

Thermodynamic Memory vs. Flat-Importance Stores: Why Long-Term Retrieval Collapses Without Decay

Clement Deust
Independent Researcher
github.com/cdeust/Cortex

May 2026

Abstract

External memory for large language models is dominated by *flat-importance* stores: vector indexes, BM25 corpora, and long-context buffers in which every item carries the same long-term retrieval prior. This design is asymptotically broken. As the corpus grows, top- k retrieval degenerates into near-arbitrary tie-breaking among items with comparable surface similarity, and the discriminative information delivered to the consumer LLM approaches zero—a failure mode that compounds the position bias of long-context decoding [Liu et al., 2023]. We formalise this collapse, then describe Cortex, a memory architecture that maintains a non-flat priority distribution across N by coupling four mechanisms: (i) continuously decaying *heat* [Ebbinghaus, 1885], (ii) a hierarchical predictive-coding write gate [Friston, 2010], (iii) consolidation cascades that compress episodic into semantic memory [Kandel, 2001, McClelland et al., 1995], and (iv) weighted score-fusion (WSF) retrieval with heat as a tie-breaker. On three independent long-term-memory benchmarks, Cortex reaches LongMemEval R@10 = 98.2% and LoCoMo R@10 = 94.2% (retrieval recall, directly comparable to the published retrieval baselines), and a retrieval-proxy MRR of 0.591 on BEAM-100K. We report the BEAM number as a retrieval-proxy (does the gold memory appear in the retrieved set), which is *not* commensurable with BEAM’s end-to-end LLM-as-judge score; we therefore make no head-to-head BEAM claim and use BEAM only for within-system, same-harness comparisons (§7.1). A direct decay dose-response on BEAM, re-measured forensically on a clean store, reverses an earlier finding of ours: on a freshly loaded corpus decay contributes no ranking benefit (six-point λ -sweep, 395 questions; $\lambda = 1.0$ weakly optimal at MRR 0.545 versus a flat 0.503 plateau for all $\lambda < 1$). An earlier two-point sweep that had shown +68% from decay is traced, by factor isolation (same code, same sample, clean versus contaminated store), to store contamination: decay had been cooling stale out-of-task memories below the retrieval heat floor. We therefore re-scope decay’s measured value as store *hygiene* and capacity control—protective in long-lived stores that accumulate stale content, neutral-to-slightly-negative for ranking on clean single-pass loads (§6.1). We characterise when flat memory remains adequate, quantify the calibration cost of decay, and bound the per-write overhead of biological consolidation. Code, data, and benchmark harness are publicly available.¹

1 Introduction

The default external memory for LLM agents is a variant of the same recipe: embed the input, write to a vector index, and at query time retrieve the top- k nearest neighbours, optionally re-ranked. This recipe succeeds at the document-retrieval scale it was designed for [Lewis et al., 2020], but

¹<https://github.com/cdeust/Cortex>

it does not scale to what agentic systems are now demanding of it—open-ended, multi-month, mixed-content memory across thousands of conversations. The bottleneck is not retrieval speed but *retrieval semantics*: a vector store treats every entry as equally important in the long term, with no mechanism to weight a fact mentioned six months ago against a decision anchored last week. As N grows, the top- k for a typical query fills with semantically plausible but contextually irrelevant items, and the downstream LLM—subject to the position bias documented in *Lost in the Middle* [Liu et al., 2023]—then processes those items in an order uncorrelated with their actual usefulness.

We argue that the missing mechanism is decay, and that decay is not a heuristic but a structural requirement: it is what keeps the priority distribution over memories non-flat at any N . This paper characterises the flat-importance failure mode, describes Cortex’s thermodynamic architecture, and reports empirical results on three published long-term-memory benchmarks. The headline numbers preview the argument: on LongMemEval [Wu et al., 2025], Cortex reaches $R@10 = 98.2\%$ versus 78.4% paper-best; on BEAM [Tavakoli et al., 2026], a retrieval-proxy MRR of 0.591 on BEAM-100K (not comparable to BEAM’s end-to-end metric; see §7.1); on LoCoMo [Maharana et al., 2024], $R@10 = 94.2\%$. All numbers are produced by the production PL/pgSQL retrieval code path, single-process, on a clean database seeded only with each benchmark’s data.

1.1 Contributions

1. A formal statement of the *flat-importance failure mode* (§3): an asymptotic argument for why uniform retrieval priors collapse top- k discriminability as N grows, independent of LLM consumption.
2. A *thermodynamic memory architecture* (§4) coupling Ebbinghaus heat decay, a Friston predictive-coding write gate, coupled neuromodulation, synaptic/emotional tagging, and a Kandel/McClelland consolidation cascade—each module traceable to a primary source and a Cortex implementation file.
3. A *three-form argument* (§5) that decay prevents collapse: information-theoretic, operational (WSF tie-breaking), and curation-by-attrition.
4. Empirical results on three long-term-memory benchmarks (§6): $R@10 = 98.2\%$ on LongMemEval (+19.8 pp over paper-best), $R@10 = 94.2\%$ on LoCoMo, and a retrieval-proxy MRR of 0.591 on BEAM-100K.

§2 positions the work against prior systems; §3 formalises the failure mode; §4 describes the architecture; §5 states the load-bearing argument; §6 reports benchmarks; §7 documents limitations. Appendices give Shannon, Erdős, Popper, and Feynman treatments of the same claims at progressively shorter length.

2 Background and Related Work

Retrieval-augmented generation. The canonical RAG architecture [Lewis et al., 2020] couples a dense retriever to a generator. Document encoders such as DPR [Karpukhin et al., 2020] and contrastive bi-encoders dominate the retrieval side. These systems target a fixed, curated corpus where every document is, by construction, equally part of the index. Long-term memory is not part of their formulation.

Long-context LLMs. A parallel line of work scales the context window itself—200k tokens (Anthropic Claude 2.1, 2023), 1M+ tokens (Google Gemini 1.5, 2024). A long context substitutes for retrieval by holding everything in attention. This works until the relevant fact is buried in the middle of the window, at which point Liu et al. [2023] show retrieval accuracy degrades sharply: U-shaped position bias persists across model families and scales. Long context does not solve discriminability—it inherits it.

Episodic memory in LLM agents. MemGPT [Packer et al., 2024] introduced a hierarchical paged memory metaphor with explicit eviction. Generative Agents [Park et al., 2023] added importance scores from a separate model call and reflection passes that summarised episodes into higher-level conclusions. Both are first steps toward non-flat memory: MemGPT decides what stays in the active page; Generative Agents weight retrieval by importance $\times$ recency $\times$ similarity. Neither implements the full biological cascade—predictive-coding gating, multi-level consolidation, neuromodulatory tagging, microglial pruning—that we draw on here.

Our heat mechanism is closely related to ACT-R base-level activation [Anderson and Schooler, 1991], in which a memory’s retrievability is a power-law-decaying sum over its past access events, and to the importance $\times$ recency $\times$ similarity retrieval rule of Generative Agents [Park et al., 2023]. The Ebbinghaus exponential we use (§4.1) is the same family of forgetting curve, and the ACT-R lifetime computation that Cortex routes through `ingested_at` (§E.1) is the discrete-event analogue. We do not claim a new activation function; we claim its integration into a five-signal fusion retriever (§5.2) and the characterisation of when it helps (§6.3).

Long-term-memory benchmarks. LongMemEval [Wu et al., 2025], LoCoMo [Maharana et al., 2024], and BEAM [Tavakoli et al., 2026] each isolate the long-horizon retrieval failure mode that Liu et al. [2023] anticipated. We report on all three in §6.

Cortex ecosystem. This paper describes the memory engine of a four-component ecosystem: *cortex-beam-abstain* [Deust, 2026a] is a learned retrieval-abstention model that complements decay on residual collapse; *ai-architect-mcp-codebase* [Deust, 2026b] is a Rust tree-sitter / LadybugDB property-graph backend that anchors memories to code symbols; *prd-spec-generator* [Deust, 2026c] is the read-heavy downstream consumer that justifies the per-write cost; *zetetic-team-subagents* [Deust, 2026d] is the 116-agent reasoning library that drives the workload distribution. §8 expands on each.

None of the prior work establishes when flat-importance retrieval *must* fail. We supply that argument next.

3 The Flat-Importance Failure Mode

3.1 Definition

A memory store is *flat-importance* if, for any two stored items x_i, x_j at time t , the long-term retrieval prior is independent of access history, recency, surprise, or causal context:

$$P(x_i \mid t) = P(x_j \mid t) \quad \text{for all } i, j \text{ once written.} \tag{1}$$

A canonical vector store is flat-importance: every entry contributes a single embedding, and only query-conditional similarity differs at retrieval time.

3.2 Asymptotic Collapse

Under flat priors, the retrieval score for a query q depends only on similarity $s(q, x_i)$. Let S_q be the empirical distribution of $s(q, x_i)$ over the corpus. As N grows, two effects compound:

1. **Concentration.** With high-dimensional embeddings, the gap between the top-1 and top- k similarity scores shrinks [Aggarwal et al., 2001, Beyer et al., 1999]. The top- k pool fills with near-tied items.
2. **Tie-breaking is uninformed.** Without a non-similarity prior, ordering among near-tied items is determined by floating-point noise and storage-order artefacts.

A useful informal statement:

Claim (flat collapse). If the retrieval prior $P(x)$ is constant and $s(q, x)$ is the only ranking signal, then as $N \rightarrow \infty$ the conditional entropy $H(\text{useful} \mid \text{retrieved top-}k) \rightarrow H(\text{useful})$; that is, the retrieval step delivers no information about which retrieved items are actually useful for q .

This is the *epistemic* failure mode. It is independent of and prior to any LLM consumption issue. A high-dimensional hubness analysis of the same regime is given by Radovanović et al. [2010].

3.3 Consequences for the LLM Consumer

Even if retrieval merely returned an unordered set, the position bias documented by Liu et al. [2023] would still degrade downstream answers when k is large. With retrieval order itself uninformative, the position bias compounds the flat-prior problem: a fact that *is* useful gets sub-ranked into the U-shaped middle and is effectively ignored.

This is why naïve “stuff more into context” approaches plateau, and why “raise k ” is not a fix at large N : the information density of retrieved tokens has dropped in proportion. The next section describes the architecture by which Cortex preserves a non-flat priority distribution and so avoids this regime.

4 Cortex’s Thermodynamic Memory Model

Cortex’s architecture is an attempt to keep the retrieval prior $P(x)$ non-flat at every N by implementing the mechanisms biological memory uses for the same problem. Each mechanism cites a primary source and a Cortex implementation file.

4.1 Heat as a Continuous Priority Field

Every memory carries a scalar `heat` in $[0, 1]$. Heat decays exponentially over time and is reheated on access—the Ebbinghaus [1885] forgetting curve, $R(t) = e^{-t/S}$, where S is memory stability.

Cortex’s decay (`mcp_server/core/thermodynamics.py::compute_decay`) is

$$h(t) = h_0 \cdot \lambda_{\text{eff}}^t \tag{2}$$

with the per-hour decay factor λ_{eff} modulated by valence and confidence. Writing λ_v for the valence-modulated factor and applying the confidence modifier as a second nested resistance term:

$$\lambda_v = 1 - \frac{1 - \lambda_{\text{base}}}{1 + |v| \cdot r \cdot (1 - e^{-t})}, \quad (3)$$

$$\lambda_{\text{eff}} = 1 - \frac{1 - \lambda_v}{1 + \kappa \cdot \text{conf}} \quad (4)$$

where $\lambda_{\text{base}} = 0.95$ for normal memories, 0.998 for high-importance memories ($I > 0.7$), $r = 0.5$ is the emotional resistance, and the time-saturation factor $1 - e^{-t}$ implements the Kleinsmith and Kaplan [1963] crossover effect: emotional advantage grows with delay [Yonelinas and Ritchey, 2015]. The confidence modifier ($\kappa = 0.1$, $\text{conf} \in [0, 1]$) is an engineering term with no paper source; it further slows decay for high-confidence memories. Half-lives at the default $\text{conf} = 1$ (with $v = 0$): ≈ 15 h for normal items, ≈ 381 h for important items; the confidence-independent form ($\text{conf} = 0$) gives ≈ 14 h and ≈ 346 h. The constants are calibrated to a hours/days timescale and are not from a single paper; they are documented as engineering choices in the source.

4.2 Predictive-Coding Write Gate

Not every input is written. Cortex routes incoming content through a hierarchical Friston [2010] free-energy gate (`mcp_server/core/hierarchical_predictive_coding.py`) operating at three levels—sensory, entity, schema—analogue to the cortical hierarchy. Items that fail to surprise the model at any level are discarded; items that surprise at the schema level receive a higher initial heat. This implements a write-side scarcity: the store grows by what is actually informative, not by what merely passes through.

4.3 Coupled Neuromodulation

Heat is not the only modulator. Cortex implements a coupled DA / NE / ACh / 5-HT cascade (`mcp_server/core/coupled_neuromodulation.py`) with cross-channel effects, following Doya [2002] and Schultz et al. [1997]. Dopamine prediction errors raise importance for items whose outcome surprised the prior; norepinephrine reshapes the gain on uncertainty.

4.4 Emotional Tagging

The inverted-U relationship between arousal and performance (“Hebb’s curve”) is due to Hebb [1955]; it is often attributed to Yerkes and Dodson [1908], but that study measured stimulus strength against habit-formation rather than arousal against performance. Qasim et al. [2023] show that high-frequency activity in the amygdala and hippocampus increases during successful encoding of emotionally arousing stimuli, a neural correlate of the brain prioritising emotionally salient inputs for storage. Cortex’s `mcp_server/core/emotional_tagging.py` combines both: arousal modulates the priority of incoming memories, and the inverted-U bound prevents over-weighting.

4.5 Synaptic Tagging

Frey and Morris [1997] showed that weak memories sharing entities with later strong potentiation events can be retroactively promoted. Cortex implements the analogue in `mcp_server/core/synaptic_tagging.py` when a strongly-encoded memory arrives, weak memories sharing entities receive a heat boost, preserving items the system did not yet know were important.

4.6 Consolidation Pipeline

Episodic memories progress through a four-stage cascade—`LABILE` $\rightarrow$ `EARLY_LTP` $\rightarrow$ `LATE_LTP` $\rightarrow$ `CONSOLIDATED`—modelled on Kandel [2001]. Implementation: `mcp_server/core/cascade.py`. Once consolidated, the Complementary Learning Systems theory of McClelland et al. [1995] governs the episodic $\rightarrow$ semantic transfer in `mcp_server/core/dual_store.cls.py`: hippocampal-style episodic traces feed cortical-style schemas, and the episodic surface area shrinks while structured knowledge accumulates. See also Tonegawa et al. [2015] on the cellular substrate (engram cells) and Hopfield [1982] on the content-addressable view of attractor memory.

4.7 Sleep Replay

Buzsáki [2015] and Hasselmo [2005] describe phase-gated encoding/retrieval/consolidation cycles. Cortex’s `oscillatory_clock.py` and `replay.py` implement an offline replay pass that consolidates and re-embeds clusters during idle windows.

4.8 Pattern Separation and Pruning

Leutgeb et al. [2007] and Yassa and Stark [2011] describe dentate-gyrus pattern separation. Cortex’s `pattern_separation.py` orthogonalises near-duplicate items so they remain distinguishable. Wang et al. [2020] describe complement-dependent microglial pruning; Cortex’s `microglial_pruning.py` prunes the lowest-utility edges of the entity graph, reclaiming structure rather than mass.

Together these mechanisms instantiate a non-flat priority field over the corpus. We now explain why that field is what prevents asymptotic collapse.

5 Why Decay Prevents Collapse

The load-bearing argument of this paper is that the mechanisms in §4 keep the retrieval prior $P(x)$ non-flat at all N , and that this is what preserves discriminability. We make this argument in three forms.

5.1 Information-Theoretic

If heat decays exponentially and is reheated on access, then in steady state the heat distribution across an active corpus is well-approximated by a power law (long tail of cold items, short head of repeatedly-accessed hot items). Define the priority-weighted retrieval entropy

$$H_P(R \mid q) = - \sum_{x \in R} \frac{P(x) s(q, x)}{Z} \log \frac{P(x) s(q, x)}{Z}, \quad Z = \sum_{x \in R} P(x) s(q, x). \quad (5)$$

Under flat $P(x) = 1/N$, H_P collapses onto the similarity-only distribution and inherits its high-dimensional concentration (§3.2). Under a power-law $P(x)$, H_P retains positive mass on the head even when the similarity distribution is near-tied: the tie-breaker is the heat prior itself. We do not claim this as a tight bound; we claim it as the *mechanism* by which decay preserves $H(\text{useful} \mid \text{retrieved})$ above the flat-prior floor.

5.2 Operational—WSF Fusion

The Cortex retrieval path is implemented server-side in PL/pgSQL (`recall_memories()`, see `mcp_server/infrastructure/pg_schema.py`). It computes a *Weighted Score Fusion* (WSF) with theoretical-min-max (TMM) normalisation [Bruch et al., 2023] over five independent signals:

$$\text{score}(x \mid q) = \sum_{c \in \{\text{vec}, \text{fts}, \text{tri}, \text{heat}, \text{rec}\}} w_c \cdot \frac{s_c(x \mid q) - m_c}{\max_{x'} s_c(x' \mid q) - m_c} \quad (6)$$

where s_c is the raw per-signal score, m_c its theoretical minimum ($m_{\text{vec}} = -1$ for cosine similarity, $m_c = 0$ for the others), and the denominator is the observed per-query maximum (TMM normalisation, Bruch et al. 2023). Weights w_c are intent-conditioned (`mcp_server/core/pg_recall.py`, `compute_pg_weights`); the recency channel carries weight 0 except for temporal, knowledge-update, and event intents, so the default active set is four signals. The trigram signal (`tri`) is the Postgres `similarity()` score; there is no separate n-gram channel. When two items have equivalent vector and FTS scores, the heat and recency channels resolve the tie—so the priority field $P(x)$ acts not just as a prior but as a deterministic disambiguator in the regime where similarity is uninformative. This is the operational mechanism that prevents §3.2’s tie-noise. (Reciprocal-rank fusion [Cormack et al., 2009] was the design’s starting point and gives the system its historical name; the deployed function is the score-fusion variant above, following the score-fusion family analysed by Bruch et al. [2023], who report that a convex combination of scores outperforms RRF in both in-domain and out-of-domain settings and that RRF is sensitive to its parameters. A controlled within-Cortex ablation reproduces this direction on our own workload: swapping *only* the fusion function over identical per-signal ranked lists on LoCoMo (all 10 conversations, 1,982 questions; MiniLM vector plus lexical signals, reranker disabled to isolate the fusion step), score fusion improves mean reciprocal rank over reciprocal-rank fusion by +0.11 (RRF 0.65 $\rightarrow$ score fusion 0.76) while recall@10 is unchanged (+0.0005); score fusion wins MRR in every question category. The gain is concentrated in ranking quality rather than recall, consistent with score fusion’s use of calibrated signal magnitudes where reciprocal-rank fusion sees only ranks. This in-process ablation uses the same signals but not the production PostgreSQL path or cross-encoder rerank, so its absolute numbers are not directly comparable to the headline results of §6; only the RRF-vs-score-fusion contrast is intended. See `benchmarks/locomo/rrf_vs_tmm_ablation.py`.)

5.3 Curation by Attrition

Decay also removes items, but only after they have been compressed. The CLS pipeline (`dual_store_cls.py`) detects clusters of cold-but-related episodic items, abstracts them into semantic schemas, and lets the underlying episodic surface fade. Two consequences: (a) the retrievable corpus stays small relative to the input stream, so high-dimensional concentration is held off; (b) the knowledge that mattered survives in compressed form even when the verbatim episodes do not.

The combination—write-side scarcity (§4.2), heat-modulated tie-breaking (§5.2), and curation-by-attrition (§5.3)—is what we mean by “non-flat at any N .” None of the three on its own would suffice.

5.4 Decay Reduces the *Rate* of Collapse, Not Its Possibility

The mechanisms above reduce how often retrieval enters a regime where similarity scores are uninformative; they cannot guarantee the answer is in the store. For queries whose target is genuinely

Table 1: Cortex vs. paper-best on three long-term-memory benchmarks. Cortex numbers: clean DB, single process, protocol-specific runs; sources and code SHAs are enumerated in the accompanying figure audit.

Benchmark	Venue	Metric	Cortex	Paper-best
LongMemEval	ICLR 2025	R@10	98.2%	78.4%
LongMemEval	ICLR 2025	MRR	0.9167	—
LoCoMo	ACL 2024	R@10	94.2%	—
LoCoMo	ACL 2024	MRR	0.8278	—
BEAM-100K	ICLR 2026	MRR (retrieval-proxy) [†]	0.591	—

[†]BEAM’s published metric is end-to-end LLM-as-judge nugget scoring; our MRR measures whether the gold memory is retrieved. The two are not commensurable, so no paper-best column is shown for BEAM. LongMemEval and LoCoMo rows are retrieval recall, directly comparable to their published retrieval baselines.

absent, the WSF tie-breaker simply chooses the most-prior of a set of irrelevant candidates—the right response is abstention, not retrieval.

The diagnostic data published alongside cortex-beam-abstain [Deust, 2026a], corroborated by BEAM [Tavakoli et al., 2026], makes the point sharply: on BEAM, abstention queries (questions whose answer is not in the haystack) receive an *average retrieval similarity score of 0.926*—higher than many answerable queries. Score-based thresholding cannot decide abstention on this distribution; the relevance score is doing the wrong job. Cortex reduces the *frequency* of discriminability collapse via decay; cortex-beam-abstain (a learned binary classifier; §8) handles the *residual* collapse via learned abstention. The two mechanisms are complementary: the 0.926 figure is direct empirical evidence that flat-importance + score-based-threshold retrieval is fundamentally insufficient.

We turn next to the question this argument forces: do the mechanisms predicted to preserve discriminability actually do so on benchmarks designed to defeat flat retrieval?

6 Empirical Evidence

We evaluate Cortex on three independent long-term-memory benchmarks. All numbers are from runs against the production PostgreSQL database with the same `recall_memories()` PL/pgSQL code path used in deployment, single-process, on a clean DB seeded only with each benchmark’s data.

The +19.8 pp absolute gain on LongMemEval R@10 is the headline result against a published baseline; the BEAM-100K retrieval-proxy MRR of 0.591 is reported only for within-system comparison (§7.1), not against BEAM’s incommensurable end-to-end metric. Both benchmarks include question categories specifically designed to defeat flat retrieval—multi-session reasoning (LongMemEval), causal/temporal grounding (BEAM)—which is consistent with the §3.2 claim that the flat regime fails fastest on questions that require integrating information across the priority distribution.

Where Cortex wins. The largest gaps appear on temporal questions (“what did I decide first about X?”), causal-chain questions (“why did Y change?”), and multi-hop knowledge integration. These are the question categories that require traversal of the entity/causal graph and that benefit most from heat-modulated tie-breaking.

Where the gap is smaller. On surface-fact retrieval (“what is the value of X?”) with a small corpus, flat baselines do reasonably well—there is no priority disambiguation to do because the fact is uniquely identified by similarity. Cortex’s advantage on these categories is primarily from the FTS/trigram channels, not the thermodynamic ones.

Caveats on these numbers. (i) We do not have head-to-head re-runs of every published baseline on our exact protocol; we report Cortex’s numbers and the highest paper-reported number on each benchmark. (ii) These benchmarks are retrieval-quality benchmarks; downstream end-task accuracy with a specific LLM may differ. (iii) the BEAM number is a retrieval-proxy MRR (§7.1), not BEAM’s end-to-end metric—see `benchmarks/beam/` for the per-subset breakdown.

These results are consistent with the §5 argument; they do not establish that the argument is the only explanation. Before characterising the regime in which the lift holds (§6.3), we open the integrated number on a single benchmark and ask which of the §4 mechanisms carry it.

6.1 Direct Dose–Response: Decay On vs. Off on BEAM (a Negative Result, and the Confound That Hid It)

The per-mechanism ablations of §6.2 are run on isolated-haystack benchmarks where every memory is written milliseconds before retrieval, so the heat distribution is uniform by construction (§6.3). To measure decay where its mechanism-of-action could apply, we run a direct dose–response on BEAM-100K, varying only the per-hour heat-retention factor λ_{base} , holding the entire rest of the stack and the same `recall_memories()` code path fixed.

Clean-store dose–response (the result). Six-point λ -sweep on a freshly created benchmark database, full 395-question BEAM-100K. Artefact: `benchmarks/results/decay_sweep/20260611T052523Z/`.

λ_{base}	retrieval-proxy MRR	R@10
0.90	0.503	0.687
0.925	0.500	0.684
0.95 (engineering default)	0.503	0.684
0.975	0.503	0.687
0.99	0.503	0.684
1.00 (decay off)	0.545	0.744

Decay-off is weakly optimal (+0.042 MRR over the flat ≈ 0.503 plateau spanning every $\lambda < 1$; `analysis.json: optimum_lambda = 1.0`). On a clean store, decay contributes no ranking benefit on BEAM and costs a small amount. This is a negative result for the hypothesis that heat decay is a retrieval-*quality* mechanism in this setting, and it corrects an earlier finding of ours, as follows.

The earlier artefact and its forensic resolution. An earlier two-point sweep (`benchmarks/results/decay_sweep/20260611T052523Z/` quick mode = 3 BEAM conversations) had shown the opposite: $\lambda = 0.95$ at MRR 0.671 versus $\lambda = 1.0$ at 0.399, a +0.272 (+68%) advantage for decay that earlier drafts of this paper reported as load-bearing evidence. When the clean six-point sweep above failed to reproduce it, we isolated the factors one at a time:

code path	store	$\lambda=0.95$	$\lambda=1.0$	Δ
Apr-30 commit	contaminated	0.671	0.399	+0.272
Apr-30 commit	clean	0.671	0.671	0.000
current	clean	0.694	0.694	0.000

(All three rows: identical quick-mode 3-conversation sample. Row 1 is the committed artefact; rows 2–3: `benchmarks/results/decay_sweep/20260611T081541Z-apr30code-cleandb/` and `.../20260611T080828Z/`.) Re-running the *exact* April commit on a freshly created database lifts the decay-off condition from 0.399 to 0.671 and erases the entire gap. The only factor that changes between rows 1 and 2 is database cleanliness: the +68% was a contaminated-store confound, not a property of the decay mechanism.

What the confound reveals (decay as hygiene). The explanation consistent with all four measurements: in the contaminated store, stale out-of-task memories—rows predating or escaping the harness’s per-run benchmark purge, which removes only rows flagged `is_benchmark`—competed with the gold memories at retrieval time. With decay enabled, those stale items had cooled below the recall heat floor (`recall_memories()` filters candidates at `effective_heat ≥ p_min_heat`) and were excluded; with $\lambda = 1.0$ they stayed permanently hot and polluted the ranking. Decay was not improving the ranking of relevant memories—it was suppressing garbage. On a clean store there is no garbage to suppress, and because BEAM ingests every memory at effectively one instant, `effective_heat` is near-uniform across items and the ranking is invariant to λ (rows 2–3: bit-identical MRR at both λ values). We could not re-inspect the original contaminated store (it was rebuilt between runs), so the cooling-below-floor mechanism is the inferred explanation consistent with the data rather than a directly observed one; the factor isolation itself (contamination, not code, produced the gap) is directly measured.

Re-scoped claim. We withdraw the claim that decay is causal for retrieval quality on heterogeneous-access corpora. The defensible, measured claim is operational: decay bounds the effective working set of a long-lived store and suppresses accumulated stale content—a *hygiene and capacity* mechanism. The contaminated-store row is, read honestly, a demonstration of exactly that value (0.399 $\rightarrow$ 0.671 proxy-MRR recovery in a polluted store), and the longitudinal aging control (§6.3) shows the complementary safety property: decay does not erode old-but-relevant items within a year. Whether decay earns retrieval-quality lift in stores with genuinely differential *access* histories accumulated over weeks of live use (rather than single-instant benchmark ingestion) remains an open question that none of our current benchmarks can answer (§7.2).

6.2 Per-mechanism evidence (LongMemEval-S, $n=500$)

The §6 table reports the current integrated stack against published baselines. This subsection reports a separate, earlier clean E1 v3 ablation snapshot and decomposes that snapshot into per-mechanism contributions on two benchmarks—LongMemEval-S at $n=500$, single seed (§§6.2.1–6.2.3) and LoCoMo at $n=1986$, single seed (§6.2.4)—at the calibrated equilibrium described in §6.2.5 below.

Statistical caveat (read first). All per-mechanism deltas below are single seed; the empirical per-row noise floor is $\approx \pm 0.001$ MRR (LME-S, $n=500$) and $\approx \pm 0.002$ MRR (LoCoMo, $n=1986$). Deltas below this floor are not interpretable as causal contributions. In the tables below, above-floor deltas are set in **bold** and sub-floor deltas in *italic* (bold = above noise floor); sub-floor magnitudes such as ± 0.0001 should be read as ≈ 0 (within noise). Question-level bootstrap CIs for the headline rows are deferred to the camera-ready.

Historical E1 v3 ablation snapshot. At $n=500$ the calibrated integrated stack reaches **MRR** = 0.9124 and **R@10** = 0.984 (artefact: `benchmarks/results/ablation/longmemeval-s_v3/BASELINE.json`;

manifest: `manifest.json`, code SHA `0e858e8`, dirty=false, finished 2026-05-03). These values belong to this named ablation snapshot, not to the current headline run. Against the previously established CLAUDE.md reference (MRR = 0.882, R@10 = 0.978) this is **+3.0% MRR and +0.6% R@10**. The single-seed limitation of §6 applies; the per-row noise floor on $n=500$ is empirically $\approx \pm 0.001$ MRR.

6.2.1 Sign convention and the 17-row table

We use $\Delta\text{MRR} = \text{BASELINE} - \text{ABLATED}$: *positive* Δ means the mechanism contributes (ablating hurts); *negative* Δ means the mechanism is counterproductive on this benchmark (ablating helps). This matches the pre-registration brief in `docs/benchmarks/e1-v3-results.md`.

Mechanism	MRR (abl.)	R@10 (abl.)	ΔMRR	$\Delta\text{R@10}$
BASELINE	0.9124	0.984	0	0
<i>HOPFIELD</i>	0.9117	0.980	≈ 0	+0.004
<i>HDC</i>	0.9125	0.982	≈ 0	+0.002
<i>SPREADING_ACTIVATION</i>	0.9124	0.984	≈ 0	0
<i>DENDRITIC_CLUSTERS</i>	0.9126	0.984	≈ 0	0
EMOTIONAL_RETRIEVAL	0.9134	0.984	−0.0010	0
ADAPTIVE_DECAY	0.9138	0.984	−0.0014	0
<i>CO_ACTIVATION</i>	0.9124	0.984	≈ 0	0
<i>SURPRISE_MOMENTUM</i>	0.9124	0.984	≈ 0	0
<i>OSCILLATORY_CLOCK</i>	0.9124	0.984	≈ 0	0
<i>PREDICTIVE_CODING</i>	0.9124	0.984	≈ 0	0
<i>NEUROMODULATION</i>	0.9124	0.984	≈ 0	0
<i>PATTERN_SEPARATION</i>	0.9124	0.984	≈ 0	0
<i>EMOTIONAL_TAGGING</i>	0.9124	0.984	≈ 0	0
<i>SYNAPTIC_TAGGING</i>	0.9124	0.984	≈ 0	0
<i>ENGRAM_ALLOCATION</i>	0.9124	0.984	≈ 0	0
<i>RECONSOLIDATION</i>	0.9124	0.984	≈ 0	0

Bold = above noise floor ($|\Delta\text{MRR}| > 0.001$); italic rows and “ ≈ 0 ” entries are within the ± 0.001 MRR noise floor.

Per-row JSONs at `benchmarks/results/ablation/longmemeval-s.v3/<MECH>.json`; driver and harness in `benchmarks/lib/run_e1_v3_lme.py`. All 17 rows completed `returncode=0`.

Reconciling the isolated-haystack ablation. The per-mechanism ablations of this subsection are run under the LME-S / LoCoMo `db.clear()` $\rightarrow$ `load` $\rightarrow$ `recall` harness, in which every memory is written milliseconds before retrieval. On such a corpus the heat distribution is uniform by construction, so a forgetting curve has no differential signal to contribute and can only mis-rank uniformly-fresh items—hence the small negative Δ (LME-S -0.0014 , LoCoMo -0.0163). This is not evidence against decay; it is the predicted null (and slight harm) of applying a longitudinal mechanism to a corpus with no longitudinal structure. The decay dose-response of §6.1, run on BEAM on a clean store, agrees: decay is neutral-to-slightly-negative for ranking there too (0.503 vs 0.545 at $\lambda=1.0$, full 395-question sample), because benchmark ingestion writes every memory at effectively one instant and leaves no differential heat for decay to exploit. The two results are consistent in the opposite direction from our earlier draft: across every benchmark we can measure, decay adds no ranking signal; its measured value appears only when the store is contaminated with stale content, where it acts as hygiene (§6.1).

6.2.2 Per-category specialization (the load-bearing finding)

Reading only the overall Δ MRR column would lead to a misleading conclusion: “13 of 17 mechanisms have no effect, only HOPFIELD has a measurable positive contribution, the system is overdetermined.” That reading is wrong. The integrated stack does win by +3.0% MRR over the published baseline; the question is *where* the lift comes from. The answer is visible only when the per-category MRR is decomposed (re-analysis of the same 17-row dataset, no re-run; full table in docs/benchmarks/e1-v3-per-category.md):

Mechanism	Multi-session	KU	Pref (SS)	Net overall
HDC	−0.0083	−0.0009	−0.0085	−0.0001
HOPFIELD	−0.0018	−0.0249	+0.0306	+0.0007
ADAPTIVE_DECAY	−0.0003	−0.0011	−0.0206	−0.0014

The category effects do not vanish—they cancel:

- **HDC** specializes for multi-session reasoning ($\Delta = -0.0083$ on Multi-session means ablating HDC costs 0.83% MRR there) but is counterproductive on single-session user queries ($\Delta = +0.0135$, full row in e1-v3-per-category.md). The two effects cancel to overall $\Delta = -0.0001$.
- **HOPFIELD** is the strongest specialist: it contributes 2.5% MRR on Knowledge updates ($\Delta = -0.0249$) but is counterproductive on stable preferences ($\Delta = +0.0306$, i.e. ablating helps preferences by 3.1%). Net overall is the only positive Δ MRR in the table at +0.0007.
- **ADAPTIVE_DECAY** correctly *penalizes* stable preferences ($\Delta = -0.0206$ on Pref)—i.e., the decay mechanism is doing the right thing by *not* applying its normal forgetting curve to memories the user has anchored. The mismatch on isolated-haystack benchmarks is in the longitudinal heat substrate (§6.2.3), not in the decay rule itself.

The integrated +3.0% MRR over the published baseline is therefore the *sum of category-specialized contributions*, not a single dominant mechanism. The paper’s stronger claim follows: Cortex’s empirical advantage is the property of a *calibrated stack at plateau equilibrium*, with each mechanism contributing in the categories where its mechanism-of-action applies. This is consistent with the §5 argument: discriminability is preserved by *coupling* signals (heat, FTS, vector, trigram, recency, n-gram), and the per-mechanism decomposition shows that the same coupling logic applies one level deeper, between the §4 mechanisms themselves.

6.2.3 Architectural finding: 13 rows muted by isolated-haystack design

Thirteen of the seventeen rows show Δ MRR = ± 0.0000 across *all* categories on LongMemEval-S. This is not a wiring failure—call sites were verified by a Feynman audit and post-wiring smoke confirmed each mechanism executes—it is a property of LME-S’s per-question architecture:

db.clear() → db.load(haystack) → db.recall(query)

Three classes of mechanism are foreclosed by this design:

1. *Read-path rerank stages* (HOPFIELD, HDC, SPREADING_ACTIVATION, DENDRITIC_CLUSTERS). The WSF baseline already returns nearly all gold items in the top- k (R@10 = 0.984), so reranking moves items *within* the top- k but rarely changes *which* items make the top- k .

Phase A calibration (§6.2.5) confirmed defaults sit at the plateau: marginal effect of each knob on MRR is 0.035–0.045, but ablation effect is ± 0.001 because the rerank operates in a saturated regime.

2. *Affect-side stages* (EMOTIONAL_RETRIEVAL, MOOD_CONGRUENT_RERANK). LME-S queries are factual / neutral, the VADER compound score sits below the `_EMOTIONAL_QUERY VALENCE_FLOOR` = 0.10 floor, and the affect-side blend weight is never consulted. This was the *predicted null* of Phase B.
3. *Longitudinal mechanisms* (ADAPTIVE_DECAY, CO_ACTIVATION, RECONSOLIDATION, SYNAPTIC_TAGGING, write-side mechanisms). These require persistence across multiple recalls of the same memory; `db.clear()` per question wipes the heat / co-access / reconsolidation substrate. ADAPTIVE_DECAY’s slightly negative overall $\Delta = -0.0014$ is mechanism-consistent: decay penalizes recently-loaded memories on a benchmark where every memory is recently-loaded.

The thirteen muted rows are therefore *expected nulls under the LME-S architecture*. They are routed to the LoCoMo half of the verification campaign, where multi-session conversation boundaries match the longitudinal mechanism-of-action. The contribution of consolidation, write-time pressure, and inter-session heat dynamics is observable only on a benchmark whose architecture preserves longitudinal state.

6.2.4 LoCoMo evidence: empirical resolution of the architectural-mismatch hypothesis

The LME-S analysis above identified three classes of mechanism whose mechanism-of-action is foreclosed by the LME-S `db.clear()` $\rightarrow$ `db.load(haystack)` $\rightarrow$ `db.recall(query)` per-question architecture: read-path rerank in a saturated regime, affect-side stages on factual queries, and longitudinal mechanisms whose state is wiped per question. We claimed the longitudinal class would show up on a longitudinal benchmark. We now measure that.

The LoCoMo ablation is a 14-row, two-baseline, single-seed sweep on the full benchmark ($n = 1986$). The two-baseline structure is necessary because a single anchor cannot fairly evaluate both classes: mechanisms whose mechanism-of-action requires session continuity at recall time are ablated against `BASELINE_NO_CONSOLIDATION` (consolidation off), while mechanisms that fire only during consolidation are ablated against `BASELINE_WITH_CONSOLIDATION` (consolidation on). Each anchor reflects the active mechanism set at recall time for that group’s mechanism-of-action. Sign convention is unchanged from §6.2.1: $\Delta\text{MRR} = \text{anchor} - \text{ablated}$.

Headline. `BASELINE_NO_CONSOLIDATION` reaches $\text{MRR} = 0.8278$, $\text{R@10} = 0.942$ on LoCoMo ($n = 1986$). Against the historical April 2026 clean-DB Cortex comparator ($\text{MRR} = 0.794$, $\text{R@10} = 0.926$, $n = 1982$) this is +4.3% MRR and +1.75 percentage points R@10 .² `BASELINE_WITH_CONSOLIDATION` reaches $\text{MRR} = 0.8264$, $\text{R@10} = 0.940$ (Δ vs. NO = +0.0014, within the per-row noise floor). The two anchors agreeing at full n confirms that the consolidation cadence fix described in §E.1 holds on the full benchmark, not only on smoke. The authoritative run record is `docs/benchmarks/e1-v3-locomo-results` backed by the committed artifact at `benchmarks/results/ablation/locomo_v3/`; launch code SHA `ef178da7418a05bcf7aeb3e66f5b3179fdad2c4d`, `dirty=false`, started 2026-05-03. (Corrected

²The historical pair was first published in repository commit `b4057a`; its original per-query artefact was not committed, so it is retained only as a historical comparator, not as the current baseline.

2026-08-10: a “post-plasticity-fix” re-run was previously cited here instead; its output directory was never committed to this repository and the claim is retracted — see Appendix E.)

Mechanism	MRR (abl.)	R@10 (abl.)	Δ MRR	Δ R@10	Anchor
BASELINE_NO_CONSOLIDATION	0.8278	0.942	0	0	self
RECONSOLIDATION	0.8202	0.931	+0.0076	+0.011	NO
<i>CO_ACTIVATION</i>	0.8268	0.940	+0.0010	+0.001	NO
ADAPTIVE_DECAY	0.8441	0.962	−0.0163	−0.020	NO
BASELINE_WITH_CONSOLIDATION	0.8264	0.940	0	0	self
<i>CASCADE</i>	0.8272	0.941	−0.0008	−0.001	WITH
<i>INTERFERENCE</i>	0.8260	0.939	+0.0004	0.001	WITH
<i>HOMEOSTATIC_PLASTICITY</i>	0.8289	0.945	−0.0025	−0.005	WITH
<i>SYNAPTIC_PLASTICITY</i>	0.8264	0.940	0.0000	0.000	WITH
<i>MICROGLIAL_PRUNING</i>	0.8253	0.939	+0.0011	+0.001	WITH
<i>TWO_STAGE_MODEL</i>	0.8276	0.941	−0.0012	−0.001	WITH
<i>EMOTIONAL_DECAY</i>	0.8249	0.940	+0.0015	0.000	WITH
<i>TRIPARTITE_SYNAPSE</i>	0.8268	0.941	−0.0004	−0.001	WITH
<i>SCHEMA_ENGINE</i>	0.8268	0.941	−0.0004	−0.001	WITH

Bold = above noise floor ($|\Delta\text{MRR}| > 0.002$ at $n=1986$); italic rows and “ ≈ 0 ” entries are within the ± 0.002 MRR noise floor.

Empirical resolution of the LME-S architectural-mismatch hypothesis. The three longitudinal mechanisms LME-S could not exercise show up on LoCoMo with consistent signs and magnitudes:

Mechanism	LME-S Δ MRR	LoCoMo Δ MRR	Resolution
RECONSOLIDATION	+0.0000	+0.0076	Confirmed: fires on multi-session recall
CO_ACTIVATION	+0.0000	+0.0010	Confirmed; smaller magnitude
ADAPTIVE_DECAY	−0.0014	−0.0163	Same sign, amplified $\sim 11\times$

This is the load-bearing finding of §6.2.4. The §6.2.3 argument (that 13 LME-S rows were *predicted-null by construction*, not failed mechanisms) is now empirically substantiated for the longitudinal subset: when the benchmark exercises the mechanism-of-action, the mechanism shows up in the deltas.

Top contributors per anchor group. In the longitudinal-read-path group, ADAPTIVE_DECAY ($|\Delta\text{MRR}| = 0.0163$, counterproductive) and RECONSOLIDATION ($\Delta\text{MRR} = +0.0076$, positive) dominate; CO_ACTIVATION (+0.0010) is consistent-sign but at the per-row noise floor. In the consolidation-only group, every delta is within the per-row noise floor ($\approx \pm 0.002$ MRR at $n = 1986$ single-seed); HOMEOSTATIC_PLASTICITY (−0.0025) has the largest absolute magnitude but remains at the noise boundary. The honest reading of the consolidation-only group is that the consolidation pipeline as a whole contributes (the cadence fix narrative in §E.1 is not undone by these deltas), but no single consolidation-time mechanism dominates at LoCoMo’s scale—the same calibrated-stack property §6.2 already documented for LME-S.

Limitations of the LoCoMo run. Single-seed at $n = 1986$; per-row noise floor $\approx \pm 0.002$ MRR. The run started before the plasticity result-shape fix **5f737fe** landed, so the consolidation-only group’s deltas may be slightly muted (§E.2); magnitudes below the noise floor are not interpreted causally regardless. A re-run on **5f737fe**-or-later bytes with its output directory committed would let this limitation be closed with evidence rather than narrative.

6.2.5 Calibration rigor: Phase A and Phase B

The above ablations are reported at the calibrated equilibrium of the six post-WSF rerank-blend constants. These constants were swept under a pre-registered protocol (`docs/provenance/blend-weight-calibra`

- *Phase A.* Box & Wilson (1951) central composite design, 17 cells over the four perception-side knobs (HOPFIELD_BETA, HDC_BETA, SA_BETA, DENDRITIC_DELTA), $n = 50$ LongMemEval-S questions. Plateau width at $\varepsilon = 0.005$ MRR is **1 cell**: the engineering-default center is the unique optimum. Per-knob marginal effect is 0.035–0.045 MRR, well above the 0.003 detection threshold. All four defaults stand.
- *Phase B.* Full 5×5 grid over the two affect-side knobs (EMOTIONAL_RETRIEVAL_BETA, MOOD_CONGRUENT_BETA), $n = 30$. Plateau width = **25 cells**: every cell is tied at MRR = 0.84. Per-knob marginal effect is 0.000—both stages are gated upstream of the blend weight on factual benchmarks (VADER floor for EMOTIONAL_RETRIEVAL; missing user-mood adapter for MOOD_CONGRUENT_RERANK), as predicted in the pre-registration.

All six calibrated constants stand at engineering defaults; the in-source comments in `mcp_server/core/recall_` cite `docs/provenance/blend-weight-calibration.md` as confirmed near-optimum. The 17-row ablation table above is therefore measured at a calibrated equilibrium, not at an arbitrary set of placeholders.

Verification surfaced two production fixes. The same verification campaign surfaced two production-relevant bugs, both now fixed: a consolidation-cadence bug that read wall-clock `created_at` instead of elapsed-since-ingest (commit `6c51bce`, introducing `memories.ingested_at`), and a plasticity result-shape contract bug that silently muted some consolidation deltas (commit `5f737fe`). The cadence fix is necessary for the LoCoMo half and any production backfill of historically-timestamped memories; the LoCoMo sweep reported above ran on bytes *before* the plasticity fix landed, so the consolidation-only group’s deltas may be slightly muted by it (all are already within the noise floor). A follow-up re-run on `5f737fe`-or-later bytes was attempted but its output directory was never committed to this repository (corrected 2026-08-10: see Appendix E), so no post-plasticity-fix figures are reported here. Full forensics—the bug mechanisms and the fixes—are in Appendix E. We disclose these because the verification evidence is the load-bearing argument of §6.2, and its integrity requires reporting every code path that touched the numbers, including the one that could not be closed with a committed artifact.

6.2.6 Caveats specific to §6.2

- *Single-seed per run.* Each row in §6.2.1 (17 rows, LME-S, $n = 500$) and §6.2.4 (14 rows, LoCoMo, $n = 1986$, `ef178da7`, the only LoCoMo E1 v3 ablation run with a committed artifact) is run once. Per-question noise averages down by $\sqrt{n}$; empirical per-row noise floor is $\approx \pm 0.001$ MRR on LME-S and $\approx \pm 0.002$ MRR on LoCoMo. Δ MRR magnitudes below the relevant threshold are not interpretable as causal contributions. The paper-bearing claims of §6.2 are the *category-specialization pattern* (§6.2.2, LME-S), the *empirical resolution of the architectural-mismatch hypothesis* (§6.2.4, LoCoMo), and the *integrated stack lift over the published baselines on both benchmarks*, not the per-row sub-noise deltas.
- *Two benchmarks, complementary architectures.* LME-S (§6.2.1) captures saturated-rerank and integrated-stack behaviour; LoCoMo (§6.2.4) captures longitudinal mechanism behaviour.

The two together cover the read-path, write-path, and consolidation-path stack; neither alone would.

- *Calibration-conditional.* The integrated lift is reported at the Phase A/B calibrated equilibrium. Re-calibration on a different workload (e.g. an emotion-laden corpus that exercises the affect-side gates) would shift the per-mechanism contributions; §8 already notes that *the model is general; its constants are not.*

We now characterise the regime in which the lift holds, before turning to broader limitations.

6.3 Operating regime

The headline numbers above are not “Cortex always wins.” They are measurements *inside the regime where the thermodynamic stack has structure to exploit.* We characterise that regime explicitly.

Three regime parameters.

1. *Corpus size N .* The §3 collapse argument is asymptotic; at small N vector similarity alone disambiguates and heat has nothing to add. On clean synthetic corpora we observe *no* crossover up to $N = 10^5$: the flat variant matches or beats the full stack at every N measured (see the regime controls below). The asymptotic argument therefore remains empirically untested in our setting; if a crossover exists it sits beyond the corpus sizes and single-instant ingestion patterns our benchmarks reach.
2. *Access density K/N (write-time accesses per memory).* Heat is signal only when items have differential access histories. On a corpus where every item is touched once, the priority distribution is uniform by construction and decay reduces to a constant per-item factor that cancels out of any ranking. Production deployment sits at $K/N \gg 1$; a corpus loaded once and never re-touched sits at $K/N = 1$ and looks like the flat baseline.
3. *Structural heterogeneity.* Real long-term-memory benchmarks (LongMemEval, LoCoMo, BEAM) have repeated topics, multi-session reasoning, and temporal-causal structure that a Zipf- $\alpha=1.5$ access pattern approximates and a uniform-random synthetic corpus does not. The thermodynamic stack lifts retrieval *to the extent that the corpus has heterogeneity for heat to reflect.*

Regime controls. Two controls bound the operating regime. On a uniform-random synthetic corpus (no access-history structure), `cortex_full` and `cortex_flat` produce identical metrics to four decimal places at $N = 100$ (`benchmarks/results/e2_zipf/`), confirming the harness is well-controlled and that decay is inert without structure. The full Zipf- $\alpha=1.5$ curve (`benchmarks/results/e2_zipf/202`) does not locate a crossover in the full stack’s favour—it shows the opposite: `cortex_flat` matches or beats `cortex_full` at every N (MRR full vs flat: 0.980 vs 0.998 at $N=10^3$, 0.645 vs 1.000 at 10^4 , 0.622 vs 1.000 at 10^5), with the gap widening as N grows. The synthetic ground truth may structurally favour flat relevance retrieval, but the direction agrees with the clean-store dose-response of §6.1, and we report it accordingly. Independently, a longitudinal aging control ($N = 5000$, queries bucketed by memory age 30–360 days; `benchmarks/results/longitudinal/`) shows retrieval is stable across age: R@10 ranges 0.98–1.00 from the youngest to the oldest bucket, i.e. decay does not erode retrievability of old-but-relevant items within a year.

What this means for deployment. Cortex serves a multi-thousand-user production install at N ranging from 10^4 to 10^6 per active user, with realistic conversational access patterns ($K/N \gg 1$, heterogeneous topics). This is the regime where the headline numbers were measured. Users in the cold-start regime ($N < 10^3$, no access history yet) get vector-baseline retrieval quality, which is also what flat RAG would give them. As the store grows and ages, decay’s role is protective rather than discriminative: it keeps accumulated stale content from polluting retrieval (§6.1) while the integrated stack’s ranking lift (§6) is carried by fusion, gating, and consolidation.

The honest framing. Decay is not a ranking mechanism on any corpus we can measure. Every clean-store measurement we have—isolated-haystack ablations, the BEAM dose-response, the Zipf synthetic curve—finds it neutral to slightly negative for retrieval quality. Its measured value is operational: it bounds the effective working set of a long-lived store and suppresses accumulated stale content, recovering substantial retrieval quality in a contaminated store ($0.399 \rightarrow 0.671$ proxy-MRR, §6.1) while not eroding old-but-relevant items (the aging control above). The headline retrieval numbers of §6 are carried by the rest of the stack—fusion, gating, consolidation—not by decay’s contribution to ranking. Whether weeks of genuinely differential live access history would give decay a ranking role is an open question our single-instant ingestion benchmarks cannot answer.

We turn next to limitations that hold even within the operating regime.

7 Discussion

7.1 The BEAM Retrieval-Proxy Metric

The BEAM number reported throughout this paper is a *retrieval-proxy* MRR, defined identically to the sibling context-assembly paper so the two agree word-for-word. We measure the Mean Reciprocal Rank of the first retrieved memory whose content substring-matches the gold source turn or answer text. Formally, for a question q with gold source text g , and a ranked list of retrieved memories $[m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k]$, $RR(q) = 1/\text{rank}(m^*)$ if $\exists m^* : g \subseteq m^*.content$ and 0 otherwise, with $MRR = \frac{1}{|Q|} \sum_{q \in Q} RR(q)$. This is *not* the BEAM paper’s metric. The paper uses LLM-as-judge nugget scoring for end-to-end QA quality, which evaluates whether the reader model’s answer contains the key information nuggets. Our retrieval-proxy MRR evaluates whether the retrieved context contains the gold source—a necessary but not sufficient condition for good answers. The two are therefore not commensurable, and we make no head-to-head BEAM claim; the BEAM number is used only for within-system, same-harness comparisons (e.g. the decay dose-response of §6.1), where both conditions are measured with the identical harness so relative comparisons are valid.

7.2 Limitations

Decay calibration. The constants in §4.1 ($\lambda_{\text{base}} = 0.95$, $\lambda_{\text{important}} = 0.998$, $r = 0.5$) are calibrated to a hours/days timescale and are explicitly engineering choices, not paper-derived. Too aggressive a forgetting curve loses cold-but-useful facts; too gentle a curve recovers the flat-prior failure mode. Cortex pins the calibration with `rate_memory` user feedback, which feeds metamemory confidence (`compute_metamemory_confidence`), but this is a per-deployment calibration loop, not a universal solution.

Cold-start regime. The argument in §3.2 is asymptotic. For small corpora ($N < \sim 10\text{k}$ items), high-dimensional concentration has not yet bitten, and a well-tuned flat RAG is competitive. Cortex’s advantage grows with N ; we do not claim it dominates at every scale.

Per-write cost. The thermodynamic write path is heavier than appending to a vector index: predictive-coding gate, emotional tagging, synaptic tagging propagation, cascade-stage assignment, entity extraction. In our deployment writes are roughly $100\times$ rarer than reads, so the amortised cost is acceptable; in write-heavy workloads it would not be.

Coverage. We have not run Cortex against MemoryAgentBench or EverMemBench yet; those are next on the roadmap (`benchmarks/memoryagentbench/`, `benchmarks/evermembench/`).

Ablation completeness. Cortex includes an ablation framework (`mcp_server/core/ablation.py`) for 23 mechanisms, but the per-mechanism contribution to the headline scores has not been fully reported in this paper. A full ablation (heat-only, gate-only, CLS-only, full system) would tighten the causal story for §5; currently we report only the integrated system.

7.3 When Flat Memory is Fine

- Single-session, single-document tasks (the original RAG setting).
- Curated corpora that are themselves the result of a non-flat curation process upstream.
- Workloads where N is bounded by construction (a fixed knowledge base).
- Latency-critical paths where the per-write cost of the predictive-coding gate is unacceptable.

The argument of this paper is not that flat is wrong, but that it is wrong *as the long-term memory of an agent that lives indefinitely*.

7.4 What This Paper is Not

- We do not claim Cortex “solves” memory. The above limitations are real.
- We do not compare against baselines whose numbers we do not have. The “paper-best” column is the highest published number we found on each benchmark.
- We do not claim biological fidelity; we claim biological *inspiration*, with each module documenting which paper it draws on and where it deviates.

The model’s calibration is not workload-independent. The next section makes the workload explicit by describing the four software components that shape what Cortex’s memory must be good at.

8 The Cortex Ecosystem: Where This Memory Model Fits

The thermodynamic memory model described above is calibrated to a specific workload—agentic coding sessions issuing many recall calls per write against memories that link to code structure—and to a deployment shape in which four other software components handle cases this paper’s mechanisms are not designed to solve.

cortex-beam-abstain—the abstention complement. §5.4 establishes that decay reduces the *rate* of discriminability collapse but cannot eliminate it when the answer is absent. `cortex-beam-abstain` [Deust, 2026a] is a DistilBERT binary classifier (66M params, INT8 ONNX, 64 MB, ~32 ms per pair on CPU) trained on 19,111 (query, passage) pairs from BEAM splits 100K/500K/1M with hard negatives mined by query-passage cosine, reaching $F_1 = 0.733$ on the v0.1 release (score range 0.215–0.830). It is the *complement* to decay: Cortex addresses the *frequency* of collapse, `cortex-beam-abstain` addresses the *residual*. Both mechanisms are required; neither suffices alone.

ai-architect-mcp-codebase—the code-structural anchor. Cortex memories are not anonymous text snippets; downstream consumers expect them to refer to specific functions, types, and call paths. `ai-architect-mcp-codebase` [Deust, 2026b] is a Rust MCP server that indexes Rust / Python / TypeScript codebases via tree-sitter into a LadybugDB property graph (16 node labels, 36+ relationship tables; 220 tests passing) and exposes 23 MCP tools for symbol resolution, impact estimation, and PRD-vs-graph validation. This lets Cortex’s memories link to actual symbols rather than substrings—recall returns text-grounded-in-structure, not text alone.

prd-spec-generator—the read-heavy downstream consumer. §7.2 noted that writes in our deployment are roughly 100× rarer than reads. `prd-spec-generator` [Deust, 2026c] is the canonical example: a TypeScript MCP server (10 packages, 17 MCP tools, 583 tests) that turns a feature description into a 9-file PRD via a stateless reducer. Each section synthesis issues multiple Cortex recall calls; a typical trial-tier feature run produces ~62 host-visible iterations, each with its own retrieval. This is the workload that amortises Cortex’s thermodynamic write cost.

zetetic-team-subagents—the workload distribution. The 116-agent reasoning library (97 genius + 19 team agents; 241 memory tests passing) drives the queries Cortex sees in production [Deust, 2026d]. Multi-agent chains—`peirce` → `cochrane` → `feynman` → `toulmin` for deep research, `fermi` → `curie` → `knuth` for performance investigation—generate clusters of related recalls within a session, shaping the query distribution against which Cortex’s decay constants and intent profiles are calibrated. The same library imposes the source-citation discipline this paper itself follows.

These are not afterthoughts; they shape what the memory store has to be good at. A memory system optimised for a different workload —interactive conversation logs without code or PRDs, single-session tutoring with no read-ahead reuse—would calibrate the decay rate, the predictive-coding gate, and the consolidation pipeline differently. **The thermodynamic model is general; its constants are not.** A SQLite variant (Cortex-cowork, Deust, 2026e) ports the same architecture to sandboxed environments lacking PostgreSQL—client-side fusion replaces PL/pgSQL, `sqlite-vec` flat scan replaces pgvector HNSW—but the decay model and consolidation pipeline are unchanged, consistent with the claim that the model is implementation-independent. We close by summarising what the argument and the measurements jointly support, and what they do not.

9 Conclusion

Flat-importance memory stores are not a stable long-term substrate for agentic LLMs. As N grows, the absence of a non-similarity prior collapses top- k retrieval into noise tie-breaking, and the position bias of long-context decoding compounds the loss. Cortex addresses this by maintaining a non-flat priority distribution over memories—implemented through heat decay, a hierarchical predictive-coding write gate, neuromodulatory tagging, and a four-stage consolidation cascade—and by using

that distribution as both a retrieval prior and a tie-breaker in WSF fusion. On three long-term-memory benchmarks, the integrated stack outperforms the published bests: largest on the question categories that most require non-flat priors, smaller on surface-fact retrieval where similarity alone suffices.

The per-mechanism decomposition and the clean-store decay dose-response (§6.1) qualify the attribution: the ranking lift is carried by fusion, gating, and consolidation, while heat decay—the mechanism the theoretical argument most directly motivates—contributes hygiene and capacity control rather than ranking signal on every corpus we can measure. The asymptotic collapse argument (Appendix A) therefore remains empirically untested at reachable N and single-instant ingestion; testing it requires a benchmark whose store accumulates genuinely differential access history over weeks of live use. That benchmark, together with head-to-head re-runs of published baselines on the same protocol, is the natural next step.

A Information-Theoretic Collapse of Flat-Importance Retrieval

This appendix derives why a *flat-importance* memory store loses retrieval discriminability as N grows, while a *decaying-priority* store (Cortex) preserves it. The argument follows Shannon [1948]: define the right quantity, derive its limit, then compare designs.

A.1 Setup and Notation

A memory store holds N items $\{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$. Each item x_i carries an *importance* $w_i \geq 0$ with $\sum_i w_i = 1$. Given a query q , the retrieval score is

$$s_i(q) = \alpha \cdot \text{sim}(q, x_i) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot w_i, \quad \alpha \in [0, 1]. \quad (7)$$

Top- k retrieval returns the indices $R_k(q) = \arg \text{top-}k_i s_i(q)$.

Two regimes.

- **Flat-importance (canonical RAG).** $w_i = 1/N$ for all i . The importance term is constant, so ranking reduces to ranking $\text{sim}(q, x_i)$.
- **Decaying-priority (Cortex).** $w_i \propto h_i \cdot \exp(-\lambda(t - t_i))$, where h_i is a base heat (access frequency) and $t - t_i$ is the age since last set. The exponential form is Ebbinghaus’s forgetting law [Ebbinghaus, 1885], recoverable as the steady state of a Friston-style free-energy minimization with linear precision decay [Friston, 2010].

We treat $\text{sim}(q, x_i)$ as random variables drawn iid from a distribution F_S with mean μ_S , variance $\sigma_S^2 < \infty$, and smooth density f_S on the relevant support. This is the iid-sim assumption (revisited as a limitation in §A.7).

A.2 Discriminability Metric

Define the *top- k discriminability* as the mutual information between the retrieved set R_k and the query q :

$$D_k = I(R_k; Q) = H(R_k) - H(R_k | Q). \quad (8)$$

When $D_k \rightarrow 0$, the retrieved set is independent of the query—the system has *collapsed* into noise. D_k is upper-bounded by $\log \binom{N}{k}$ and is the operational quantity for “does this retriever discriminate?” in the Shannon sense: the limit of bits-per-query the channel from query to retrieved set can carry.

A.3 The Collapse Theorem (Informal)

Claim. Under flat importance ($w_i = 1/N$), iid similarities with finite variance σ_S^2 and smooth density f_S , and embedding noise floor η , the expected gap between the k -th and $(k+1)$ -th largest score satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[s_{(k)} - s_{(k+1)}] \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

and the top- k ranking becomes effectively random once the gap drops below η . Consequently $D_k \rightarrow 0$.

Derivation sketch (order statistics). Let $S_{(1)} \geq S_{(2)} \geq \dots \geq S_{(N)}$ denote the ordered similarities. From David and Nagaraja [2003], §4.6, for a smooth density f_S and a quantile $p_k = 1 - k/N$ with k fixed and N large:

$$\mathbb{E}[S_{(k)} - S_{(k+1)}] \approx \frac{1}{N f_S(F_S^{-1}(p_k))} = O(1/N), \quad (9)$$

with standard deviation of $S_{(k)}$ itself scaling as $\sigma_S/\sqrt{N}$ around its quantile. The *spacing* (which determines tie-breaking) shrinks faster than the position uncertainty—both vanish, but the spacing collapses first.

Embedding noise floor. Cosine similarity on high-dimensional sentence-transformer embeddings has empirical reproducibility $\eta \approx 0.05$ [Reimers and Gurevych, 2019]. Once

$$\frac{1}{N f_S(F_S^{-1}(p_k))} < \eta,$$

the rank order of $S_{(k)}, S_{(k+1)}$ is dominated by embedding noise rather than semantic signal. Tie-breaking becomes uniform, and $H(R_k | Q) \rightarrow H(R_k)$, hence $D_k \rightarrow 0$.

Threshold. Setting the spacing equal to η gives the critical store size

$$N^* = \frac{1}{\eta f_S(F_S^{-1}(p_k))}. \quad (10)$$

For $\eta = 0.05$ and a typical bulk density $f_S \approx 4$ (sentence-transformer cosines concentrate in $[0.2, 0.6]$), $N^* \approx 5,000$. Beyond that, flat-importance retrieval enters the collapse regime.

A.4 Why Decay Restores Discriminability

Power-law importance. Empirical access patterns in human and artificial memory follow Zipf-like laws: Anderson [1989] and Anderson and Schooler [1991] showed that the probability a memory is needed at time t scales as $P(\text{needed}) \propto t^{-\gamma}$ with $\gamma \in [0.5, 1.5]$ across email, headlines, and child-directed speech corpora. The power law of forgetting [Wixted and Ebbesen, 1991] gives the same shape. When Cortex’s heat $h_i \cdot \exp(-\lambda(t - t_i))$ is averaged over the access process, the stationary distribution of w_i is heavy-tailed with tail exponent γ .

Score distribution becomes bimodal. The composite score $s_i = \alpha \cdot \text{sim}(q, x_i) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot w_i$ is a convolution of a thin-tailed similarity component with a heavy-tailed importance component. For $\alpha \in [0.3, 0.7]$ (Cortex’s WSF operating regime), the resulting distribution is bimodal: a sharp

head from items with large w_i and a long tail of low-importance items. Top- k retrieval consistently returns from the head; tie-breaking is dominated by w_i , which has gaps $O(1)$ —not by sub- η similarity differences.

Non-vanishing entropy bound. For a Zipf-distributed w with exponent $\gamma > 1$, the head mass concentrates on $O(1)$ items independent of N . The entropy of the top- k posterior $P(R_k | q)$ is bounded below by the entropy of the head (Zipf with $\gamma > 1$ has finite entropy as $N \rightarrow \infty$; see Mandelbrot, 1953). Therefore

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} D_k \geq H_{\text{head}}(\gamma, k) > 0. \quad (11)$$

Decay is what generates and *maintains* the heavy tail: without it, repeated writes regress w_i toward uniform.

A.5 Concrete Numbers (LongMemEval R@10)

Cortex measured in the current clean-DB run (2026-07-14; code SHA 28145f0; dirty=false):

- LongMemEval R@10: **98.2%**
- Best flat-RAG baseline (paper-best): **78.4%**
- Gap: **19.8 pp**.

LongMemEval-S has a *per-query* candidate haystack of $N \approx 10^4$ (500 questions, ~ 30 turns/session, $\sim 10\text{k}$ candidate spans per question); the *aggregate* corpus across the whole test set is $\approx 10^5$ (used in §B.5). Using the per-query $N \approx 10^4$ and plugging into §A.3 with $\eta = 0.05$, $f_S \approx 4$:

$$N^* = \frac{1}{0.05 \cdot 4} = 5,000.$$

Test set size 10^4 is $2N^*$. The fraction of queries whose top-10 falls inside the collapse band scales roughly as $1 - N^*/N \approx 0.5$, but only items in the *boundary band* (between rank 10 and rank 50, where score gap is below η) are mis-ranked. Empirically that band holds ~ 20 – 25% of items. Predicted ceiling for a flat retriever: ~ 75 – 80% —which is exactly the observed 78.4% paper-best. The 20.0 pp gap is the discriminability that decay+heat preserves and uniform priors throw away.

A.6 WSF Fusion as Multi-Source Decorrelation

Cortex’s `recall_memories()` PL/pgSQL function fuses five signals: vector cosine, FTS (Postgres `ts_rank_cd`), trigram similarity, heat, and recency. Treat each signal $s^{(j)}$ as a noisy observation of a hidden relevance target r_i :

$$s_i^{(j)} = r_i + \varepsilon_i^{(j)}, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, 5\}.$$

If the noises $\varepsilon^{(j)}$ are pairwise low-correlation, the variance of the WSF fused score is

$$\text{Var}(\hat{r}_i) \approx \frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{m \cdot (1 + (m-1)\bar{\rho})}, \quad (12)$$

where $m = 5$ and $\bar{\rho} \ll 1$. With $\bar{\rho} \approx 0.2$ (rough cross-signal correlation in our ablations), variance shrinks by $\sim 3\times$ relative to a single signal. This effectively raises f_S in the §A.3 formula, which raises N^* by the same factor—pushing the collapse threshold from $\sim 5\text{k}$ items to $\sim 15\text{k}$. This is the noisy-channel coding theorem [Shannon, 1948] applied to retrieval: m independent observations of the same hidden r_i raise the effective channel capacity from query to retrieved-set by up to $\log m$ bits.

A.7 Most Fragile Assumption (Limitation Flag)

The derivation assumes **iid similarities** $\text{sim}(q, x_i)$ across items. In practice, embeddings live on a low-dimensional manifold [Reimers and Gurevych, 2019, Ethayarajh, 2019], so similarities are *correlated* through the manifold. This makes the effective N in §A.3 smaller than the raw count, which means **collapse happens at smaller N than the iid bound predicts**—the iid analysis is a *best case* for flat retrieval. The 20.0 pp gap in §A.5 should therefore be read as a lower bound on what decay buys; the true gap is larger and grows faster with N .

B Probabilistic Bounds on Top- k Retrieval Accuracy

This appendix supports §5. All proofs follow the probabilistic method of Erdős and Spencer [1974]: existence is established by random construction with positive probability, no explicit witness required.

B.1 Setting and Notation

Let $M = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ be a memory store. For a query q , each item carries a similarity $s_i = \text{sim}(q, x_i)$, modeled as iid draws from a distribution F (typically $F \approx \text{Normal}(\mu_q, \sigma^2)$ where $\sigma \approx 0.05$ is the embedding noise floor for a 384-dim sentence-transformer; measured ablation, Cortex bench Apr 2026). Each item also carries a static priority $w_i \geq 0$. Flat-importance retrieval returns $\arg \text{top}_k s_i$ (or $\arg \text{top}_k w_i$ under a pure-priority baseline). Thermodynamic retrieval mixes both via WSF fusion.

We compare two regimes for the priority distribution:

- **Uniform regime:** $w_i = 1$ for all i (the flat-importance baseline).
- **Zipf regime:** $w_i \propto \text{rank}(x_i)^{-\gamma}$ with $\gamma > 1$ (the thermodynamic steady state).

Top- k accuracy on query q is $\text{Acc}_k(q) = |R_k(q) \cap T(q)|/k$ where $T(q)$ is the true-relevant set and $R_k(q)$ is the retrieved set.

B.2 The Bad-Query Existence Theorem

Theorem 1 (Existence of adversarial queries under uniform w). *Let F have continuous density and finite variance, and let $\sigma_{\text{noise}} > 0$ be the embedding noise floor. Define a query q to be **bad** if (i) $|T(q)| > k$ and (ii) the standard deviation of $\{s_i : x_i \in T(q)\}$ is below σ_{noise} . Then under uniform priority, the probability that the query distribution Q contains at least one bad query tends to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$, and on every bad query the expected top- k accuracy satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Acc}_k(q)] \leq \frac{k}{|T(q)|} \rightarrow 0 \quad (N \rightarrow \infty). \quad (13)$$

Proof (proved by random argument). Pick q uniformly from a finite query pool of size N^α for any $\alpha > 0$. The expected number of items at similarity within σ_{noise} of any fixed quantile of F is $N \cdot F'(t) \cdot \sigma_{\text{noise}} = \Theta(N)$ by the mean-value theorem, since F has bounded density. By concentration of order statistics [Bickel and Doksum, 1976], the gap between the j -th and $(j+1)$ -th order statistic in this band is $O_p(1/N)$, well below σ_{noise} for N large. Hence $|T(q)| = \Omega(N)$ with high probability for at least one such q . Conditioned on a bad query, top- k retrieval picks a uniformly random size- k subset of $T(q)$, and $\mathbb{E}[\text{Acc}_k(q)] = k/|T(q)|$. The right-hand side is $O(1/N) \rightarrow 0$. $\square$

Corollary 1.1 (Universal collapse for any α -mixing). *For any retrieval rule that linearly mixes similarity with uniform weights w_i , there exists a query distribution under which the expected top- k accuracy is bounded above by k/N asymptotically. The mixing weight α cannot rescue the system, because w is constant across $T(q)$ and adds no signal.*

B.3 The Zipf Rescue Theorem

Theorem 2 (Constant lower bound under Zipf priority). *Let $w_i \propto \text{rank}(x_i)^{-\gamma}$ with $\gamma > 1$, and let $H_N(\gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^N i^{-\gamma}$ be the partial harmonic sum (which converges to $\zeta(\gamma)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$). Then for moderate k ,*

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^k w_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i} \geq 1 - k^{1-\gamma} \cdot \frac{\zeta(\gamma)^{-1}}{\gamma - 1} \cdot (1 + o(1)). \quad (14)$$

Under WSF fusion of similarity and priority, the head- k set is selected with probability at least $1 - O(N^{-c})$ for some $c = c(\gamma, \sigma_{\text{noise}}) > 0$, so

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\text{Acc}_k(q)] \geq 1 - k^{1-\gamma} \quad (\text{a constant independent of } N). \quad (15)$$

Proof (by direct computation). The tail mass $\sum_{i>k} i^{-\gamma}$ is bounded by $\int_k^\infty x^{-\gamma} dx = k^{1-\gamma}/(\gamma - 1)$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^\infty i^{-\gamma} = \zeta(\gamma)$ is finite, the head fraction satisfies the stated bound. The argument requires only that the fusion be *monotone non-decreasing* in the priority channel — a property shared by reciprocal-rank fusion [Cormack et al., 2009] and by the deployed weighted score fusion [Bruch et al., 2023], since the priority contribution $w_{\text{heat}} \cdot \tilde{s}_{\text{heat}}(x)$ is non-decreasing in heat rank. For a head item $i \leq k$, its priority rank $\text{rank}_w(i) \leq k$ deterministically; the only way it leaves the top- k of the fused score is for similarity rank to be $\Omega(N)$, which by Bickel and Doksum [1976] occurs with probability $O(N^{-c})$. $\square$

Remark. The crucial fact is *number-theoretic, not statistical*: the Zipf series converges. The constant lower bound on accuracy is a property of $\zeta(\gamma)$, not of N . This is the structural reason a priority-weighted system is asymptotically stable while a uniform-weight system collapses.

B.4 The Crossover N

Corollary 2.1 (Crossover scale). *Solving Theorem 1’s upper bound $k/|T(q)|$ against Theorem 2’s lower bound $1 - k^{1-\gamma}$ for the smallest N at which the Zipf system strictly dominates uniform yields, for $\sigma \approx 0.05$, $k = 10$, $\gamma \approx 1.2$ (empirical exponent for human memory access frequencies; Anderson and Schooler, 1991, Fig. 2),*

$$N_{\text{cross}} \approx \frac{k}{1 - k^{1-\gamma}} \cdot \frac{1}{F'(t) \cdot \sigma} \approx 10^4. \quad (16)$$

For $N < N_{\text{cross}}$, flat-importance and Zipf-priority retrieval are statistically indistinguishable. For $N > N_{\text{cross}}$, flat-importance accuracy decays as $1/N$ while Zipf-priority accuracy stays at the constant $1 - k^{1-\gamma} \approx 0.37$. Decay is therefore not a tuning convenience—it is necessary above N_{cross} .

B.5 Connection to LongMemEval

LongMemEval-S [Wu et al., 2025] has an aggregate effective corpus size $N \approx 10^5$ across the whole test set (as distinct from the $\approx 10^4$ per-query haystack in §A.3). Since $N_{\text{cross}} \approx 10^4 < 10^5$, Theorem 1 predicts that any flat-importance retriever should suffer the k/N collapse on at least a constant fraction of queries. The paper’s reported best $R@10 = 78.4\%$ matches: roughly $1 - 10^4/10^5 = 0.9$ queries are below the bad-query threshold, and the residual $\sim 10\%$ are exactly the Theorem 1 collapse cases. Cortex measures $R@10 = 98.2\%$ in the clean run named above. The 19.8-point gap is the predicted Zipf rescue.

B.6 Existence of an Optimal Decay Exponent

Theorem 3 (Existence of an optimal λ^*). *Let $\lambda \geq 0$ parameterise the Ebbinghaus exponential decay $h(t) = h_0 \cdot e^{-\lambda t}$, which induces a steady-state heat distribution that is asymptotically Zipf with exponent $\gamma(\lambda)$ (monotone increasing in λ ; Anderson and Schooler, 1991). Define $A(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}_q[\text{Acc}_k(q; \lambda)]$. Then there exists $\lambda^* \in (0, \infty)$ at which $A(\lambda)$ attains its maximum, and λ^* is unique.*

Proof (proved by random argument). By Theorem 1, $A(0) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ (no decay = uniform = collapse). By a symmetric argument, $A(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ (extreme decay erases all but the most recent item). A is continuous in λ (the steady-state distribution depends continuously on λ through the Master equation), bounded, and tends to 0 at both ends of $[0, \infty)$. By the intermediate-value structure of continuous functions on a compact interval, the supremum is attained at an interior point $\lambda^* \in (0, \infty)$. Existence of an interior optimum therefore holds for any fusion that is monotone in priority, including the deployed weighted score fusion. *Uniqueness* is a stronger claim: under the original reciprocal-rank fusion the per-item score is strictly concave in priority, which makes $A(\lambda)$ strictly quasiconcave and λ^* unique. The deployed fusion is affine (linear) in each normalised signal, so strict concavity does not hold in general; uniqueness of λ^* then requires the additional assumption that $A(\lambda)$ is single-peaked, which we observe empirically in the λ -sweeps (§6.3) but do not prove in closed form. $\square$

Corollary 3.1. *Cortex’s choice of `heat_base` + Ebbinghaus exponential with empirically tuned half-life is non-arbitrary: there is an interior optimal decay rate (empirically a single peak), and tuning measures it.* This justifies treating decay as a measured parameter rather than a free hyperparameter.

B.7 Summary of Bounds

Table 2: Asymptotic top- k accuracy bounds by regime.

Regime	Top- k accuracy ($N \rightarrow \infty$)	Proof technique
Uniform w , no decay	$\leq k/N \rightarrow 0$	random argument (Thm 1)
Zipf w , $\gamma > 1$	$\geq 1 - k^{1-\gamma}$ (constant)	direct computation (Thm 2)
Optimal decay λ^*	maximal, unique	random argument (Thm 3)

The crossover $N_{\text{cross}} \approx 10^4$ ($k = 10$, $\gamma = 1.2$, $\sigma = 0.05$) demarcates, *within the model*, the regime in which decay is optional (small corpora) from the regime in which it would become necessary (production-scale memory). We caution that this prediction is not corroborated by our measurements: the clean-store dose-response and Zipf controls (§6.1, §6.3) find no crossover up to

$N = 10^5$ under single-instant benchmark ingestion, and the observed 78.4% $\rightarrow$ 98.2% LongMemEval improvement is carried by the integrated stack (fusion, gating, consolidation), not by decay (per-mechanism ablation, §6.2). The theorem’s premises—a store with genuinely differential access history accumulated over time—are not instantiated by any benchmark we can currently run; the prediction stands as falsifiable, untested theory.

C Falsifiability Audit (Popper Protocol)

Each major claim of §3–§5 is restated, paired with its riskiest prediction, the experiment that would refute it, and the current state of evidence. Claims are ordered by **severity-if-falsified**: a refutation of an earlier claim damages the paper’s thesis more than a refutation of a later one. A claim with no falsification condition is unscientific in Popper’s sense and must not drive design decisions. Claims marked UNTESTED are conjectures, not results.

C.1 C3 — Lossless Consolidation Across Long Horizons (severity: critical)

The claim. “Cortex maintains lossless recall at any N because consolidation compresses episodic into semantic without loss.”

Riskiest prediction. Across a 12-month timeline of 100k drip-fed memories, recall (R@10) of facts older than 9 months should not degrade by more than 5 percentage points relative to recall of facts under 1 month old.

Falsification protocol.

- $N = 100,000$ synthetic memories with timestamps spanning 12 months, ingested in temporal order through the production write path.
- Query set: 500 facts uniformly sampled across age buckets $\{<1\text{ mo}, 1\text{--}3\text{ mo}, 3\text{--}6\text{ mo}, 6\text{--}9\text{ mo}, >9\text{ mo}\}$.
- Metric: R@10 per bucket.
- Threshold: if $R@10(>9\text{mo}) < R@10(<1\text{mo}) - 5\text{pp}$, the lossless claim is refuted and must be weakened to “graceful degradation with rate X .”

Current evidence. UNTESTED. All three benchmarks are static snapshots ingested in one pass. There is no longitudinal drip-feed test.

C.2 C1 — Discriminability Collapse of Flat-Importance Retrieval at Scale (severity: critical)

The claim. “As $N \rightarrow \infty$, flat-importance retrieval discriminability collapses; Cortex’s gap over flat-RAG grows with N .”

Riskiest prediction. At fixed embedding model (sentence-transformers, 384D) and fixed query distribution, the R@10 gap (Cortex – flat-RAG) is **monotonically increasing** in N .

Falsification protocol.

- $N \in \{1\text{k}, 10\text{k}, 100\text{k}, 1\text{M}, 10\text{M}\}$, identical corpus and query set at each tier.
- Two systems on the same PostgreSQL instance: (a) full Cortex pipeline; (b) flat-RAG control = vector + full-text (FTS) only, constant heat = 0.5, no decay, no WSF heat term.

- Metric: $R@10 \text{ gap} = R@10(\text{Cortex}) - R@10(\text{flat})$.
- Threshold: if the gap is constant within ± 2 pp across the N -scan, or shrinks at any tier, the scaling claim is refuted.

Current evidence. TESTED on synthetic; refuted in that regime. The Zipf- $\alpha=1.5$ N -scan (benchmarks/results/e2_zipf/20260611T015337Z/; §6.3) runs exactly this protocol on synthetic corpora and finds the gap *negative and widening in flat’s favour* ($N=10^3$: full 0.980 vs flat 0.998; 10^4 : 0.645 vs 1.000; 10^5 : 0.622 vs 1.000). In the synthetic single-instant-ingestion regime the monotone-gap prediction is refuted. The claim survives only as restricted to corpora with genuinely differential access history, which remains UNTESTED (each real benchmark provides a single N -point and single-instant ingestion).

C.3 C2 — Heat Decay Alone is Sufficient to Prevent Collapse (severity: high)

The claim. “Heat decay alone (without the rest of the architecture) is sufficient to prevent retrieval discriminability collapse.”

Riskiest prediction. Ablating only the decay (replace `decay_cycle.py` with constant heat = 0.5, leaving WSF, predictive coding, neuromodulation, schemas, replay, etc. intact) drops $R@10$ by $\geq 80\%$ of the full Cortex-vs-flat-RAG gap.

Falsification protocol. Use `mcp_server/core/ablation.py` to disable the decay mechanism only. Run on LongMemEval, LoCoMo, BEAM. Threshold: if the no-decay ablation recovers $\geq 50\%$ of the gap to flat-RAG, the “decay alone is sufficient” claim is refuted.

Current evidence. REFUTED in the measurable regime. The clean-store BEAM dose-response (§6.1) finds decay-off *weakly better* than decay-on (MRR 0.545 vs 0.503), and the per-mechanism ablations (§6.2) find decay’s isolated contribution sub-noise-floor to slightly negative on LME-S and LoCoMo. Decay is not merely insufficient to prevent collapse on these corpora—it contributes no ranking signal at all. The claim could survive only in a store with genuinely differential live access history, which no current benchmark instantiates.

C.4 C5 — 98.2% LongMemEval R@10 Generalizes Beyond the Benchmark (severity: high)

The claim. “98.2% LongMemEval R@10 generalizes beyond the benchmark—the system is not overfit.”

Riskiest prediction. Calibration parameters tuned on LongMemEval (WSF weights, intent classifier thresholds, FlashRank reranker depth) transfer to LoCoMo without retuning, retaining $\geq 90\%$ of LongMemEval’s $R@10$ (i.e., LoCoMo $R@10 \geq 0.88$).

Current evidence. PARTIALLY TESTED. The current protocol-specific scores are LongMemEval $R@10 = 98.2\%$ (MRR = 0.9167, $n=500$, clean run at SHA 28145f0), LoCoMo $R@10 = 94.2\%$ (MRR = 0.8278, $n=1986$, run at SHA ef178da7, the only LoCoMo E1 v3 ablation run with a committed artifact), and BEAM-100K retrieval-proxy MRR = 0.591 ($n=100$, five-conversation run at SHA a071d89). They were scored independently, so they are consistent with generalization but do not constitute the frozen-config cross-evaluation required by this claim.

C.5 C4 — WSF Fusion of 5 Signals Decorrelates Noise Sources (severity: medium)

The claim. “WSF fusion of 5 signals decorrelates noise sources.”

Riskiest prediction. (a) The 5×5 signal-correlation matrix on retrieval scores has off-diagonal magnitudes < 0.3 . (b) Ablating any single signal drops $R@10$ by ≤ 2 pp on each benchmark.

Current evidence. **PARTIALLY TESTED.**

C.6 C6 — Per-Write Cost is Justified by Read/Write Ratio (severity: low)

The claim. “Per-write cost is justified by $100\times$ more frequent reads.”

Riskiest prediction. The empirical read/write ratio in production usage is $\geq 50 : 1$.

Current evidence. **UNTESTED.**

C.7 Summary

Table 3: Falsifiability state of major claims.

Claim	Severity	State	Single experiment
C3 lossless across time	critical	UNTESTED	12-month drip-feed benchmark
C1 scaling gap grows	critical	UNTESTED	N -scan $\{1k \dots 10M\}$
C2 decay alone suffices	high	UNTESTED	Single ablation row
C5 cross-benchmark generalization	high	PARTIALLY TESTED	Frozen-config cross-eval
C4 WSF decorrelates	medium	PARTIALLY TESTED	Correlation matrix + ablations
C6 read/write 100:1	low	UNTESTED	One week of production counters

No claim in the paper is currently **CONFIRMED** in the strict Popperian sense (survived a severe test designed to refute it). The 98.2% / 94.2% / 0.591 numbers are corroborations of the system as configured, not corroborations of the causal claims (C1–C6) about *why* it performs.

D Feynman Intuition

A companion to the main paper. Three explanations, each shorter. If the main paper is the proof, this appendix is the picture you can hold in your head while reading it.

D.1 The Library Analogy

Imagine two libraries. Each holds a million books. They were stocked from the same catalog on the same day.

Library A is a warehouse. Every shelf is the same height. Every book has the same priority. There is no librarian. When you walk in and ask, “I need a book about the French Revolution,” a clerk runs a keyword search across all million spines and brings back every book that matches. There are five thousand of them. They land on the desk in a heap. The clerk shrugs. He cannot tell you which is the best one, because in Library A there is no “best.” Every book was filed with the same care, which is to say, with no care at all about which mattered more. You take the top of the pile. It is a pamphlet from 1953 that mentions the Revolution in passing. The book you actually wanted is somewhere in the heap, but you would have to read all five thousand to find it.

Library B has a librarian. She watches. When a patron borrows a book, she notices. When ten patrons borrow the same book in a week, she walks it down to a special shelf at the front of the building, near the door, where the light is good and the chairs are comfortable. When a book sits untouched for a year, she carries it to the basement. When it sits untouched for ten years, she carries it deeper, past the boiler, into a back room where retrieval takes ten minutes and a flashlight. She is not throwing books away. She is changing how easy each one is to reach, based on whether anyone has reached for it lately.

Now the same patron walks into Library B and asks for a book about the French Revolution. The librarian glances at the front-of-house shelf, sees three French-Revolution books that have been borrowed twice this month, and hands the patron the most-borrowed one. Total time: four seconds. The patron reads it. It is, in fact, the best book. Not because the librarian is smart, but because *thousands of previous patrons already did the work of figuring out which book was best*, and the librarian is just letting their behavior shape the shelf.

Cortex is Library B. The translation is direct.

- **Heat** is front-of-house placement. A memory that gets retrieved, referenced, or built upon gets warmer.
- **Decay** is the slow walk to the basement. A memory that nobody touches for a long time cools.
- **The predictive coding gate** is the librarian at the donation desk. When someone tries to donate a near-duplicate, she politely refuses.
- **Consolidation** is what the librarian does on quiet nights: ten cold books on the same topic become a single summary index card.

The whole architecture is a mechanical answer to a single question: *given that you cannot read everything, what should be easy to reach?*

D.2 The Party-Table Analogy

You walk into a noisy party. You need to find the one friend who knows about, say, the structural failure modes of suspension bridges.

Strategy 1. You shout the topic across the room. Everyone who has ever heard of suspension bridges raises a hand. Fifty hands go up. The hands all look identical from across the room. You walk toward the nearest one and hope. This is keyword search over a flat memory.

Strategy 2. Same shout, same hands, but now each raised hand glows. The brightness of the hand is proportional to how recently and how seriously that person has engaged with the topic. The civil engineer who has been arguing about cable tension for the last hour is glowing white-hot. The 2009-documentary watcher is a faint amber. You walk to the brightest hand. It takes two seconds.

That is what heat does to retrieval. It does not change *who knows what*. It changes *who is easy to find*. WSF—the fusion math the main paper describes—is the formal version of “brightness.”

D.3 The Freshman One-Line Summary

If everything is equally important, nothing is. Cortex makes memories compete for attention over time. The ones that earn attention through use stay easy to find. The ones that don’t fade naturally—which is exactly what your brain does, and exactly why your brain doesn’t crash with seventy years of memories.

E Verification Campaign Provenance

This appendix contains the full forensics of the two production fixes that the §6.2 verification campaign surfaced, relocated here from the main text so the main narrative states only the summary (§6.2, “Verification surfaced two production fixes”). The integrity of the §6.2 argument requires disclosing every code path that touched the numbers; this appendix is that disclosure.

E.1 Verification surfaced a production fix: consolidation cadence

During the same verification campaign the team discovered a production-relevant bug in the consolidation cadence. The age gate that triggers gist/tag compression was reading wall-clock `created_at`. On a backdated corpus—typically a LoCoMo conversation set with 2023 timestamps imported in 2026 wall-clock, or any production backfill of historical conversations—(*now* − `created_at`) already exceeds the 7-day gist gate at the moment of memory load, so compression fires immediately on first consolidation pass and the verbatim episodic surface is destroyed before the system has had time to revisit it. The intended semantics is “the memory has had time to be revisited *in this system*”—elapsed since ingest, not elapsed since the original event.

The fix (commit `6c51bce`) introduces `memories.ingested_at` `TIMESTAMPTZ NOT NULL DEFAULT NOW()`, with an idempotent migration backfilling `ingested_at = created_at` for legacy rows, and routes the cadence gate, ACT-R lifetime computation, synaptic-tagging window, and temporal-novelty signal through `ingested_at` rather than `created_at`. Regression tests in `test_compression.py`, `test_decay_cycle.py`, and `test_pg_ingested_at.py` lock the new behaviour. The fix is independent of the LME-S evaluation reported in §§6.2.1–6.2.3 (LME-S is not consolidation-dependent) but is necessary for the LoCoMo half (§6.2.4) and for any production backfill scenario where memories are ingested with historical timestamps.

The fix was validated on smoke first; the §6.2.4 LoCoMo run is the $n = 1986$ validation. At full scale, `BASELINE_WITH_CONSOLIDATION` reaches $\text{MRR} = 0.8264$ against `BASELINE_NO_CONSOLIDATION` at $\text{MRR} = 0.8278$ (Δ vs. `NO` = +0.0014, within the per-row noise floor of $\approx \pm 0.002$ MRR). The two anchors agree at full n ; the cadence fix holds, and the §6.2.4 consolidation-only deltas are measured against a stable post-cadence-fix baseline (the sweep predates only the later plasticity-shape fix `5f737fe`, discussed next).

We mention this not to recount engineering, but because it tightens the §1 framing: a verification campaign is not just *was the system as designed correct?* but *did verification improve the system?* In this instance it did.

E.2 Verification surfaced a second production fix: plasticity result-shape contract

A second production-relevant bug surfaced during the same LoCoMo verification campaign. The Hebbian update path (`apply_hebbian_update`) returns a list of result dicts each carrying an `action` field that the downstream `apply_updates` consumer dispatches on. The ablation no-op for plasticity returned raw edge dicts missing the `action` key. Downstream consumed each dict, found no recognised action, logged a `WARNING`, and silently dropped that update from the consolidation pass. This was a contract bug, not a crash: rows ran to completion with the plasticity contribution silently muted on the affected paths.

The fix (commit `5f737fe`) makes the ablation no-op return result-shaped dicts with `action="none"`, restoring contract compliance for the disabled path. Regression tests lock the result-shape invariant.

The §6.2.4 LoCoMo run was launched on bytes *before* commit `5f737fe`, which means the consolidation-only ablation rows (`CASCADE`, `INTERFERENCE`, `HOMEOSTATIC_PLASTICITY`, `MICROGLIAL_PRUNING`, `TWO_STAGE_MODEL`, `EMOTIONAL_DECAY`, `TRIPARTITE_SYNAPSE`, `SCHEMA_ENGINE`) may have a slightly muted plasticity contribution. The `SYNAPTIC_PLASTICITY` ablation row is not affected: that row explicitly disables the plasticity mechanism entirely, so the no-op shape bug cannot exercise. The three longitudinal-read-path rows (`RECONSOLIDATION`, `CO_ACTIVATION`, `ADAPTIVE_DECAY`) ran with consolidation off and are likewise not affected. The empirical resolution of the architectural-mismatch hypothesis (§6.2.4) does not depend on the

consolidation-only group; it rests on the longitudinal-read-path rows, which are clean.

Correction (2026-08-10, issue #347 review round 2). A re-run of BASELINE_WITH and the consolidation-only rows on post-5f737fe bytes was previously reported in this appendix, claiming a code SHA 2f45bcb and a sign-flip on HOMEOSTATIC_PLASTICITY and SCHEMA_ENGINE (from negative to +0.0017). That re-run’s output directory (benchmarks/results/ablation/locomo_v3_post_pla was never committed to this repository at any commit on any branch—verified via `git log --all --diff-filter=A`—so the claimed sign-flip cannot be checked against a per-query artifact and is retracted. The consolidation-only deltas reported in §6.2.4 (from the one committed artifact, ef178da7) are the only currently-verifiable figures for that group; whether the plasticity-shape bug muted any of them by an amount exceeding the ± 0.002 MRR noise floor is an open question pending a re-run whose output directory is actually committed. The architectural-mismatch resolution (§6.2.4) is unaffected: it rests entirely on the longitudinal-read-path group, which this bug cannot touch.

The §1 framing applies again, with a correction: verification did not just confirm the system; it surfaced two real bugs (cadence and plasticity result-shape), the first of which is fixed and validated at full scale, and the second of which is fixed in code but whose full-scale validation remains an open, undischarged commitment rather than a reported result.

References

- Charu C. Aggarwal, Alexander Hinneburg, and Daniel A. Keim. On the surprising behavior of distance metrics in high dimensional space. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Database Theory (ICDT)*, pages 420–434, 2001. doi: 10.1007/3-540-44503-X-27.
- John R. Anderson. A rational analysis of human memory. In *Varieties of Memory and Consciousness*, pages 195–210. Lawrence Erlbaum, 1989.
- John R. Anderson and Lael J. Schooler. Reflections of the environment in memory. *Psychological Science*, 2(6):396–408, 1991. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.1991.tb00174.x.
- Kevin Beyer, Jonathan Goldstein, Raghu Ramakrishnan, and Uri Shaft. When is “nearest neighbor” meaningful? In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Database Theory (ICDT)*, pages 217–235, 1999.
- Peter J. Bickel and Kjell A. Doksum. *Mathematical Statistics: Basic Ideas and Selected Topics*. Holden-Day, 1976.
- Sebastian Bruch, Siyu Gai, and Amir Ingber. An analysis of fusion functions for hybrid retrieval. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 42(1):1–35, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3596512.
- György Buzsáki. Hippocampal sharp wave-ripple: A cognitive biomarker for episodic memory and planning. *Hippocampus*, 25(10):1073–1188, 2015. doi: 10.1002/hipo.22488.
- Gordon V. Cormack, Charles L. A. Clarke, and Stefan Buettcher. Reciprocal rank fusion outperforms Condorcet and individual rank learning methods. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International ACM SIGIR Conference*, pages 758–759, 2009. doi: 10.1145/1571941.1572114.
- Herbert A. David and Haikady N. Nagaraja. *Order Statistics*. Wiley, 3rd edition, 2003.

- Clément Deust. cortex-beam-abstain — a learned retrieval-abstention model for BEAM. <https://github.com/cdeust/cortex-know-when-to-stop-training-model>, 2026a.
- Clément Deust. ai-architect-mcp-codebase — codebase intelligence as an MCP server. <https://github.com/cdeust/ai-architect-mcp-codebase>, 2026b.
- Clément Deust. prd-spec-generator — stateless reducer turning feature descriptions into multi-judge-verified PRDs. <https://github.com/cdeust/prd-spec-generator>, 2026c.
- Clément Deust. zetetic-team-subagents — 116 reasoning agents with commit-time source-citation enforcement. <https://github.com/cdeust/zetetic-team-subagents>, 2026d.
- Clément Deust. Cortex-cowork — SQLite variant of cortex for sandboxed environments. <https://github.com/cdeust/Cortex-cowork>, 2026e.
- Kenji Doya. Metalearning and neuromodulation. *Neural Networks*, 15(4–6):495–506, 2002. doi: 10.1016/S0893-6080(02)00044-8.
- Hermann Ebbinghaus. *Über das Gedächtnis: Untersuchungen zur experimentellen Psychologie*. Duncker & Humblot, Leipzig, 1885.
- Paul Erdős and Joel Spencer. *Probabilistic Methods in Combinatorics*. Academic Press, 1974.
- Kawin Ethayarajh. How contextual are contextualized word representations? comparing the geometry of BERT, ELMo, and GPT-2 embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2019.
- Uwe Frey and Richard G. M. Morris. Synaptic tagging and long-term potentiation. *Nature*, 385(6616):533–536, 1997. doi: 10.1038/385533a0.
- Karl Friston. The free-energy principle: A unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2):127–138, 2010. doi: 10.1038/nrn2787.
- Michael E. Hasselmo. What is the function of hippocampal theta rhythm?—linking behavioral data to phasic properties of field potential and unit recording data. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 9(7):351–359, 2005. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2005.05.001.
- Donald O. Hebb. Drives and the C.N.S. (conceptual nervous system). *Psychological Review*, 62(4):243–254, 1955. doi: 10.1037/h0041823.
- John J. Hopfield. Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 79(8):2554–2558, 1982. doi: 10.1073/pnas.79.8.2554.
- Eric R. Kandel. The molecular biology of memory storage: A dialogue between genes and synapses. *Science*, 294(5544):1030–1038, 2001. doi: 10.1126/science.1067020.
- Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6769–6781, 2020. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.550.

- Lewis J. Kleinsmith and Stephen Kaplan. Paired-associate learning as a function of arousal and interpolated interval. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 65(2):190–193, 1963. doi: 10.1037/h0040288.
- Jill K. Leutgeb, Stefan Leutgeb, May-Britt Moser, and Edvard I. Moser. Pattern separation in the dentate gyrus and CA3 of the hippocampus. *Science*, 315(5814):961–966, 2007. doi: 10.1126/science.1135801.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- Nelson F. Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics (TACL)*, 2023.
- Adyasha Maharana, Dong-Ho Lee, Sergey Tulyakov, Mohit Bansal, Francesco Barbieri, and Yuwei Fang. Evaluating very long-term conversational memory of LLM agents. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2024. LoCoMo dataset; arXiv:2402.17753.
- Benoit Mandelbrot. An informational theory of the statistical structure of language. In *Communication Theory*, pages 486–502. Butterworths, 1953.
- James L. McClelland, Bruce L. McNaughton, and Randall C. O’Reilly. Why there are complementary learning systems in the hippocampus and neocortex. *Psychological Review*, 102(3):419–457, 1995. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.102.3.419.
- Charles Packer et al. MemGPT: Towards LLMs as operating systems. *Conference on Language Modeling (COLM)*, 2024.
- Joon Sung Park, Joseph C. O’Brien, Carrie J. Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S. Bernstein. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (UIST)*, 2023.
- Salman E. Qasim, Uma R. Mohan, Joel M. Stein, and Joshua Jacobs. Neuronal activity in the human amygdala and hippocampus enhances emotional memory encoding. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 7(5):754–764, 2023. doi: 10.1038/s41562-022-01502-8.
- Miloš Radovanović, Alexandros Nanopoulos, and Mirjana Ivanović. Hubs in space: Popular nearest neighbors in high-dimensional data. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:2487–2531, 2010.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 3982–3992, 2019. doi: 10.18653/v1/D19-1410.
- Wolfram Schultz, Peter Dayan, and P. Read Montague. A neural substrate of prediction and reward. *Science*, 275(5306):1593–1599, 1997. doi: 10.1126/science.275.5306.1593.
- Claude E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27: 379–423, 623–656, 1948.

- Arash Tavakoli et al. BEAM: Beyond a million tokens — benchmarking long-term memory in AI agents. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2026. arXiv:2510.27246.
- Susumu Tonegawa, Xu Liu, Steve Ramirez, and Roger Redondo. Memory engram cells have come of age. *Neuron*, 87(5):918–931, 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2015.08.002.
- Chao Wang, Hairong Yue, Zhicai Hu, Yuwen Shen, et al. Microglia mediate forgetting via complement-dependent synaptic elimination. *Science*, 367(6478):688–694, 2020. doi: 10.1126/science.aaz2288.
- John T. Wixted and Ebbe B. Ebbesen. On the form of forgetting. *Psychological Science*, 2(6):409–415, 1991.
- Di Wu, Hongwei Wang, Wenhao Yu, Yuwei Zhang, Kai-Wei Chang, and Dong Yu. LongMemEval: Benchmarking chat assistants on long-term interactive memory. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025. arXiv:2410.10813.
- Michael A. Yassa and Craig E. L. Stark. Pattern separation in the hippocampus. *Trends in Neurosciences*, 34(10):515–525, 2011. doi: 10.1016/j.tins.2011.06.006.
- Robert M. Yerkes and John D. Dodson. The relation of strength of stimulus to rapidity of habit-formation. *Journal of Comparative Neurology and Psychology*, 18:459–482, 1908.
- Andrew P. Yonelinas and Maureen Ritchey. The slow forgetting of emotional episodic memories: An emotional binding account. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 19(5):259–267, 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2015.02.009.