1 Agradecimientos

Agradezco a CONICYT Proyecto Fondecyt Regular N°1170292 por la financiación de esta investigación.

2 Resumen

Decisions are part of our daily lives, and it appears as if some kind of process is evaluating second to second all of our options. In all of such situations a big question arises, should I go for the well-known option or should I take my chances a look for a new one?. This **exploration-exploitation dilemma** is also present in both, foraging for resources and **semantic search**. As such, both problems can be seen as decision-making processes where resources and semantic contents locations are unknown, and somehow one must establish an efficient criterion for searching in an efficient way. Certain search patterns, which are ubiquitous across many taxa, seems to provide an optimal way for foraging through a previously unknown environment. Given that both semantic search and foraging share similarities, an evolutionary co-option of the mechanisms controlling foraging for semantic search is discussed. Underlying strategies for searching through patchy environments, neural implementations of exploration-exploitation control and internal aspects of foraging are discussed in hopes of providing an evolutionary framework for semantic search research.

3 Tabla de contenido

Contents

4 Índices de ilustraciones

5 Introduction

5.1 Semantic search

5.1.1 What it is

5.1.2 Empirical evidence

5.1.3 Observed patterns

5.1.4 Justfication of 'space' or 'effort'

Semantic memories are memories about the meaning of things, this conceptual knowlegde allows us to interact and recognize objects, plan the future and remember the past (Binder and Desai, 2011). Given such pivotal role, the way that we 'navigate' through such memories will determine the way we interact with the world. The space in which the 'navigation' occurs has been called semantic space, which corresponds to an abstraction where semantic memories are placed in a multi-dimensional space and the conection between them are defined by some vector assigning the relationship between each one in every dimension (Lund and Burgess, 1996). In humans, however, that way that semantic memories organize into such space is not clear (Benedek et al., 2017).

Free recall tasks, which prompt the participant to recall as many objects pertaining to a certain category in a limited amount of time, have observed a 'patchy' distribution of such memories (Hills et al., 2009), this patchy distribution refers to a signicantly faster retrieval time when the participant is within a certain category (which is determined beforehand). The pattern describing such inter-response intervals have been compared to that of food-foraging (Rhodes and Turvey, 2007), this suggest a notion of distance between memory contents that has been observed when participants are asked to represent in a 2D space such memories (Montez et al., 2015)

5.2 Sequential decision making

5.2.1 What is the 'problem' present in semantic search (specific to retrieval tasks)

5.2.2 Brief intro to sequential decision making an its issue (da paso a exploration-exploitation)

5.3 The exploration-exploitation dilemma in foraging and semantic search

5.3.1 Presentar el dilemma

5.3.2 Connect both through evidence

5.3.3 Connect both through logic

6 Models for a Heuristic

6.0.1 Define heuristics clearly

6.0.2 Put the question of what is the underlying heuristic

6.0.3 Argue how a model could represent a heuristic

6.0.4 Rule-based

6.0.5 Random walks

7 A case of co-option

7.0.1 Introduce the concept of co-option, emphasis on behavioral or search traits

7.0.2 From where semantic search is co-opted from ? introduce foraging

7.0.3 How this came to be

8 Neural implementations

8.0.1 Once a strategy/heuristic is identified, it is necesary to identify the structure underlying it

8.0.2 Base on exploration exploitation dilemma

9 State dependent foraging

10 Conclusions

11 References

References

Benedek, M., Kenett, Y. N., Umdasch, K., Anaki, D., Faust, M., and Neubauer, A. C. (2017). How semantic memory structure and intelligence contribute to creative thought: A network science approach. *Thinking & Reasoning*, 23(2):158–183.

Binder, J. R. and Desai, R. H. (2011). The neurobiology of semantic memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 15(11):527–536.

Hills, T., Todd, P., and Jones, M. (2009). *Optimal Foraging in Semantic Memory*. American Psychological Association (APA).

Lund, K. and Burgess, C. (1996). Producing high-dimensional semantic spaces from lexical co-occurrence. *Behavior Research Methods Instruments, & Computers*, 28(2):203–208.

Montez, P., Thompson, G., and Kello, C. T. (2015). The Role of Semantic Clustering in Optimal Memory Foraging. *Cognitive Science*, 39(8):1925–1939.

Rhodes, T. and Turvey, M. T. (2007). Human memory retrieval as Lévy foraging. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 385(1):255–260.