potential applications across both virtual and physical environments (Sec. 3.2). Moreover, we provide the future direction based on the limitations of recent works (Sec. 4). Finally, we conclude this perspective work in Sec. 5. In summary, our major contributions are as follows:

- **We propose a neuroscience-inspired spatial reasoning framework for agentic AI.** To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to explore the neuroscience-based framework design for agentic spatial reasoning. Our proposed framework lays the foundation to achieve the human-like intelligence in AI spatial reasoning.
- **We conduct a framework-guided systematic analysis of recent spatial reasoning methods.** Unlike prior works, we conduct a comprehensive review of the representative research on AI spatial intelligence across our designed framework, enabling a clear understanding of the gap between current research and the ideal of human-like spatial reasoning.
- **We highlight the key limitations of agentic spatial reasoning and advocate some future directions based on our proposed framework.** Following the analysis, we systematically highlight key limitations in current spatial reasoning models, thereby providing the future research direction towards the human intelligence in agents.

2 Neuroscience-Inspired Agentic Spatial Intelligence

In this section, we revisit the neuroscience foundations of spatial cognition, covering (1) the neural mechanisms of key brain regions involved in spatial reasoning, (2) the cognitive map theory, (3) spatial memory systems, and (4) emerging computational neuroscience models relevant to spatial reasoning (Sec. 2.1). Building on this strong foundation, we propose a generic computational framework alongside the analysis of the types of spatial reasoning behaviors essential for agents and the pathways for its implementation (Sec. 2.2).

2.1 Spatial Cognition From Neuroscience

2.1.1 Neural mechanisms for spatial processing. In the human brain, spatial reasoning has been conceptualized as a sequence of neural computations that transform sensory input into abstract spatial representations used for decision-making [17, 135]. In this context, neuroscience research follows a general framework that captures the spatial processing as a hierarchical flow, commencing

from early sensory integration to egocentric and allocentric map, then finally high-order reasoning [17]. This framework reflects how spatial cognition is functionally organized across brain regions, forming a coherent basis to analyze its neural mechanisms.

Sensory Integration. The brain's ability to perceive and navigate the world relies on the process of combining information from different sensory modalities to form a unified representation of space. Classical neuroscience defines this integration as a fundamental function of higher cortical areas, allowing the brain to resolve ambiguities and enhance perceptual accuracy by leveraging complementary inputs [62].

Visual Sensing plays a dominant role in humans, guiding both perception and action. Visual information is initially processed in the primary visual cortex (V1) of the occipital lobe, where neurons respond to basic features like orientation, spatial frequency, and motion direction. Among them, the dorsal stream, projecting to the posterior parietal cortex (PPC), is involved in motion detection, spatial localization, and visually guided action [195]. The ventral stream projects to the inferior temporal cortex (ITC) and is specialized for identifying and making sense of visual information, allowing us to perceive the shape, color, and texture of objects [195].

Auditory sensing relies on cortical and subcortical pathways centered in the temporal lobe. Sound features (e.g., pitch, loudness) are first decoded in the primary auditory cortex (A1) and refined in secondary areas, while subcortical structures like the inferior colliculus (IC) analyze binaural cues for spatial hearing [13, 141]. Specifically, interaural time differences (ITD) localize low-frequency sounds, whereas interaural level differences (ILD) guide high-frequency localization.

Tactile sensing is processed primarily in the parietal lobe, where haptic inputs are first handled by the primary (S1) and then the secondary somatosensory cortex (S2) for higher-level interpretation and multisensory integration [62]. Object features are processed along partially segregated pathways: orientation information follows a dorsal stream toward parietal areas for spatial planning, while texture information engages a ventral stream that converges with visual regions, enabling early cross-modal integration of tactile and visual cues.

Overall, human spatial perception arises from integrating visual, auditory, and haptic inputs, which are initially encoded in egocentric coordinates and then converge in the PPC to support spatial awareness, motor planning, and egocentric mapping.

Egocentric Map. Humans predominantly perceive and interact with their environment from a first-person perspective, relying on egocentric frames of reference to encode and recall spatial information. Egocentric maps represent space relative to the observer's current position and orientation, emphasizing subject-to-object relationships that give rise to body-centered spatial reasoning tasks such as path integration, obstacle avoidance, and goal-directed action [16]. In the human brain, egocentric spatial representations are primarily supported by the Caudate Nucleus and, more generally, by the Medial Parietal Lobe regions [16]. Among these, the Posterior Parietal Cortex (PPC) integrates egocentric information to construct a first-person perspective of space, supported by regions included in the parietal lobe [16]. Additionally, directional orientation is supported by head-direction cells located in the Retrosplenial Cortex (RSC), which help encode heading information relative to the environment [180].

Allocentric Map. The allocentric map refers to a world-centered spatial representation in the brain that encodes the positions of objects relative to each other, independent of the observer's current location or orientation [147]. From a neuroscience perspective, its neural functions are primarily mediated by the Hippocampal-Entorhinal system [75, 145]. This neuron system encodes the spatial relationships between external cues in a manner that is independent of the animal's current location or orientation. Anatomically, it involves reciprocal connectivity between the Hippocampus (HPC) and the Medial Entorhinal Cortex (MEC), where distinct classes of spatially modulated neurons contribute to the encoding and integration of a world-centered spatial representation.

Table 1. Biological functions of corresponding regions of the brain

Category	Type	Brain Regions	Biological Mechanisms
Multi-Sensory Integration	Visual	Visual Cortex (V1) Inferior Temporal Cortex (ITC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detection of spatial frequency, orientation and motion. • Perceiving shape, color and texture.
	Tactile	Somatosensory Cortex (S1/S2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process haptic signals and integrate with other senses.
	Auditory	Auditory Cortex (A1) Interaural Time Difference (ITD) Interaural Level Difference (ILD) Inferior Colliculus (IC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process pitch, loudness, and direction for sound localization. • Locate low-frequency sounds • Locate high-frequency sounds • Analyze binaural cues
Egocentric Map	Spatial Encode	Posterior Parietal Cortex (PPC) Retrosplenial Cortex (RSC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Egocentric stream integration • Directional orientation via head-direction cells.
Alloentric Map	Place Cells	Hippocampus (HPC) CA1 CA3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align with place cells under contextual and location signals. • Pattern completion • Pattern separation
	Grid Cells	Medial Entorhinal Cortex (MEC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable grid cells with firing patterns and self-motion encoding.
Spatial Reasoning & Decision Making	Inference	Prefrontal Cortex (PFC) Medial Prefrontal Cortex (mPFC) Dorsomedial Prefrontal Cortex (dmPFC) Dorsal Anterior Cingulate Cortex (dACC) Lateral Prefrontal Cortex (IPFC) Orbitofrontal Cortex (OFC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain reasoning process • Recall the location of targets • Route planning • Alternative route searching • Replanning • Managing inference process

The **Medial Entorhinal Cortex** (MEC) is critical for the allocentric map by containing grid cells, a type of neuron that exhibits a distinctive firing pattern when humans navigate across physical space. Each grid cell becomes active at multiple locations that form a regular, hexagonal grid, thereby creating a structured internal map of the surrounding environment [41, 75]. This periodic firing supports the brain in measuring distance and position by encoding movement through self-motion signals [75]. Hence, grid cells within MEC provides a continuous metric foundation for the brain, which is subsequently integrate with HPC for building the allocentric spatial map.

Within the **Hippocampus** (HPC), the CA1 and CA3 subfields are key regions involved in allocentric spatial representation [147]. These areas contain place cells, which are pyramidal neurons that fire selectively when an animal or human occupies a specific location in an environment, regardless of its heading direction [142]. In CA3, place cell activity arise from recurrent connectivity, supporting pattern completion and stable encoding of familiar spatial contexts [142, 170]. In contrast, CA1 place cells integrate input from both CA3 and the MEC, enabling the pattern separation capability in distinguishing the overlapped spatial inputs [170], while maintaining contextual modulation [142]. Therefore, hippocampal place cells operates in conjunct with grid cells, supporting the context-aware and location-specific in the allocentric map.

While grid cells within MEC offer a continuous coordinate system for estimating position and distance, place cells in HPC bind this metric to discrete context-aware spatial experiences. This integration forms the spatial representation widely known in neuroscience as the cognitive map, a foundational theory in spatial cognition that will be comprehensively examined in Sec. 2.1.2. The resulting map serves as the key component for higher-order spatial reasoning tasks, bridging low-level encoding with complex cognition behaviours.

Spatial Reasoning and Decision-Making Spatial reasoning and decision-making arise from hippocampal–cortical circuits that integrate sensory inputs into internal representations, relay them via the RSC to the PPC, PFC, and then to cortical regions for action, and encode goal-related rewards to guide adaptive behavior [122]. The prefrontal cortex (PFC), as the brain’s executive control center, supports spatial reasoning by managing working memory and engaging distinct regions for different stages of spatial behaviors [155]. Taking navigation as an example, the medial prefrontal




Fig. 2. The neuroscience-based cognitive map. It is rooted in the hippocampus (orange) and entorhinal cortex (blue), where the entorhinal cortex encodes Euclidean metrics and the hippocampus encodes relational topological graphs, together forming integrated hybrid and hierarchical maps.

cortex (mPFC) recalls the location of the target, which is then passed to the dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (dmPFC) for route planning. Subsequently, if a detour is necessary, the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (dACC) searches for alternative routes. Following this, the lateral prefrontal cortex (lPFC) replans the route and avoids incorrect shortcuts. During this process, the Orbitofrontal Cortex (OFC) selects specific paths and infers their potential outcomes, while the mPFC represents the proximity or distance of the path. When the navigator goes beyond the target range, the dACC assists them in returning along the original path. In summary, as a higher-order brain region, the main role of the PFC is the operator of the cognitive map. It receives spatial information from the HPC and then flexibly applies it for planning, inference, and prediction.

2.1.2 Cognitive map theory. As a foundation of spatial cognition, Tolman *et al.* [192] first proposed the concept of cognitive map based on the spatial navigation behavior of rats in maze tasks. In both humans and animals, this representation is a subjective internal form of external information and objective knowledge, which is functionally analogous to geographically created maps. As illustrated in Fig. 2, current theoretical debates primarily involve two hypotheses: the Euclidean map and the topological graph, representing opposite extremes regarding the precision of representation [192]. The Euclidean map demands the accurate representation of spatial coordinates, while the topological graph contains no metric information. As both have limitations in explaining spatial behavior, researchers have developed integrated metric-topological cognitive maps and more recently explored hierarchical models.

Euclidean Map. Building on Tolman’s concept of the cognitive map, O’Keefe and Nadel further proposed that the cognitive map possesses a unified Euclidean metric structure [147]. The primary physiological evidence supporting this proposal comes from the discovery of place cells in the HPC and grid cells in the MEC (described in Sec. 2.1.1). These two cell types provide a metric background and landmark anchoring for the spatial environment. The Euclidean cognitive map is founded on an allocentric reference frame, meaning it is not affected by the navigator’s own embodied experience [147]. It functions like a cartographic map that preserves geometric relations between locations, enabling flexible navigation through novel paths and shortcuts, with pointing performance further indicating that spatial updating operates on Euclidean geometry [146, 205]. However, rather than conforming to strict Euclidean rules, human spatial representations appear to follow more adaptive, context-driven geometries [194].

Topological Graph. Inspired by the memory space theory [46], the topological graph hypothesis has been proposed as an alternative form for the cognitive map [104]. Unlike the precise metrics of a Euclidean map, the topological graph hypothesis suggests that the cognitive map only encodes

a rough topological structure. An environment’s topological structure is a network composed of nodes and the connecting edges between them. Generally, nodes represent locations, while edges represent the path relationships between these locations. This “place graph” captures the connectivity between locations but does not require embedding them into a globally consistent coordinate system (coordinate-free). Additionally, nodes can also represent specific views or local areas; correspondingly, edges represent the actions required to transition between different views or areas [90]. A topological graph balances between route memory and Euclidean maps by flexibly representing multiple paths in a compressed, non-metric structure that reduces memory demands. However, its lack of metric detail makes it insufficient to fully explain human spatial navigation.

Hierarchical Map. While Euclidean and topological map theories treat locations as uniformly represented, real-world environments often have nested structures, e.g., rooms within buildings or buildings within a campus [138]. To build a coherent cognitive map, the brain must integrate spatial information from these discrete regions. This suggests that cognitive maps may have a hierarchical structure, where fine-grained local details are stored at lower levels and abstract, generalized layouts at higher levels [83]. In such a structure, different regions are represented as separate branches, allowing the brain to manage complexity by organizing space into meaningful subunits. This helps reduce cognitive load while supporting flexible navigation across different spatial scales.

Hybrid Map. Hybrid cognitive maps combine Euclidean, topological, and hierarchical representations, providing a flexible, biologically plausible framework that better reflects the variability and adaptability of human spatial behavior than traditional single-paradigm models. They embed locally metric topological graphs within a global metric space while enabling multi-scale abstraction without enforcing strict hierarchical boundaries [9]. This fusion allows for context-sensitive reasoning, balancing efficiency in planning with biological plausibility in representation. A typical representative of a hybrid cognitive map is the hybrid graph model, where edges encode path lengths and nodes capture angular relations, enabling flexible navigation, such as shortcuts and detours, even without globally consistent coordinates. By integrating hybrid aspects of graph-based structures and cognitive maps, the theory provides a unified framework that overcomes the limitations of relying solely on either representation or treating them independently.

2.1.3 Spatial Memory Systems. Spatial memory remains a foundational role in human spatial reasoning, enabling individuals to represent, manipulate, and navigate within their environments. From a neuroscience perspective, spatial reasoning emerges not solely from perception or motor planning, but also from the integration and coordination of memory systems that operate across the brain in multiple timescales. As described in Fig. 3, neuroscientists categorize these into working memory, episodic memory, and long-term semantic memory, in which each corresponds to different functional networks and cognitive roles.

Working Memory. In the human brain, working memory is a short-term cognitive mechanism that temporarily maintains and manipulates task-relevant information. Specifically, it enables the brain to keep the observed information accessible over short periods, supporting mental operations such as planning and decision-making when the sensory input is no longer perceptually available. Functionally, this memory system relies on persistent neural activity rather than long-term synaptic changes [64], making it highly flexible but also sensitive to cognitive load and interference. It operates over a timescale of seconds and acts as a dynamic buffer for integrating real-time sensory input with internal task goals.

Neuroscientific research has localized spatial working memory primarily to the **frontoparietal network**, with key contributions from the dlPFC and PPC [40]. These regions coordinate attentional control, goal maintenance, and sensorimotor integration, supported by sustained delay-period activity in prefrontal and parietal neurons. The PPC encodes spatial attention and transient location

cues, while the dlPFC manipulates and updates this information in line with behavioral goals. Given the neural basis in the frontoparietal network, working memory effectively supports spatial reasoning by maintaining egocentric spatial representations (i.e., current position, heading direction, and surrounding cues) through its reliance on the dlPFC and PPC, whose roles in egocentric processing were outlined in Sec. 2.1.1. It functions as an online buffer for short-term spatial inference and decision-making, allowing individuals to simulate movement, retain temporary goals, and update self-location during navigation. These abilities are crucial when external spatial cues are lacking, relying on internally maintained egocentric information.

Episodic Memory. Tulving [193] defined episodic memory as the system that encodes, stores, and retrieves autobiographical experiences within specific spatiotemporal contexts. It supports episodic recollection by enabling the mental recall of the experienced events with both spatial and temporal contexts (e.g., “where and when they occurred”).

Biologically, episodic memory is primarily supported by the **medial temporal lobe** (MTL), which includes the HPC, MEC, parahippocampal cortex, and perirhinal cortex [47]. Building upon the HPC and the MEC, as described in Sec. 2.1.1, this network enables the encoding and retrieval of experiences embedded in space and time. The HPC via place cells plays a central role in binding spatial and temporal elements with contextual-awareness into unified memory traces, while the MEC not only provides spatial metrics through grid cells but also channels multimodal sensory information toward the hippocampus [142]. Complementing this core loop, the parahippocampal cortex encodes scene-based contextual features (i.e., environmental layouts and spatial geometry) and the perirhinal cortex contributes object-related content and familiarity signals [47]. Moreover, the MTL consolidates episodic traces from the HPC into neocortical regions, forming stable semantic knowledge that preserves spatial experiences, with episodic memory enabling recall and recombination of past events to support spatial reasoning [77].

Long-Term Memory. From a neuroscience standpoint, long-term memory refers to the brain’s capacity to store information over extended periods, ranging from hours to a lifetime. Unlike working or episodic memory, which deal with short-term access or specific experiences, long-term memory supports the accumulation of abstracted, semantic knowledge about the world [193]. This includes spatial schemas, landmark familiarity, navigational rules, and environmental regularities, all of which contribute to efficient spatial reasoning across diverse contexts [17].

A central neural substrate of long-term semantic memory is the **default network**, including the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC), posterior cingulate cortex (PCC), angular gyrus, and medial temporal lobe (MTL) sub-systems, which is consistently engaged during internally directed cognition (e.g., mental simulation, and prospective thinking) [15]. To support the corresponding neural functions, the default network coordinates with the hippocampus and frontoparietal systems, enabling the consolidation and abstraction of past spatial experiences into task-relevant knowledge through interactions with working and episodic memory [15]. Within this network, the mPFC encodes high-level schemas and behavioral rules, while the angular gyrus integrates multimodal concepts and retrieves context-rich memories. The PCC serves as a hub linking episodic traces in the medial temporal lobe with semantic representations in the neocortex. Through repeated reactivation, such as during rest or sleep, episodic content is transformed into generalized priors that guide perception, planning, and goal-directed action [42]. This semantic foundation allows




Fig. 3. Memory systems in human cognition: working, episodic, and long-term.




Fig. 4. Development of the backbone neuroscience models for spatial reasoning.

the brain to support spatial reasoning not by simulating space directly, but by reusing generalized priors to guide perception, planning, and goal-directed action.

2.1.4 Computational Models from Neuroscience. To understand how the biological brain performs spatial reasoning, neuroscience provides a rich set of computational models that describe how the brain perceives, represents, and acts upon spatial information. These models have long served as a conceptual bridge to AI research, where both foundational and emerging neuroscience models have inspired the development of AI algorithms [129]. Following that, the neuroscience models potentially provide the lens for analyzing the spatial intelligence in agents, offering structured ways to understand perception, internal representations, embodied cognition, and planning in dynamic environments.

Serving as a theoretical foundation for many brain models, Bayesian inference provides the foundation for viewing the brain as an inference engine, leading to the Bayesian Brain Hypothesis [101] and its operationalization through Predictive Coding [167]. This framework was generalized by the Free Energy Principle (FEP) [55] and extended by Active Inference [56] to include action, culminating in Hierarchical Active Inference (HAI) [56], which overlaps with Successor Representation in predictive planning. Recent models such as the Tolman–Eichenbaum Machine (TEM) [203] build on these ideas to link neural inference with AI, particularly for spatial cognition. A general timeline of these theoretical developments is illustrated in Fig. 4.

Bayesian Inference. As the core of emerging neuroscience models, Bayesian Inference offers a foundational theory for understanding the information processing within the brain in uncertainty conditions [101], which can be formulated as:

$$P(\mathcal{H} | \mathcal{E}) = \frac{P(\mathcal{E} | \mathcal{H}) \cdot P(\mathcal{H})}{P(\mathcal{E})} \quad (1)$$

where $P(\mathcal{H} | \mathcal{E})$ is the posterior probability, demonstrating the updated belief about the hypothesis \mathcal{H} after observing the evidence \mathcal{E} . Meanwhile, $P(\mathcal{E} | \mathcal{H})$ is the likelihood, indicating the probability of the observed evidence \mathcal{E} with the given hypothesis \mathcal{H} . The $P(\mathcal{H})$ is the prior probability, illustrating the internal belief of the brain regarding the hypothesis \mathcal{H} before considering new evidence. Finally, $P(\mathcal{E})$ is the evidence probability, a normalization factor that ensures all possible hypotheses' probabilities sum to one.

Predictive Coding. In the context of spatial reasoning, predictive coding facilitates forward inference [159], enabling the brain to anticipate sensory consequences of self-motion, integrate multimodal spatial cues, and resolve ambiguity in localization and goal-directed planning by refining its spatial belief map in real time.

Predictive coding posits that the brain maintains internal models of spatial structure and continuously minimizes the prediction error $\epsilon_t = x_t - \hat{x}_t$ between the incoming sensor input x_t and top-down spatial predictions \hat{x}_t . This error drives the update of latent spatial beliefs H through gradient descent on the variational free energy F :

$$\frac{dH}{dt} \propto -\frac{\partial F}{\partial H}$$

Successor Representation. The Successor Representation (SR) theory proposes that Euclidean and topological maps are two forms of the same neural encoding, with the HPC representing current

states along with future-reachable states and their probabilities [186]. Hence, topological graphs encode states as nodes with weighted transitions, while Euclidean maps anchor states to spatial positions connected by paths.

The SR matrix $M(s, s')$ is defined as: the expected discounted cumulative number of future visits to state s' starting from the current state s (following a specific policy). In other words, $M(s, s')$ measures the “reachability” or “predictiveness” of s' from s .

$$M(s, s') = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \cdot \mathbb{I}(s_t = s') \mid s_0 = s \right]$$

where γ is the discount factor, \mathbb{I} is the indicator function (1 if $s_t = s'$, 0 otherwise), and \mathbb{E} denotes expectation.

The value of a state $V(s)$ (i.e., the cumulative reward obtainable from state s) can be decomposed into the inner product of the SR and the reward function $R(s')$ (the immediate reward in state s'):

$$V(s) = \sum_{s'} M(s, s') \cdot R(s')$$

Free Energy Principle. The Free Energy Principle (FEP), as formulated by Friston et al. [55], states that the brain maintains its internal states and structure by minimizing a quantity known as **variational free energy** F , which serves as a tractable bound on sensory surprise or negative log evidence $-\log P(D)$. Given sensory data D and hidden environmental causes H , the brain constructs a generative model

$$P(D, H) = P(D \mid H)P(H), \quad (2)$$

and seeks to approximate the true posterior $P(H \mid D)$ using a recognition density $Q(H)$. Since direct computation of $P(H \mid D)$ is generally intractable due to the marginal likelihood

$$P(D) = \int P(D, H) dH, \quad (3)$$

variational inference is used to minimize the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence between $Q(H)$ and $P(H \mid D)$:

$$F[Q] = D_{\text{KL}}(Q(H) \parallel P(H \mid D)) - \log P(D) \geq -\log P(D). \quad (4)$$

This variational free energy can be equivalently expressed as:

$$F[Q] = \mathbb{E}_Q[\log Q(H)] - \mathbb{E}_Q[\log P(H, D)], \quad (5)$$

highlighting that free energy is minimized when the approximate posterior $Q(H)$ matches the true posterior and when the generative model accurately predicts sensory input. These dynamics explain how the brain updates beliefs and selects actions to reduce free energy and thereby resist entropy. Furthermore, Friston [54] extends the theory to hierarchical generative models, aligning with empirical architectures in cortical hierarchies, where top-down predictions and bottom-up prediction errors are exchanged between layers.

Hierarchical Active Inference. Building upon the Free-Energy Principle (FEP), Friston et al. [54] introduces Active Inference theory by treating both perception and action as processes that minimize variational free energy. While FEP describes how the brain maintains homeostasis by suppressing sensory surprise, active inference operationalizes this through continual updating of internal beliefs and selection of actions that fulfill prior expectations.

Active Inference has frequently been analyzed by neuroscientists through the lens of hierarchical generative models [56], as a means to characterize how the brain constructs and uses internal models of the world to perform inference and reasoning across multiple cortical regions. This hierarchical formulation allows for the modeling of distinct layers of processing, ranging from




Fig. 5. The architecture of TEM. (A) Generative model showing the top-down process from actions (a) and latent states (g) through state transitions, memory retrieval, and temporal filtering to generate sensory predictions (p) and observations (x). (B) Inference model depicting the bottom-up inference from observations (x) to latent states via memory retrieval, conjunctive memory formation, and updates to memory (M).

low-level sensory predictions to higher-order cognitive functions, within a unified probabilistic framework [161]. Extending from Eq. (2) of FEP, Hierarchical Active Inference (HAI) demonstrates the internal world belief of the brain via a structured generative model, illustrated as:

$$P(o_{1:T}, s_{1:T}, \pi) = P(\pi) \cdot P(s_1) \cdot \prod_{t=1}^T P(o_t | s_t) \cdot P(s_t | s_{t-1}, \pi) \quad (6)$$

where $o_{1:T}$ denotes sequences of sensory observations, $s_{1:T}$ are the corresponding hidden neural states inferred by the brain, and π represents a policy encoding internal preferences or behavioral tendencies. $P(\pi)$ is the prior over such policies; $P(s_1)$ encodes prior beliefs about initial causes; $P(o_t | s_t)$ defines the likelihood mapping from latent states to sensory input; and $P(s_t | s_{t-1}, \pi)$ models state transitions modulated by internal policy dynamics.

Based on this hierarchical generative model, the brain constantly strives to minimize variational free energy, as mentioned in Eq. (5), acting as an upper bound on sensory surprise. This optimization principle drives the system to either update internal beliefs or initiate actions in response to mismatches between predicted and actual sensory input. Despite this unified principle, Friston's framework functionally layers this generative model into three hierarchical cognitive processes: Perception, Belief Updating, and Policy Selection [54].

- **Perception** focuses on inferring low-level hidden states s_t that best causes sensory observations o_t , primarily through the likelihood mapping $P(o_t | s_t)$.
- **Belief Updating** involves continually revising internal representations of latent states $s_{1:T}$, guided by prior knowledge $P(s_1)$ and the dynamic evolution of states $P(s_t | s_{t-1}, \pi)$. This refinement allows the brain to move beyond immediate sensory explanations and infer deeper structural, contextual, and abstract properties of the environment over time.
- **Policy Selection** is the brain's prospective decision-making process, where it chooses the policy π expected to minimize future uncertainty and achieve preferred outcomes, actively shaping future state transitions $P(s_t | s_{t-1}, \pi)$ and subsequent sensory experiences.

TEM. Tolman-Eichenbaum Machine (TEM) was proposed by Whittington *et al.* [203], a framework that unifies Euclidean and topological spatial representations to generalize across environments with different sensory details. As illustrated in Fig. 5, the core idea behind TEM is structural generalization with the ability to abstract latent relational structures and bind them to specific sensory inputs. This involves factorizing knowledge into separable components, enabling flexible recombination in new environments. In the model, structural abstraction occurs in the entorhinal cortex, while the hippocampus binds specific sensory details. After training, TEM exhibits neural




Fig. 6. The proposed framework of Agentic Spatial Intelligence. Following human cognition from perception, cognition, to action, the framework contains six modules: (1) multi-sensory input, (2) information processing, (3) egocentric-allothetic, (4) cognitive map, (5) spatial neural memory, and (6) spatial reasoning.

properties analogous to grid cells, place cells, and object-vector cells, mirroring biological data in both physical and abstract spaces. These findings suggest that Euclidean and topological maps may reflect different manifestations of a common representational mechanism. TEM was further enhanced by integrating self-attention, aligning it with Transformer architectures [204].

2.2 The Proposed Generic Framework

Inspiring from the neuroscience foundations, we propose a conceptual computation framework, serving as a perspective landscape for achieving agents with human-like spatial intelligence, as illustrated in Fig. 6. Alongside the required modules, we emphasize the spatial reasoning behaviors based on the neuroscience models discussed in Sec. 2.1.4 and subsequently discuss the system-level implementation of agents' spatial reasoning, including both emerging software and hardware.

2.2.1 Low-level Multimodal Sensing. The human brain is capable of processing information across multiple sensory pathways via PPC and early sensory cortices (discussed in Sec. 2.1.1). Therefore, to support spatial reasoning in AI agents, the low-level sensing contains multimodal sensory inputs (shown in Fig. 7) and an information processing module.

(a) Multi-Sensory Input Module. introduces core modalities that provide diverse input signals for spatial reasoning, including vision, auditory, tactile, motion, and motor feedback.

Vision. Vision-based sensing is central to spatial intelligence in embodied agents, with diverse modalities offering complementary strengths. As the primary means of perceiving scene structure and semantics, cameras provide the geometric and contextual cues that support spatial mapping, localization, and interaction. **Monocular** and **Stereo cameras** capture 2D images for mapping, navigation, and object interaction, while **Depth cameras** such as structured light and ToF sensors directly acquire dense 3D geometry for motion-robust manipulation and low-light operation. **Event-based cameras** provides microsecond latency and high dynamic range for agile motion perception. **Omnidirectional** and **Multispectral** systems expand situational awareness and robustness under



Fig. 7. The multi-sensory input required for agents. It consists of bio-inspired modalities: visual, auditory, tactile, bio-signals, motion, and motor feedback.

varying illumination, and specialized devices such as light field and polarization cameras enable refocusing, occlusion reasoning, and material property inference. **LiDAR** excels at generating dense, high-resolution 3D point clouds, while **Radar** provides reliable long-range, all-weather detection that is crucial for safety-critical applications.

Auditory. Inspired by the biological auditory cortex (Sec. 2.1.1), auditory sensing equips agents with temporal and spectral information for localizing sound sources, estimating distance, and interpreting acoustic cues, thereby enhancing spatial awareness and intelligence for navigation and decision-making. **Microphones** [48] enhances perception by extracting binaural cues (Interaural Time Difference and Interaural Level Difference) from phase and amplitude disparities. These cues, analogous to processing in the mammalian superior olivary complex and inferior colliculus, enable Direction of Arrival (DoA) estimation from time delays and intensity gradients, inspired by tonotopic mapping in the auditory cortex. **Ultrasonic sensors** [181] on the other hand operate beyond human hearing, emitting high-frequency pulses and measuring echo time-of-flight to compute distances, similar to bat and dolphin echolocation.

Tactile. Tactile sensing, inspired by the human somatosensory cortex, enables embodied agents to perceive surface geometry, texture, and contact forces, supporting spatial reasoning through touch and physical interaction. **Haptic sensors**, analogous to skin thermoreceptors and mechanoreceptors [95], capture tactile properties like texture, vibration, and temperature, allowing agents to differentiate materials such as soft cloth and cold metal. **Tactile skins**, inspired by the somatosensory homunculus, embeds dense taxel arrays on flexible surfaces to provide high-resolution contact sensing [76]. **Whisker sensors** [156], inspired by the rodents' vibrissal, are flexible filaments embedded with strain gauges or bending sensors that detect contact direction, angle, and force. **Optical tactile sensors** detect deformation of a soft medium (e.g., elastomer) via internal reflections or direct imaging, with LEDs illuminating the interface and cameras tracking changes in light patterns or geometry to estimate pressure, contours, and shear forces. The **DIGIT sensor** [106] integrates a deformable gel, internal LEDs, and a high-resolution camera to provide rich 2D tactile information for precise manipulation.

Motion. Humans perceive movement from an egocentric viewpoint through inertial and proprioceptive cues for continuous self-localization and navigation without external references, a capacity that motion sensing seeks to replicate in agents. **Inertial Measurement Units (IMUs)** provide continuous estimates of linear acceleration and angular velocity [87], enabling dead reckoning and short-term trajectory estimation. Analogous to the vestibular system, they combine tri-axial *accelerometers* for translational motion, tilt, and vibration sensing with *gyroscopes* for rotational motion and orientation. Motion can also be derived visually via optical flow, feature tracking, and visual-inertial odometry (VIO), using egocentric cameras to extract self-motion cues relative to landmarks. This complements IMUs by correcting drift and adding spatial context. Low-level motion data can be transformed into structured forms such as skeletal sequences or the *Skinned Multi-Person Linear* (SMPL) parametric body model [130], enabling physically grounded tracking.




Fig. 8. Information Processing Module (IPM) for Spatial Reasoning. Multisensory inputs are preprocessed and attention-weighted before passing through modality-specific encoders. Query/key projections and contrastive learning fuse them into a unified cross-modal latent representation.

Motor Feedback. Reliable physical motor feedback plays a critical role in spatial intelligence, enabling embodied agents to reason about contact dynamics, manipulate objects in unstructured environments, and adapt their spatial strategies through physical interaction. **Optical force sensors** [153] detect light transmission or reflection changes in deformable media, captured by cameras or photodiodes, offering resistance for soft robotics and tactile fingertips. **Capacitive and piezoelectric sensors** [97] measure force through capacitance or voltage changes, often embedded in skins or grippers. **Magnetic/Hall effect sensors** [99] track magnet displacement in elastomeric substrates, providing compact, robust designs with vector readouts for normal and shear forces. **Proprioceptive sensors** [177] use flexible conductors, liquid metals, or optical fibers to monitor deformation, curvature, and load in soft robotics and wearables. In robotics, motor feedback is fused with vision and tactile inputs using filtering or learning methods to enhance contact estimation, compliant planning, and manipulation.

Key Insight 1. Apart from vision, agents should be equipped with human-inspired sensing modalities, such as auditory and tactile, thereby enabling spatial reasoning across diverse modalities.

(b) Information Processing Module. The human brain naturally integrates multi-modal inputs into a unified perceptual experience via specialized sensory organs and convergent neural circuits (Sec. 2.1.1). Similarly, the Information Processing Module (IPM) is designed to transduce raw data from heterogeneous sensors into a structured representation for spatial reasoning, as illustrated in Fig. 8. Inspired by neurobiology, it preconditions raw multimodal signals such as vision, audio, and proprioception through four key computational stages for downstream cognitive operations.

Sensor Calibration and Synchronization. In the brain, primary sensory cortices encode modality-specific signals that are aligned in time and space by multisensory integration regions such as the PPC, and Parietal Operculum [10]. These regions play a critical role in reconciling discrepancies across sensory modalities, enabling coherent perceptual experiences despite variations in timing, spatial origin, or intensity. Analogously, the IPM first performs spatiotemporal calibration across sensors. This includes timestamp synchronization of different cameras with IMUs and LiDAR; alignment of audio streams via interaural difference analysis; and integration of proprioceptive and tactile data through reference frame transformation. This ensures that all incoming signals are temporally coherent and spatially consistent, enabling robust multimodal perception and downstream reasoning.

Algorithm 1 Low-Level Information Processing

Require: *sensory_data*

- 1: *calibrated_data* \leftarrow *SensorCalibrationAndSync*(*sensory_data*)
 - 2: *clean_data* \leftarrow *NoiseRemovalAndNormalization*(*calibrated_data*)
 - 3: *attended_modalities* \leftarrow *MultisensoryAttentionController*(*clean_data*)
 - 4: *unified_latent_space* \leftarrow *CrossModalFeatureIntegration*(*attended_modalities*)
 - 5: **return** *unified_latent_space*
-

Noise Removal and Normalization. In the early stages of sensory processing, mechanisms like lateral inhibition, adaptation, and spectral filtering enhance signal salience and suppress redundancy [39]. IPM replicates these through a modality-specific signal conditioning pipeline. For example, image denoising and histogram equalization for vision; spectral noise reduction for audio; baseline correction and spatial smoothing for tactile skins; and drift correction for IMUs. These operations optimize the fidelity and relevance of each sensory stream, ensuring that subsequent processing stages operate on clean, informative representations.

Multisensory Attention Controller. Just as the biological agents modulate sensory gain via attention, like saccadic suppression during gaze shifts or auditory inhibition during vocalization [98]; the IPM includes a multisensory attention controller. Depending on task demands and sensory reliability, it prioritizes the most informative modalities. For example, under low light, LiDAR and radar take precedence; when hands are in contact, tactile-visual attention is invoked; and during human-agent interaction, visual and speech cues may be prioritized to infer user intention. This dynamic attention mechanism ensures computational efficiency and resilience in noisy or occluded environments. Once the most salient modalities are selectively attended, the sensory signals are routed into a cross-modal integration pipeline for deeper representational synthesis.

Cross-Modal Feature Integration. In biological systems, multisensory representations emerge in heteromodal areas such as the Superior Colliculus and PPC, where visual, auditory, and somatosensory inputs converge into common egocentric formats [187]. The IPM captures this multisensory convergence through foundation models, employing modality-specific backbones, such as vision-language models (VLMs) [218], audio-visual transformers [2], and tactile-image encoders [123]. These modality-specific streams are aligned and integrated to produce a unified multimodal latent space. This latent space constitutes a compact representation, wherein semantically and spatially aligned features from vision, audition, touch, and proprioception are jointly encoded (e.g., 3D semantic segmentation [107]). It serves as a rich and continuous perceptual scaffold, enabling context-aware spatial reasoning, predictive modeling, and the subsequent transformation into 3D allocentric reference frames.

Key Insight 2. The IPM transforms multimodal sensory data into a unified representation for spatial reasoning, mimicking the brain’s sensory integration via calibration, noise reduction, dynamic attention, and cross-modal integration. This process is summarized in Algorithm 1, which provides a high-level pseudo-code sketch of the IPM’s algorithmic flow.

2.2.2 Egocentric-Allocentric Module. Following low-level sensing (Sec. 2.1.1), the human brain converts egocentric views into stable allocentric maps via the hippocampus and entorhinal cortex, with grid and place cells supporting mental simulation. Inspired by this mechanism, our egocentric–allocentric module performs analogous scene abstraction and perspective transformation, producing a persistent, geometry-consistent allocentric 3D map from the unified latent space previously generated by the IPM. As illustrated in Fig. 9, building upon the 3D generative modeling,




Fig. 9. Egocentric-to-Allocentric transformation. It commence by projecting previous cross-modal latent to 3D representation, which are then passed through the scene abstraction and perspective change for allocentric construction.

it learns a direct mapping from the abstract latent space of an agent’s perception to the parameter space of an explicit 3D scene.

3D Egocentric Construction. After low-level sensory preprocessing by the IPM, the 3D Egocentric Construction module builds spatially grounded geometric maps from the agent’s viewpoint. These maps are tokenized via emerging 3D layers, such as point cloud transformer [223] and Gaussian splatting feature extractor [165], which convert the low-level latent space into structured 3D tokens [113]. Through the constructed 3D maps, it provides a degree-of-freedom (DoF) pose-anchored egocentric space [127] that encodes the object extents, distances, orientations, and free-space geometry [168].

Scene Abstraction. The scene abstraction module derives higher-level, semantic representations from sensory input. It detects and localizes objects in 3D, estimates poses, and infers symbolic spatial relationships (e.g., “chair left of table”, “object behind obstacle”)[107]. It leverages geometric priors from the 3D construction to ensure that semantic labels and spatial relationships are anchored to accurate physical structure while remaining pose-aligned and egocentric [126, 128]. The module maintains bidirectional connectivity with the cognitive map module (Sec. 2.2.3), serving as the symbolic substrate for contextual inference, memory formation, and mental simulation [213, 215]. This loop enables the estimation and refinement of symbolic spatial relationships in light of evolving knowledge, attention, or goals.

Perspective Shift. Building on egocentric scene abstractions, this component retrieves past 3D snapshots with their poses from working memory and transforms them into a common allocentric frame [67]. The produced task-specific, short-term allocentric map supports mental reorientation by enabling transformations back into any desired egocentric viewpoint [109]. When a new viewpoint is needed, it retrieves relevant memories, transforms object positions from each egocentric view into a common allocentric frame, and then reprojects this scene into a new egocentric frame defined by the target viewpoint. This process parallels human spatial reorientation, where the brain builds a viewpoint-independent allocentric model and reprojects it into a new perspective.

Key Insight 3. This module enables agents to build and manipulate spatial representations like the human brain, constructing 3D egocentric maps from sensory data, abstracting semantic relationships, and flexibly shifting perspectives between egocentric and allocentric frames. The sequential logic of this module is demonstrated in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Egocentric-Allocentric Conversion

Require: *unified_latent_space*

- 1: *WorkingMemory* \leftarrow *InitializeWorkingMemory*()
 - 2: *egocentric_3D_map* \leftarrow *Construct3DEgocentric*(*unified_latent_space*)
 - 3: *scene_abstraction* \leftarrow *SemanticSceneAbstraction*(*egocentric_3D_map*)
 - 4: *allocentric_map* \leftarrow *PerspectiveShift*(*scene_abstraction*, *WorkingMemory*)
 - 5: **return** *allocentric_map*
-

2.2.3 Internal Mental Model. In humans, the spatial mental model is crucial as it involves both cognitive maps (Sec. 2.1.2) and long-term knowledge (Sec. 2.1.3) that support navigation and reasoning. To mimic this capability, we introduce two modules: a Cognitive Map Module and a Spatial Neural Memory Module, as outlined in Algorithm 3. The pseudo-code abstracts the algorithmic flow of these modules in forming the internal spatial mental model.

(a) Cognitive Map Module. In the human brain, the cognitive map is the core mechanism supporting spatial reasoning (Sec. 2.1.2). Inspired by this, AI agents internally employ an artificial cognitive map with grid and place cell layers to enable efficient spatial reasoning in complex environments. As illustrated in Fig. 10, \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{G}' denote the graph before and after contextual remapping, where the topology remains fixed but node weights change. $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_t$ represents self-motion cues, $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t$ external landmarks, and \mathbf{p}_t the anchored position.

Grid Cells Layer. Building on neuroscientific findings from Sec. 2.1.1, grid cells provide a grid-based metric representation of allocentric space within the cognitive map. Therefore, the grid cells layer equips the agent with an internal metric representation of space, capturing distance and direction through four components (Fig. 10). **The Grid-based Representation** leverages a hexagonal lattice pattern, reflecting the periodic firing fields that emerge in grid cells of the medial entorhinal cortex (MEC) [75]. The hexagonal pattern demonstrates an efficient solution for space encoding, in which it can emerge naturally from energy minimization and spatial coverage objectives, making them particularly well-suited for the AI agent [185]. To support the emergence of such spatial structure, **Learning-based Methods** provides an effective mechanism for inducing grid-based representations. By designing the learning frameworks consisting of neuroscience-inspired components, such as predictive loss and hexagonal regularization [173], the agent can generate an internal grid-like map, allowing interaction with other modules for complex spatial reasoning tasks. Moreover, inspired by the role of grid cells in self-motion tracking, **The Path Integration** component aims to estimate spatial position from self-motion cues (i.e., velocity and direction) [6]. It provides an essential foundation for spatial intelligence, particularly for the embodied AI agent operating in dynamic environments. However, in biological systems, grid-based representations rely not only on self-motion cues but are also anchored to external landmarks, ensuring long-term spatial inference. Therefore, to mimic this mechanism, **The Anchoring Gate** serves as the modulation interface between other modules and the internal grid-based representation. By integrating reference signals from early perceptual modules, it adjusts the accumulated drift from path integration and improves spatial consistency in reasoning.

Place Cells Layer. Complementing grid cells, place cells encode space through sparse, context-dependent activations that form a topological map and support episodic memory via interactions with the entorhinal cortex and neocortex [145]. The place cells layer in our model mimics the key functions of biological place cells in the HPC with four components, as described in Fig. 10. **Topological Representation** is a core element inspired by the relational spatial coding of place cells within cognitive map [145], [147]. It operates in a graph-based structure, where each node




Fig. 10. Cognitive map for spatial reasoning. This module encodes the agent’s internal representation via a grid-based map and a topological graph.

and edge reflect learned relations between the input (i.e., objects and locations), enabling relational spatial inference across complex tasks (i.e., navigation and object-centric) [8]. While topological representation captures structural spatial relations, another key property of biological place cells is their ability to adapt representations in response to contextual changes. To reflect this, **The Contextual Remapping** mechanism enables the place cell layer to shift activation patterns based on task demands and high-level goals. By interacting with other context-aware modules, it allows the agent to maintain multiple internal spatial maps and flexibly switch between them as environmental or task contexts change [160]. When context shifts, the active representation is rapidly transformed, preserving local spatial structure while globally reorganizing the map to reflect the new situation [160]. This mechanism mimics hippocampal global remapping, where place-cell firing patterns reorganize across contexts while maintaining coherent internal geometry [147], [110].

As described in Sec. 2.1.3, beyond the spatial encoding, the biological place cells are believed to function as spatial memory indices in the HPC, supporting the retrieval of episodic context tied to specific locations. Inspired by that, **The Memory Indexing** component enables the place cells layer to bind spatial representations with grounded experiences, forming a functional gateway aligned with episodic memory [70]. Accordingly, it encodes key spatial activations as memory indices, serving as contextual cues for querying episodic traces stored in the downstream module. The map itself remains a lightweight, index-based representation, supporting efficient interaction with memory and reasoning modules [70]. This function primarily reflects what is known in neuroscience as retrospective coding, where place cells reactivate representations of previously experienced locations. However, effective spatial reasoning also requires prospective coding, which refers to the ability of biological place cells to predict future spatial states based on contextual signals and intended goals. Therefore, **The Prospective Coding** component is designed to generate internal representations of potential future spatial states, extending beyond immediate perception. It provides learning objectives that encourage the capture of predictive regularities over time [148], allowing the agent to anticipate spatial configurations before they are experienced [68]. This component resembles preplay and replay phenomena observed in the HPC, offering a foundation for spatial inference and flexible navigation in dynamic environments.

Key Insight 4. Cognitive Map Module mimics the human brain by empowering AI to construct an internal representation, using grid-like patterns anchored to metric features and topological networks for contextual memory indexing and relational abstraction.

(b) Spatial Neural Memory Module. Building upon the memory-based systems of the human brain, this module is a bio-inspired architecture that endows agents with adaptive and long-term

Algorithm 3 Internal Mental Model

Require: *unified_latent_space, allocentric_map*

- 1: *self_motion* \leftarrow Current motion cues (IMU, odometry, proprioception)
 - 2: *landmarks* \leftarrow Detected spatial anchors from *allocentric_map*
 - 3: *context_signals* \leftarrow Task context, semantic cues, prior knowledge
 - 4: *trajectory* \leftarrow Sequence of recent poses from working memory
 - 5: *events* \leftarrow Significant interactions or observations
 - Cognitive Map
 - 6: *grid_cells_layer* \leftarrow *GridCellsRepresentation(allocentric_map, self_motion, landmarks)*
 - 7: *place_cells_layer* \leftarrow *PlaceCellsRepresentation(grid_cells_layer, context_signals)*
 - 8: *cognitive_map* \leftarrow *IntegrateGridAndPlaceCells(grid_cells_layer, place_cells_layer)*
 - Spatial Neural Memory
 - 9: *semantic_encoding* \leftarrow *SpatialSemanticEncoding(unified_latent_space)*
 - 10: *episodic_memory* \leftarrow *EpisodicMemoryUpdate(trajectory, events)*
 - 11: *adaptive_memory* \leftarrow *AdaptiveMemoryUpdating(semantic_encoding, episodic_memory)*
 - 12: *mental_model* \leftarrow *BuildInternalModel(cognitive_map, adaptive_memory)*
 - 13: **return** *mental_model*
-

knowledge. It is structured around three interdependent subsystems: spatial–semantic encoding, episodic spatial memory, and adaptive memory updating; each responsible for constructing, retaining, and dynamically refining knowledge representations essential for real-time spatial reasoning and long-term adaptability.

Spatial–Semantic Encoding. Spatial–Semantic Encoding provides a unified representation of both the geometry and meaning of its surroundings to agents, mirroring the function of long-term memory in humans. This is achieved through grounded visual perception, which aligns vision with semantic cues, and non-visual grounding, which incorporates tactile, auditory, motion, bio-signals, and linguistic cues to enrich or substitute visual understanding. The agent retains this information within a long-term spatial-semantic knowledge base, where experiences accumulate over time into a persistent metric map annotated with object and region-level semantics.

Grounded Visual Perception. 3D-VLMs and 3D-MLLMs provide a powerful approach for building unified 3D visual–semantic representations of an environment. By jointly processing multimodal 3D inputs (e.g., RGB images, depth maps, point clouds) and natural language, these large models can implicitly learn geometric structure, spatial relationships, and object semantics without relying on explicit SLAM or handcrafted mapping pipelines [1]. This capability enables robust grounding of language instructions, such as “place the box next to the red chair”, within volumetric scene representations [1]. As a result, 3D foundation models support referential resolution, goal localization, serving as key components for spatial reasoning in dynamic real-world environments.

Non-Visual Multimodal Grounding. In the absence of vision, agents build spatial knowledge by encoding non-visual modalities into persistent multimodal embeddings that capture structural and semantic aspects of the environment [29]. Through this process, linguistic inputs supply spatial priors and semantic grounding while aligning with tactile, auditory, proprioceptive, and motion signals to support coherent spatial reasoning. Tactile signals encode material properties (e.g., texture, hardness, friction) into reusable object descriptors that inform manipulation strategies beyond the current scene. Auditory cues (e.g., room-scale echoes, appliance hums) can be embedded as spatial–acoustic signatures for recognizing functional zones across environments [29]. Proprioceptive and force feedback form embodied state memories, supporting safe and dexterous interaction patterns over time. Even bio-signals (e.g., fMRI and EEG) can be stored as neural-intent embeddings,




Fig. 11. (A) **Spatial-Semantic Encoding**. Sensory inputs are transformed into spatial and semantic representations for unified understanding across modalities. (B) **Episodic Spatial Memory**. Multimodal inputs are encoded by a transformer, compressed via entropy modeling for efficient spatial-temporal memory.

linking latent cognitive states to likely action templates [22]. Motion trajectories, captured from inertial and kinematic sensors, can be preserved as spatio-temporal motion primitives [52], enabling agents to recall and adapt locomotion or manipulation patterns across different environments. By integrating linguistically aligned non-visual embeddings into a long-term spatial-semantic memory, foundational models can reason effectively under partial perception, leveraging accumulated multimodal experience.

Episodic Spatial Memory. In biological systems, episodic memory, supported by the HPC-MEC, encodes spatial and temporal context and enables trajectory reasoning, causal inference, and foresight. Translating this to artificial agents, an auto-regressive transformer provides a natural computational framework for modeling sequential recall and predicting future states by unfolding stored experiences over time [28]. To operate in dynamic environments, agents must not only update episodes continuously for short-term reasoning, but also offload older episodes into a cold-storage layer. Hence, this episodic store can be efficiently maintained through compression, where entropy models and codec compressor (e.g., ANS) and advanced schemes, such as bits-back coding, can minimize storage cost while preserving the semantic and structural fidelity of experiences [82, 100]. Such a design unifies episodic recall, spatial representation, and memory compression, enabling agents to navigate, localize, and plan with both rich context and scalable memory capacity.

Adaptive Memory Updating. Effective spatial reasoning in dynamic environments relies on balancing stability and plasticity, where mechanisms like systems consolidation integrate short-term episodic memories into long-term knowledge for continuous refinement. Inspired by this, AI agents should maintain a fast-learning episodic memory that captures recent events in detail and selectively transfers relevant information into a stable long-term spatial-semantic memory. This integration allows agents to generalize from specific experiences, update their understanding of the world, and adapt to changes without erasing useful prior knowledge. Continual learning methods such as parameter isolation, synaptic consolidation, and memory replay enable incremental learning while preventing catastrophic forgetting [179]. Online learning further supports rapid updates during real-time interactions, which is especially useful for navigation and instruction following [179]. In settings where labeled data is limited, self-supervised learning allows agents to




Fig. 12. Reasoning Module for Spatial Reasoning. Predictive world modelling refers to the predictive ability of internal model while explicit spatial reasoning using alignment methods to perform structured inference.

extract meaningful structure directly from sensory input. Adaptive memory updating acts as the bridge between experience and generalization, enabling embodied agents to learn continually and operate flexibly across changing environments.

Key Insight 5. The Spatial Neural Memory Module emulates the human mental model by integrating spatial-semantic encoding, episodic memory, and adaptive updating, forming a dynamic internal model alongside the cognitive map for robust spatial reasoning and adaptability.

2.2.4 Reasoning Module. When humans form a cognitive map, they use it actively for complex spatial reasoning, such as imagining alternate viewpoints and manipulating spatial relationships to achieve goals. This transcends simple “stimulus–response” behavior, reflecting advanced intelligence. The reasoning module emulates this capability, serving as the executive hub of our framework. It transforms structured spatial knowledge from the cognitive map (Sec. 2.2.3) and spatial neural memory (Sec. 2.2.3) into task-oriented and predictive logical thinking sequences.

Predictive World Modelling. The core of this approach lies in using the internal cognitive map to infer the external world, forming a predictive world model. This is not just a static snapshot of the environment, but a dynamic, predictive internal simulator. In our framework, the cognitive map (Sec. 2.1.4) and spatial neural memory (Sec. 2.2.3) form an internal mental model of spatial knowledge, which is naturally enriched with intuitive physical and semantic constraints [135], serving as the foundation of this world model. By leveraging generative (e.g., diffusion and variational autoencoders) and joint-predictive architecture [108], the agent can perform predictive inference on this mental model. For example, the model can predict what a new viewpoint will look like after moving within the environment or potential future changes in a certain area. This approach reflects the neuroscientific view that the brain continually predicts upcoming sensory input and refines its world model by comparing predictions with reality [208].

Explicit Spatial Reasoning and Alignment. Once possessing the predictive world model, the key question becomes: how should an Artificial Spatial Intelligence agent use it to perform correct and complex multi-step spatial reasoning? Such methods aim to enable the agent to explicitly construct and apply a structured reasoning process, directly extracting structured knowledge from perceptual information. Our Reasoning Module addresses this by enabling multi-step spatial thinking. It decomposes the reasoning process, aligns it with human spatial preferences, and trains the agent to learn optimal strategies through exploration in a world-model simulation. Specifically, this can be achieved by training the model for step-by-step spatial reasoning using visual-aware

Chain-of-Thought (CoT)[111] and reinforcement learning (RL)[151], allowing it to reason through a learned paradigm before acting. Alternatively, the model can construct intermediate spatial artifacts (e.g., auxiliary lines, visual aids) from multimodal perception and use them as the basis for inference.

Key Insight 6. Reasoning Module enables agents to perform complex spatial reasoning by transforming the internal model into dynamic, predictive world models, using structured multi-step reasoning and alignment with human spatial preferences to infer in complex environments. Algorithm 4 outlines the high-level logic of the reasoning process.

In summary, the proposed framework integrates multimodal sensing, egocentric-alloentric conversion, mental modeling, and reasoning into a coherent pipeline for agentic spatial intelligence. Thus, Algorithm 5 summarizes the integrated process, providing a high-level pseudo-code sketch of the complete perception–cognition–action loop.

2.2.5 Spatial Reasoning Behaviours. In the human brain, reasoning processes are distributed across specialized neural system with each tuned to particular cognitive demands. Enabling this into agents with spatial intelligence requires categorizing spatial reasoning tasks and decomposing behaviors in ways that align with corresponding modules [129]. As described in Sec. 2.1.4, neuroscience computational models formalize the brain’s decomposition of cognitive functions, serving as a foundation for systematically categorizing spatial reasoning behaviors in AI agents. Building on this, we adopt the **Hierarchical Active Inference** (HAI) framework, derived from foundational neuroscience models such as *Bayesian Inference* and the *Free Energy Principle*, and widely regarded as a minimal model for studying spatial reasoning. HAI models cognition as a layered process of perception, inference, and action, using predictive feedback across levels to manage spatial reasoning at varying levels of abstraction, thereby providing a biologically inspired framework for analyzing and decomposing such behaviors in AI agents. Following the HAI layered theory, we categorize spatial reasoning behaviours into three groups: 3D Perceptual Inference, Hidden-State Inference, and Policy Selection. This reflects the functional tiers emphasized in the HAI framework and aligns with the hierarchical nature of spatial reasoning, making it well-suited for bio-inspired AI spatial intelligence.

3D Perceptual Inference. In HAI, perceptual inference forms the fundamental layer of the cognitive hierarchy, processing raw sensory data to make low-level predictions about the environment. Extending this, 3D perceptual inference grounds low-level spatial intelligence by reasoning about 3D structure from multi-modal inputs (e.g., vision, tactile, auditory). Continuous processing of these modalities allows the agent to infer depth, shape, and spatial boundaries directly from raw input, without relying on higher-order cues, enabling real-time responses to dynamic environments. For instance, recent AI systems have widely explored tasks such as monocular depth estimation, 3D motion pose estimation, 3D semantic segmentation, which exemplify the low-level 3D spatial understanding from raw sensory data of AI agents. Therefore, the notion of 3D perceptual inference behaviors enables a structured foundation for anchoring higher-level spatial reasoning, ensuring that complex cognitive functions are grounded in accurate and adaptive sensory understanding.

Hidden-State Inference. After raw sensory prediction, HAI advances to latent belief inference, where the brain infers hidden causes of input to build coherent, temporally extended internal representations. Therefore, the hidden-state inference behaviors are formed to generate and manipulate internal spatial models beyond the observed scene. Operating at a higher cognitive level, this spatial reasoning behavior supports the simulation of unseen dynamics and structural patterns abstraction within the environment. Hence, we divide the hidden-state inference into three major

Algorithm 4 Reasoning Module

Require: *mental_model*

- 1: *predictive_world_model* \leftarrow *PredictFutureStates(mental_model)*
 - 2: *structured_reasoning* \leftarrow *ExplicitSpatialReasoning(predictive_world_model)*
 - 3: *action_policy* \leftarrow *PolicyLearning(structured_reasoning)*
 - 4: **return** *action_policy*
-

groups: Structural Reasoning, Mental Simulation, and Abstract Reasoning, each showing complex forms of internal representation and generalization for spatial intelligence.

Structural Reasoning is the ability to infer and manipulate the spatial structure of an environment beyond immediate perception, supporting internal models that capture both physical geometry and spatial relations. *Geometric Reasoning* infers metric properties such as distances, angles, orientations, object geometries, and relative scales, enabling accurate representations for tasks requiring fine-grained precision. *Topological Reasoning* captures non-metric relations, such as connectivity, containment, adjacency, and continuity, abstracting from exact measurements to model invariant structural relationships for generalization across environments. *Spatiotemporal Reasoning* integrates spatial structure with temporal dynamics to model how entities move, transform, or interact over time, supporting prediction, continuity tracking, and event sequence understanding. These reasoning types form the structural backbone for hidden-state spatial cognition, enabling agents to maintain a coherent spatial understanding under uncertainty space.

Mental Simulation builds upon structural representations by allowing the agent to internally manipulate spatial models over time, aligning with the belief latent of the HAI framework. It enables the simulation of predictive spatial scenarios and anticipate the hidden spatial aspects of the environment. To enable that, *perspective taking* is a essential spatial task which involves mentally shifting the individual viewpoint to understand how the environment appears from different positions, thereby enhancing spatial awareness. Meanwhile, *visuospatial reasoning* is also another behavior that supports the mental manipulation of objects or scenes, such as rotating, resizing, or repositioning them to support spatial reasoning, with mental rotation being a well-studied example in neuroscience. These mental mechanisms jointly enable more flexible spatial reasoning beyond direct perception.

Abstract Reasoning enables an agent to infer hidden rules, relational patterns, or symbolic structures not directly observable from perception. As a branch of hidden-state inference, it uncovers latent causes and abstract regularities underlying spatial or task-specific environments. Among abstract reasoning, symbolic inference enables the spatial reasoning over abstract spatial rules and relational logic beyond direct perception. Following that, lingual-based spatial reasoning uses linguistic input to guide spatial inference and decision-making in the non-perceptual environment. Additionally, schema-based inference supports generalization by applying prior abstract spatial templates to interpret new or incomplete situations. These components enable agents to reason over abstract representations, facilitating analogy, and problem-solving in complex environments.

Policy Selection forms the final stage of spatial reasoning in the HAI framework, where the agent transforms internal beliefs into concrete action sequences. These behaviours coordinate information from perceptual representations and inferred hidden structure, allowing the agent to reason and select actions that align with spatial goals. Taking goal-directed navigation as an example, the agent constructs a local spatial map from sensory input, integrates inferred topological or schematic knowledge to evaluate possible routes, and selects the most efficient path toward the target. Abstract reasoning components, such as symbolic constraints or language-guided goals, may

Algorithm 5 Agentic Spatial Intelligence Framework

Require: *Environment* ▷ Raw multimodal sensory stream
▷ Continuous interaction loop

- 1: **while** true **do**
- 2: *sensory_data* ← *Environment.CollectSensors*(
- 3: *vision: getData(Camera, LiDAR, Depth, EventCam)*
- 4: *audio: getData(Microphones, Ultrasonic)*
- 5: *tactile: getData(TactileSkin, WhiskerSensors)*
- 6: *motion: getData(IMU, VIO)*
- 7: *motor_feedback: getData(ForceSensors, Piezoelectric)*)
- 8: *unified_latent_space* ← *InformationProcessing(sensory_data)*
- 9: *allocentric_map* ← *EgocentricAllocentricConversion(unified_latent_space)*
- 10: *mental_model* ← *InternalMemoryModel(unified_latent_space, allocentric_map)*
- 11: *action_policy* ← *Reasoning(mental_model)*
- 12: *action* ← *ExecuteAction(action_policy, actuators)*
- 13: *feedback* ← *ReceiveMotorAndEnvironmentalFeedback()*
- 14: *Environment* ← *Update(Environment, feedback)*
- 15: **end while**

also modulate the chosen action policy (e.g., “avoid the red zone”). By unifying information across layers, policy selection behaviours allow agents to act coherently within dynamic environments.

2.2.6 Implementation of Agentic Spatial Intelligence. This section explores practical deployment pathways for agentic spatial reasoning in real-world settings, focusing on two core components: computing and communications. Building on this, we examine a progression of agents deployment paradigms, including edge AI, neuromorphic computing, and intelligent communication. Table 2 provides an overview of deployment tools.

Edge AI. Edge computing refers to the paradigm of processing data locally at or near the source of generation, rather than relying on centralized cloud infrastructure [120]. This approach enables low-latency and privacy-preserving AI implementation, making it particularly well-suited for on-device applications in mobile, wearable, and robotic systems.

Edge AI for Agents. To enable on-device spatial reasoning, Edge AI relies on compact, efficient models optimized for limited compute environments. Hence, AI model compression techniques (e.g., model pruning, quantization) [27], and knowledge distillation [198] are employed to convert large models into Tiny AI models that maintain accurate performance while reducing memory and energy demands. Building upon this, recent advancements in small-scale foundation models, such as small vision-language, have enabled multimodal fusion directly on edge devices [228], supporting spatial reasoning without relying on cloud computing. In parallel, lightweight 3D spatial representations have also emerged to support real-time processing on resource-constrained devices, employing hierarchical encoding and blob-level to enable compact scene representations with reduced memory and computational costs [222].

Hardware/Softwares. The deployment of agentic spatial reasoning in edge computing can be potentially supported by a diverse range of both embedded hardware and software platforms. Regarding hardware implementation, emerging systems such as NVIDIA Jetson Orin Nano [143], Google Coral Edge TPU [65], and Intel Movidius Myriad X [89] offer a balance between low power consumption and high-performance AI inference, making them well-suited for agentic spatial reasoning. These platforms integrate AI accelerators within system-on-chip (SoC) architectures, enabling close coupling with multimodal sensors and supporting on-device execution of lightweight 3D spatial models such as depth-based SLAM, point cloud projection, and 3D Gaussian splatting.

Table 2. Deployment Paradigms for Agentic Spatial Intelligence.

Paradigms	Deployment Tools		Key Features
Edge AI	Hardware	NVIDIA Jetson Series [143], Google Coral Edge [65], Intel Movidius Myriad [89]	Low-latency multimodal fusion, model compression for on-device reasoning
	Software	TensorRT [35], ONNX Runtime [94], Tengine [190], PyTorch Mobile [219], TensorFlow Lite [33]	
Neuromorphic Computing	Hardware	Intel’s Loihi series [34], BrainChip’s Akida [162]	Event-driven, low-power SNN for temporal coding in dynamic environments
	Software	Brian2 [188], BindsNET [78], SpiNNaker [58], Norse [158]	
Intelligent Communication	Simulation Tools	Aerial Omniverse Digital Twin [157], PHY-Sionna [3], Aerial Commercial Testbed [144], AI-RAN Sionna Kit [20]	AI-native 5G/6G for low-latency, adaptive multi-agent coordination

On the software side, a variety of optimized inference frameworks facilitate the deployment of spatial models under edge constraints. Specifically, open-sources such as TensorRT [35], ONNX Runtime [94], Tengine [190], PyTorch Mobile [219], and TensorFlow Lite [33] provide model quantization, operator fusion, and hardware-specific acceleration, enabling efficient execution on a range of embedded processors. These runtimes support real-time perception and reasoning pipelines, and are often integrated with lightweight system schedulers or ROS-based middleware to manage multi-sensor fusion and decision-making in spatial reasoning.

Neuromorphic Computing. Beyond conventional edge accelerators, neuromorphic computing offers a biologically inspired approach to spatial intelligence, emphasizing event-driven processing and low power consumption [125].

Brain-inspired Computing. Key method of this paradigm is Spiking Neural Network (SNN), which models the brain’s temporal coding mechanisms by transmitting discrete spikes across time. Specifically, SNN emulates the event-driven and temporally sparse communication patterns of biological neurons, processing information through discrete spikes rather than continuous activations [214]. This asynchronous and low-frequency operation enables significantly reduced energy consumption compared to conventional neural networks, particularly in real-time settings. Due to the efficient use of compute and memory, SNN is well-suited for deploying agentic spatial reasoning on edge hardware where power and latency are critical constraints [176].

Hardware/Software. Neuromorphic hardware have been widely developed to support the efficient execution of SNN and brain-inspired models. Notable examples include Intel’s Loihi series, which features on-chip plasticity, asynchronous spike routing, and hierarchical memory structures that mimic cortical processing [34]; and BrainChip’s Akida, which is optimized for ultra low power inference and event-based sensor integration at the edge [162]. By aligning hardware-level operations with the sparse, temporal nature of SNN, they allow agents to process multimodal inputs more efficiently, particularly under energy and timing constraints.

To support the deployment of the neuromorphic hardware, various open-source SNN frameworks have been developed for both simulation and hardware execution [125]. Simulators such as NEST [43], Brian2 [188], and BindsNET [78] offer intuitive environments for building and testing SNN architectures, with support for large-scale neural network integration. Moreover, for hardware execution development, SpiNNaker [58] enables distributed SNN execution across custom neuromorphic systems, while Norse [158] provides a PyTorch-based library optimized for GPU-accelerated spiking computation. Together, these tools form a critical software foundation for prototyping and deploying brain-inspired spatial reasoning agents across diverse platforms.

Intelligence Communication. In addition to computing architectures, communication framework is also critical for deploying agents in dynamic environments. In particular, advanced 5G/6G systems and AI-native communication stacks are expected to provide the low-latency, high-reliability links necessary for distributed spatial intelligence.

5G Beyond and 6G Wireless Systems. Next-generation wireless systems, such as 5G and the emerging 6G paradigm, are poised to serve as critical infrastructure for the deployment of agents’ spatial reasoning in dynamic, real-world environments. They enable ultra-reliable, low-latency

Table 3. Representative works in low-level multimodal sensory processing for embodied agents.

Category	Method	Modality	Publication	Highlights	Limitations
Sensor Calibration and Synchronization	Li et al. [116]	LiDAR, IMU, Camera	Inf. Fusion'2025	Target-free continuous-time optimization for multimodal calibration	Needs precise IMU calibration; high compute cost
	Wang et al. [196]	LiDAR, IMU	Preprint'2025	Active trajectory optimization using Fisher Information	Sensitive to sensor quality and scene richness
	Herau et al. [79]	RGB, Depth	CVPR'2024	NeRF-based self-supervised cross-sensor calibration	Fails in linear motion; scales poorly with many sensors
Noise Removal and Normalization	QFormer [92]	RGB	IJCAI'2024	Quaternion transformer for efficient image denoising	Limiting use beyond image denoising
	Fang et al. [50]	Audio	ICASSP'2023	Joint ego/environmental audio denoising via VAE+NMF	Requires robust ego-noise pretraining; high complexity
	Qian et al. [164]	Audio-Visual	JSTSP'2025	Context-aware audio-visual speech enhancement	Only supports single speaker; no separation
	RegBN [61]	Multimodal	ANIPS'2023	Batch normalization across modalities with regularization	Slow due to costly SVD and L-BFGS steps.
Multisensory Attention Control	AdapTac [115]	Vision, Tactile, Force	Preprint'2025	Force-guided visual-tactile attention for manipulation	Lacks robustness without RL fine-tuning
	FAM-HRI [105]	Vision, Audio, Language	Preprint'2025	Gaze-speech fusion for intent-driven control via LLMs	LLM/VLM inference delays processing
	Eftekhari et al. [45]	RGB	ICLR'2024	Task-conditioned codebook for visual filtering	Codebook collapse; loss of fine details
	UniTouch [211]	Tactile, Audio, Vision	CVPR'2024	Touch embeddings aligned with audio-visual features	Lacks for task-driven attention modulation
	Gizdov et al. [63]	RGB	CVPR'2025	Foveated sampling for efficient visual grounding	No dynamic gaze control; fixed attention
Cross-Modal Feature Integration	AVFormer [174]	Audio-Visual	CVPR'2023	Visual adapters for audio-visual speech recognition	Not end-to-end; pretrained modules required
	Gan et al. [60]	Vision, Sound	ICRA'2020	Dual-branch model for vision-sound navigation	No spatial memory or mapping
	MViTac [32]	Vision, Tactile	ICRA'2024	Self-supervised visual-tactile learning	Weak grasp prediction due to sparse data
	Polyglot [103]	Image, Audio, Text	CAGD'2022	Aligns image, audio, text in shared space	Embeddings lack spatial/topological grounding

transmission of spatial information, which is particularly important for embodied agents operating in motion-rich or multi-agent scenarios [220]. Beyond conventional connectivity, 6G is expected to embrace AI-native wireless architectures [144], including programmable networks (e.g., open-radio access networks [144], rate multiple splitting access [81], and integrated sensing and communication frameworks [30]), where learning-based agents can dynamically adapt communication strategies to environmental and task-specific demands.

Emerging Softwares. Obtaining the essential requirements from wireless systems in the agentic era, NVIDIA has released a comprehensive Aerial Research portfolio to support the development of AI-native 6G infrastructures. Specifically, it contains Sionna, an open-source GPU-accelerated library for simulating physical-layer communication [3]; the Aerial Omniverse Digital Twin for full-stack 6G simulation [157]; and the Sionna Research Kit on Jetson for prototyping AI-RAN algorithms on embedded platforms [20]. These platforms enable scalable and low-latency communication, which aligned with the needs of AI agents operating under mobility, partial observability, and real-time constraints.

3 Comprehensive Analysis of Agentic Spatial Intelligence

3.1 Insights From The Proposed Framework

In this section, we conduct an in-depth analysis of state-of-the-art (SOTA) research corresponding to the modules within the proposed framework. Hence, we aim to outline potential methods tailored for each module and expose critical gaps that need to be addressed for agentic systems to meet human-level spatial intelligence.

3.1.1 Low-Level Multimodal Sensory Processing. This part examines recent research works on low-level perception of the agents, grounding upon the multi-sensory input (Sec. 2.2.1) and information processing (IPM) modules (Sec. 2.2.1) within our proposed framework. Specifically, we analyze the

sensory processing pipeline of the IPM and examine the types of sensory modalities and sensors adopted in these works.

Sensor Calibration and Synchronization. Modern intelligent systems increasingly depend on multimodal sensor fusion to achieve greater levels of autonomy. Thus, precise and consistent spatiotemporal calibration across heterogeneous sensors is crucial. Hence, Li *et al.* [116] proposed a fully automatic, target-free framework based on continuous-time optimization for the spatiotemporal calibration of multi-modal sensors, including IMU, LiDAR, camera, and Radar. By employing an IMU-centric initialization and joint batch optimization strategy, the method eliminates the need for overlapping fields of view and manual intervention. However, **the method remains limited by its reliance on precise IMU calibration and the heavy computational cost of high-dimensional factor graph optimization, which hinders real-time deployment with low-grade IMUs.** Wang *et al.* [196] proposed an observability-aware active calibration framework for ground robots with multimodal sensors (e.g., microphone arrays, LiDAR, wheel odometry). By optimizing robot trajectories using B-spline curves guided by the Fisher Information Matrix, it enhances parameter observability. Although real-time online calibration with extended Kalman filtering is used, **the method remains sensitive to sensor quality, relying on DOA accuracy for microphones and scene features for LiDAR, and may degrade in complex acoustic or sparse visual environments without advanced processing.** Recently proposed method by Herau *et al.* [79] uses Neural Radiance Fields (NeRF) to perform spatio-temporal calibration of multi-modal sensors without relying on physical targets or supervision. By training separate NeRFs for each camera and alternating between scene representation and cross-sensor pose optimization, it ensures alignment based only on overlapping regions. However, **the method struggles in scenes with linear motion (ambiguous time-space disentanglement), large open environments, and scales poorly with increasing sensor count due to training overhead.** These advances highlight the shift toward self-supervised, adaptable calibration, though practical deployment still requires balancing accuracy, generalizability, and efficiency in real-world conditions.

Noise Removal and Normalization. As traditional image denoising relied on handcrafted priors, statistical models, which often struggled with complex degradations and lacked adaptability, DL has served as a potential solution with a more adaptable and effective solution. Building on this paradigm, recent models like QFormer [92] enhance efficiency by introducing a Quaternion Transformer Block that leverages quaternion algebra to model cross-channel color correlations while replacing self-attention with lightweight sequential operations. Although QFormer achieves state-of-the-art denoising performance with significantly fewer parameters and faster inference, **its reliance on quaternion algebra and added skip-connection modifications increases implementation complexity and may limit applicability beyond color image denoising.** Fang *et al.* [50] proposed a partially adaptive multichannel framework that jointly reduces ego-noise and environmental noise in human-robot interaction using a VAE-based speech model and NMF-based noise modeling. The approach pre-trains an ego-noise model to exploit its structured spatial and spectral patterns, while adapting the environmental noise model to unknown disturbances. However, **the method relies on accurate pre-training of ego-noise, which may limit its adaptability if the robot's hardware or operating conditions change.** Similarly, Qian *et al.* [164] propose a novel framework that integrates Conformer and Mamba modules, enabling it to capture both global contextual dependencies and fine grained cross-modal representations. Despite its efficacy, **the method is currently limited to single speaker enhancement and does not address the more challenging problem of speaker separation in overlapping speech scenarios.** In 3D perception, RegBN [61] has been introduced as a regularization-based batch normalization framework tailored for multimodal data, addressing confounding effects and inter-modal dependencies without relying on learnable parameters. Demonstrated across diverse




Fig. 13. Architecture from [45]. Although the network achieves selective visual representation for improved generalization, the codebook bottleneck limits adaptability to novel environments and restrict the expressiveness of learned features, especially in dynamic or highly variable visual contexts.

architectures and tasks, RegBN enables effective normalization of features from a broad spectrum of modalities (e.g., language, audio, image, video, depth, force, and proprioception). However, **RegBN incurs substantially higher training overhead, requiring per-batch SVD and L-BFGS optimization when normalizing a pair of layers with dimensions 256×1024 .**

Multisensory Attention Controller. Recent advancements in multimodal perception and interaction have focused on adaptive fusion strategies and biologically inspired mechanisms to enhance task relevance in embodied agents. Li *et al.* [115] introduces AdapTac, an adaptive visuo-tactile fusion framework for dexterous manipulation that employs a force-guided attention mechanism to dynamically adjust visual and tactile weights across manipulation stages, reflecting modality priority shifts based on sensory relevance. While AdapTac demonstrates strong performance, **its reliance on imitation learning without reinforcement fine-tuning limits robustness in highly dynamic or error-prone scenarios.** Complementing this, Lai *et al.* [105] introduces FAM-HRI, a foundation-model-assisted framework for multimodal human-robot interaction that fuses real-time speech and gaze inputs from lightweight AR glasses. By leveraging LLM, it dynamically prioritizes relevant modalities based on user intent and context, enabling precise intent recognition and responsive robot control. However, **the reliance on heavyweight LLM/VLM inference causes processing delays, undermining real-time responsiveness.** Eftekhari *et al.* [45] introduces a lightweight, task-conditioned codebook bottleneck that filters general-purpose visual representations in embodied AI (Fig. 13), enabling agents to focus selectively on task-relevant visual. By conditioning on goals and past actions, it prioritizes salient sensory inputs while suppressing irrelevant information. While the codebook module enhances task-relevant representation and generalization, **it suffers from codebook collapse, where only a few latent codes dominate and fine-grained visual details are lost, limiting both representational diversity and broader reasoning.** Yang *et al.* [211] proposed UniTouch, a framework for learning unified tactile representations through contrastive alignment with visual and auditory embeddings from pretrained foundation models. This multimodal alignment supports zero shot tactile question answering and grasp prediction, even in the absence of explicit touch-language pairs. By embedding tactile signals in a shared semantic space, UniTouch lays the groundwork for dynamic attention switching between modalities allowing agents to rely more heavily on touch in visually occluded or contact-rich scenarios. However, **the model lacks mechanisms for task-driven attention modulation, tactile inputs are treated uniformly regardless of context, and does not incorporate spatial anchoring or temporal memory, which limits its ability to dynamically adjust the salience of touch based on environmental uncertainty, manipulation stage, or goal relevance.** Gizdov *et al.* [63] introduces a foveated sampling technique that mimics human vision by allocating higher resolution to the center of fixation and lower resolution to the periphery, showing that large multimodal models can be guided to prioritize salient visual regions through foveated sampling alone, without

Table 4. Representative works in the Egocentric-Allocentric Transformation.

Category	Method	Publication&Year	Highlights	Limitations
3D Egocentric Construction	Spatial Prediction [213]	ICLR'25	Coarse layout generation using VLMs.	No geometric grounding.
	GS SLAM [216]	CVPR'24	Dense 3D mapping from egocentric views.	No semantic understanding.
	Multi-View Memory [212]	CVPR'2025	Memory with frontier-based exploration.	No symbolic abstraction.
Scene Abstraction	Disjoint Reasoning [169]	CVPR'25	Implicit spatial consistency from VLMs.	No explicit memory.
	Cognitive Conversion [215]	arXiv	Symbolic egocentric-to-allocentric mapping.	No neural instantiation.
	3D Prior Interaction [132]	NeurIPS'24	Prompt-based reasoning with 3D priors.	Static priors.
Perspective Shift	Visual Perspective Taking [67]	NeurIPS'24	VPT benchmark using VLM prompting.	Hallucination errors.
	Mental Imagery [109]	CVPR'25	Perspective-aware reasoning via imagination.	Limited scene diversity testing.
	Pose-Aware Decoding [21]	AAAI'21	Allocentric semantic map from egocentric.	Needs depth and supervision.

requiring architectural modifications. The method however, uses a **single static fixation and lacks architectural adaptation or dynamic gaze mechanisms, limiting broader applicability and scalability**. Together, these works show a trend toward building flexible perception systems that are not only multimodal and adaptive, but also grounded in biological principles.

Cross-Modal Feature Integration. Recent advances in large language, vision, and multimodal models have greatly advanced AI agents, enabling richer reasoning and interaction across diverse sensory inputs [218]. Beyond language and vision, modalities such as audio and touch are increasingly integrated, supported by cross-modal architectures that align different signals within a unified representation space. For instance, AVFormer [174] introduces a lightweight approach to inject visual context into frozen speech recognition models by leveraging trainable adapters and visual projection layers. This design enables robust audiovisual speech recognition without requiring full model retraining. While highly data efficient and effective in zero shot settings, **AVFormer depends on separately pretrained visual and audio encoders and cannot be optimized in an end to end manner, which may constrain its adaptability for fine grained multimodal interaction**. Similarly, Gan *et al.*[60] validated the integration of sound and vision for navigation using a dual-branch Siamese network feeding into a GRU-based RL policy. **While effective in leveraging multimodal cues, the model lacked explicit spatial memory or mapping capabilities, limiting its robustness in acoustically challenging or ambiguous environments**. Similarly, MViTac [32] proposes a self supervised contrastive learning framework that integrates visual and tactile inputs to learn both intermodal and intramodal representations. It achieves strong performance on material classification and grasp prediction benchmarks, but **still lags behind supervised methods in grasp prediction tasks, largely due to the limitations of sparse and imbalanced training data**. Building on to unify representations across sensory modalities, Komarichev *et al.* [103] proposed Polyglot, a contrastive learning framework that maps semantically related inputs, such as images, text, and audio, into a shared representation space. While it succeeds in aligning diverse modalities, **the resulting embeddings lack spatial interpretability, failing to capture both geometric distances and topological relationships**. Together, such approaches mark an important step toward unified learning systems that integrate perception and action, supporting the development of more adaptive grounded agents.

Research Gap 1. Recent multimodal sensory processing methods remain modality-specific, often incurring high computational costs, and still lack a unified, efficient framework capable of generalizing across heterogeneous sensors.

3.1.2 Egocentric-Allocentric Transformation. As discussed in Sec. 2.2.2, the goal of this module is to mimic the act of “imagination”, reconstructing the scene from a new point of view via intermediate geometric and symbolic abstractions.

3D Contruction and Scene Abstraction. To simulate how the same scene would appear from a different viewpoint, Yang *et al.* [213] demonstrated that VLMs can indeed form coarse spatial layouts from visual and textual cues. **However, these layouts are often imprecise and lack a firm grounding in the physical geometry of the scene, limiting an agent’s ability to perform precise navigation or interaction.** The core of the problem lies in memory and continuity. Additionally, Ravi *et al.* [169] examined VLMs on long-horizon reasoning across frames where objects are never co-visible and found that models lag behind human performance by 28%, with steeper declines in accuracy (60% to 30%) as the temporal gap widens, providing trajectories or bird’s-eye-view projections to VLMs results in only marginal improvements, whereas providing oracle 3D coordinates leads to a substantial 20% performance increase. **This highlights a core bottleneck of multi-frame VLMs in constructing and maintaining 3D scene representations over time from visual signals.** Encouraging from this challenge, Yugay *et al.* [216] utilized 3D Gaussian Splatting to construct photorealistic maps, thereby constructing a dense, geometrically accurate, and visually rich 3D representation of the environment. This technique establishes the geometric backbone for a true allocentric map, advancing beyond the coarse spatial layouts of earlier VLM approaches. It produces a persistent, viewpoint-agnostic world model dedicated solely to geometry and rendering, without any semantic layer or reasoning capability. Complementing this geometric perspective, Yang *et al.* [212] proposed a structured memory architecture that accumulates multi-view snapshots over time using frontier-based exploration. This supports long-term reasoning over spatial layouts and object positions, allowing for visually coherent and temporally grounded scene representations. **However, it lacks a symbolic interface or capacity for linguistic querying, limiting its general-purpose reasoning utility.** As can be seen, the discrete scene abstraction (object types, 3D boxes, headings) omits fine-grained details and uncertainty modeling, resulting in a non-differentiable, non-probabilistic pipeline. Ma *et al.* [132] addressed that by proposing SpatialPIN, integrating 3D priors, such as NeRFs and point clouds into the prompting process. It enables VLMs to reason over spatial structure more faithfully, showing that geometry-aware prompting can complement latent mental simulation. **Though its reliance on precomputed 3D assets limits its applicability in open-world or dynamic environments.** Together, these works reveal a growing divide in the field: between systems optimized for geometric memory and those focused on symbolic spatial abstraction, with neither achieving the full spectrum of cognitive flexibility required for egocentric-to-allocentric transformation.

Visual Perspective-Taking. Another key requirement for efficient egocentric to allocentric conversion is visual perspective-taking (VPT), the ability to query a rich 3D map to imagine a scene from another viewpoint. Accordingly, Goral *et al.* [67] systematically evaluated existing models on VPT tasks, in which they revealed a critical weakness: rather than performing genuine geometric transformations, most VLMs tend to “hallucinate” the new perspective textually. **Even with sophisticated prompts, performance fails to generalize as the model lacks multi-view fusion, mesh representation, scene graphs, or implicit tokens for simulating viewpoint shifts.** For more explicit mechanisms, Lee *et al.* [109] proposed a novel method based on “mental imagery simulation”. This approach aims to replace unstructured hallucination with a structured two-step pipeline of abstraction and geometric projection. However, **because each step is pretrained separately and manually integrated, errors compound across stages, in which if object detection fails (e.g., due to occlusion, clutter, or unusual objects), the entire abstraction collapses.** Moreover, Cartillier *et al.* [21] proposed the SMNet, which learns to project egocentric RGB-D views into a global, allocentric semantic map using a falling-tensor memory and neural decoding module. It enables symbolic queries such as “find the chair” and supports basic navigation by embedding explicit object categories in space. **However, it assumes near-perfect perception and lacks mechanisms for viewpoint-conditioned simulation or tracking across time.** This

Table 5. Representative works in cognitive map for spatial reasoning.

Category	Method	Publication&Year	Highlights	Limitations
Grid Cells Layer	Grid-DRL [6]	Nature'2018	DRL and LSTM for path-integration	Fixed, supervised cues and hard-wired anchoring
	PF-Grids [185]	NeurIPS'2019	Pattern-formation for RNN/LSTM	Lacks anchoring to landmarks and drift correction
	PF-ANN [172]	NeurIPS'2022	Evaluation on DL-based grid-cell models	Grid requires specific and biologically setup
	Grid-SSL [173]	NeurIPS'2023	Self-supervised RNN on egocentric motion	Rely on self-motion cues; no landmark anchoring
Place Cells Layer	GNN [8]	DeepMind'2018	Relational GNN for topological space	Lacks context-remapping; no spatial field
	Place-RNN [160]	NeurIPS'2024	Similarity-based objectives for remapping	Lacks heterogeneous/multi-field coding
	VPC [68]	NMI'2024	Visual predictive coding with self-attention	Lacks focus on biological place-cell functions
	FTM [31]	ECCV'2024	Frontier topological memory with NeRF	Only targets landmark navigation

shift replaces hallucinated imagery with structured 3D priors, providing an efficient middle ground between full scene memory and latent reasoning.

Research Gap 2. Current methods for 3D scene construction and visual perspective-taking remain fragmented between geometric and symbolic approaches, often relying on brittle or hallucinated models, and thus lack unified, persistent 3D representations that combine geometric grounding with semantic cues.

3.1.3 Cognitive Map in Agents. As described in Sec. 2.2.3, the Cognitive Map Module integrates a grid cells layer for metric spatial representation and a place cells layer for topological, context-aware representation, together forming an internal spatial model for reasoning in dynamic environments. In this section, we review SOTA works within this module to examine emerging techniques and remaining gaps toward achieving a human-like cognitive map in AI agents. Table 5 presents the key highlights and gaps of the representative works.

Grid Cells in Cognitive Maps. To enable grid-like representations of cognitive maps in deep learning models, several works [185], [173], [6], [172] have explored the metric features within the neural networks. To that end, Sorscher *et al.* [185] links normative learning and mechanistic attractor models by casting position-encoding learning dynamics as a pattern-formation (PF) system, proving that representational constraints (notably nonnegativity) select hexagonal lattices, thereby offering a principled route to the grid cells layer. By analyzing in various neural networks, such as recurrent neural network (RNN) and long short-term neural network (LSTM), the authors explain the efficiency of hexagonal grids within spatial representation across different network architectures. Despite the strength of its theoretical framework, **this work does not account for several essential functions of biological grid cells in the human cognitive map, including anchoring to external landmarks, correcting drift over extended trajectories, and integrating with contextual and memory systems to support robust spatial reasoning.** To focus on more practical methods, Schaeffer *et al.* [173] trains an RNN with self-supervised objectives (e.g., path-invariance, capacity, separation) on egocentric motion, yielding multi-modular grid codes that generalize beyond training. Thereby, this work directly instantiates the grid cells layer for metric encoding and path integration, offering a practical method for learning grid-like lattices in functioning agents. However, **this grid-based self-supervised learning (Grid-SSL) approach relies primarily on self-motion cues and lacks landmark/sensory anchoring and drift correction mechanisms and does not integrate grid codes with memory/goal signals for long-horizon, human-like spatial reasoning.** Additionally, Banino *et al.* [6] propose a deep reinforcement learning (DRL)-based path-integration LSTM that develops entorhinal-like grid units with DRL to perform vector-based navigation. This work bridges the DRL context to our grid cells layer by forming an LSTM with a dropout-regularized linear layer to yield grid, head-direction, border-like units and a vision module to inject place/head-direction patterns, while




Fig. 14. The representative works tailored in (a) cognitive map module and (b) spatial neural memory module

a policy LSTM consumes the current and remembered “goal grid code” to guide actions. Nevertheless, **this model relies on fixed, supervised cues and hard-wired anchoring, which limits context-dependent remapping and prevents the flexible landmark integration and memory interaction seen in human grid cells.** Moreover, standing on a critics view, Schaeffer et al. [172] critically evaluate DL-based grid cells models trained on path integration tasks, showing that **grid-like representations only emerge under highly specific and biologically implausible architectural, readout, and hyperparameter choices,** rather than as a natural outcome of the task. As a result, **current DL methods fail to capture key properties of biological grid cells, including stable multi-module coding, correct period ratios, robustness to sensory heterogeneity, and context-linked anchoring and drift correction.**

Place Cells in Cognitive Maps. Recent research on place cells has increasingly focused on exploring their topological nature and contextual flexibility, from graph-based representations of object–location relationships and mechanisms for contextual remapping to their role in linking with episodic memory and predicting future spatial states. An early work of Battaglia *et al.* [8] has introduced graph neural network (GNN) as a powerful framework for modeling relational reasoning, where nodes and edges naturally capture the topological structure of spatial environments, making it highly relevant to the topological coding of place cells in the cognitive map. However, **such graph-based models typically lack key biological characteristics of place-cell topology, such as context-dependent remapping, non-uniform spatial field distributions, and integration with landmark and reward signals observed in the human cognitive map.** To this end, Pettersen *et al.* [160] enables the contextual-remapping of place cells in neural networks by constructing a similarity-based objective that makes population codes mirror distances in space. Thereby, the proposed method yields place-like representations in feedforward networks that can flexibly reorganize their spatial maps across different contexts, achieving decorrelated activation patterns akin to global remapping. However, **the approach assumes simplified scalar context inputs and supervised position labels, and does not capture key biological properties of place cells such as heterogeneous field sizes and multi-field coding.** Additionally, Gornet *et al.* [68] presents a visual predictive coding (VPC) method with a self-attention layer that learns latent “place-like” units anchored to visual landmarks, supporting landmark-based localization and vector navigation much like place cells use landmark cues. However, **it primarily targets topological/vector navigation and landmark localization from vision, without modeling key biological features of place cells.** Besides, Cui *et al.* [31] proposes a frontier-enhanced topological memory (FTM) that augments a graph of explored places with NeRF-rendered ghost nodes for unseen frontiers, enabling landmark-guided navigation. Although this work aligns well with the topological-based memory indexing role of biological place cells, it primarily targets

Table 6. Representative works in Spatial Neural Memory Modules for embodied spatial reasoning.

Category	Method	Publication & Year	Highlights	Limitations
Spatial–Semantic Encoding	BEVFormer [118]	TPAMI’2024	BEV map from multi-camera	Less effective than LiDAR-based methods
	SayCan [1]	PMLR’2023	LLM + value functions	Limited skills; poor ambiguity handling
	Meerkat [29]	ECCV’2024	Audio-visual grounding	Struggles with occlusion, overlap, partial grounding.
Episodic Memory	Episodic Transformer [154]	ICCV’2021	Full episode attention	Needs annotations; poor real-world transfer
	SMT [51]	CVPR’2019	Attention over unstructured memory	High compute; approximation errors
Continual Memory Updating	Lu et al. [131]	Preprint’2025	Prompt tuning in CLIP	Evaluated only with CLIP; generalization untested
	HiMemFormer [200]	Preprint’2024	Hierarchical memory for action	Lacks adaptive memory weighting

landmark-guided navigation and **does not address other complementary functions such as contextual remapping or integration with episodic memory.**

Research Gap 3. Current DL models of grid and place cells representations often succeed only under narrow or highly specific settings, lacking generalization and failing to capture core biological functions such as landmark anchoring, drift correction, multi-field coding, and context-dependent remapping.

3.1.4 Spatial Neural Memory Module. Spatial intelligence necessitates the ability to perceive, interpret, and adapt to dynamic environments. As discussed in Section 2.2.3, effective navigation and interaction require agents to construct spatial-semantic representations, retain episodic memories, and continuously update internal memory structures in response to environmental changes.

Spatial–Semantic Encoding. provides agents with a unified representation that binds spatial geometry with semantic meaning. This process unfolds through grounded visual perception and non-visual multimodal grounding. Visual SLAM remains foundational in constructing egocentric metric maps via fused odometry, depth, and image-based data. These geometric scaffolds are enriched by 3D scene understanding, which leverages point clouds and learned features to differentiate object categories, surfaces, and boundaries. BEVFormer [118] is a spatiotemporal transformer framework designed to learn bird’s-eye-view (BEV) representations directly from multi-camera inputs, enabling accurate and efficient 3D object detection and map segmentation. By introducing grid-shaped BEV queries with spatial cross-attention and temporal self-attention, it achieve state-of-the-art results on various benchmark datasets. BEVFormer’s performance is still **limited by the inherent challenges of accurately inferring 3D spatial information from 2D camera inputs, making it less effective and efficient than LiDAR-based methods.** SayCan [1] grounds large language models in robotic affordances by combining language-driven task planning with reinforcement learned value functions that evaluate the feasibility of actions in real world contexts. This integration enables zero shot execution of complex, temporally extended instructions with significantly improved performance over non grounded baselines. However, SayCan is **constrained by the coverage and reliability of its pretrained skill set; if a required skill is absent or fails, the system lacks adaptability.** Moreover, **it inherits the reasoning limitations of language models, particularly in handling negation, ambiguity, and novel scenarios.** Meerkat [29] introduces the first unified audio-visual large language model that achieves fine-grained spatial and temporal grounding by aligning image and audio features through optimal transport and cross-modal attention. Meerkat extracts CLIP-based image and CLAP-based audio features, aligns them via a weakly supervised Optimal Transport module (AVOpT), and refines region-level attention using the Audio-Visual Attention Consistency Enforcement (AVACE) module. Despite the good results, **Meerkat still struggles with occluded objects and overlapping sounds, often mislocalizing regions and capturing only partial event durations.**

Episodic Spatial Memory. Episodic memory based architectures have emerged as a powerful paradigm for long-horizon vision and language navigation by enabling agents to reason over extended temporal contexts. Episodic Transformer [154] is a multimodal transformer architecture that processes the full episode history of visual observations, actions, and language instructions to overcome the limitations of recurrent models. It employs modality-specific encoders and fuses the encoded streams through a multimodal transformer with causal attention to predict the next action. **While effective, its performance is highly dependent on high quality synthetic annotations, limiting its applicability in real world environments where such supervision is scarce.** Complementing this, Scene Memory Transformer (SMT) [51] introduces a memory-based policy that stores all past observations in an unstructured memory and uses attention mechanisms to aggregate spatio-temporal context for action selection in long-horizon tasks. Unlike RNNs or structured memory approaches, SMT employs a transformer-based encoder-decoder architecture trained with DRL to enable more flexible and expressive reasoning. However, **its attention-based design incurs quadratic computational cost with increasing memory size, which can be prohibitive in extended episodes.** While memory factorization reduces this complexity to linear time, **it introduces approximation that may degrade performance in more complex scenarios.** These architectures demonstrate the promise and trade-offs of transformer-based memory systems in enabling scalable and context-aware navigation in embodied agents.

Adaptive Memory Updating. Dynamic environments demand not only memory retention but also continual adaptation. To operate effectively in such settings, spatial reasoning agents must update their internal models without catastrophic forgetting and flexibly accommodate changes over time and space. Lu *et al.*[131] introduces TPPT-V and TPPT-VT, two lightweight continual learning strategies for CLIP that use static and learnable textual prototypes to guide visual prompt tuning. TPPT-V anchors visual representations to fixed class text embeddings to mitigate forgetting, while TPPT-VT jointly tunes visual and textual prompts with a diversity regularization to prevent representation collapse and enhance adaptation. However, **the method has only been evaluated with CLIP; its generalization, computational overhead, and efficacy on other vision–language backbones or broader continual-learning settings remain untested.** Complementing these methods, HiMemFormer [200] introduces a transformer-based architecture for online multi-agent action anticipation by incorporating both agent-specific and global contextual memory. It hierarchically encodes long and short-term temporal cues, employing an Agent-to-Context Encoder to merge agent-centric and contextual information, followed by a Context-to-Agent Decoder that performs coarse-to-fine action prediction using short-term memories. The model is trained with dual-stage supervision, applying cross-entropy loss to both coarse and refined predictions. But **HiMemFormer relies on fixed hierarchies for long and short-term memory without adaptive weighting or clear interpretability, which may limit its responsiveness to dynamic environmental changes.**

Research Gap 4. Current approaches tailored with spatial neural memory struggle to achieve robust geometry–semantics fusion under occlusion and novelty, scalable and data-efficient episodic reasoning, and adaptive memory updating with generalizability and interpretability.

3.1.5 Spatial Reasoning in Agents. As the executive hub of our framework, the Reasoning Module transforms structured knowledge from the cognitive map into goal-oriented intelligent actions through world-model-based learning and explicit spatial reasoning. This section will analyze past research to examine how existing methods have tackled the challenge of spatial reasoning and discuss their relationship to the core components of our proposed module.

Table 7. Representative works in reasoning module for spatial reasoning.

Category	Work	Publication & Year	Highlights	Limitation
Predictive World Modelling	[74]	Nature'2025	Optimizes behavior in imagined future trajectories.	Lacks a multi-step, structured spatial reasoning
	[226]	NYU'2024	Predicts future dynamics in the latent space.	
	[225]	UMass'2024	Integrates 3D-LLM with aligned diffusion models.	
Explicit Spatial Reasoning and Alignment	[12]	CVPR'2025	Generates and utilizes explicit spatial information.	Fails to build a unified, dynamic world model
	[111]	ICML'2025	Generates visual thoughts as part of the reasoning.	
	[206]	Ant Group'2025	Performs drawing operations in the visual space.	

Predictive World Modelling. The DreamerV3 agent proposed by Hafner *et al.* [74] learns a predictive world model to simulate future possibilities, which directly corresponds to the world-model-based learning emphasized in our framework for planning. This method trains a Recurrent State-Space Model to predict future latent states and subsequently uses an actor-critic RL approach to derive optimal actions within imagined trajectories. However, **its reasoning process is implicit, with its policy being learned directly by maximizing rewards in simulation.** Therefore, this approach lacks an explicit, multi-step, and structured spatial reasoning paradigm, such as generating intermediate representations or following a CoT process. Zhou *et al.* [226] presented DINO-WM, a world model that learns to predict dynamics within the latent space of pre-trained predictive visual features learned from DINOv2. The model achieves zero-shot visual planning and control by optimizing a sequence of actions at test time to reach a goal state in this latent space. However, as a JEPa-based predictive architecture, **it faces notable challenges including accurately modeling long-horizon dynamics, mitigating error accumulation during latent rollouts, and ensuring robust generalization beyond the visual distributions seen during pre-training.** Apart from traditional DL and emerging predictive learning, Zhen *et al.* [225] introduced 3D-VLA, a generative-based approach that utilizes diffusion models for world modelling. By continuously predicting future multimodal scenes (e.g., images, point clouds), it realizes the cognitive map as a predictive internal simulator to support subsequent planning. Nevertheless, **continuous generation via diffusion is highly resource-intensive and may not align with the compact, abstracted internal mental models employed by humans for efficient reasoning and planning, as it can be treated as explicit scene modeling rather than the implicit, internally maintained representations humans use.**

Explicit Spatial Reasoning and Alignment. Bigverdi *et al.* [12] proposed the “Perception Tokens” which align with the core idea of “Explicit Spatial Reasoning” in our reasoning module by enabling multimodal models to generate auxiliary information, such as depth maps or bounding boxes, as intermediate reasoning steps. This method uses a VQ-VAE to convert intermediate image representations (like depth maps) into a tokenized format and employs a multi-task training framework to have the model leverage these visual perception tokens for reasoning. However, **this work primarily focuses on distilling representations from specific visual tasks into a language model, rather than building a unified, dynamic world model that can be flexibly used for planning and prediction.** The Multimodal Visualization-of-Thought (MVoT) [111] framework introduces a reasoning paradigm for MLLMs that generates interleaved verbal and visual thoughts, enabling the model to visualize reasoning traces for improved performance in spatial tasks like maze navigation and environmental interactions. It corresponds with our Reasoning Module’s emphasis on explicit spatial reasoning by constructing visual aids to support multi-step inferences. However, **MVoT is mainly concerned with generating static image visualizations which falls short of fully realizing our neuro-inspired module’s goals.** ViLaSR [206] proposes a “drawing to reason in space” framework, which enables vision-language models to solve complex spatial problems by drawing visual markers like bounding boxes and auxiliary lines on images.

However, **this approach remains limited, as it emphasizes external visual input without enabling agents to simulate environmental dynamics.**

Research Gap 5. Current reasoning approaches either rely on implicit world-model learning that lacks explicit multi-step spatial reasoning, or on explicit visualization techniques that remain task-specific, static, and tied to external inputs. As a result, no existing method offers a unified reasoning framework that combines predictive world models with explicit, and neuro-inspired spatial reasoning to support robust planning and goal-directed behavior.

3.2 Datasets and Emerging Applications

3.2.1 Datasets and Benchmarks. To achieve human-level spatial intelligence, agentic systems must be evaluated on spatial reasoning tasks that align with the full spectrum of human spatial cognitive processes. While numerous 3D vision and spatial reasoning benchmarks have been proposed for AI, they are rarely organized in a way that clearly maps to specific cognitive processes observed in humans. To this end, we address this problem by providing a systematic analysis of the most representative benchmarks, structured according to a spatial reasoning behavior foundationed by HAI (mentioned in Sec. 2.2.5) with the core levels: 3D perceptual inference, hidden-state inference, and policy selection.

3D Perceptual Inference: At the level of low-level cognition, agents must be equipped to process diverse sensory modalities, enabling perception not just through vision, but also via auditory, motion, tactile, and bio-signal inputs.

Visual. In terms of low-level 3D visual inference, **NYU Depth-v2** [182] delivers 1,449 densely annotated indoor RGB-D frames and remains a foundational benchmark for evaluating how well models infer depth from a single image. **ObjectNet3D** [207] bridges web photos and precise 3D geometry by aligning 90k images with CAD meshes across 100 categories, making it a definitive benchmark for joint category recognition and 6-Degree of Freedom (DoF) pose estimation under the clutter, occlusion, and appearance variation that synthetic data rarely captures. **MVSEC** [227] is recorded through an event camera, delivering microsecond-level temporal resolution, challenging networks to handle high-speed motion and extreme lighting that ruin conventional frames. Its synchronized IMU and LiDAR streams enable the fusion of event data with additional sensors for tight SLAM and optical-flow benchmarks. **ARKitScenes** [7] provides 1.6 million RGB-D frames with scene meshes and ARKit poses, showing what large-scale 3D indoor reconstruction looks like “in the wild” with commodity hardware. The built-in ARKit poses make it a playground for research on relocalization and neural rendering from casually scanned spaces. Finally, **Objaverse-XL** [38] aggregates 10 million richly textured 3D assets scraped from the web, dwarfing prior shape repositories and powering contemporary 3D generative models. Its sheer scale and category breadth encourage zero-shot generalization and have made it the go-to corpus for novel-view synthesis and web-scale object understanding.

Motion. Apart from visual, motion is also essential in low-level cognitive processing. **DIP-IMU** [88] records 64 motion-capture sequences from 10 participants equipped with 17 Xsens inertial sensors, yielding over 330,000 time-aligned frames with both IMU signals and optical motion capture ground truth. As a foundational dataset for body-pose estimation from sparse sensors, it plays a key role in equipping agentic systems with proprioceptive inference capabilities, enabling low-latency full-body pose reconstruction when visual input is limited or absent. **AMASS** [134] consolidates 15 heterogeneous motion capture datasets into a unified SMPL representation, covering over 11,000 motion clips and more than 40 hours of activity from 344 subjects. Its richness in action diversity and mesh-level consistency makes it a crucial resource for training agents to generalize across

Table 8. Representative Datasets/Benchmarks For Spatial Reasoning Evaluation.

Category	Name	Year	Task	Type	Contents
3D Perceptual Inference	NYU Depth-v2 [182]	2012	Monocular Depth Estimation	Visual	1,499 depth RGB-D frame
	ObjectNet3D [207]	2016	3D Object Recognition	Visual	90,127 images; 100 categories
	MVSEC [227]	2018	Event-based Tasks	Visual	12 event streams
	ARKitScenes [7]	2021	3D Indoor Reconstruction	Visual	1.6M RGB-D frames with meshes
	Objaverse-XL [38]	2023	Novel View Synthesis	Visual	10M 3D objects
	DIP-IMU [88]	2018	Human Pose Estimation	Motion	64 sequences; 330k instants
	AMASS [134]	2019	3D Motion Reconstruction	Motion	11k motion-SMPL pairs
	EgoBody [221]	2022	Multi-View Motion Estimation	Motion	200k+ RGB-D-SMPL pairs
	ReSkin [11]	2021	Force Estimation	Tactile-Force	1.2M tactile events
	9DTact [121]	2023	6D Force Estimation	Tactile-Force	100k images-torque pairs
	FeelAnyForce [175]	2024	3D Contact Force Estimation	Tactile-Force	200k indentations
	FoTa [224]	2024	Tactile Sensing	Tactile	3M tactile images
	TVL [57]	2024	Language-Tactile Descriptions	Tactile	43,741 vision-DIGIT pairs
	TV-Touch [86]	2025	Robotics Visuo-Tactile	Tactile	40k visual-tactile pairs
	Hidden-State Inference	SoundSpaces [23]	2020	Audio-Visual Navigation	Auditory
Ego-Exo4D [69]		2024	3D audio-vision tasks	Auditory	motions; multi-view video 4,551 demos with audio; force; vision; kinematics
REASSEMBLE [184]		2025	Robotic Assembly	Auditory	
3DMatch [217]		2017	Point Cloud Recall	Geometrical	70k RGB-D images
CLEVR [96]		2017	VQA	Topological	100k RGB-D images; 1M QA
BOP [84]		2018	6D Pose Estimation	Geometrical	89 objects; 339k RGB-D images
3D Scene Graph [4]		2019	3D Graph Prediction	Topological	572 scene graphs
SCAN2CAD [5]		2019	9-DoF alignment	Geometrical	97,607 key-point pairs
AGQA [71]		2021	VQA	Spatiotemporal/ Topological	9.6k videos; 192M QA
MindCube [215]		2025	VQA	Mental Simulation	3,268 images; 21,154 QA
Policy Selection	3DSRBench [133]	2025	VQA	Geometrical/ Topological	2,772 QA from MS-COCO
	IntPhys2 [14]	2025	Dynamic Physical Inference	Spatiotemporal	1,416 videos
	SITE [199]	2025	VQA	Mental Simulation/ Abstract Reasoning	13,172 images; 3,808 videos; and 8,068 QA
	AI2-THOR [102]	2017	Navigation/Manipulation	Decision-Making	3D egocentric environment simulator
	TDW [59]	2020	Navigation/Manipulation	Decision-Making	3D simulator with audio and visual
Policy Selection	Habitat 2.0 [189]	2021	Navigation/Manipulation	Decision-Making	3D environment with multi-sensory
	iGibson 2.0 [112]	2022	Navigation/Manipulation	Interactive Decision-Making	3D environment with logical states
	Habitat 3.0 [163]	2023	Human Robot Interaction	Interactive Decision-Making	3D environment with SMPL and multi-agents

complex motion patterns, supporting both motion synthesis and temporal reasoning grounded in physical embodiment. **EgoBody** [221] captures 36 subjects in 125 indoor scenes using a unique hybrid setup: one actor wears a HoloLens2 headset to collect egocentric RGB-D, head pose, and gaze data, while external cameras simultaneously record ground-truth SMPL meshes. With over 200,000 paired frames linking first-person perception to third-person full-body motion, EgoBody enables agents to learn from both embodied and allocentric viewpoints, bridging perceptual input with internal motion states in dynamic spatial contexts.

Tactile and Force Feedback. As tactile is a robust sensing modality for bio-inspired agentic spatial reasoning, **ReSkin** [11] couples a magnet-particle elastomer “skin” with a self-calibrating board to stream dense 3-axis magnetic-field readings at kilohertz rates, resulting in 1.2 million event regime. It captures slips, taps and impacts that potentially let the agents learn to localise micro-forces with the same spatial acuity human Merkel cells provide. **9DTact** [121] extends

optical GelSight ideas into a 32 mm cube sensor and releases 100 k image-torque pairs over 175 objects; its pixel-accurate 3-D height fields plus full 6-D force labels teach agents to infer both geometry and wrench from a single touch, a prerequisite for reasoning about object affordances in clutter. **FeelAnyForce** [175] gathers 200 k robot-controlled indentations on GelSight-Mini while logging RGB-D and force vectors, then shows a transformer that generalises across unseen sensors. **Fota** [224] aggregates more than 3 million tactile frames from 13 different sensors and 11 tasks into one unified format, enabling the formation of foundation tactile model that supports long-horizon manipulations and mirrors how large-vision corpora seeded visual commonsense in LLM. **TVL** [57] bridges sensory and semantic space with 44k in-the-wild vision–touch pairs, which are annotated mostly from GPT-4V, enabling open-vocabulary tactile captioning. **TV-Touch** [86] provides 40k paired DigiT images and stereo RGB frames for dexterous gripper scenes, forming a 3D visuo-tactile benchmark that unifies grasp planning and force prediction. This benchmark can potentially become a high-level testbed for policy-centred agents.

Auditory. Regarding auditory sensing, **SoundSpaces** [23] augments the photorealistic Matterport3D and Replica worlds with geometrical-acoustic simulations, providing more than 20k stereo room-impulse-response/RGB pairs that let agents “hear” a target and learn audio-visual way-finding under realistic reverberation and occlusion. **Ego-Exo4D** [69] scales auditory perception into the social realm, curating 1,000 hours of multichannel audio synchronised with egocentric head-mounted video, exocentric multi-view cameras, 3-D point clouds, IMU, gaze and rich language commentary of skilled activities; by aligning what the actor hears with external observations, it trains agents to reason jointly from “inside” and “outside” perspectives during complex human motion. **REASSEMBLE** [184] turns sound into a manipulation cue: its 4,551 contact-rich assembly demonstrations record microphone waveforms alongside force–torque, event-camera, and multi-view RGB streams on the NIST Task Board, giving agents the multimodal evidence needed to predict subtle contact events, verify insertions, and plan corrective actions when visual data alone is ambiguous.

Hidden-State Inference: Hidden-state inference demands that an agents reconstruct what it cannot directly observe, such as latent geometry, topology, dynamics, and causal relations, and the current benchmark landscape targets these facets in complementary ways. **3DMatch** [217] learns local 3-D patch descriptors from 70k RGB-D fragments captured in noisy indoor scans, challenging models to recover geometric-based point-cloud correspondences despite occlusion and partial views. **CLEVR** [96] focuses on Visual Question Answering (VQA) with 100k rendered scenes and 1 M template-controlled questions, forcing agents to topologically track object attributes and spatial relations that are implicit rather than visible at first glance. **BOP** [84] aggregates 339k RGB-D images of 89 real objects across multiple setups, providing pixel-accurate meshes and ground-truth 6-DoF poses so that hidden geometric features must be inferred under heavy clutter. **3D Scene Graph** [4] converts whole ScanNet reconstructions into 572 hierarchical graphs (e.g., building-room-object-camera), evaluating whether a model can induce the latent relational topology of an environment rather than mere geometry. **SCAN2CAD** [5] aligns CAD models to 1k Matterport scans via 97k manually annotated key-point correspondences, demanding 9-DoF alignment that links unseen canonical shape priors to noisy real scans. Moreover, **AGQA** [71] provides a VQA baseline for spatiotemporal reasoning by pairing 9.6k synthetic videos with 192 M questions whose logic chains span multiple events. Therefore, agents must integrate hidden causal states across long temporal windows. **MindCube** [215] distills spatial-mental-simulation into 3,268 cube-stack images and 21,154 VQA-based questions that require imagining unseen faces and inside-out rotations, directly probing the ability to run internal mental models for spatial reasoning. **3DSRBench** [133] introduces 2,762 open-vocabulary 3D questions over COCO scenes, intertwining both geometric and topological cues so the model must infer implicit spatial relations beyond labeled objects. **IntPhys**

2 [14] delivers 1,416 photorealistic videos of object violations (permanence, solidity, continuity, immutability), testing whether systems can foresee physically plausible trajectories and flag hidden violations as infants do. Finally, **SITE** [199] also design a VQA that unifies 13,172 images, 3,808 videos, and 8,068 multi-choice prompts across scales from figural to environmental. It adds novel “view-taking” and dynamic-scene tasks so that spatial reasoning models must reconstruct intrinsic vs. extrinsic frames and unseen motion paths to answer correctly. Together these benchmarks trace a continuum from latent geometry to abstract mental simulation, providing the scaffolding needed to train and evaluate agents that reason beneath the surface.

Policy Selection: At this level, spatial reasoning research leans on photorealistic simulators that let agents learn end-to-end decision-making under realistic physics and multisensory feedback. **AI2-THOR** [102] set the stage with 120 household scenes, whose physics-driven arm enables agents to co-optimize where to navigate and how to manipulate objects. **ThreeDWorld (TDW)** [59] raises the ceiling with near-photoreal visuals, high-fidelity spatial audio, cloth-and-liquid physics, a generative scene engine, and multi-agent support—exposing policies to cross-modal cues and complex material dynamics unavailable in earlier platforms. **Habitat 2.0** [189] pivots from static navigation to interactive rearrangement, combining GPU-accelerated rigid-body physics with thousands of scanned apartments so an agent must decide both where to move and how to reconfigure its surroundings. **iGibson 2.0** [112] complements this with a logic-state sampler that spawns endless task variations (cook, slice, soak, freeze) and a VR teleoperation interface, supporting curriculum design and imitation learning for long-horizon household activities. Pushing toward social intelligence, **Habitat 3.0** [163] introduces controllable humanoid avatars, accurate SMPL physics, and human-in-the-loop collaboration benchmarks, creating a sandbox where agents must negotiate shared goals with simulated people before venturing into real homes.

3.2.2 Emerging Applications of AI Spatial Intelligence. The spatial reasoning in agents is reflected in its wide-ranging applications across both virtual and physical domains, from immersive digital interfaces to real-world robotic systems.

Virtual Applications: Virtual applications are increasingly demanding AI systems with the capability of interpreting and responding to spatial context.

Virtual Assistance Systems. Agentic spatial reasoning is enabling assistance systems to move beyond basic dialogue toward context-aware, physically grounded interaction. Equipped with tools such as Meta’s Project Aria [49], agents can interpret spatial language (e.g., “behind the cabinet”), localize the user, and map relevant objects in real time. This capability supports emerging applications from everyday retail assistance to technical maintenance, where AR devices can highlight precise components directly within the user’s view.

Immersive Virtual and Extended Reality. Agentic spatial reasoning is poised to become a cornerstone of immersive virtual and extended reality (VR/XR), empowering agents to perceive, interpret, and act seamlessly within persistent 3D environments. As industries invest heavily in the metaverse vision, through platforms like Meta Quest [140] and photorealistic systems such as Codec Avatars [139], agents with spatial thinking can bring these worlds to life. They enable NPCs that navigate virtual spaces with human-like awareness, adapt to user positions, and maintain natural, context-rich interactions. This means VR agents can guide human avatars through social hubs and virtual games by leveraging terrain for strategic advantage within a shared workspace.

Embodied Physical Applications: Agentic spatial intelligence holds significant potential for robotics applications, enabling embodied systems to perceive, reason, and act autonomously in complex, unstructured environments. Many modern robots (e.g., Tesla Optimus [191]) have already integrated large foundation models for perception and control, and equipping them with spatial reasoning capabilities would further enhance their ability to plan in dynamic spaces, and adapt behaviors to




Fig. 15. Applications from Agentic Spatial Intelligence, including (a) Virtual and (b) Physical Applications.

complex tasks. This advancement would accelerate the development of versatile robotic platforms capable of operating effectively across service, industrial, and assistive domains.

Embodied Household Assistance. Spatial reasoning enables household robots to understand room layouts, track object locations, and efficiently plan for tasks such as fetching items, rearranging furniture, or assisting with meal preparation. For instance, a robot equipped with LiDAR mapping and semantic perception could navigate to the kitchen, locate a specific mug in a cupboard, and bring it to the user in the living room while avoiding pets and clutter along the way.

Industrial and Manufacture Robot Platform. Spatial intelligence allows industrial robots to map factory floors, coordinate with other machines, and adapt their paths in real time to avoid collisions or bottlenecks. For example, autonomous mobile robots in Amazon warehouses use LiDAR, vision, and predictive path planning to deliver shelves to pickers efficiently, while robotic arms adjust their motions dynamically when working alongside human operators.

Healthcare Assistant Robots. In medical settings, spatial reasoning enables robots to interpret complex room geometries, maintain precise localization, and coordinate movement around patients, staff, and equipment while executing context-specific tasks. For instance, robots can autonomously navigate crowded hospital corridors to deliver medication, reposition equipment in surgical theaters, or assist patients at home by locating and fetching essential items while avoiding obstacles.

4 Future Direction

Based on our proposed computational framework (Sec. 2.2) and recent research gap (RG) of SOTA works (discussed in Sec. 3.1), this section will examine key future research directions for achieving human-like spatial reasoning capability in future agentic systems.

4.1 Bio-inspired Multimodal Sensing

Contemporary AI systems primarily rely on static, pre-defined modality pipelines, lacking the dynamic, context-aware integration found in biological perception (RG-1 in Sec. 3.1.1). To approach human-like spatial intelligence in agents, future research must incorporate both active and passive sensing mechanisms that adaptively attend to task-relevant multimodal inputs.

Biological Spatial Intelligence. Beyond the human-inspired sensory, bio-signals enhanced by Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCI) offer a promising channel for AI spatial intelligence by capturing physiological states for human-agent communication [229], thereby guiding agent spatial behavior (e.g., navigation) [73]. Non-invasive BCI methods utilize brain signals, such as **Electroencephalography (EEG)**, **Magnetoencephalography (MEG)**, **Functional MRI (fMRI)**, each of which offers high temporal/spatial resolution neural recording for AI-driven brain decoding (e.g., visual imagery) [22], leading to immersive human-agent interaction [80]. Parallely, **Electromyography (EMG)**, particularly **Wrist-based surface EMG (sEMG)**, records skeletal muscle activity to decode gestures, effort, and coordination [183], enabling the translation of muscle activity into real-time interfaces for gesture recognition, silent typing, and direct muscular communication [171, 183].

Sensing Framework with Bottom-Up and Top-Down Attention. Developing sensing methods that integrate bottom-up perception driven by salient environmental cues and top-down attention guided by internal goals and task relevance. Such combination allows agents to dynamically prioritize and adapt their sensory intake based on changing contexts, rather than relying solely on static, pre-trained modality pipelines of recent AI methods. Emerging backbone lies in transformer-based attention mechanisms, whose predictive nature and contextual flexibility make them well-suited for modeling both top-down and bottom-up perceptual processes [91].

Brain-inspired Sensing with Spiking-based Encoding. In biological systems, perception is not only multimodal but also inherently time-sensitive, with neural representations shaped by the precise timing of spikes across modalities. Therefore, integrating spiking neural networks (SNNs) into the modality-specific encoders presents a compelling opportunity. With the discrete event-driven spikes feature, combining SNNs with traditional neural networks, such as convolution-based [178] and transformer-based [72], can enhance temporal resolution and contextual reasoning, forming a hybrid processing pipeline that more faithfully captures the richness of human-like perception.

Research Direction 1. Future bio-inspired multimodal sensing systems should integrate dynamic, context-aware attention and event-sensitive neural encoding to achieve human-like spatial perception across varied environments.

4.2 Spatial Perspective Taking

In terms of perspective taking, current AI systems struggle with reliably converting between egocentric and allocentric spatial frames, often treating this transformation as an implicit byproduct rather than modeling it explicitly (RG-2 in Sec. 3.1.2). In contrast, biological systems perform flexible perspective shifts through specialized brain regions, highlighting the need for future spatial reasoning research to develop dedicated mechanisms for such transformations.

Cross-View Learning and Alignment. A key challenge in egocentric–allocentric transformation is the ability to align observations across different viewpoints, particularly when scenes are only partially observed. Cross-view learning offers a pathway for agents to learn viewpoint-invariant spatial representations by contrasting or associating multiple perspectives of the same environment [36]. Emerging backbone techniques include contrastive learning and self-supervised alignment frameworks with contrastive loss of single and multiple viewpoints [53] and DINO-based self-supervised objectives [150] for map-view matching between egocentric and allocentric viewpoints.

Bidirectional Frame Conversion. To support human-like spatial reasoning, agents must be able to flexibly convert between egocentric and allocentric frames in both directions, depending on the task context. This requires architectures that can learn structured spatial transformations and selectively recall or update representations anchored to different reference frames. Promising backbone techniques include transformer-based sequence-to-structure models (e.g., ViT) for structural mapping and attention routing [24], enabling modular and context-aware internal frame switching across perceptual and memory systems.

Research Direction 2. Future spatial perspective-taking systems should develop explicit mechanisms for bidirectional egocentric–allocentric transformations to enable flexible, task-adaptive spatial reasoning across diverse viewpoints.

4.3 Internal Cognitive Map Modelling

Although spatial mapping techniques have advanced, current AI agents still lack an internal model that coherently captures structural and semantic information for general spatial reasoning. In contrast, biological cognitive maps can flexibly illustrate the world via topology, geometry, and episodic context (**RG-3** in Sec. 2.2), highlighting key directions for developing such capabilities in AI agents. Therefore, future research should focus on developing hybrid cognitive map architectures that unify topological, metric, and semantic representations into a flexible and context-aware spatial memory system.

Hybrid Metric-Topological Representation. To navigate effectively, agents must combine the strengths of both metric precision and topological generalisation, just as humans leverage Euclidean distances for fine control and graph-like structures for flexible route planning. However, most current systems isolate these two representations, resulting in either overly rigid or overly abstract behaviours when faced with spatial uncertainty. Unifying these two forms via GNN, enhanced with successor representations or local coordinate anchors, offers a path toward cognitively grounded spatial models that balance generalisation with geometric fidelity [202].

Hierarchical Spatial Abstraction. Human cognition structures space hierarchically, allowing flexible reasoning across scales—from objects in a room to navigating across cities. In contrast, existing AI systems lack such layered abstraction, making their spatial reasoning either too granular or too coarse for complex, goal-directed tasks. As a future direction, Hierarchical graph learning with knowledge graph [93] or graph-based contrastive framework [114] provide a feasible foundation to model this abstraction dynamically, thereby potentially enabling the formation of internal world representation with their robust in-context inference and topological structure.

Context Mapping. To act intelligently, an agent must go beyond geometry and understand what entities are, what they afford, and how they relate to goals—mirroring the semantic grounding found in human spatial cognition. Yet most AI maps are purely geometric, lacking the capacity to bind visual inputs to meaningful, actionable concepts. Integrating the retrieval of spatial memory with auto-regressive architectures such as VLMs and spatially-aware transformers [28], with a decision-making layer using DRL methods can enable dynamic memory mapping with efficient contextual retrieval.

Research Direction 3. Future internal cognitive map systems should develop hybrid architectures that integrate topological, metric, and semantic representations to enable flexible, context-aware spatial reasoning across diverse scales and tasks.

4.4 Adaptive Spatial Memory Systems

As noted in **RG-4** of Sec. 3.1.4, current AI agents rely on shallow or static memory mechanisms that lack semantic binding, episodic recall, or long-term consolidation. In contrast, biological systems leverage a hierarchical memory architecture for flexible recall and continual integration, suggesting future spatial reasoning should move toward dynamic, multi-scale memory models inspired by hippocampal–cortical interactions.

Semantic-Spatial Memory Integration. Robust action planning requires an agent to know not just where things are but also what they are and how they can be used. Therefore, binding semantics to spatial nodes creates long-term knowledge that supports affordance reasoning, and multi-step goal execution. To this end, lingual-based modality serves as the backbone for semantic binding, in which the generalization from recent language models can support the spatial processing via supervised fine-tuning (SFT) [151] or post-training methods (e.g., RLHF, DPO) [151].

Dual-Tier Episodic Architecture. In dynamic space, agents need a fast, high-resolution memory buffer for recent experiences while still retaining condensed traces of older episodes for days or weeks. Therefore, designing a memory architecture that emphasizes both active and static episodic memory is essential for agents, as processing 3D space requires a large amount of resources. Without this split, either the memory overflows or the agent forgets events vital for future reasoning. A hot/cold arrangement mirrors hippocampal replay and enables one-shot learning plus durable recall. A promising future direction for efficient spatial memory in agents is to integrate flexible neural codec compression, leveraging bits-back coding [82] and deep-learning-based entropy models [117] for cold storage of 3D space, with transformer-based memory architectures that support long-context episodic interactions [26].

Continual Memory Update. Deploying agents in the real world requires integrating unfamiliar layouts and objects without degrading existing knowledge. Naïve fine-tuning often leads to catastrophic forgetting, where updated weights overwrite core representations and destabilize navigation. To address this, lifelong learning mechanisms should preserve stable spatial representations while selectively incorporating novel scene information, allowing the map to expand coherently over time. Promising directions include modular memory architectures that localize updates to relevant submodules, preventing global interference, and dynamic capacity allocation via growable or sparsely activated networks to maintain scalability. Predictive coding frameworks can further stabilize learning by guiding updates to minimize sensory prediction errors, ensuring that spatial knowledge is refined consistently as new experiences are acquired.

Consolidation Replay. Humans replay salient experiences during rest to strengthen useful associations and prune noise, a process that agents should emulate. Without replay, semantic-spatial links drift and the map fragments as environments change. Future work should explore saliency-based replay prioritization using reward cues, and generative replay to simulate diverse past experiences [179]. Cross-modal replay can strengthen multimodal associations. Also, integrating replay with temporal credit assignment will enhance reasoning over long-horizon tasks [201].

Research Direction 4. Future adaptive spatial memory systems should develop dynamic, multi-scale architectures inspired by biological processes to enable robust, scalable, and continually updating spatial reasoning across diverse environments.

4.5 Spatial Inference with Predictive Nature

Although strong spatial representations have been developed, a major challenge lies in how agentic systems can actively leverage these representations for efficient and context-aware reasoning (RG-5 in Sec. 3.1.4). To address this, future research should prioritize enabling the predictive nature of spatial representations, forming an interactive world model that simulates potential outcomes and guides decision-making. Moreover, such a world model must be tightly aligned with not only real-world signals but also the human preference to prevent hallucinations and maintain both consistent spatial awareness and trustworthiness throughout spatial reasoning.

Predictive Learning Frameworks. Reasoning improves when the world model can accurately forecast how the cognitive map will evolve after hypothetical moves, supporting shortcut discovery, detour evaluation, and risk-aware planning. By training latent-dynamics models to perform multi-step look-ahead and to expose prediction uncertainty, the agent gains a “mental simulator” that guides decisions before acting. Promising backbones lie on 3D generative modeling (e.g., Genie 3 [37] and visual predictive learning [108], in which the former can model the 3D world, providing the agents capability of understanding the 3D environment, while the latter enable the visual-centric predictive manner for agentic’s spatial reasoning, mimic the predictive nature of human brain.

Spatial-aware Explicit Alignment. Even a well-trained world model can falter when its internal representations drift from the underlying geometry and semantics established by earlier mapping stages. To ensure consistency across perception, memory, and reasoning, explicit alignment mechanisms are essential. **Incorporating spatial-equivariant architectures or post-training alignment objectives that tether reasoning embeddings to ground-truth topology and view-point transformations enhances multi-step inference and mitigates hallucination.** Future agents can further benefit from spatial-centric backbones such as Visual-of-Thought (VoT) [111] and preference optimization with spatial task-centric [210], where structured alignment is learned through reasoning-guided preference feedback over spatial tasks.

Affective Reasoning. In addition to physical and causal knowledge, humans use emotional and social commonsense to anticipate intentions and adapt behavior. Affective reasoning allows agents to interpret “why” actions are taken, not just “what” is possible. For example, people tend to avoid collisions, follow social norms, and move toward goals they value [124]. By integrating affective priors with the predictive world model, the agent can infer motivations, model social dynamics, and adapt reasoning strategies accordingly [85]. **Neurosymbolic affective knowledge** bases such as SenticNet [19] provide the structured representation needed to encode these priors, enabling richer, human-aligned spatial reasoning in complex environments.

Research Direction 5. Future spatial thinking systems should develop predictive, interactive world models aligned with real-world and human preferences to enable trustworthy, context-aware reasoning and planning across dynamic environments.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we proposed a conceptual computational framework through the lens of neuroscience framework for Agentic Spatial Intelligence, paving the way to achieve the human spatial intelligence in agentic systems. Following the neuroscience foundations, we defined the category of spatial reasoning behaviours through the basis of neuroscience models. Building upon these components, we conducted a framework-oriented analysis on recent representative works, identifying gaps and limitations in current approaches from a neurocognitive perspective. In addition, we systematically reviewed and categorized recent benchmarks and datasets based on our defined spatial reasoning behaviours, offering a cognitively grounded lens for evaluating agentic spatial reasoning. Finally, we outlined future research directions for each module, highlighting promising techniques that align with both biological principles and emerging machine learning paradigms. Altogether, this work offers a general perspective that providing a landscape to structure the design of spatial reasoning, paving a principled path toward building agents capable of flexible, human-aligned spatial intelligence.

References

- [1] Michael Ahn, Anthony Brohan, Noah Brown, Yevgen Chebotar, Omar Cortes, Byron David, Chelsea Finn, Chuyuan Fu, Keerthana Gopalakrishnan, Karol Hausman, et al. 2022. Do as i can, not as i say: Grounding language in robotic affordances. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01691* (2022).
- [2] Hassan Akbari, Liangzhe Yuan, Rui Qian, Wei-Hong Chuang, Shih-Fu Chang, Yin Cui, and Boqing Gong. 2021. Vatt: Transformers for multimodal self-supervised learning from raw video, audio and text. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), 24206–24221.
- [3] Fayçal Ait Aoudia, Jakob Hoydis, Merlin Nimier-David, Sebastian Cammerer, and Alexander Keller. 2025. Sionna RT: Technical Report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.21719* (2025).
- [4] Iro Armeni, Zhi-Yang He, JunYoung Gwak, Amir R Zamir, Martin Fischer, Jitendra Malik, and Silvio Savarese. 2019. 3D Scene Graph: A Structure for Unified Semantics, 3D Space, and Camera. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*. 5664–5673.

- [5] Armen Avetisyan, Manuel Dahnert, Angela Dai, Manolis Savva, Angel X Chang, and Matthias Nießner. 2019. Scan2cad: Learning cad model alignment in rgb-d scans. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2614–2623.
- [6] Andrea Banino, Caswell Barry, Benigno Uria, Charles Blundell, Timothy Lillicrap, Piotr Mirowski, Alexander Pritzel, Martin J Chadwick, Thomas Degris, Joseph Modayil, et al. 2018. Vector-based navigation using grid-like representations in artificial agents. *Nature* 557, 7705 (2018), 429–433.
- [7] Gilad Baruch, Zhuoyuan Chen, Afshin Dehghan, Yuri Feigin, Peter Fu, Thomas Gebauer, et al. 2021. ARKitScenes: A Diverse Real-World Dataset For 3D Indoor Scene Understanding Using Mobile RGB-D Data. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- [8] Peter W Battaglia, Jessica B Hamrick, Victor Bapst, Alvaro Sanchez-Gonzalez, Vinicius Zambaldi, Mateusz Malinowski, Andrea Tacchetti, David Raposo, Adam Santoro, Ryan Faulkner, et al. 2018. Relational inductive biases, deep learning, and graph networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01261* (2018).
- [9] Tristan Baumann and Hanspeter A Mallot. 2023. Metric information in cognitive maps: Euclidean embedding of non-Euclidean environments. *PLOS Computational Biology* 19, 12 (2023), e1011748.
- [10] Michael S Beauchamp, Kathryn E Lee, Brenna D Argall, and Alex Martin. 2004. Integration of auditory and visual information about objects in superior temporal sulcus. *Neuron* 41, 5 (2004), 809–823.
- [11] Raunaq Bhirangi, Tess Hellebrekers, Carmel Majidi, and Abhinav Gupta. 2022. ReSkin: versatile, replaceable, lasting tactile skins. In *Conference on Robot Learning*. 587–597.
- [12] Mahtab Bigverdi, Zelun Luo, Cheng-Yu Hsieh, Ethan Shen, Dongping Chen, Linda G Shapiro, and Ranjay Krishna. 2025. Perception tokens enhance visual reasoning in multimodal language models. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*. 3836–3845.
- [13] Jennifer K Bizley and Yale E Cohen. 2013. The what, where and how of auditory-object perception. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 14, 10 (2013), 693–707. doi:10.1038/nrn3565
- [14] Florian Bordes, Quentin Garrido, Justine T Kao, Adina Williams, Michael Rabbat, and Emmanuel Dupoux. 2025. IntPhys 2: Benchmarking Intuitive Physics Understanding In Complex Synthetic Environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.09849* (2025).
- [15] Randy L Buckner, Jessica R Andrews-Hanna, and Daniel L Schacter. 2008. The brain’s default network: anatomy, function, and relevance to disease. *Annals of the new York Academy of Sciences* 1124, 1 (2008), 1–38.
- [16] Neil Burgess. 2008. Spatial cognition and the brain. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1124, 1 (2008), 77–97.
- [17] Patrick Byrne, Suzanna Becker, and Neil Burgess. 2007. Remembering the past and imagining the future: a neural model of spatial memory and imagery. *Psychological review* 114, 2 (2007), 340.
- [18] Erik Cambria, Rui Mao, Melvin Chen, Zhaoxia Wang, and Seng-Beng Ho. 2023. Seven Pillars for the Future of Artificial Intelligence. *IEEE Intelligent Systems* 38, 6 (2023), 62–69.
- [19] Erik Cambria, Rui Mao, Xulang Zhang, Luwei Xiao, Tiesunlong Shen, and Avinash Anand. 2026. SenticNet 9: Generative Commonsense for Emotion AI via Conceptual Primitive Discovery and Time Shift Mechanism. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems* 13 (2026).
- [20] Sebastian Cammerer, Guillermo Marcus, Tobias Zirr, Fayçal Ait Aoudia, et al. 2025. Sionna Research Kit: A GPU-Accelerated Research Platform for AI-RAN. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.15848* (2025).
- [21] Vincent Cartillier, Zhile Ren, Neha Jain, Stefan Lee, Irfan Essa, and Dhruv Batra. 2021. Semantic MapNet: Building Allocentric Semantic Maps and Representations from Egocentric Views. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 35, 2 (2021), 964–972. doi:10.1609/aaai.v35i2.16180
- [22] Geeling Chau, Christopher Wang, Sabera Talukder, Vighnesh Subramaniam, Saraswati Soedarmadji, Yisong Yue, Boris Katz, and Andrei Barbu. 2025. Population transformer: Learning population-level representations of neural activity. *ArXiv* (2025), arXiv–2406.
- [23] Changan Chen, Unnat Jain, Carl Schissler, Sebastia Vicenc Amengual Gari, Ziad Al-Halah, Vamsi Krishna Ithapu, Philip Robinson, and Kristen Grauman. 2020. Soundspaces: Audio-visual navigation in 3d environments. In *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 17–36.
- [24] Chang Chen, Jiaming Zhang, Kailun Yang, Kunyu Peng, and Rainer Stiefelhagen. 2023. Trans4Map: Revisiting holistic bird’s-eye-view mapping from egocentric images to allocentric semantics with vision transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 4013–4022.
- [25] Shiqi Chen, Tongyao Zhu, Ruochen Zhou, Jinghan Zhang, Siyang Gao, Juan Carlos Niebles, Mor Geva, Junxian He, Jiajun Wu, and Manling Li. 2025. Why is spatial reasoning hard for vlms? an attention mechanism perspective on focus areas. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.01773* (2025).
- [26] Yinpeng Chen, DeLesley Hutchins, Aren Jansen, Andrey Zhmoginov, David Racz, and Jesper Andersen. 2024. Melodi: Exploring memory compression for long contexts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.03156* (2024).
- [27] Hongrong Cheng, Miao Zhang, and Javen Qinfeng Shi. 2024. A survey on deep neural network pruning: Taxonomy, comparison, analysis, and recommendations. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (2024).

- [28] Junmo Cho, Jaesik Yoon, and Sungjin Ahn. 2024. Spatially-Aware Transformer for Embodied Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15160* (2024).
- [29] Sanjoy Chowdhury, Sayan Nag, Subhrajyoti Dasgupta, Jun Chen, Mohamed Elhoseiny, Ruohan Gao, and Dinesh Manocha. 2024. Meerkat: Audio-visual large language model for grounding in space and time. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 52–70.
- [30] Nam Hoai Chu, Diep N Nguyen, Dinh Thai Hoang, et al. 2023. AI-enabled mm-Waveform configuration for autonomous vehicles with integrated communication and sensing. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 10, 19 (2023), 16727–16743.
- [31] Xinru Cui, Qiming Liu, Zhe Liu, and Hesheng Wang. 2024. Frontier-Enhanced Topological Memory with Improved Exploration Awareness for Embodied Visual Navigation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. 296–313.
- [32] Vedant Dave et al. 2024. Multimodal visual-tactile representation learning through self-supervised contrastive pre-training. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 8013–8020.
- [33] Robert David, Jared Duke, Advait Jain, et al. 2021. Tensorflow lite micro: Embedded machine learning for tinyml systems. *Proceedings of machine learning and systems* 3 (2021), 800–811.
- [34] Mike Davies, Narayan Srinivasa, Tsung-Han Lin, Gautham China, et al. 2018. Loihi: A neuromorphic manycore processor with on-chip learning. *Ieee Micro* 38, 1 (2018), 82–99.
- [35] Pooya Davoodi, Chul Gwon, Guangda Lai, and Trevor Morris. 2019. Tensorrt inference with tensorflow. In *GPU Technology Conference*.
- [36] Soumyaratna Debnath, Ashish Tiwari, Kaustubh Sadekar, and Shanmuganathan Raman. 2025. RASP: Revisiting 3D Anamorphic Art for Shadow-Guided Packing of Irregular Objects. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*. 5849–5858.
- [37] Deepmind. 2025. Genie 3: A new frontier for world models. <https://deepmind.google/discover/blog/genie-3-a-new-frontier-for-world-models/> Accessed: July, 30, 2025.
- [38] Matt Deitke, Ruoshi Liu, Matthew Wallingford, Huong Ngo, Oscar Michel, Aditya Kusupati, Alan Fan, Christian Laforte, Vikram Voleti, Samir Yitzhak Gadre, et al. 2023. Objaverse-xl: A universe of 10m+ 3d objects. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 35799–35813.
- [39] Joseph Del Rosario, Stefano Coletta, Soon Ho Kim, Zach Mobbille, Kayla Peelman, Brice Williams, et al. 2025. Lateral inhibition in V1 controls neural and perceptual contrast sensitivity. *Nature Neuroscience* (2025), 1–12.
- [40] Mark D’Esposito and Bradley R Postle. 2015. The cognitive neuroscience of working memory. *Annual review of psychology* 66, 1 (2015), 115–142.
- [41] Christian F Doeller, Caswell Barry, and Neil Burgess. 2010. Evidence for grid cells in a human memory network. *Nature* 463, 7281 (2010), 657–661.
- [42] Yadin Dudai, Avi Karni, and Jan Born. 2015. The consolidation and transformation of memory. *Neuron* 88, 1 (2015), 20–32.
- [43] Alexander Dupuy, Jed Schwartz, Yechiam Yemini, and David Bacon. 1990. NEST: A network simulation and prototyping testbed. *Commun. ACM* 33, 10 (1990), 63–74.
- [44] Zane Durante, Qiuyuan Huang, Naoki Wake, Ran Gong, Jae Sung Park, Bidipta Sarkar, Rohan Taori, Yusuke Noda, Demetri Terzopoulos, Yejin Choi, et al. 2024. Agent ai: Surveying the horizons of multimodal interaction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03568* (2024).
- [45] Ainaz Eftekhari, Kuo-Hao Zeng, Jiafei Duan, Ali Farhadi, Aniruddha Kembhavi, and Ranjay Krishna. 2024. Selective Visual Representations Improve Convergence and Generalization for Embodied AI. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [46] Howard Eichenbaum. 1997. Declarative memory: Insights from cognitive neurobiology. *Annual review of psychology* 48, 1 (1997), 547–572.
- [47] Howard Eichenbaum, Andrew P Yonelinas, and Charan Ranganath. 2007. The medial temporal lobe and recognition memory. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* 30, 1 (2007), 123–152.
- [48] Gary W Elko and Jürgen Meyer. 2008. Microphone arrays. In *Springer Handbook of Speech Processing*, Jacob Benesty, M. Mohan Sondhi, and Yiteng Huang (Eds.). Springer, 1021–1041. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-49127-9_49
- [49] Jakob Engel, Kiran Somasundaram, Michael Goesele, Albert Sun, Alexander Gamino, Andrew Turner, et al. 2023. Project aria: A new tool for egocentric multi-modal ai research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.13561* (2023).
- [50] Huajian Fang, Niklas Wittmer, Johannes Twiefel, Stefan Wermter, and Timo Gerkmann. 2023. Partially adaptive multichannel joint reduction of ego-noise and environmental noise. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [51] Kuan Fang, Alexander Toshev, Li Fei-Fei, and Silvio Savarese. 2019. Scene memory transformer for embodied agents in long-horizon tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 538–547.
- [52] Yao Feng, Jing Lin, Sai Kumar Dwivedi, Yu Sun, Priyanka Patel, and Michael J Black. 2024. Chatpose: Chatting about 3d human pose. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2093–2103.

- [53] Markus Frey, Christian F Doeller, and Caswell Barry. 2023. Probing neural representations of scene perception in a hippocampally dependent task using artificial neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2113–2121.
- [54] Karl Friston. 2010. The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 11, 2 (2010), 127–138.
- [55] Karl Friston, James Kilner, and Lee Harrison. 2006. A free energy principle for the brain. *Journal of Physiology-Paris* 100, 1-3 (2006), 70–87.
- [56] Karl J Friston, Thomas Parr, and Bert de Vries. 2017. The graphical brain: Belief propagation and active inference. *Network neuroscience* 1, 4 (2017), 381–414.
- [57] Letian Fu, Gaurav Datta, Huang Huang, William Chung-Ho Panitch, Jaimyn Drake, Joseph Ortiz, Mustafa Mukadam, Mike Lambeta, Roberto Calandra, and Ken Goldberg. 2024. A Touch, Vision, and Language Dataset for Multimodal Alignment. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 14080–14101.
- [58] Steve Furber and Petruț Bogdan. 2020. *Spinnaker-a spiking neural network architecture*. Now publishers.
- [59] Chuang Gan, Jeremy Schwartz, Seth Alter, Damian Mrowca, Martin Schrimpf, James Traer, et al. 2020. Threedworld: A platform for interactive multi-modal physical simulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.04954* (2020).
- [60] Chuang Gan, Yiwei Zhang, Jiajun Wu, Boqing Gong, and Joshua B. Tenenbaum. 2020. Look, Listen, and Act: Towards Audio-Visual Embodied Navigation. In *ICRA*.
- [61] Morteza Ghahremani Bozandani and Christian Wachinger. 2023. Regbn: Batch normalization of multimodal data with regularization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 21687–21701.
- [62] Asif A Ghazanfar and Charles E Schroeder. 2006. Is neocortex essentially multisensory? *Trends in cognitive sciences* 10, 6 (2006), 278–285.
- [63] Andrey Gizdov, Shimon Ullman, and Daniel Harari. 2025. Seeing More with Less: Human-like Representations in Vision Models. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*. 4408–4417.
- [64] P.S Goldman-Rakic. 1995. Cellular basis of working memory. *Neuron* 14, 3 (1995), 477–485.
- [65] Google. [n. d.]. Coral Edge TPU Products. Online. <https://coral.ai>.
- [66] Google. 2025. Gemini CLI: your open-source AI agent. <https://blog.google/technology/developers/introducing-gemini-cli-open-source-ai-agent/> Accessed: July. 30, 2025.
- [67] Gracjan Góral, Alicja Ziarko, Michał Nauman, and Maciej Wołczyk. 2024. Seeing Through Their Eyes: Evaluating Visual Perspective Taking in Vision Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12969* (2024).
- [68] James Gornet and Matt Thomson. 2024. Automated construction of cognitive maps with visual predictive coding. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 6, 7 (2024), 820–833.
- [69] Kristen Grauman, Andrew Westbury, Lorenzo Torresani, Kris Kitani, Jitendra Malik, Triantafyllos Afouras, et al. 2024. Ego-exo4d: Understanding skilled human activity from first-and third-person perspectives. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 19383–19400.
- [70] Alex Graves, Greg Wayne, Malcolm Reynolds, Tim Harley, Ivo Danihelka, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwińska, et al. 2016. Hybrid computing using a neural network with dynamic external memory. *Nature* 538, 7626 (2016), 471–476.
- [71] Madeleine Grunde-McLaughlin, Ranjay Krishna, et al. 2021. Agqa: A benchmark for compositional spatio-temporal reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 11287–11297.
- [72] Lingyue Guo, Zeyu Gao, Jinye Qu, Suiwu Zheng, Runhao Jiang, Yanfeng Lu, and Hong Qiao. 2023. Transformer-based spiking neural networks for multimodal audiovisual classification. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems* 16, 3 (2023), 1077–1086.
- [73] Zhanqiang Guo, Jiamin Wu, Yonghao Song, Jiahui Bu, Weijian Mai, Qihao Zheng, Wanli Ouyang, and Chunfeng Song. 2025. Neuro-3D: Towards 3D visual decoding from EEG signals. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*. 23870–23880.
- [74] Danijar Hafner, Jurgis Pasukonis, Jimmy Ba, and Timothy Lillicrap. 2023. Mastering diverse domains through world models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.04104* (2023).
- [75] Torkel Hafting, Marianne Fyhn, Sturla Molden, May-Britt Moser, and Edvard I Moser. 2005. Microstructure of a spatial map in the entorhinal cortex. *Nature* 436, 7052 (2005), 801–806.
- [76] Michael L Hammock, Alexander Chortos, Benjamin CK Tee, Jeffrey BH Tok, and Zhenan Bao. 2013. 25th anniversary article: The evolution of electronic skin (e-skin): A brief history, design considerations, and recent progress. *Advanced Materials* 25, 42 (2013), 5997–6038.
- [77] Demis Hassabis and Eleanor A Maguire. 2007. Deconstructing episodic memory with construction. *Trends in cognitive sciences* 11, 7 (2007), 299–306.
- [78] Hananel Hazan, Daniel J Saunders, Hassaan Khan, Devdhar Patel, Darpan T Sanghavi, Hava T Siegelmann, and Robert Kozma. 2018. Bindnet: A machine learning-oriented spiking neural networks library in python. *Frontiers in neuroinformatics* 12 (2018), 89.

- [79] Quentin Herau, Nathan Piasco, Moussab Bennehar, Luis Roldao, Dzmitry Tsishkou, Cyrille Migniot, Pascal Vasseur, and Cédric Demonceaux. 2024. Soac: Spatio-temporal overlap-aware multi-sensor calibration using neural radiance fields. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 15131–15140.
- [80] Nguyen Quang Hieu, Dinh Thai Hoang, Diep N. Nguyen, Van-Dinh Nguyen, Yong Xiao, and Eryk Dutkiewicz. 2024. Enhancing Immersion and Presence in the Metaverse With Over-the-Air Brain-Computer Interface. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications* 23, 12 (2024), 18532–18548.
- [81] Nguyen Quang Hieu, Dinh Thai Hoang, Dusit Niyato, Diep N Nguyen, Dong In Kim, and Abbas Jamalipour. 2023. Joint power allocation and rate control for rate splitting multiple access networks with covert communications. *IEEE Transactions on Communications* 71, 4 (2023), 2274–2287.
- [82] Nguyen Quang Hieu, Minh Nguyen, Dinh Thai Hoang, Diep N Nguyen, and Eryk Dutkiewicz. 2024. Point Cloud Compression with Bits-back Coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18115* (2024).
- [83] Stephen C Hirtle and John Jonides. 1985. Evidence of hierarchies in cognitive maps. *Memory & cognition* 13, 3 (1985), 208–217.
- [84] Tomas Hodan, Frank Michel, Eric Brachmann, Wadim Kehl, Anders GlentBuch, Dirk Kraft, Bertram Drost, Joel Vidal, Stephan Ihrke, Xenophon Zabulis, et al. 2018. Bop: Benchmark for 6d object pose estimation. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*. 19–34.
- [85] Newton Howard and Erik Cambria. 2013. Intention awareness: Improving upon situation awareness in human-centric environments. *Human-centric Computing and Information Sciences* 3, 9 (2013).
- [86] Binghao Huang, Yixuan Wang, Xinyi Yang, Yiyue Luo, and Yunzhu Li. 2025. 3D-ViTac: Learning Fine-Grained Manipulation with Visuo-Tactile Sensing. In *Conference on Robot Learning*. 2557–2578.
- [87] Yinghao Huang, Manuel Kaufmann, Emre Aksan, Michael J Black, Otmar Hilliges, and Gerard Pons-Moll. 2018. Deep inertial poser: Learning to reconstruct human pose from sparse inertial measurements in real time. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)* 37, 6 (2018), 1–15.
- [88] Yinghao Huang, Manuel Kaufmann, Emre Aksan, Michael J. Black, Otmar Hilliges, and Gerard Pons-Moll. 2018. Deep Inertial Poser Learning to Reconstruct Human Pose from Sparse Inertial Measurements in Real Time. *ACM Transactions on Graphics, (Proc. SIGGRAPH Asia)* 37, 6 (Nov. 2018), 185:1–185:15.
- [89] Intel. [n. d.]. Intel Movidius Myriad X VPU. Online. <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/products/sku/125926/intel-movidius-myriad-x-vision-processing-unit-4gb/specifications.html>.
- [90] Lucia F Jacobs and Françoise Schenk. 2003. Unpacking the cognitive map: the parallel map theory of hippocampal function. *Psychological review* 110, 2 (2003), 285.
- [91] Ayush Jain, Nikolaos Gkanatsios, Ishita Mediratta, and Katerina Fragkiadaki. 2022. Bottom up top down detection transformers for language grounding in images and point clouds. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 417–433.
- [92] Bo Jiang, Yao Lu, Guangming Lu, and Bob Zhang. 2024. QFormer: An efficient quaternion transformer for image denoising. In *Proc. 33rd Int. Joint Conf. Artif. Intell.* 4237–4245.
- [93] Pengcheng Jiang, Lang Cao, Cao Danica Xiao, Parminder Bhatia, et al. 2024. Kg-fit: Knowledge graph fine-tuning upon open-world knowledge. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37 (2024), 136220–136258.
- [94] Tian Jin, Gheorghe-Teodor Bercea, Tung D Le, Tong Chen, Gong Su, Haruki Imai, et al. 2020. Compiling onnx neural network models using mlir. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.08272* (2020).
- [95] Roland S Johansson and J Randall Flanagan. 2009. Coding and use of tactile signals from the fingertips in object manipulation tasks. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 10, 5 (2009), 345–359.
- [96] Justin Johnson, Bharath Hariharan, Laurens Van Der Maaten, Li Fei-Fei, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Ross Girshick. 2017. Clevr: A diagnostic dataset for compositional language and elementary visual reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2901–2910.
- [97] Charles C. Kemp, Aaron Edsinger, and Eduardo R. Torres-Jara. 2007. Challenges for robot manipulation in human environments. *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine* 14, 1 (2007), 20–29. doi:10.1109/MRA.2007.339605
- [98] Amirhossein Khalilian-Gourtani, Ran Wang, Xupeng Chen, Leyao Yu, Patricia Dugan, Daniel Friedman, Werner Doyle, Orrin Devinsky, Yao Wang, and Adeen Flinker. 2024. A corollary discharge circuit in human speech. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 121, 50 (2024), e2404121121.
- [99] Sungmin Kim, Cecilia Laschi, and Barry Trimmer. 2016. Soft skin for tactile sensing. *Advanced Materials* 28, 22 (2016), 4560–4572. doi:10.1002/adma.201505115
- [100] Diederik Kingma, Tim Salimans, Ben Poole, and Jonathan Ho. 2021. Variational diffusion models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), 21696–21707.
- [101] David C Knill and Alexandre Pouget. 2004. The Bayesian brain: the role of uncertainty in neural coding and computation. *TRENDS in Neurosciences* 27, 12 (2004), 712–719.
- [102] Eric Kolve, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Winson Han, Eli Vanderbilt, Luca Weihs, Alvaro Herrasti, et al. 2017. Ai2-thor: An interactive 3d environment for visual ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.05474* (2017).

- [103] Anton Komarichev et al. 2022. Polyglot: Learning a Coordinated Semantic-Geometric Latent Space for Multimodal Agents. *Computer Aided Geometric Design* (2022).
- [104] Benjamin Kuipers. 1978. Modeling spatial knowledge. *Cognitive science* 2, 2 (1978), 129–153.
- [105] Yuzhi Lai, Shenghai Yuan, Boya Zhang, Benjamin Kiefer, Peizheng Li, and Andreas Zell. 2025. FAM-HRI: Foundation-Model Assisted Multi-Modal Human-Robot Interaction Combining Gaze and Speech. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.16492* (2025).
- [106] Mike Lambeta, Shuwen Chou, Rui Tian, et al. 2020. DIGIT: A novel compact high-resolution tactile sensor for dexterous manipulation. In *Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS)*.
- [107] Kun Lan, Haoran Li, Haolin Shi, Wenjun Wu, Lin Wang, and Yong Liao. 2024. 2d-guided 3d gaussian segmentation. In *2024 Asian Conference on Communication and Networks (ASIANComNet)*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [108] Yann LeCun. 2022. A path towards autonomous machine intelligence version 0.9. 2, 2022-06-27. *Open Review* 62, 1 (2022), 1–62.
- [109] Phillip Y. Lee, Jihyeon Je, Chanhok Park, Mikaela Angelina Uy, Leonidas Guibas, and Minhyuk Sung. 2025. Perspective-Aware Reasoning in Vision-Language Models via Mental Imagery Simulation. In *CVPR*.
- [110] Stefan Leutgeb, Jill K Leutgeb, Carol A Barnes, Edvard I Moser, et al. 2005. Independent codes for spatial and episodic memory in hippocampal neuronal ensembles. *Science* 309, 5734 (2005), 619–623.
- [111] Chengzu Li, Wenshan Wu, Huanyu Zhang, Yan Xia, Shaoguang Mao, Li Dong, et al. 2025. Imagine While Reasoning in Space: Multimodal Visualization-of-Thought. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [112] Chengshu Li, Fei Xia, Roberto Martín-Martín, Michael Lingelbach, Sanjana Srivastava, Bokui Shen, Kent Elliott Vainio, Cem Gokmen, Gokul Dharan, Tanish Jain, et al. 2022. iGibson 2.0: Object-Centric Simulation for Robot Learning of Everyday Household Tasks. In *Conference on Robot Learning*. 455–465.
- [113] Haoran Li, Haolin Shi, Wenli Zhang, Wenjun Wu, Yong Liao, Lin Wang, Lik-hang Lee, and Peng Yuan Zhou. 2024. Dreamscene: 3d gaussian-based text-to-3d scene generation via formation pattern sampling. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 214–230.
- [114] Jiangmeng Li, Yifan Jin, Hang Gao, Wenwen Qiang, Changwen Zheng, and Fuchun Sun. 2024. Hierarchical topology isomorphism expertise embedded graph contrastive learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 13518–13527.
- [115] Jinzhou Li, Tianhao Wu, Jiyao Zhang, et al. 2025. Adaptive Visuo-Tactile Fusion with Predictive Force Attention for Dexterous Manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.13982* (2025).
- [116] Shengyu Li, Shulong Chen, et al. 2025. Accurate and automatic spatiotemporal calibration for multi-modal sensor system based on continuous-time optimization. *Information Fusion* 120 (2025), 103071.
- [117] Sicheng Li, Hao Li, Yiyi Liao, and Lu Yu. 2024. Nerfcodec: Neural feature compression meets neural radiance fields for memory-efficient scene representation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 21274–21283.
- [118] Zhiqi Li, Wenhui Wang, Hongyang Li, Enze Xie, Chonghao Sima, Tong Lu, Qiao Yu, and Jifeng Dai. 2024. Bevformer: learning bird’s-eye-view representation from lidar-camera via spatiotemporal transformers. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (2024).
- [119] Zhong-Zhi Li, Duzhen Zhang, Ming-Liang Zhang, Jiabin Zhang, Zengyan Liu, Yuxuan Yao, Haotian Xu, Junhao Zheng, Pei-Jie Wang, Xiuyi Chen, et al. 2025. From system 1 to system 2: A survey of reasoning large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.17419* (2025).
- [120] Wei Yang Bryan Lim, Nguyen Cong Luong, Dinh Thai Hoang, Yutao Jiao, Ying-Chang Liang, Qiang Yang, Dusit Niyato, and Chunyan Miao. 2020. Federated learning in mobile edge networks: A comprehensive survey. *IEEE communications surveys & tutorials* 22, 3 (2020), 2031–2063.
- [121] Changyi Lin, Han Zhang, et al. 2023. 9dtact: A compact vision-based tactile sensor for accurate 3d shape reconstruction and generalizable 6d force estimation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters* 9, 2 (2023), 923–930.
- [122] Wang Lin and Wang Liang. 2017. Neural Circuit Basis of Cognitive Map. *SCI, CA, Scopis, AJ* 44, 3 (2017), 187.
- [123] Fangchen Liu, Chuanyu Li, Yihua Qin, Ankit Shaw, Jing Xu, Pieter Abbeel, and Rui Chen. 2025. Vitamin: Learning contact-rich tasks through robot-free visuo-tactile manipulation interface. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.06156* (2025).
- [124] Hao Liu, Runguo Wei, Geng Tu, Jiali Lin, Dazhi Jiang, and Erik Cambria. 2025. Knowing What and Why: Causal Emotion Entailment for Emotion Recognition in Conversations. *Expert Systems with Applications* 274 (2025), 126924.
- [125] Jian Liu, Xiongtao Shi, Thai Duy Nguyen, Haitian Zhang, et al. 2025. Neural Brain: A Neuroscience-inspired Framework for Embodied Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.07634* (2025).
- [126] Jian Liu, Wei Sun, et al. 2023. Robotic Continuous Grasping System by Shape Transformer-Guided Multiobject Category-Level 6-D Pose Estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics* 19, 11 (2023), 11171–11181.
- [127] Jian Liu, Wei Sun, Hui Yang, Pengchao Deng, Chongpei Liu, et al. 2025. Diff9d: Diffusion-based domain-generalized category-level 9-dof object pose estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (2025).

- [128] Jian Liu, Wei Sun, Hui Yang, Zhiwen Zeng, Chongpei Liu, et al. 2024. Deep Learning-Based Object Pose Estimation: A Comprehensive Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07801* (2024).
- [129] Zinan Liu, Haoran Li, Jingyi Lu, et al. 2025. Nature’s Insight: A Novel Framework and Comprehensive Analysis of Agentic Reasoning Through the Lens of Neuroscience. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.05515* (2025).
- [130] Matthew Loper, Naureen Mahmood, Javier Romero, Gerard Pons-Moll, and Michael J Black. 2015. SMPL: a skinned multi-person linear model. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)* 34, 6 (2015), 1–16.
- [131] Haodong Lu, Xinyu Zhang, Kristen Moore, Jason Xue, et al. 2025. Continual Learning on CLIP via Incremental Prompt Tuning with Intrinsic Textual Anchors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.20680* (2025).
- [132] Chenyang Ma, Kai Lu, Ta-Ying Cheng, Niki Trigoni, and Andrew Markham. 2024. SpatialPIN: Enhancing Spatial Reasoning Capabilities of Vision-Language Models through Prompting and Interacting 3D Priors. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- [133] Wufei Ma, Haoyu Chen, Guofeng Zhang, Yu-Cheng Chou, Celso M de Melo, and Alan Yuille. 2024. 3dsrbench: A comprehensive 3d spatial reasoning benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.07825* (2024).
- [134] Naureen Mahmood, Nima Ghorbani, et al. 2019. AMASS: Archive of motion capture as surface shapes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 5442–5451.
- [135] Rui Mao, Guanyi Chen, Xiao Li, Mengshi Ge, and Erik Cambria. 2025. A Comparative Analysis of Metaphorical Cognition in ChatGPT and Human Minds. *Cognitive Computation* 17 (2025), 35.
- [136] Rui Mao, Guanyi Chen, Xulang Zhang, Frank Guerin, and Erik Cambria. 2024. GPTEval: A Survey on Assessments of ChatGPT and GPT-4. In *LREC-COLING*. 7844–7866.
- [137] Rui Mao, Qian Liu, Xiao Li, Erik Cambria, and Amir Hussain. 2025. Bridging Minds and Machines: Toward an Integration of AI and Cognitive Science. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.20674* (2025).
- [138] Tobias Meilinger et al. 2016. Qualitative differences in memory for vista and environmental spaces are caused by opaque borders, not movement or successive presentation. *Cognition* 155 (2016), 77–95.
- [139] Meta Platforms, Inc. 2025. Codec Avatars: Meta Immersive Telepresence. <https://www.meta.com/emerging-tech/codec-avatars/>. Accessed: 2025-08-21.
- [140] Meta Platforms, Inc. 2025. Meta Quest Virtual Reality Headset. <https://www.meta.com/quest/>. Accessed: 2025-08-21.
- [141] John C Middlebrooks and David M Green. 1991. Sound localization by human listeners. *Annual Review of Psychology* 42 (1991), 135–159. doi:10.1146/annurev.ps.42.020191.001031
- [142] Edvard I Moser, Emilio Kropff, and May-Britt Moser. 2008. Place cells, grid cells, and the brain’s spatial representation system. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* 31, 1 (2008), 69–89.
- [143] NVIDIA Corporation. 2023. Jetson Orin Nano Series. Online. <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/autonomous-machines/embedded-systems/>.
- [144] NVIDIA Corporation. 2025. NVIDIA Aerial Expands With New Tools for Building AI-Native Wireless Networks. Online. <https://blogs.nvidia.com/blog/aerial-telecom-research/>.
- [145] John O’Keefe and Jonathan Dostrovsky. 1971. The hippocampus as a spatial map: preliminary evidence from unit activity in the freely-moving rat. *Brain research* (1971).
- [146] John O’Keefe and Jonathan Dostrovsky. 1971. The hippocampus as a spatial map: preliminary evidence from unit activity in the freely-moving rat. *Brain research* (1971).
- [147] J O’Keefe and L Nadel. 1978. The Hippocampus as a Cognitive Map.
- [148] Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. 2018. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748* (2018).
- [149] OpenAI. 2025. Introducing ChatGPT agent: bridging research and action. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-chatgpt-agent/> Accessed: July. 30, 2025.
- [150] Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy Vo, Marc Szafraniec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, et al. 2023. Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07193* (2023).
- [151] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 27730–27744.
- [152] Allan Paivio. 2013. *Imagery and verbal processes*. Psychology Press.
- [153] Yong-Lae Park, Carmel Majidi, Rebecca K. Kramer, Pascal Bérard, and Robert J. Wood. 2010. Hyperelastic pressure sensing with a liquid-embedded elastomer. *Advanced Functional Materials* 20, 21 (2010), 3547–3555.
- [154] Alexander Pashevich, Cordelia Schmid, and Chen Sun. 2021. Episodic transformer for vision-and-language navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 15942–15952.
- [155] Eva Zita Patai and Hugo J Spiers. 2021. The versatile wayfinder: prefrontal contributions to spatial navigation. *Trends in cognitive sciences* 25, 6 (2021), 520–533.

- [156] Matthew J Pearson, Michael H Evans, and Robert Trew. 2007. A biomimetic whisker for robots. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ASME International Conference on Advanced Intelligent Mechatronics*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [157] Roberto Pegurri, Eugenio Moro, Francesco Linsalata, Jakob Hoydis, and Umberto Spagnolini. 2025. Towards Digital Network Twins: Full-Stack and Multi-Stack Solution for 6G Simulations. In *2025 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*. IEEE, 1–3.
- [158] Christian-Gernot Pehle and Jens Egholm Pedersen. 2021. Norse-A deep learning library for spiking neural networks. *Zenodo* (2021).
- [159] Will D Penny, Peter Zeidman, and Neil Burgess. 2013. Forward and backward inference in spatial cognition. *PLoS computational biology* 9, 12 (2013), e1003383.
- [160] Markus Pettersen, Frederik Rogge, and Mikkel Elle Lepperød. 2024. Learning Place Cell Representations and Context-Dependent Remapping. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 37. 244–269.
- [161] Giovanni Pezzulo, Francesco Rigoli, and Karl J Friston. 2018. Hierarchical active inference: a theory of motivated control. *Trends in cognitive sciences* 22, 4 (2018), 294–306.
- [162] Brien M Posey. 2022. What is the akida event domain neural processor? *2020* (2022).
- [163] Xavier Puig, Eric Undersander, Andrew Szot, Mikael Dallaire Cote, Tsung-Yen Yang, Ruslan Partsey, Ruta Desai, Alexander William Clegg, Michal Hlavac, So Yeon Min, et al. 2023. Habitat 3.0: A co-habitat for humans, avatars and robots. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13724* (2023).
- [164] Xinyuan Qian, Jiaran Gao, Yaodan Zhang, QiQuan Zhang, Hexin Liu, Leibny Paola Garcia, and Haizhou Li. 2025. SAV-SE: Scene-aware Audio-Visual Speech Enhancement with Selective State Space Model. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing* (2025).
- [165] Minghan Qin, Wanhua Li, Jiawei Zhou, Haoqian Wang, and Hanspeter Pfister. 2024. Langsplat: 3d language gaussian splatting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 20051–20060.
- [166] Rizwan Qureshi, Ranjan Sapkota, Abbas Shah, Amgad Muneer, Anas Zafar, Ashmal Vayani, et al. 2025. Thinking Beyond Tokens: From Brain-Inspired Intelligence to Cognitive Foundations for Artificial General Intelligence and its Societal Impact. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.00951* (2025).
- [167] Rajesh PN Rao and Dana H Ballard. 1999. Predictive coding in the visual cortex: a functional interpretation of some extra-classical receptive-field effects. *Nature neuroscience* 2, 1 (1999), 79–87.
- [168] Aditya Ravi, Sudeep Manandhar, Kasi Viswanathan, Nemanja Djuric, Sarthak Sharma, and Ibrahim Pirk. 2024. OutSight: A Multi-Sensor 3D Object Detection Framework with Cross-Modal Representation Learning. *arXiv:2404.09995* [cs.CV]
- [169] Sahithya Ravi, Gabriel Sarch, Vibhav Vineet, et al. 2025. Out of Sight, Not Out of Context? Egocentric Spatial Reasoning in VLMs Across Disjoint Frames. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.24257* (2025).
- [170] Edmund T Rolls. 2013. The mechanisms for pattern completion and pattern separation in the hippocampus. *Frontiers in systems neuroscience* 7 (2013), 74.
- [171] Sasha Salter, Richard Warren, Collin Schlager, Adrian Spurr, Shangchen Han, Rohin Bhasin, Yujun Cai, Peter Walkington, Anuoluwapo Bolarinwa, Robert J Wang, et al. 2024. emg2pose: A large and diverse benchmark for surface electromyographic hand pose estimation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37 (2024), 55703–55728.
- [172] Rylan Schaeffer et al. 2022. No free lunch from deep learning in neuroscience: A case study through models of the entorhinal-hippocampal circuit. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 16052–16067.
- [173] Rylan Schaeffer, Mikail Khona, Tzuhsuan Ma, Cristobal Eyzaguirre, Sanmi Koyejo, and Ila Fiete. 2023. Self-Supervised Learning of Representations for Space Generates Multi-Modular Grid Cells. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 36. 23140–23157.
- [174] Paul Hongsuck Seo et al. 2023. Avformer: Injecting vision into frozen speech models for zero-shot av-asr. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 22922–22931.
- [175] Amir-Hossein Shahidzadeh, Gabriele Caddeo, Koushik Alapati, Lorenzo Natale, Cornelia Fermüller, and Yiannis Aloimonos. 2024. FeelAnyForce: Estimating contact force feedback from tactile sensation for vision-based tactile sensors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02048* (2024).
- [176] Chen Shang, Jiadong Yu, and Dinh Thai Hoang. 2025. Energy-efficient and intelligent ISAC in V2X networks with spiking neural networks-driven DRL. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.01038* (2025).
- [177] Qiongjie Shi, Beibei Dong, Tian-Li He, Yunlong Zi, Zhihong Zeng, et al. 2020. Electronic skin: Advances and future prospects. *Science* 370, 6518 (2020), 998–1004.
- [178] Xinyu Shi, Zecheng Hao, and Zhaofei Yu. 2024. Spikingresformer: Bridging resnet and vision transformer in spiking neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 5610–5619.
- [179] Hanul Shin, Jung Kwon Lee, Jaehong Kim, and Jiwon Kim. 2017. Continual learning with deep generative replay. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [180] Jonathan P Shine, José P Valdés-Herrera, Mary Hegarty, and Thomas Wolbers. 2016. The human retrosplenial cortex and thalamus code head direction in a global reference frame. *Journal of Neuroscience* 36, 24 (2016), 6371–6381.

- [181] K. Kirk Shung and Mark Zippuro. 1996. Ultrasonic transducers and arrays. *IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Magazine* 15, 6 (1996), 20–30.
- [182] Nathan Silberman, Derek Hoiem, Pushmeet Kohli, and Rob Fergus. 2012. Indoor segmentation and support inference from rgbd images. In *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 746–760.
- [183] Viswanath Sivakumar, Jeffrey Seely, Alan Du, Sean Bittner, Adam Berenzweig, Anuoluwapo Bolarinwa, Alex Gramfort, and Michael Mandel. 2024. emg2qwerty: A large dataset with baselines for touch typing using surface electromyography. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37 (2024), 91373–91389.
- [184] Daniel Sliwowski, Shail Jadav, Sergej Stanovcic, Jędrzej Orbik, et al. 2025. Reassemble: A multimodal dataset for contact-rich robotic assembly and disassembly. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.05086* (2025).
- [185] Ben Sorscher, Gabriel Mel, Surya Ganguli, and Samuel Ocko. 2019. A unified theory for the origin of grid cells through the lens of pattern formation. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, Vol. 32.
- [186] Kimberly L Stachenfeld, Matthew M Botvinick, and Samuel J Gershman. 2017. The hippocampus as a predictive map. *Nature neuroscience* 20, 11 (2017), 1643–1653.
- [187] John F Stein. 1992. The representation of egocentric space in the posterior parietal cortex. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 15, 4 (1992), 691–700.
- [188] Marcel Stimberg et al. 2019. Brian 2, an intuitive and efficient neural simulator. *elife* 8 (2019), e47314.
- [189] Andrew Szot, Alexander Clegg, Eric Undersander, Erik Wijmans, and Yiliand others Zhao. 2021. Habitat 2.0: Training home assistants to rearrange their habitat. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), 251–266.
- [190] Tengine. 2021. Deploy Edge AI App In a Second With Tengine and SuperEdge. Online. https://github.com/OAID/Tengine/blob/tengine-lite/doc/docs_en/source_compile/deploy_SuperEdge.md.
- [191] Tesla, Inc. 2025. Tesla Optimus Humanoid Robot. <https://www.tesla.com/ai>. Accessed: 2025-08-21.
- [192] Edward C Tolman. 1948. Cognitive maps in rats and men. *Psychological review* 55, 4 (1948), 189.
- [193] Endel Tulving. 1983. *Elements of Episodic Memory*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, GB.
- [194] Barbara Tversky. 1981. Distortions in memory for maps. *Cognitive psychology* 13, 3 (1981), 407–433.
- [195] Leslie G. Ungerleider and Mortimer Mishkin. 1982. Two cortical visual systems. In *Analysis of Visual Behavior*, D. J. Ingle, M. A. Goodale, and R. J. W. Mansfield (Eds.). MIT Press, 549–586.
- [196] Jiang Wang, Yaozhong Kang, Linya Fu, et al. 2025. Observability-Aware Active Calibration of Multi-Sensor Extrinsic for Ground Robots via Online Trajectory Optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.13420* (2025).
- [197] Lei Wang, Chen Ma, Xueyang Feng, Zeyu Zhang, Hao Yang, Jingsen Zhang, et al. 2024. A survey on large language model based autonomous agents. *Frontiers of Computer Science* 18, 6 (2024), 186345.
- [198] Lin Wang and Kuk-Jin Yoon. 2021. Knowledge distillation and student-teacher learning for visual intelligence: A review and new outlooks. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 44, 6 (2021), 3048–3068.
- [199] Wenqi Wang, Reuben Tan, Pengyue Zhu, Jianwei Yang, Zhengyuan Yang, Lijuan Wang, et al. 2025. SITE: towards Spatial Intelligence Thorough Evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.05456* (2025).
- [200] Zirui Wang, Xinran Zhao, et al. 2024. HiMemFormer: Hierarchical Memory-Aware Transformer for Multi-Agent Action Anticipation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.01455* (2024).
- [201] Greg Wayne, Chia-Chun Hung, David Amos, Mehdi Mirza, Arun Ahuja, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, Jack Rae, Piotr Mirowski, Joel Z Leibo, Adam Santoro, et al. 2018. Unsupervised predictive memory in a goal-directed agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.10760* (2018).
- [202] James CR Whittington, David McCaffary, Jacob JW Bakermans, and Timothy EJ Behrens. 2022. How to build a cognitive map. *Nature neuroscience* 25, 10 (2022), 1257–1272.
- [203] James CR Whittington, Timothy H Muller, Shirley Mark, Guifen Chen, Caswell Barry, Neil Burgess, and Timothy EJ Behrens. 2020. The Tolman-Eichenbaum machine: unifying space and relational memory through generalization in the hippocampal formation. *Cell* 183, 5 (2020), 1249–1263.
- [204] James CR Whittington, Joseph Warren, and Timothy EJ Behrens. 2021. Relating transformers to models and neural representations of the hippocampal formation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04035* (2021).
- [205] Christopher Widdowson and Ranxiao Frances Wang. 2022. Human navigation in curved spaces. *Cognition* 218 (2022), 104923.
- [206] Junfei Wu, Jian Guan, Kaituo Feng, Qiang Liu, Shu Wu, Liang Wang, et al. 2025. Reinforcing spatial reasoning in vision-language models with interwoven thinking and visual drawing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.09965* (2025).
- [207] Yu Xiang, Wonhui Kim, Wei Chen, Jingwei Ji, Christopher Choy, Hao Su, et al. 2016. Objectnet3d: A large scale database for 3d object recognition. In *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 160–176.
- [208] Eric Xing, Mingkai Deng, et al. 2025. Critiques of World Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.05169* (2025).
- [209] Fangzhi Xu, Qika Lin, Jiawei Han, et al. 2025. Are Large Language Models Really Good Logical Reasoners? A Comprehensive Evaluation and Beyond. *Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 37 (2025), 1620–1634.
- [210] Ziang Yan, Zhilin Li, Yinan He, Chenting Wang, Kunchang Li, Xinhao Li, Xiangyu Zeng, Zilei Wang, Yali Wang, Yu Qiao, et al. 2025. Task preference optimization: Improving multimodal large language models with vision task

- alignment. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*. 29880–29892.
- [211] Fengyu Yang, Chao Feng, Ziyang Chen, Hyoungseob Park, Daniel Wang, Yiming Dou, Ziyao Zeng, Xien Chen, Rit Gangopadhyay, Andrew Owens, et al. 2024. Binding touch to everything: Learning unified multimodal tactile representations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 26340–26353.
- [212] Fanbo Yang, Ankur Handa, Vladlen Koltun, and Thomas Funkhouser. 2024. 3D-Mem: 3D Scene Memory for Embodied Reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02395* (2024).
- [213] Jihan Yang, Shusheng Yang, Anjali W Gupta, Rilyn Han, Li Fei-Fei, and Saining Xie. 2025. Thinking in space: How multimodal large language models see, remember, and recall spaces. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*. 10632–10643.
- [214] Man Yao, Guangshe Zhao, Hengyu Zhang, Yifan Hu, Lei Deng, Yonghong Tian, Bo Xu, and Guoqi Li. 2023. Attention spiking neural networks. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 45, 8 (2023), 9393–9410.
- [215] Baiqiao Yin, Qineng Wang, Pingyue Zhang, Jianshu Zhang, Kangrui Wang, Zihan Wang, et al. 2025. Spatial Mental Modeling from Limited Views. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.21458* (2025).
- [216] Vladimir Yugay, Yue Li, Theo Gevers, and Martin R. Oswald. 2023. Gaussian-SLAM: Photo-realistic Dense SLAM with Gaussian Splatting. *arXiv:2312.10070* [cs.CV]
- [217] Andy Zeng, Shuran Song, Matthias Nießner, Matthew Fisher, Jianxiong Xiao, and Thomas Funkhouser. 2017. 3dmatch: Learning local geometric descriptors from rgb-d reconstructions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 1802–1811.
- [218] Jingyi Zhang, Jiaxing Huang, Sheng Jin, and Shijian Lu. 2024. Vision-language models for vision tasks: A survey. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 46, 8 (2024), 5625–5644.
- [219] Qiyang Zhang, Xiang Li, Xiangying Che, Xiao Ma, Ao Zhou, Mengwei Xu, et al. 2022. A comprehensive benchmark of deep learning libraries on mobile devices. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 3298–3307.
- [220] Ruichen Zhang, Shunpu Tang, Yinqiu Liu, Dusit Niyato, et al. 2025. Toward agentic ai: generative information retrieval inspired intelligent communications and networking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.16866* (2025).
- [221] Siwei Zhang, Qianli Ma, Yan Zhang, Zhiyin Qian, Taein Kwon, Marc Pollefeys, Federica Bogo, and Siyu Tang. 2022. Egobody: Human body shape and motion of interacting people from head-mounted devices. In *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 180–200.
- [222] Zhaoliang Zhang, Tianchen Song, Yongjae Lee, Li Yang, Cheng Peng, Rama Chellappa, and Deliang Fan. 2024. Lp-3dgs: Learning to prune 3d gaussian splatting. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37 (2024), 122434–122457.
- [223] Hengshuang Zhao, Li Jiang, Jiaya Jia, Philip HS Torr, and Vladlen Koltun. 2021. Point transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 16259–16268.
- [224] Jialiang Zhao, Yuxiang Ma, Lirui Wang, and Edward H Adelson. 2024. Transferable tactile transformers for representation learning across diverse sensors and tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13640* (2024).
- [225] Haoyu Zhen, Xiaowen Qiu, Peihao Chen, Jincheng Yang, Xin Yan, Yilun Du, Yining Hong, and Chuang Gan. 2024. 3d-vla: A 3d vision-language-action generative world model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09631* (2024).
- [226] Gaoyue Zhou, Hengkai Pan, Yann LeCun, and Lerrel Pinto. 2024. Dino-wm: World models on pre-trained visual features enable zero-shot planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04983* (2024).
- [227] Alex Zihao Zhu, Dinesh Thakur, Tolga Özaslan, et al. 2018. The multivehicle stereo event camera dataset: An event camera dataset for 3D perception. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters* 3, 3 (2018), 2032–2039.
- [228] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, et al. 2024. MiniGPT-4: Enhancing Vision-Language Understanding with Advanced Large Language Models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [229] Howe Yuan Zhu, Nguyen Quang Hieu, Dinh Thai Hoang, et al. 2024. A Human-Centric Metaverse Enabled by Brain-Computer Interface: A Survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 26, 3 (2024), 2120–2145.