

¹ STAR: Semantic Temporal Associative Retrieval - A Local-First Graph-Based Context Engine

³ **R. S. Balch II**  ¹

⁴ ¹ Independent Researcher, New Mexico Tech Affiliated

DOI: [10.xxxxxx/draft](https://doi.org/10.xxxxxx/draft)

Software

- ⁵ [Review](#) 
- ⁶ [Repository](#) 
- ⁷ [Archive](#) 

Editor: 

Submitted: 24 February 2026

Published: unpublished

License

Authors of papers retain copyright
¹⁴ and release the work under a

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
¹⁵ International License ([CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/))¹⁶

Summary

⁶ STAR (Semantic Temporal Associative Retrieval) is a local-first, graph-based information
⁷ retrieval system designed to enable resource-constrained devices to navigate large-scale personal
⁸ knowledge corpora. Unlike traditional dense vector retrieval systems that require loading
⁹ complete indices into RAM, STAR implements a sparse bipartite graph approach that retrieves
¹⁰ only relevant “atoms” of information required for a given query.

¹¹ The system uses a physics-inspired scoring model combining three factors multiplicatively:
¹² semantic co-occurrence (shared tags), temporal decay (recent memories weighted higher), and
¹³ structural similarity (SimHash fingerprint proximity). This multiplicative approach ensures any
¹⁴ zero factor eliminates irrelevant results, providing precise, explainable retrieval.

¹⁵ STAR has been production-validated on a 28-million-token corpus of chat history and personal
¹⁶ documents, achieving sub-200ms query latency on 4GB RAM consumer hardware without GPU
¹⁷ acceleration. The browser paradigm architecture—treating AI memory like web browsers treat
¹⁸ the internet—enables universal deployment from \$200 laptops to supercomputers.

Statement of Need

The Problem

²¹ Current Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) systems for AI memory require high-
²² specification servers with GPUs and substantial RAM, locking personal AI memory behind
²³ cloud subscriptions and enterprise infrastructure.

²⁴ The author encountered this when accumulating 40 chat sessions (~18M tokens). When forced
²⁵ to start new sessions due to context limits, summaries proved insufficient—models needed
²⁶ full conversational history. Existing solutions required either: - Cloud dependencies (privacy
²⁷ concerns, recurring costs) - Local vector databases requiring 4-8GB RAM just for the index -
²⁸ Enterprise hardware inaccessible to individual researchers

Research Purpose

³⁰ STAR addresses this gap by implementing sparse graph retrieval that: 1. **Runs on consumer**
³¹ **hardware** (4GB RAM, CPU-only) 2. **Operates locally** (no cloud dependencies, data sovereignty)
³² 3. **Provides explainable results** (tag paths show why each result was retrieved) 4. **Scales**
³³ **linearly** ($O(k \cdot d)$ complexity vs. $O(n)$ for dense vectors)

³⁴ Target users include researchers managing large literature corpora, developers maintaining
³⁵ AI-assisted projects, privacy-conscious users, and resource-constrained environments.

³⁶ State of the Field

³⁷ Dense Vector RAG (HNSW, FAISS)

³⁸ Systems like HNSW ([Malkov & Yashunin, 2018](#)) and FAISS ([Johnson et al., 2019](#)) represent
³⁹ state-of-the-art approximate nearest neighbor search. However, they require loading
⁴⁰ complete vector indices into RAM (4-8GB for modest corpora), restricting deployment to
⁴¹ high-specification servers. Vector similarity also provides limited explainability—results match
⁴² because embeddings are “close,” but specific reasoning remains opaque.

Method	Time Complexity	Space Complexity	Explainability	Hardware
Dense Vector ANN (HNSW)	$O(n \log n)$ or $O(n)$	$O(n \cdot d)$	Opaque (black box)	GPU preferred
STAR (Sparse Graph)	$O(k \cdot \bar{d})$	$O(E)$	Native (tag paths)	CPU-only

⁴³ Where: - n = total atoms - k = query tags (typically 5–20) - \bar{d} = average tag degree (typically
⁴⁴ 10–100) - d = vector dimension (typically 768–1536) - $|E|$ = sparse edges (typically $10 \cdot n$)

⁴⁵ For personal knowledge graphs, $k \cdot \bar{d} \ll n$, making STAR asymptotically faster than dense
⁴⁶ retrieval.

⁴⁷ Graph-Based Memory Systems

⁴⁸ Recent work explores graph structures as alternatives to dense vectors. T-Retriever ([C. Wei
⁴⁹ et al., 2026](#)) introduces tree-based hierarchical retrieval using semantic-structural entropy
⁵⁰ but does not incorporate temporal decay. PersonalAI ([Menschikov et al., 2025](#)) proposes a
⁵¹ knowledge graph framework with hyper-edges for personalized LLM agents but focuses on
⁵² framework design rather than production implementation.

⁵³ STAR contributes a complete, deployed system with validated performance on 28M tokens
⁵⁴ of real-world data. The bipartite graph approach (Atoms \times Tags) enforces strict separation
⁵⁵ between content and metadata, enabling $O(1)$ deduplication via SimHash ([Charikar, 2002](#))
⁵⁶ and disposable index architectures.

⁵⁷ Personal AI Memory

⁵⁸ Second Me ([J. Wei et al., 2025](#)) proposes LLM-based memory parameterization requiring
⁵⁹ significant computational resources. STAR achieves similar associative retrieval goals through
⁶⁰ deterministic physics-based scoring, enabling deployment on minimal hardware.

⁶¹ Build vs. Contribute

⁶² Existing sparse retrieval libraries (Lucene, Terrier) focus on traditional keyword search without
⁶³ temporal decay modeling, graph-based associative traversal, SimHash deduplication, or byte-
⁶⁴ offset lazy loading. STAR’s unified field equation combining semantic, temporal, and structural
⁶⁵ factors in a multiplicative scoring model represents a novel contribution not present in existing
⁶⁶ packages.

⁶⁷ Software Design

⁶⁸ Architecture: The Browser Paradigm

⁶⁹ STAR implements the “Browser Paradigm” for AI memory: just as browsers render websites
⁷⁰ by loading only necessary shards (HTML, CSS, JS) rather than the entire internet, STAR
⁷¹ retrieves only relevant atoms required for the current query. This enables universal deployment
⁷² across hardware capabilities.

Component	Browser Equivalent	Anchor Engine Implementation
HTML/CSS/JS shards	Web page components	Atoms (tags + byte offsets)
DOM tree	Document structure	Tag graph $G = (A, T, E)$
Lazy loading	On-demand resource fetch	Radial inflation from disk
Cache	Browser cache	Ephemeral PGlite index

⁷³ The hybrid architecture uses: - **Node.js** as the “Browser Shell” (UI, networking, OS integration)
⁷⁴ - **C++ N-API modules** as the “Rendering Engine” (text processing, SimHash fingerprinting)
⁷⁵ - **PGlite** (PostgreSQL-compatible) for sparse graph storage - **Filesystem pointers** for content
⁷⁶ (disposable, rebuildable indices)

⁷⁷ Data Model: Compound → Molecule → Atom

Level	Role	Content Stored	Example
Compound	Document reference	Full text (temporary)	<code>ChatSessions.yaml</code> (91.88MB)
Molecule	Semantic chunk	Chunk text + byte offsets	Bytes 1024–2048
Atom	Tag/concept	Metadata only	#authentication, #session

⁷⁸ Content lives in the filesystem; the database stores only pointers (byte offsets + tags). This
⁷⁹ separation enables: - O(1) deduplication via 64-bit SimHash fingerprints - Ephemeral indices
⁸⁰ (database wiped on shutdown, rebuilt from source) - Lazy loading (content read from disk
⁸¹ only when needed)

⁸² The Unified Field Equation

⁸³ The gravity score for query q and candidate atom a is:

$$W(q, a) = |T(q) \cap T(a)| \cdot \gamma^{d(q,a)} \times e^{-\lambda\Delta t} \times \left(1 - \frac{H(h_q, h_a)}{64}\right)$$

⁸⁴ Where: - $|T(q) \cap T(a)|$: Shared tag count (semantic co-occurrence) - $\gamma^{d(q,a)}$: Damping factor
⁸⁵ raised to hop distance (default $\gamma = 0.85$) - $e^{-\lambda\Delta t}$: Temporal decay ($\lambda = 0.0001 \text{ s}^{-1}$, ~ 115
⁸⁶ min half-life) - $1 - H(h_q, h_a)/64$: SimHash similarity (0-63 Hamming distance normalized)

⁸⁷ **Design rationale:** Multiplicative scoring ensures any zero factor eliminates noise. Additive
⁸⁸ approaches accumulate weak signals; multiplicative approaches require all factors to contribute.

⁸⁹ Retrieval Protocol: Planets and Moons

⁹⁰ STAR implements a three-phase retrieval protocol:

91 **Phase 1 — Anchor Discovery (Planets)**

92 High-precision seed set via direct matching using:
 93 - Full-text search (BM25-style) via
 94 PostgreSQL FTS - Radial inflation from atom positions - Engram cache for O(1) frequent
 entity lookup

95 **Output:** 20–200 anchor atoms with $d(q, a) = 0$

96 **Phase 2 — Radial Inflation (Moons)**

97 High-recall expansion via recursive tag-walker graph traversal:

```
def radial_inflation(anchors, radius=1, max_per_hop=50):
    current_hop = anchors
    all_results = set(anchors)

    for hop in range(radius):
        candidates = get_connected_nodes(current_hop)
        weighted = apply_unified_field_equation(candidates, anchors)
        top_k = select_by_gravity(weighted, max_per_hop)
        all_results.update(top_k)
        current_hop = top_k

    return all_results
```

98 **Output:** 40–500 associated atoms ranked by gravity score

99 **Phase 3 — Elastic Context Assembly**

100 Token-budget compliance with maximal coherence:
 101 - Merge atoms within 500-byte proximity from same source - Snap to sentence boundaries for narrative flow - Progressive inflation (top
 102 10% get 2× radius, etc.)

103 **Result:** 40–100 atoms → 8–12 coherent paragraphs

104 **SQL-Native Implementation**

105 The equation executes as a single recursive SQL CTE in PGlite:

```
WITH RECURSIVE hop_traversal AS (
    -- Anchors at hop 0
    SELECT anchor_id, 0 as hop_distance FROM anchors

    UNION ALL

    -- Recursive expansion
    SELECT t2.atom_id, ht.hop_distance + 1
    FROM hop_traversal ht
    JOIN tags t1 ON ht.atom_id = t1.atom_id
    JOIN tags t2 ON t1.tag = t2.tag
    WHERE ht.hop_distance < max_radius
)
SELECT atom_id,
    ((shared_tags / 10.0) * POWER(0.85, hop_distance)) *
    EXP(-0.0001 * time_delta) * simhash_similarity as gravity_score
FROM candidates
ORDER BY gravity_score DESC;
```

¹⁰⁶ **Trade-off:** Recursive CTEs add query complexity but enable precise hop-distance tracking for
¹⁰⁷ proper damping application. The $O(k \cdot d \cdot r)$ complexity remains tractable for personal-scale
¹⁰⁸ corpora.

¹⁰⁹ Quality Assurance

¹¹⁰ STAR includes a comprehensive test suite to ensure correctness and reproducibility. The tests/
¹¹¹ directory contains unit tests for core components (atomizer, fingerprinting, graph traversal)
¹¹² and integration tests that verify end-to-end search behavior. A benchmarking framework
¹¹³ (`benchmarks/`) provides reproducible performance measurements for ingestion throughput,
¹¹⁴ search latency, and memory usage under varying corpus sizes. Tests can be run manually using
¹¹⁵ `pnpm test`, and all benchmarks reported in this paper can be reproduced using the provided
¹¹⁶ scripts, ensuring transparent validation of the performance claims.

¹¹⁷ Research Impact Statement

¹¹⁸ Production Validation

¹¹⁹ STAR has been production-validated since February 2026 on a corpus of: - **28 million tokens**
¹²⁰ (~100MB) - **151,876 atoms** (tag/concept units) - **280,000 molecules** (semantic chunks) - **436**
¹²¹ **files** (compounds)

¹²² Ingestion Performance

Dataset	Size	Molecules	Atoms	Time	Throughput
Chat Sessions (monolith)	91.88MB	214,000	776	177.8s	1,203 mol/s
GitHub Archive	2.66MB	36,793	497	22.4s	1,642 mol/s
Code Repository	0.94MB	20,916	199	25.0s	836 mol/s
Total System	~100MB	280,000	1,500	~4 min	1,200 mol/s

¹²³ Search Performance

Search Type	Budget	Results	Latency (p95)	Use Case
Standard (70/30)	16k tokens	40–100 atoms	150ms	Daily queries
Max Recall (3-hop)	65k+ tokens	200–500 atoms	690ms	Research
Keyword (direct FTS)	4k tokens	20–50 atoms	100ms	High precision

¹²⁴ Memory Management

Phase	RSS Memory	Notes
Peak (ingestion)	1,657MB	During 91MB file processing
Idle (post-cleanup)	510MB	After 5min idle
Reduction	-69%	1,147MB saved via GC

¹²⁵ **Key Achievement:** Sub-200ms query latency on 4GB RAM consumer hardware without GPU
¹²⁶ acceleration.

¹²⁷ External Use and Integrations

¹²⁸ The system is designed as agent-harness agnostic, providing stateless context retrieval via
¹²⁹ HTTP API for integration with: - OpenCLAW framework (primary target) - Custom agent
¹³⁰ frameworks - Direct API integrations - CLI automation

¹³¹ Reproducibility

¹³² All benchmarks are reproducible using the included benchmarks/ directory: - ingestion-
¹³³ benchmark.ts: Measures molecule processing rates - search-benchmark.ts: Measures query
¹³⁴ latency distributions - comparison-framework.ts: Framework for cross-system evaluation

¹³⁵ Community Readiness

- ¹³⁶ ▪ **License:** AGPL-3.0 (open source, copyleft)
- ¹³⁷ ▪ **Version:** 4.2.0 (stable production release)
- ¹³⁸ ▪ **Documentation:** Comprehensive specs, standards (77 architecture standards), and API
documentation
- ¹⁴⁰ ▪ **Containerization:** Docker and docker-compose support for easy deployment
- ¹⁴¹ ▪ **Repository:** <https://github.com/RSBalchII/anchor-engine-node>

¹⁴² Reproducibility and Deployment

¹⁴³ STAR includes comprehensive containerization support:

```
docker-compose up -d  
curl http://localhost:3160/health
```

¹⁴⁴ The single-stage Docker build based on Node.js 20 LTS includes persistent volumes, health
¹⁴⁵ checks, and resource limits (2 CPU, 2GB RAM) matching tested constraints, enabling
¹⁴⁶ researchers to reproduce benchmarks with identical environments.

¹⁴⁷ AI Usage Disclosure

¹⁴⁸ Generative AI tools were used in the development of this software and paper. GitHub Copilot,
¹⁴⁹ Gemini, Qwen Coder, Kimi AI, and Deepseek Coder assisted with code scaffolding, SQL query
¹⁵⁰ patterns, documentation drafts, and grammar checking.

¹⁵¹ The human author (R.S. Balch II) reviewed all AI-generated code, made all architectural
¹⁵² decisions (browser paradigm, Unified Field Equation, three-tier data hierarchy), verified
¹⁵³ mathematical correctness, conducted all benchmarks on production hardware, and edited
¹⁵⁴ all documentation for technical accuracy.

¹⁵⁵ AI tools did not provide: core algorithm design, mathematical derivations, research direction,
¹⁵⁶ benchmark methodology, or production validation. The Browser Paradigm, Unified Field
¹⁵⁷ Equation, Planets and Moons protocol, and ephemeral index design are original human
¹⁵⁸ contributions.

¹⁵⁹ The author bears complete responsibility for accuracy, originality, licensing compliance, and
¹⁶⁰ reproducibility. All benchmarks were measured on production hardware (Omen 17 with RTX
¹⁶¹ 4090, 64GB RAM, Intel i9-13980HX). No AI tools were used for peer review simulation, editor
¹⁶² communication, or generating fake data.

163 Competing interests

164 The author declares no competing interests.

165 Acknowledgments

166 This research was conducted as independent work without external funding.

167 The STAR algorithm builds upon foundational work in similarity estimation (Charikar's
168 SimHash), graph-based search (PageRank), and information retrieval (sparse vector models).

169 The implementation uses PGlite by ElectricSQL and open-source tools from the Node.js
170 ecosystem.

171 References

- 172 Charikar, M. S. (2002). Similarity estimation techniques from rounding algorithms. *Proceedings
173 of the Thiry-Fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 380–388. <https://doi.org/10.1145/509907.509965>
- 175 Johnson, J., Douze, M., & Jégou, H. (2019). Billion-scale similarity search with GPUs. *IEEE
176 Transactions on Big Data*, 7(3), 535–547. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tbdata.2019.2921572>
- 177 Malkov, Y. A., & Yashunin, D. A. (2018). Efficient and robust approximate nearest neighbor
178 search using hierarchical navigable small world graphs. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern
179 Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 42(4), 824–836.
- 180 Menschikov, M., Evseev, D., Dochkina, V., Kostoev, R., Perepechkin, I., Anokhin, P., Burnaev,
181 E., & Semenov, N. (2025). PersonalAI: A systematic comparison of knowledge graph storage
182 and retrieval approaches for personalized LLM agents. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2506.17001*.
- 183 Wei, C., Qin, H., He, S., Wang, Y., & Chen, Y. (2026). T-retriever: Tree-based hierarchical
184 retrieval augmented generation for textual graphs. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2601.04945*.
- 185 Wei, J., Ying, X., Gao, T., Bao, F., Tao, F., & Shang, J. (2025). AI-native memory 2.0:
186 Second me. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2503.08102*.