Labeling trials based on target memorability. Although memorability is observed for target, but if we group trials based on target, the neural traces during the retrieval phase always has target information (target identity). Maybe come up another way to grouping the trials.

figure out a neural correlates for “memorable state.” This can be used to later infer memory search for memorable states.  (Not sure how to implement it, but seems to be a good way if we want to go with the memory search story)

Analyzing similarity measures (say RSA) with neural noise measures (say entropy). A prediction is that if memorable words are more consistent with one another, should expect less neural noise across trials or even within trials (No big jump in the search space, everything stay roughly similar place). However, in the low memory words condition, if initial search start as high memorable words but later need to switch to low memory words, the neural noise may be larger (bigger jumps in the neural search space).

- For the future paper, I felt the ranked chart of the targets and the probes wasn’t very clear / compelling because it shows the spread of memory performance, but not so much the consistency. The distribution of what word pairs were actually seen is an important methodological point, but again not something very meaningful about the results. The most compelling part is the split-half consistency. I have a way I can visualize this (e.g., showing the average lines of the two halves plotted together), or we could use just bar plots of the average correlation coefficients for the various stimulus types, but this is somewhat the key behavioral result to hinge off of.

- **To do for me**: Should I go ahead and collect ratings of valence and arousal on the words?

- **To do for me**: Multidimensional scaling to visualize the similarity geometry of the target words (based on GLoVE or also based on neural data), colored by memorability. (Example:<https://www.jmp.com/support/help/14-2/images/MDSplot1.png>)

- The current way it’s framed, it’s like memorability is an epiphenomenon of the SAM model. It may make people wonder why not directly measuring matching strength instead of using memorability?

- **To think about doing**: Representational similarity analysis (pattern similarity) of the word pairs and memorability. We could potentially make a movie to visualize how similarity changes over time, or construct models to compare with the data. Does the data show the same neural representation to what I see for images? (Memorable words more similar, forgettable ones more dispersed)

- **Suggestion from Vishnu:** Look at RTs to intrusions and see if intrusion RTs are faster for memorable error words.

- **Discussion:** Can we tell if a list is a high versus low memorable list (based on average item memorability)? Does the average list memorability affect the search space people start in? So perhaps we are decoding list memorability rather than item memorability? (But perhaps this doesn’t work since memorability is defined by a median split.) Can we do decoding of average memorability of list? Overall questions about context versus item (maybe something we want to get away from).

- Someone mentioned doing the neural analysis on intrusion memorability

- Someone mentioned also looking at encoding signals of these pairs

- **To do:** It’ll be important to split up memorability and memory. Specifically:

                \* Look at decoding of correct vs. incorrect memory for forgettable items and memorable items separately

                \* This is somewhat parallel to looking at the memorability effect for incorrect items  which is incredibly important!!!