Structure from noise: Mental errors yield abstract representations of events
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Humans are adept at uncovering complex associations in the world around them, yet the underlying mechanisms remain poorly understood. Intuitively, learning the higher-order structure of statistical relationships should involve sophisticated mental processes, expending valuable computational resources. Here we propose a competing perspective: that higher-order associations actually arise from natural errors in learning. Combining ideas from information theory and reinforcement learning, we derive a novel maximum entropy model of people’s internal expectations about the transition structures underlying sequences of ordered events. Importantly, our model analytically accounts for previously unexplained network effects on human expectations and quantitatively describes human reaction times in probabilistic sequential motor tasks. Additionally, our model asserts that human expectations should depend critically on the different topological scales in a transition network, a prediction that we subsequently test and validate in a novel experiment. Generally, our results highlight the important role of mental errors in shaping abstract representations, and directly inspire new physically-motivated models of human behavior.
Our experience of the world is punctuated in time by discrete events, all connected by an architecture of hidden forces and causes. In order to form expectations about the future, one of the brain’s primary functions is to infer the statistical structure underlying past experiences. In fact, even within the first year of life, infants reliably detect the frequency with which one phoneme follows another in spoken language. By the time we reach adulthood, uncovering statistical relationships between items and events enables us to perform abstract reasoning, identify visual patterns, produce language, develop social intuition, and segment continuous streams of data into self-similar parcels. Increasingly, the structure of transitions between events is conceptualized as a network, and one natural way to interpret a sequence of events is as a walk along this transition graph. It has long been known that people are sensitive to differences in transition probabilities (i.e., differences in the weights on edges in the transition network)—intuitively, people are surprised when they witness a rare transition. Perhaps more interestingly, mounting evidence suggests that humans are also sensitive to abstract, higher-order features of transition networks like clusters and communities, even when the transition probabilities are uniform.

But how and why does the brain learn these abstract features? Does the inference of higher-order structures require sophisticated learning algorithms at the expense of precious mental resources? Or instead, does focusing on the coarse-grained architecture of a network allow us to ignore the fine-scale details, thereby conserving mental energy?

To answer these questions, here we propose a single driving hypothesis: that when building models of the world, the brain is finely-tuned to maximize accuracy while simultaneously minimizing the use of computational resources. From this simple assumption, we show that the free energy
principle necessarily leads to a maximum entropy description of people’s internal expectations. As we vary the amount of statistical noise in our model, we find that higher-order features of the transition network organically come into focus while the fine-scale structure fades away, thus providing a concise mechanism explaining an array of previously observed network effects on human expectations. We emphasize that this focus on mental errors stands in stark contrast to the prevailing intuition cognitive science that the human brain is optimized to identify complex patterns and maximize prediction accuracy. Broadly, the surprising role of statistical noise in shaping human expectations highlights the value of simple thermodynamic models for understanding cognition, with relevance for learning and planning as well as diagnosing and treating psychiatric disorders.

Network effects on human expectations

In the cognitive sciences, mounting evidence suggests that human expectations depend critically on the higher-order features of transition networks. For example, when asked to parse sequences of ordered stimuli into temporal blocks, humans consistently choose parcellations that reflect the community structure of the underlying transition graph. Here, we make these notions concrete with empirical evidence for higher-order network effects in a probabilistic sequential response task. Specifically, we presented human subjects with sequences of stimuli on a computer screen, each stimulus depicting a row of five grey squares with one or two of the squares highlighted in red (Fig. 10a). In response to each stimulus, subjects were asked to press one or two computer keys mirroring the highlighted squares (Fig. 10b). Each of the 15 different stimuli represented a node
Fig. 1: Subjects respond to sequences of stimuli drawn from a random walk on an underlying transition graph.

a, An example sequence of visual stimuli (left) representing a random walk on an underlying transition network (right). b, For each stimulus, subjects are asked to respond by pressing a combination of one or two buttons on a keyboard. c, Each of the 15 possible button combinations corresponds to a node in an underlying transition network. Subjects were asked to respond to sequences of 1500 such nodes drawn from two different transition architectures: 173 responded to sequences drawn from a modular graph (left) and 185 responded to sequences drawn from a lattice graph (right). d, The average reaction times across all subjects for the different button combinations, where the diagonal elements represent single-button presses and the off-diagonal elements represent two-button presses. e, Average reaction times as a function of trial number, characterized by a steep drop-off in the first 500 trials followed by a gradual decline in the remaining 1000 trials.
in an underlying transition network, upon which a random walk stipulated the sequential order of stimuli (Fig. 10a). Importantly, by measuring the speed with which a subject responded to each stimulus, we were able to infer their expectations about the transition structure—a fast reaction reflected a strongly-anticipated transition, while a slow reaction reflected a weakly-anticipated or surprising transition.

While it has long been known that humans can detect differences in transition probabilities—for instance, rare transitions lead to sharp increases in reaction times—only recently has it become clear that people’s expectations also reflect the higher-order architecture of transition networks. To clearly study these higher-order effects without the confounding effects of edge weight variability, here we only consider transition graphs with (i) a uniform transition probability 0.25 on the edges and (ii) nodes of uniform degree \( k = 4 \). Specifically, we consider two different graph topologies: a modular graph with three communities of five densely-connected nodes and a lattice graph representing a \( 3 \times 5 \) grid with periodic boundary conditions (Fig. 10c). Since all nodes in these graphs have the same local topology, we stress that any systematic difference in reaction times between different parts of a graph, or between the two graphs themselves, must stem from expectations about their higher-order structure. Regressing out the dependence of reaction times on the different button combinations (Fig. 10d) as well as the natural quickening of reactions with time (Fig. 10e; see Methods for details), we identify two robust effects of higher-order network structure on subjects’ reactions. First, in the modular graph we find that reactions corresponding to within-cluster transitions are 50 ms faster than reactions to between-cluster transitions (\( p = 2 \times 10^{-15} \)), an effect known as the cross-cluster surprisal (Fig. 2c). Second, across each
Fig. 2: The effects of higher-order network structure on human reaction times.

a, The cross-cluster surprisal effect in the modular graph, defined by an average increase in reaction times for between-cluster transitions (right) relative to within-cluster transitions (left). b, The modular-lattice effect, characterized by an overall increase in reaction times in the lattice graph (right) relative to the modular graph (left).

network as a whole, we find that reactions in the modular graph are 31 ms faster than those in the lattice graph ($p = 8 \times 10^{-8}$), a phenomenon that we coin the modular-lattice effect (Fig. 2b). Together, these results indicate that people’s internal anticipations of events depend critically on the higher-order architecture of the transition graphs. But how do people learn abstract features like community structure from sequences of events? Furthermore, what purpose does this knowledge of higher-order structure serve? In what follows, we leverage ideas from information theory and reinforcement learning to argue that the answers to these questions lie in understanding the subtle role of mental errors.
A maximum entropy model of internal expectations

Throughout our discussion, we have implicitly assumed, as is common in the literature, that humans maintain an internal expectation $\hat{A}$ about the transition structure, where $\hat{A}_{ij}$ represents the expected probability of transitioning from node $i$ to node $j$. Given a running tally $n_{ij}$ of the number of times each transition has occurred, one might naively expect that the human brain is optimized to learn the true transition structure as accurately as possible. This common hypothesis is represented by the maximum likelihood estimate, taking the simple form

$$\hat{A}^{\text{MLE}}_{ij} = \frac{n_{ij}}{\sum_k n_{ik}}.$$  

(1)

To see that humans cannot be performing maximum likelihood estimation, we note that equation (1) provides an unbiased estimate of the transition structure, that is, the estimated edge weights in $\hat{A}^{\text{MLE}}$ are evenly distributed about their true value 0.25, independent of the higher-order transition structure. Thus, the fact that people’s reaction times depend systematically on higher-order network architecture marks a clear deviation from maximum likelihood estimation. We remark that thinking of these higher-order effects as indicative of mental errors goes against common intuition in reinforcement learning specifically and cognitive science generally, where the learning of higher-order relationships is often associated with sophisticated mental processes. To understand how mental errors might give rise to abstract representations of transition structures, we must delve deeper into the learning process itself.

Errors in graph learning. Consider a sequence of nodes $(x_1, x_2, \ldots)$, where $x_t \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ represents the node observed at time $t$ and $N$ is the size of the network (here $N = 15$ for all
graphs). To update the maximum likelihood estimate of the transition structure at time \( t + 1 \), one increments the counts \( n_{ij} \) using the following recursive rule,

\[
n_{ij}(t + 1) = n_{ij}(t) + 1(i = x_t)1(j = x_{t+1}),
\]

where \( 1(\cdot) = 1 \) if its argument is true or 0 otherwise. Importantly, we note that at each time \( t + 1 \), a person must recall the previous node that occurred at time \( t \); in other words, they must associate a cause \( x_t \) to each effect \( x_{t+1} \) that they witness. While maximum likelihood estimation requires perfect recollection of the previous node at each step, human errors in perception and recall are inevitable.\textsuperscript{20,21,30–35} Thus, a more plausible scenario is that, when attempting to recall the node at time \( t \), a person instead remembers the node at time \( t - \Delta t \) with some decreasing probability \( P(\Delta t) \), where \( \Delta t \geq 0 \). This memory distribution, in turn, generates an internal belief about which node occurred at time \( t \),

\[
B_t(i) = \sum_{\Delta t = 0}^{t-1} P(\Delta t)1(i = x_{t-\Delta t}).
\]

Updating equation (2) accordingly, we arrive at a new learning rule that accounts for natural errors in perception and recall,

\[
\tilde{n}_{ij}(t + 1) = \tilde{n}_{ij}(t) + B_t(i)1(j = x_{t+1}).
\]

Using this revised counting rule, we can begin to form more realistic predictions about people’s internal estimates of the transition structure, \( \hat{A}_{ij} = \tilde{n}_{ij} / \sum_k \tilde{n}_{ik} \).

**Choosing a memory distribution: The free energy principle.** In order to make predictions about people’s expectations, we must choose a particular mathematical form for the memory distribution \( P(\Delta t) \). To do so, we begin with a single driving hypothesis: that the brain is finely-tuned to (i)
minimize errors while also (ii) minimizing the consumption of computational resources. Formally, we define the error of a recalled node to be its distance in time from the desired node (i.e., $\Delta t$), such that the average error of a candidate distribution $Q$ is given by $E(Q) = \sum_{\Delta t} Q(\Delta t) \Delta t$. By contrast, it might seem difficult to formalize the computational cost associated with storing and recalling events from a distribution $Q$. To the contrary, Shannon famously showed that there is only one suitable quantity that (i) increases with increasing certainty and (ii) is additive for independent sources of information$^{18}$—namely, the negative entropy $-S(Q) = \sum_{\Delta t} Q(\Delta t) \log Q(\Delta t)$. All together, the total cost of a distribution $Q$ is its free energy $F(Q) = \beta E(Q) - S(Q)$, where $\beta$ is the inverse temperature parameter, which quantifies the relative value that the brain places on accuracy versus computational cost$^{20,21}$ In this way, our simple assumption about resource constraints in the brain necessarily leads to a particular form for $P$: it must be the distribution that minimizes $F(Q)$, namely the Boltzmann distribution$^{19}$

$$P(\Delta t) = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-\beta \Delta t},$$

(5)

where $Z$ is the normalizing constant (see Methods). Taken together, equations (3-5) define our maximum entropy model of people’s internal transition estimates $\hat{A}$. We remark that any value placed on computational resources (i.e., any $\beta < \infty$) introduces mental errors—or statistical noise—into a person’s estimation of the transition structure. Interestingly, free energy arguments similar to the one presented here have recently become a popular way to formalize abstract assumptions about resource constraints in the brain$^{20,21}$ with applications from bounded-rational decision making$^{36}$ to human action, perception, and learning under temporal or computational limitations$^{30,33}$ In what follows, we show that our thermodynamic choice for $P(\Delta t)$ leads to a
concise analytic form for $\hat{A}$, allowing us to make simple qualitative predictions about the effects of higher-order network architecture on human expectations.

**Analytic predictions of higher-order network effects.** To gain an intuition for the model, we consider the infinite-time limit, such that the transition estimates become independent of the particular random walk chosen for analysis. Given a true transition matrix $A$, one can show that the asymptotic estimates in our model are equivalent to an average over walks of various lengths,

$$\hat{A} = \sum_{\Delta t} P(\Delta t) A^{\Delta t+1},$$

which, in turn, can be fashioned into the following analytic expression,

$$\hat{A} = \left(1 - e^{-\beta}\right) A (I - e^{-\beta} A)^{-1}, \quad (6)$$

where $I$ is the identity matrix (see Methods). The model contains a single free parameter $\beta$, which represents the lack of statistical noise in a person’s mental representation. In the limit $\beta \to \infty$ (no mental errors), our model becomes equivalent to maximum likelihood estimation (Fig. 3a), and the asymptotic estimates $\hat{A}$ converge to the true transition structure $A$ (Fig. 3b), as expected. Conversely, in the limit $\beta \to 0$ (overwhelming mental errors), the memory distribution $P(\Delta t)$ becomes uniform across all past nodes (Fig. 3a), and the transition estimates lose all sense of the underlying structure (Fig. 3b). Remarkably, however, at intermediate noise levels, higher-order features of the transition network, like communities of densely-connected nodes, come into sharper focus, while some of the fine-scale features, like the edges between communities, fade away (Fig. 3b). In fact, applying equation (6) to the modular graph, we find that the average expected probability of within-community transitions reaches over 1.6 times the estimated probability of between-community transitions (Fig. 3c), thus offering an explanation for the cross-cluster surprisal effect. Furthermore, we find that the average estimated transition probabilities in the modular graph reach over
1.4 times the estimated probabilities in the lattice graph (Fig. 3D), thereby predicting the modular-lattice effect. In addition to these higher-order network phenomena, we also find that variations in human expectations due to fine-scale differences at the nodal level \cite{10,15} can also be explained by taking into account natural errors in cognition (Supplementary Fig. 1).

To understand how higher-order graph features impact people’s internal expectations, we point out that dense clusters of nodes in the transition network give rise to temporal blocks of nodes in a random walk \cite{17}. Locally perturbing the order of nodes to reflect mental errors \cite{20,21,30–35} these temporal blocks remain relatively intact, while the boundaries between blocks become difficult to identify. In this way, topological communities help to conserve the internal assignment of probability weight to transitions that actually exist, making people’s expectations robust to mental errors. We arrive at a complementary viewpoint by noting that equation (6) closely resembles the successor representation in reinforcement learning \cite{38,39}, which has been linked to optimal planning in dynamical environments. \cite{22,23} From this perspective, if rather than focusing on the one-step transition structure, humans are instead planning their reactions multiple steps in advance, then the transition estimates $\hat{A}$ represent optimal predictions into the future, where $\beta$ tunes the desired time-scale (see Supplementary Information for an extended discussion). Whether we interpret our model as representing errors in learning or optimal planning, it qualitatively predicts the effects of higher-order network structure on human reaction times. But can we use the same ideas to quantitatively describe these behavior of particular individuals?
Fig. 3: A maximum entropy model of human estimates of transition probabilities.

a, Illustration of the maximum entropy distribution $P(\Delta t)$ representing the probability of recalling an event $\Delta t$ time steps from the target event (dashed line). In the limit $\beta \to 0$, the distribution becomes uniform over all past events (left). In the opposite limit $\beta \to \infty$, the distribution becomes a delta function on the desired event (right). For intermediate amounts of noise, the distribution drops off monotonically (center). b, The resulting internal estimates of the transition structure. For $\beta \to 0$, the estimates become all-to-all, losing any resemblance to the true structure (left), while for $\beta \to \infty$, the transition estimates become exact (right). At intermediate noise levels, the higher-order community structure organically comes into focus (center). c-d, Predictions of the cross-cluster surprisal effect (panel c) and modular-lattice effect (panel d) as functions of the inverse temperature $\beta$. 
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Predicting the behavior of individual humans

In order to model the behavior of particular individuals, we must relate the transition estimates in equations (3-5) to predictions about people’s reaction times. Given a sequence of nodes \( x_1, \ldots, x_{t-1} \), we note that the reaction to the next node \( x_t \) is determined by the expected probability of transitioning from \( x_{t-1} \) to \( x_t \), calculated at time \( t-1 \), which we denote by \( a(t) = \hat{A}_{x_{t-1}, x_t}(t-1) \). From this internal anticipation \( a(t) \), the simplest possible prediction \( \hat{r}(t) \) for a person’s reaction time is given by the linear relationship

\[
\hat{r}(t) = r_0 + r_1 a(t),
\]

where the intercept \( r_0 \) represents a person’s reaction time with zero anticipation and the slope \( r_1 \) quantifies the strength of the relationship between a person’s reactions and their internal expectations. To learn the parameters \( \beta, r_0, \) and \( r_1 \) that best describe a given individual, we minimize the RMS prediction error with respect to their observed reaction times after regressing out the button combination and trial dependencies (see Methods). The distributions of the learned parameters are shown in Fig. 4a. Across the 358 runs in the modular and lattice graphs, 44 were best described as performing maximum likelihood estimation \((\beta \to \infty)\) and 71 seemed to lack any notion of the transition structure whatsoever \((\beta \to 0)\), while across the remaining 243 runs, the average inverse temperature was \( \beta = 0.31 \). Interestingly, this value roughly corresponds to the point at which our model predicts the strongest network effects (Fig. 3c-d). Additionally, the average slope is large and negative \((r_1 = -1127 \text{ ms})\), indicating that the transition estimates in our model are strongly predictive of (and anticorrelated with) people’s reaction times (Fig. 4b).

To measure the accuracy of our framework, we compare against a hierarchy of compet-
Fig. 4: Learning model parameters to fit individual subjects’ reaction times.

a, Distributions of the learned parameters for our maximum entropy model across all 358 runs. For the inverse temperature $\beta$ (left), 44 subjects were best described as performing maximum likelihood estimation ($\beta \rightarrow \infty$), 71 lacked any notion of the transition structure ($\beta \rightarrow 0$), and the remaining 243 subjects had an average value of $\beta = 0.31$. The intercept $r_0$ was mostly positive, with an average value of 103 ms (center), while the slope $r_1$ was strongly negative with an average value of $-1127$ ms (right). b, The predicted change in reaction times as a function of a subjects’ internal anticipation for 20 randomly-selected subjects (grey) as well as the average prediction over all subjects (red). c, Average linear parameters for the fourth-order competing model. Besides the intercept, all coefficients are negative with increasingly higher-order transitions having progressively less and less predictive power. d, Comparison of the average RMS error for our maximum entropy model versus the RMS errors of the competing models up to fourth-order. The maximum entropy predictions maintain higher accuracy than the competing hierarchy up to the third-order model.
In particular, we define the \( \hat{A}^{(\ell)}_{ij} \) representing the popular intuition that humans learn explicit representations of higher-order transition features—a hypothesis that requires the excessive consumption, rather than conservation, of mental resources. In particular, we define the \( \ell \)-th order transition structure by
\[
\hat{A}^{(\ell)}_{ij} = \frac{n^{(\ell)}_{ij}}{\sum_k n^{(\ell)}_{ik}},
\]
where \( n^{(\ell)}_{ij} \) counts the number of observed transitions from node \( i \) to node \( j \) in \( \ell \) steps. We then define a hierarchy of models that explicitly take into account increasingly higher-order transition features, such that the \( \ell \)-th order model contains perfect information about transition structures up to topological length \( \ell \),

\[
\hat{r}^{(0)}(t) = c_0 \\
\hat{r}^{(1)}(t) = c_0 + c_1 a^{(1)}(t) \\
\vdots \\
\hat{r}^{(\ell)}(t) = c_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} c_k a^{(k)}(t),
\]

where \( a^{(k)}(t) = \hat{A}^{(k)}_{x_{t-1},x_t}(t-1) \). Generally, each model \( \hat{r}^{(\ell)} \) contains \( \ell + 1 \) parameters \( c_0, \ldots, c_\ell \), where \( c_k \) quantifies the predictive power of the \( k \)-th order transition structure. Intuitively, we expect \( c_1, c_2, \ldots \) to be negative, reflecting a decrease in reaction times due to increased expectations, and decreasing in size, reflecting the intuition that higher- and higher-order transition structures should be progressively less predictive. Indeed, considering the fourth-order model \( \hat{r}^{(4)} \) as an example, we find that progressively higher-order transition structures play decreasingly significant roles in shaping human reactions (Fig. 4c). Compared to the strong slope in our model \( r_1 = -1127 \text{ ms} \), even the largest coefficient \( c_1 = -165 \text{ ms} \) is nearly an order of magnitude smaller. In fact, our maximum entropy model achieves higher accuracy than the first three orders of the competing model hierarchy (Fig. 4d)—this is despite the fact that the third-order model even
contains one more parameter. Taken together, these results indicate that the free energy hypothesis, and the resulting maximum entropy model, are consistently more effective at describing human reactions than the hypothesis that people learn explicit representations of the higher-order transition structure.

**Network violations reveal an implicit understanding of topological distance**

Now that we have an accurate model describing how people react to sequences of events, we can use this framework to make novel predictions about human behavior. Thus far, in keeping with the majority of existing research, we have focused exclusively on static transition graphs, which do not account for shifts in the underlying architecture. However, the statistical structures governing human life are constantly in flux, and people are often forced to respond to rare or novel transitions. Here we show that, when confronted with a novel transition—or violation—people’s reactions depend critically on the violation’s topological length in the underlying network, thus revealing that people implicitly represent the topological distances between all nodes in the transition graph, not just those directly connected by an edge.

To easily interpret the effects of topological distance, we consider a ring graph where each node is connected to its nearest and next-nearest neighbors in the ring (Fig. 5a). We asked subjects to respond to sequences of 1500 nodes drawn from random walks on the ring graph, but with 50 violations randomly interspersed (see Methods). These violations were divided into two categories: short violations of topological distance two and long violations of topological distances three and
Fig. 5: Network violations yield surprise that grows with topological distance.

**a**, A ring graph consisting of 15 nodes, where each node is connected to its nearest neighbors and next-nearest neighbors on the ring. Starting at the boxed node, a sequence can undergo a standard transition (green), a short violation of the transition structure (blue), or a long violation (red). **b**, Our model predicts that subjects’ anticipations of both short (blue) and long (red) violations should be weaker than their anticipations of standard transitions (left). Furthermore, we predict that subjects’ anticipations of violations should decrease with increasing topological distance (right). **c**, The average effects of network violations across 78 subjects, estimated using a mixed effects model, with error bars indicating one standard deviation from the mean. We find that all network violations yield increased reaction times relative to standard transitions, with topologically distant violations inducing slower reactions than short violations, thus confirming the predictions of our model.

four (Fig. 5a). Based on maximum likelihood estimation (equation (1)), one would naively predict that people are equally surprised by all types of violations—indeed, each violation has never been seen before. In stark contrast to this intuition, our model predicts that a person’s surprise at the sight of a novel transition should depend crucially on the violation’s topological distance in the underlying graph, with topologically longer violations inducing increased surprise over short, local violations (Fig. 5b). In the data, we find that all violations give rise to sharp increases in reaction times relative to standard transitions (Fig. 5c), indicating that people are in fact learning the underlying transition structure. More importantly, we find that long violations yield significantly
longer reaction times than short violations ($p = 0.01$; Fig. 5c), even after accounting for recency effects (see Methods). These results suggest that mental errors—while forcing human expectations to systematically deviate from reality—allow people to gain an implicit understanding of the topological scales in a transition network, thereby making their reactions relatively robust to the types of local violations that are ubiquitous in human life.

Conclusions and outlook

Human expectations of future events depend critically on the higher-order organization of probabilistic transitions, yet the underlying mechanisms remain poorly understood. Here we show that these network effects, along with a number of other novel phenomena, can be understood as stemming from mental errors in people’s estimates of the transition structure. Combining ideas from information theory and reinforcement learning, we propose a new physically-motivated model of human expectations that accounts for natural constraints on mental resources. These resource constraints generate statistical errors in people’s internal representations of events, which, in turn, explain with remarkably accuracy an array of higher-order network phenomena in human experiments. Importantly, our model admits a concise analytic form that aids intuition and, by learning the inverse temperature $\beta$ that best describes a particular individual, can be used to predict human behavior on a person-by-person basis.

Our work directly inspires new research directions, with important implications from understanding human learning and planning to diagnosing and treating psychiatric disorders.
For example, one could use our model to design transition networks that aid people’s learning by taking into account mental errors. Given the notion that densely-connected communities make people’s transition estimates robust to statistical noise, we anticipate that optimal networks will adopt a hierarchical community structure, thus providing a possible explanation for the hierarchical organization observed in knowledge and language networks. Another important direction should investigate the connections between our maximum entropy framework and the successor representation in reinforcement learning, which maintains that brain regions like the hippocampus are designed to make optimal predictions about the future. But rather than acting as an optimized computer, might the brain instead admit a finely-tuned amount of statistical noise to perform the same tasks? Questions such as these demonstrate the value of thinking closely about mental errors, and point out the need for more thermodynamical theories of human cognition.

Methods

Experimental setup. Subjects performed a self-paced serial reaction time task using a computer screen and keyboard. Each stimulus was presented as a horizontal row of five grey squares; all five squares were shown at all times. The squares corresponded spatially with the keys ‘Space’, ‘H’, ‘J’, ‘K’, and ‘L’, with the left square representing ‘Space’ and the right square representing ‘L’ (Fig. 10b). To indicate a target key or pair of keys for the subject to press, the corresponding squares would become outlined in red (Fig. 10b). When subjects pressed the correct key combination, the squares on the screen would immediately display the next target. If an incorrect key or pair of keys was pressed, the message ‘Error!’ was displayed on the screen below the stimuli and remained until the subject pressed the correct key(s). The order in which stimuli were presented to each subject was prescribed by a random walk on a graph of $N = 15$ nodes. For each subject, one of the 15 key combinations was randomly assigned to each node in the graph (Fig. 10b). Across all graphs, each node was connected to four other nodes with a uniform 0.25 transition probability.
Importantly, given the uniform edge weights and homogeneous node degrees \((k = 4)\), the only differences between the transition graphs lay in their higher-order structure.

In the first experiment, we considered two different graph topologies: a modular graph with three communities of five densely-connected nodes and a lattice graph representing a \(3 \times 5\) grid with periodic boundary conditions (Fig. 10c). The purpose of this experiment was to demonstrate the systematic dependencies of human reaction times on higher-order network structure, following similar results reported in recent literature.\(^{14,15}\) In particular, we demonstrate two higher-order network effects: In the cross-cluster surprisal effect, average reaction times for within-cluster transitions in the modular graph are significantly faster than reaction times for between-cluster transitions (Fig. 2a); and in the modular-lattice effect, average reaction times in the modular graph are significantly faster than reaction times in the lattice graph (Fig. 2b).

In the second experiment, we considered a ring graph where each node was connected to its nearest and next-nearest neighbors in the ring (Fig. 5a). In order to study the dependence of human expectations on violations to the network structure, the first 500 trials for each subject constituted a standard random walk, allowing each subject time to develop expectations about the underlying transition structure. Across the final 1000 trials, we randomly distributed 50 network violations: 20 short violations of topological distance two and 30 long violations, 20 of topological distance three and 10 of topological distance four (Fig. 5a). As predicted by our model, we found a novel violations effect, wherein violations of longer topological distance give rise to larger increases in reaction times than short, local violations (Fig. 5b-c).

**Data analysis.** To make inferences about subjects’ internal expectations based on their reaction times, we used more stringent filtering techniques than previous experiments when pre-processing the data.\(^{15}\) Across both experiments, we first excluded from analysis the first 500 trials, in which subjects’ reaction times varied wildly (Fig. 10c), focusing instead on the final 1000 trials, at which point subjects had already developed internal expectations about the transition structures. We then excluded all trials in which subjects responded incorrectly. Finally, we excluded reaction times that were implausible, either three standard deviations from a subjects’ mean reaction time or below 100 ms. Furthermore, when measuring the network effects in both experiments, we also excluded reaction times over 3500 ms.
for implausibility (Figs. 2 and 5). When learning the parameters of our model and measuring model performance in the first experiment (Fig. 3), to avoid large fluctuations in the results based on outlier reactions, we were even more stringent, excluding all reaction times over 2000 ms. Taken together, when measuring the cross-cluster surprisal and modular-lattice effects (Fig. 2), we used an average of 931 trials per subject; when learning and evaluating our model (Fig. 4), we used an average of 911 trials per subject; and when measuring the violation effects (Fig. 5), we used an average of 917 trials per subject.

Measurement of higher-order network effects using mixed effects models. In order to extract the effects of higher-order network structure on subjects’ reaction times, we used linear mixed effects models, which have become prominent in human research where many measurements are made for each subject. Put simply, mixed effects models generalize standard linear regression techniques to include both fixed effects, which are constant across subjects, and random effects, which vary between subjects. Compared with standard linear models, mixed effects models allow for differentiation between effects that are subject-specific and those that persist across an entire population. Here, all models were fit using the `fitlme` function in MATLAB (R2018a), and random effects were chosen as the maximal structure that (i) allowed model convergence and (ii) did not include effects whose 95% confidence intervals overlapped with zero. In what follows, when referring to our mixed effects models, we employ the standard R notation.

First, we considered the cross-cluster surprisal effect (Fig. 2a). Since we were only interested in measuring higher-order effects of the network topology on human reaction times, it was important to regress out simple biomechanical dependencies on the target button combinations (Fig. 10d) and the natural quickening of reactions with time (Fig. 10e). Also, since some subjects responded to both the modular and lattice graphs (see Experimental Procedures), it was important to account for changes in reaction times due to which stage of the experiment a subject was in. To measure the cross-cluster surprisal effect, we fit a mixed effects model with the formula ‘$RT \sim \log(Trial) \ast Stage + Target + Trans\_Type + (1 + \log(Trial) \ast Stage + Trans\_Type | ID)$’, where $RT$ is the reaction time, $Trial$ is the trial number between 501 and 1500 (we found that $\log(Trial)$ was far more predictive of subjects’ reaction times than the trial number itself), $Stage$ is the stage of the experiment (either one or two), $Target$
is the target button combination, $Trans_{Type}$ is the type of transition (either within-cluster or between-cluster), and $ID$ is each subject’s unique ID. Learning this mixed effects model (Supplementary Tab. 1), we found a fixed 50 ms increase in reaction times ($p = 2 \times 10^{-15}$) for between-cluster transitions relative to within-cluster transitions (Fig. 2a). This increase indicates that the subjects had systematically stronger expectations for within-cluster transitions than for between-cluster transitions.

We next studied the modular-lattice effect (Fig. 2b). To do so, we fit a mixed effects model with the formula $'RT \sim \log(Trial) \times Stage + Target + Graph + (1 + \log(Trial) \times Stage + Graph | ID)'$, where $Graph$ represents the type of transition network, either modular or lattice. Learning this mixed effects model (Supplementary Tab. 2), we found a fixed 31 ms increase in reaction times ($p = 8 \times 10^{-8}$) in the lattice graph relative to the modular graph (Fig. 2b). This increase indicates that subjects had systematically stronger expectations overall for transitions in the modular graph than in the lattice graph, again suggesting that densely-connected communities conserve probability weight in mental estimates of transition structures.

Finally, we considered the effects of violations of varying topological distance in the ring lattice (Fig. 3b). We fit a mixed effects model with the formula $'RT \sim \log(Trial) + Target + Recency + Top\_Dist + (1 + \log(Trial) + Recency + Top\_Dist | ID)'$, where $Recency$ represents the number of trials since last observing a node and $Top\_Dist$ represents the topological distance of a transition, either one for a standard transition, two for a short violation, or three for a long violation. We included $Recency$ in the model to ensure that any dependence on topological distance was purely due to internal expectations about the transition structure and not merely the result of recency effects. Learning the model (Supplementary Tabs. 3 and 4), we found a 38 ms increase in reaction times for short violations relative to standard transitions ($p = 7 \times 10^{-6}$), a 63 ms increase in reaction times for long violations relative to standard transitions ($p = 7 \times 10^{-16}$), and a 28 ms increase in reaction times for long violations relative to short violations ($p = 0.01$). Together, these results indicate that, even after accounting for recency effects, people’s expectations of network violations decrease with increasing topological distance. Put simply, people are more surprised by violations to the network structure that take them further from their current position in the network, suggesting that people have an implicit understanding of the topological distances between nodes in the network.
Analytic derivation of our maximum entropy model and the infinite-sequence limit. Here we provide a more thorough derivation of our maximum entropy model of human expectations, with the goal of fostering intuition. Given a matrix of erroneous transition counts $\tilde{n}_{ij}$, our estimate of the transition structure is given by $
AB_{ij} = \frac{\tilde{n}_{ij}}{\sum_k \tilde{n}_{ik}}$.

When observing a sequence of nodes $x_1, x_2, \ldots$, in order to construct the counts $\tilde{n}_{ij}$, we assume that humans use the following recursive rule: $\tilde{n}_{ij}(t + 1) = \tilde{n}_{ij}(t) + B_t(i) \mathbf{1}(j = x_{t+1})$, where $B_t(i)$ denotes the belief, or perceived probability, that node $i$ occurred at the previous time $t$. This belief, in turn, can be written in terms of the probability $P(\Delta t)$ of accidentally recalling the node that occurred $\Delta t$ time steps from the desired node at time $t$: $B_t(i) = \sum_{t-\Delta t=0}^{t-1} P(\Delta t) \mathbf{1}(i = x_t-\Delta t)$.

In order to make quantitative predictions about people’s estimates of a transition structure, we must choose a mathematical form for $P(\Delta t)$. To do so, we leverage the free energy hypothesis$^{20, 21}$. When building mental models, the brain is finely-tuned to simultaneously minimize errors and the consumption of computational resources. The average error associated with a candidate distribution $Q(\Delta t)$ is assumed to be the average distance in time of the recalled node from the target node, denoted $E(Q) = \sum_{\Delta t} Q(\Delta t) \Delta t$. Furthermore, Shannon famously proved that the only suitable choice for the computational cost of a candidate distribution is its negative entropy$^{18}$ denoted $-S(Q) = \sum_{\Delta t} Q(\Delta t) \log Q(\Delta t)$. Taken together, the total cost associated with a distribution $Q(\Delta t)$ is given by the free energy $F(Q) = \beta E(Q) - S(Q)$, where $\beta$, referred to as the inverse temperature, parameterizes the relative importance of minimizing errors versus computational costs. By minimizing $F$ with respect to $Q$, we arrive at the Boltzmann distribution $P(\Delta t) = e^{-\beta \Delta t}/Z$, where $Z$ is the normalizing partition function$^{19}$. We emphasize that this mathematical form for $P(\Delta t)$ followed necessarily from our free energy assumption about the functionality of the human brain.

To gain an analytic intuition for the model without referring to a particular random walk, we consider the limit of an infinitely-long sequence of nodes. To begin, we consider a sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_T$ of length $T$. At the end of this
sequence, the counting matrix takes the form

$$\tilde{n}_{ij}(T) = \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} B_t(i) \mathbf{1}(j = x_{t+1})$$

$$= \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \left( \sum_{\Delta t = 0}^{t-1} P(\Delta t) \mathbf{1}(i = x_{t-\Delta t}) \right) \mathbf{1}(j = x_{t+1}).$$

(8)

Dividing both sides by $T$, the right-hand side becomes a time average, which by the ergodic theorem converges to an expectation over the transition structure in the limit $T \to \infty$,

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{\tilde{n}_{ij}(T)}{T} = \sum_{\Delta t = 0}^{\infty} P(\Delta t) \langle \mathbf{1}(i = x_{t-\Delta t}) \mathbf{1}(j = x_{t+1}) \rangle_A,$$

(9)

where $\langle \cdot \rangle_A$ denotes an expectation over random walks in $A$. We note that the expectation of an identity function is simply a probability, such that $\langle \mathbf{1}(i = x_{t-\Delta t}) \mathbf{1}(j = x_{t+1}) \rangle_A = p_i (A^{\Delta t+1})_{ij}$, where $p_i$ is the long-run probability of node $i$ appearing in the sequence and $(A^{\Delta t+1})_{ij}$ is the probability of randomly walking from $i$ to $j$ in $\Delta t + 1$ steps.

Putting these pieces together, we find that the expectation $\hat{A}$ converges to a concise mathematical form,

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{\hat{A}_{ij}(T)}{T} = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{\tilde{n}_{ij}(T)}{T} = \sum_{\Delta t = 0}^{\infty} P(\Delta t) \langle (A^{\Delta t+1})_{ij} \rangle_A$$

$$= \sum_{\Delta t = 0}^{\infty} P(\Delta t) (A^{\Delta t+1})_{ij}.$$

(10)

Thus far, we have not appealed to our maximum entropy form for $P(\Delta t)$. It turns out that doing so allows us to write down an analytic expression for the long-time expectations $\hat{A}$ simply in terms of the transition structure $A$ and the inverse temperature $\beta$. Noting that $Z = \sum_{\Delta t = 0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta \Delta t} = 1/(1 - e^{-\beta})$ and $\sum_{\Delta t = 0}^{\infty} (e^{-\beta} A)^{\Delta t} = (I - e^{-\beta} A)^{-1}$, we have

$$\hat{A} = \sum_{\Delta t = 0}^{\infty} P(\Delta t) A^{\Delta t+1}$$

$$= \frac{1}{Z} A \sum_{\Delta t = 0}^{\infty} (e^{-\beta} A)^{\Delta t}$$

$$= (1 - e^{-\beta}) A (I - e^{-\beta} A)^{-1}.$$ 

(11)

This surprisingly simple formula for the expectations $\hat{A}_{ij}$ is the basis for all of our analytic predictions (Figs. 3c-d, 5b) and is closely related to notions of communicability in complex network theory.
Learning model parameters and making quantitative predictions. Given an observed sequence of nodes \(x_1, \ldots, x_{t-1}\), and given an inverse temperature \(\beta\), our model predicts the anticipation, or expectation, of the subsequent node \(x_t\) to be
\[
a(t) = \hat{A}_{x_{t-1}, x_t}(t-1).
\]
In order to quantitatively describe the reactions of an individual subject, we must relate the expectations \(a(t)\) to predictions about a person’s reaction times \(\hat{r}(t)\) and then learn the model parameters that best fit the reactions of an individual subject. The simplest possible prediction is given by the linear relation \(\hat{r}(t) = r_0 + r_1 a(t)\), where the intercept \(r_0\) represents a person’s reaction time with zero anticipation and the slope \(r_1\) quantifies the strength with which a person’s reaction times depend on their internal expectations.

In total, our predictions \(\hat{r}(t)\) contain three parameters \((\beta, r_0, \text{ and } r_1)\), which must be learned from the data for each subject. Before learning these parameters, however, we first regress out the dependencies of each subject’s reaction times on the button combinations and trial number using a mixed effects model of the form ‘\(RT \sim \log(Trial) \ast Stage + Target + (1 + \log(Trial) \ast Stage \mid ID)\)’. Then, to learn the model parameters that best describe an individual’s reactions, we minimize the RMS prediction error with respect to each subject’s observed reaction times, \(\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\sum_t (r(t) - \hat{r}(t))^2}\). We note that, given a choice for the inverse temperature \(\beta\), the linear parameters \(r_0\) and \(r_1\) can be calculated analytically using standard linear regression techniques. Thus, the problem of learning the model parameters can be restated as a one-dimensional minimization problem; that is, minimizing RMSE with respect to the inverse temperature \(\beta\). To find the global minimum, we began by calculating RMSE along 200 logarithmically-spaced values for \(\beta\) between \(10^{-4}\) and 10. Then, starting at the minimum value of this search, we performed gradient descent until the gradient fell below an absolute value of \(10^{-6}\). The gradient of the RMS error with respect to the inverse temperature is given by
\[
\frac{\partial \text{RMSE}}{\partial \beta} = \frac{r_1}{\text{RMSE}} \sum_t (r(t) - \hat{r}(t)) \frac{\partial a(t)}{\partial \beta},
\]
where the derivative of the expectation is given by
\[
\frac{\partial \hat{A}_{ij}(t)}{\partial \beta} = \sum_k \hat{n}_{ik}(t) \left( \frac{\partial \hat{n}_{ij}(t)}{\partial \beta} - \hat{A}_{ij} \sum_\ell \frac{\partial \hat{n}_{ij}(t)}{\partial \beta} \right).
\]
Recalling equation (8), the derivative of the transition counts can be written
\[
\frac{\partial \hat{n}_{ij}(t)}{\partial \beta} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{t-1} \sum_{\Delta t=0}^{t'-1} \frac{\partial P_{\ell'}(\Delta t)}{\partial \beta} 1(i = x_{t'-\Delta t}) 1(j = x_{t'+1}),
\]
where \( P_{t'}(\Delta t) \) represents the probability of accidentally remembering the node \( x_{t' - \Delta t} \) instead of the target node \( x_{t'} \).

Taking one more derivative, we have

\[
\frac{\partial P_{t'}(\Delta t)}{\partial \beta} = P_{t'}(\Delta t) \left( -\Delta t + \sum_{\Delta t' = 0}^{t' - 1} P_{\Delta t'}(\Delta t') \Delta t' \right).
\]  (15)

Taken together, equations (12-15) define the derivative of the RMS error with respect to the inverse temperature \( \beta \), thus completing the description of our gradient descent algorithm. Finally, we note that, in addition to the learning procedure described above, for each subject we also manually checked the RMS errors associated with the two limits \( \beta \to 0 \) and \( \beta \to \infty \). The resulting model parameters for all subjects that responded to the modular or lattice graphs are shown in Fig. 4.

**Experimental procedures.** All participants provided informed consent in writing and experimental methods were approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Pennsylvania. In total, we recruited 364 unique participants to complete our study on Amazon’s Mechanical Turk, an online marketplace for crowdsourced work. For the first experiment, 101 participants only responded to sequences drawn from the modular graph, 113 participants only responded to sequences drawn from the lattice graph, and 72 participants responded to sequences drawn from both the modular and lattice graphs in back-to-back sessions for a total of 173 exposures to the modular graph and 185 exposures to the lattice graph. For the second experiment, we recruited 78 participants to respond to sequences drawn from the ring graph with violations randomly interspersed. Worker IDs were used to exclude duplicate participants between experiments, and all participants were financially remunerated for their time. In the first experiment, subjects were paid up to $11 for up to an estimated 60 minutes: $3 per network for up to two networks, $2 per network for correctly responding on at least 90% of the trials, and $1 for completing the entire task. In the second experiment, subjects were paid up to $7.50 for an estimated 30 minutes: $5.50 for completing the experiment and $2 for correctly responding on at least 90% of the trials.

At the beginning of each experiment, subjects were provided with the following instructions: “In a few minutes, you will see five squares shown on the screen, which will light up as the experiment progresses. These squares correspond with keys on your keyboard, and your job is to watch the squares and press the corresponding key when that square lights up.” For the 72 subjects that responded to both the modular and lattice graphs, an additional piece
of information was also provided: “This part will take around 30 minutes, followed by a similar task which will take another 30 minutes.” Before each experiment began, subjects were given a short quiz to verify that they had read and understood the instructions. If any questions were answered incorrectly, subjects were shown the instructions again and asked to repeat the quiz until they answered all questions correctly. Next, all subjects were shown a 10-trial segment that did not count towards their performance; this segment also displayed text on the screen explicitly telling the subject what keys to press on their keyboard. Subjects then began their 1500-trial experiment. For the subjects that responded to both the modular and lattice graphs, a brief reminder was presented before the second graph, but no new instructions were given. After completing each experiment, subjects were presented with performance information and their bonus earned, as well as the option to provide feedback.

Data Availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon request.
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Structure from noise: Mental errors yield abstract representations of events

Supplementary Information

In this Supplementary Information, we provide extended discussion and data to support the results presented in the main text. We begin by presenting experimental evidence showing that human reaction times—in addition to depending on higher-order network features—also reflect differences in the fine-scale structure at the level of individual nodes. Just as for the higher-order effects presented in the main text, we demonstrate that these fine-scale phenomena are accurately predicted by our maximum entropy model. To facilitate the reproducibility of our main results, we then present the mixed effects models that were used to measure higher-order network effects in our human experiments. Finally, we highlight the relation between our model and the successor representation in reinforcement learning, describing both mathematical similarities and conceptual differences.

The effects of node heterogeneity on human expectations

In the main text, we demonstrated that human expectations depend critically on the higher-order network structure of transitions. In addition to these higher-order phenomena, it has long been known that human expectations also reflect differences in the fine-scale structure of transition networks.\textsuperscript{6,15} For instance, humans are surprised by rare transitions, represented in a transition network by edges with low probability weight.\textsuperscript{6} Here, we provide empirical evidence showing that people’s expectations also depend on the local topologies of the nodes that bookend a transition, and that these fine-scale effects are consistently predicted by our maximum entropy model.
In order to clearly study the effects of higher-order network structure, in the main text we focused on networks with uniform edge weights and node degrees. Here, to study the effects of node heterogeneity, we instead consider a set of Erdős-Rényi random graphs with the same number of nodes \( N = 15 \) and edges \( 30 \) as in our previous modular and lattice graphs. To ensure that the random walks are properly defined, we set the transition probability \( A_{ij} \) of each edge in the graph to \( 1/d_i \), where \( d_i \) is the degree of node \( i \). Since the probabilities \( A_{ij} \) decrease as the degree \( d_i \) increases, one should suspect that high-degree (or hub) nodes yield decreased anticipations—and therefore increased reaction times—at the next step of a random sequence. Indeed, using equation (6), we find that our model analytically predicts decreased expectations following a high-degree node (Fig. 6a). Furthermore, across 177 human subjects, we find a strong positive correlation between people’s reaction times and the degree of the preceding node in the sequence (Fig. 6b).

Interestingly, while people’s anticipations exhibit a sharp decline if the preceding node has high-degree, our model predicts that these hub nodes instead yield increased anticipations on the current step (Fig. 6c). Thus, while hub nodes give rise to marked increases in reaction times on the subsequent step, these high-degree nodes actually yield faster reactions on the current step (Fig. 6d). This juxtaposition of effects from one time step to the next highlights the complex ways in which the network structure of transitions can affect people’s mental representations. Additionally, the success of our model in predicting these competing phenomena further strengthens our conclusion that mental errors play a crucial role in shaping people’s internal expectations.
Supplementary Fig. 1: The effects of node degree on reaction times.

a, The average expectation $\hat{A}_{ij}$ plotted with respect to the degree of the preceding node $i$ across a range of inverse temperatures $\beta$. As expected, expectations decrease as the degree of the preceding node increases; and for $\beta = 10$, we have $\hat{A}_{ij} \approx A_{ij} = 1/d_i$. The lines and shaded regions represent averages and 95% confidence intervals over 1000 randomly-generated Erdős-Rényi networks. b, People exhibit sharp increases in reaction time following nodes of higher degree, with Spearman’s correlation $r_S = 0.23$. The data is combined across 177 subjects, each of whom was asked to respond to a sequence of 1500 stimuli drawn from a random Erdős-Rényi network. Each data point represents the average reaction time for one node of a graph, and so each subject contributes 15 points. The line and shaded region represent the best fit and 95% confidence interval, respectively. c, The average expectation $\hat{A}_{ij}$ plotted with respect to the degree of the current node $j$ across the same range of inverse temperatures as in a. d, People exhibit a steady decline in reaction times as the current node degree increases, with Spearman’s correlation $r_S = -0.10$. 
Measurement of higher-order network effects using mixed effects models

In order to extract the effects of higher-order network structure on subjects’ reaction times, we used linear mixed effects models, which have become prominent in human research where many measurements are made for each subject.\cite{28,51} In what follows, when referring to our mixed effects models, we adopt the standard R notation.\cite{53}

First, we measured the cross-cluster surprisal effect (Fig. 2a) using a mixed effects model with the formula ‘\(RT \sim \log(\text{Trial}) \ast \text{Stage} + \text{Target} + \text{Trans.Type} + (1 + \log(\text{Trial}) \ast \text{Stage} + \text{Trans.Type} | \text{ID})\)’, where \(RT\) is the reaction time, \(\text{Trial}\) is the trial number between 501 and 1500 (we found that \(\log(\text{Trial})\) was far more predictive than the trial number itself), \(\text{Stage}\) is the stage of the experiment (either one or two), \(\text{Target}\) is the target button combination, \(\text{Trans.Type}\) is the type of transition (either within-cluster or between-cluster), and \(\text{ID}\) is each subject’s unique ID. This mixed effects model (Supplementary Tab. 1) reports a statistically significant 50 ms increase in reaction times for between-cluster transitions relative to within-cluster transitions (Fig. 2a), indicating that subjects had systematically stronger expectations for within-cluster transitions than for between-cluster transitions.

We next measured the modular-lattice effect (Fig. 2b) using a mixed effects model of the form ‘\(RT \sim \log(\text{Trial}) \ast \text{Stage} + \text{Target} + \text{Graph} + (1 + \log(\text{Trial}) \ast \text{Stage} + \text{Graph} | \text{ID})\)’, where \(\text{Graph}\) represents the type of transition network, either modular or lattice. This mixed effects model (Supplementary Tab. 2) reports a statistically significant 31 ms increase in reaction times in the lattice graph relative to the modular graph (Fig. 2b), indicating that subjects had
**Supplementary Tab. 1: Mixed effects model measuring the cross-cluster surprisal effect.** A mixed effects model fit to the reaction time data for the modular graph with the goal of measuring the cross-cluster surprisal effect. We find a significant 50 ms increase in reaction times for between-cluster transitions versus within-cluster transitions. The significance column represents $p$-values less than 0.001 (***)**, less than 0.01 (**), and less than 0.05 (*).

| Effect                  | Estimate (ms) | t-value | Pr(>|t|) | Significance |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------|---------|--------------|
| (Intercept)             | 1528.30 ± 78.15 | 19.56   | < 10$^{-20}$ | ***          |
| log(Trial)              | −101.32 ± 9.65 | −10.50  | < 10$^{-20}$ | ***          |
| Stage                   | −708.19 ± 95.00 | −7.45   | 9.04 × 10$^{-14}$ | ***          |
| Trans_Type              | 49.68 ± 6.26   | 7.94    | 2.00 × 10$^{-15}$ | ***          |
| log(Trial):Stage        | 78.94 ± 11.92  | 6.63    | 3.48 × 10$^{-11}$ | ***          |

systematically stronger expectations overall for transitions in the modular graph than in the lattice graph.

Finally, we considered the effects of violations of varying topological distance in the ring lattice (Fig. 5c). To measure the effects of violations relative to standard transitions, we first fit a mixed effects model with the formula ‘$RT \sim \log(Trial) + Target + Recency + Top\_Dist + (1 + \log(Trial) + Recency + Top\_Dist | ID)$’, where *Recency* represents the number of trials since last observing a node[^1] and *Top\_Dist* represents the topological distance of a transition, either one for a standard transition, two for a short violation, or three for a long violation. This mixed effects model (Supplementary Tab. 3) reports statistically significant increases in reaction times over standard transitions of 38 ms for short violations and 63 ms for long violations. Second, to measure the
| Effect                 | Estimate (ms) | t-value | Pr(>|t|)        | Significance |
|------------------------|--------------|---------|----------------|--------------|
| (Intercept)            | 1467.30 ± 48.98 | 29.96   | < 10^{-20}     | ***          |
| log(Trial)             | -98.44 ± 6.17   | -15.96 | < 10^{-20}     | ***          |
| Stage                  | -588.31 ± 60.43 | -9.74  | < 10^{-20}     | ***          |
| Graph                  | 31.40 ± 5.86    | 5.36   | 8.37 × 10^{-8} | ***          |
| log(Trial):Stage       | 75.32 ± 8.54    | 8.83   | 1.10 × 10^{-18}| ***          |

**Supplementary Tab. 2: Mixed effects model measuring the modular-lattice effect.** A mixed effects model fit to the reaction time data for the modular and lattice graphs with the goal of measuring the modular-lattice effect. We find a significant 31 ms increase in reaction times overall in the lattice graph relative to the modular graph. The significance column represents p-values less than 0.001 (***), less than 0.01 (**), and less than 0.05 (*).

difference in reaction times between long and short violations, we implemented a model of the same form, but restricted Top_Dist to only include short violations of topological distance two and long violations of topological distances three and four. This model (Supplementary Tab. 4) reports a statistically significant 28 ms increase in reaction times for long violations relative to short violations. Together, these results indicate that, even after accounting for recency effects, people’s expectations of network violations decrease with increasing topological distance. Put simply, people are more surprised by violations to the network structure that take them farther from their current position in the network, suggesting that people have an implicit understanding of the topological distances between nodes in the network.
### Supplementary Tab. 3: Mixed effects model measuring the effects of violations relative to standard transitions

A mixed effects model fit to the reaction time data for the ring graph with the goal of measuring the effects of violations relative to standard transitions. We find a significant increase in reaction times of 38 ms for short violations and 63 ms for long violations, even after accounting for recency effects. The significance column represents $p$-values less than 0.001 (***)}, less than 0.01 (**), and less than 0.05 (*).

| Effect                                | Estimate (ms) | t-value | Pr($>|t|)$   | Significance |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|---------|--------------|--------------|
| (Intercept)                           | 1352.70 ± 79.23 | 17.07   | $< 10^{-20}$ | ***          |
| log(Trial)                            | $-101.07 ± 10.15$ | $-9.96$ | $< 10^{-20}$ | ***          |
| Recency                               | $2.08 ± 0.13$ | 16.20   | $< 10^{-20}$ | ***          |
| Top_Dist (short vs. no violation)     | $37.94 ± 8.44$ | 4.50    | $6.92 \times 10^{-6}$ | ***          |
| Top_Dist (long vs. no violation)      | $63.29 ± 7.84$ | 8.07    | $6.92 \times 10^{-16}$ | ***          |

### Supplementary Tab. 4: Mixed effects model measuring the effects of long versus short violations

A mixed effects model fit to the reaction time data for the ring graph with the goal of measuring the effects of long versus short violations. We find a significant 28 ms increase in reaction times for long violations relative to short violations, even after accounting for recency effects. The significance column represents $p$-values less than 0.001 (***)}, less than 0.01 (**), and less than 0.05 (*).

| Effect                                | Estimate (ms) | t-value | Pr($>|t|)$   | Significance |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|---------|--------------|--------------|
| (Intercept)                           | 1380.90 ± 156.14 | 8.84    | $1.44 \times 10^{-18}$ | ***          |
| log(Trial)                            | $-97.07 ± 21.25$ | $-4.57$ | $5.10 \times 10^{-6}$ | ***          |
| Recency                               | $0.71 ± 0.27$ | 2.67    | 0.0077       | **           |
| Top_Dist (long vs. short violation)   | $28.44 ± 11.18$ | 2.54    | 0.011        | *            |
Relationship with the successor representation

In the limit of an infinitely-long sequence of nodes, we showed in the main text that the transition estimates in our model take the following concise analytic form,

\[ \hat{A} = (1 - e^{-\beta})A(I - e^{-\beta}A)^{-1}, \]  

where \( A \) is the true transition structure, \( \beta \) is the inverse temperature in our memory distribution, and \( I \) is the identity matrix. Interestingly, this equation takes a similar form to the successor representation from reinforcement learning,

\[ M = A(I - \gamma A)^{-1}, \]

where \( \gamma \) is the future discount factor, which tunes the desired time-scale over which a person wishes to make predictions. Put simply, starting at some node \( i \), the successor representation \( M_{ij} \) counts the future discounted occupancy of node \( j \). Identifying \( \gamma = e^{-\beta} \), we notice that the successor representation is equivalent to an unnormalized version of our transition estimates. Moreover, the same mathematical form crops up in complex network theory, where it is known as the communicability between nodes in a graph.

The relationship between the transition estimates in our model and the successor representation is fascinating, especially given the marked differences in the concepts that the two models are based upon. In our model, people attempting to learn the one-step transition structure \( A \) instead arrive at the erroneous estimate \( \hat{A} \) due to natural errors in perception and recall. By contrast, given a desired time-scale \( \gamma \), the successor representation defines the optimal prediction of node occupancies into the future. Interestingly, the successor representation has been linked to grid cells.
and abstract representations in the hippocampus\cite{16,22} decision making in reward-based tasks\cite{23,57} and the temporal difference and temporal context models of learning and memory\cite{34,39,56}. Across all of these contexts, the successor representation implicitly assumes that humans make optimal predictions about the future; however, our results show that a similar mathematical form can instead represent a person who simply attempts to predict one step into the future, but misses the mark due to natural errors in cognition. This biologically-plausible hypothesis of erroneous predictions highlights the importance of thinking carefully about mental errors and opens the door for new interpretations of human behaviors related to reinforcement learning.
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