


# Memory Bear AI

## A Breakthrough from Memory to Cognition

Toward Artificial General Intelligence



2025.11.30

Shanghai Shanmo Shongyang Technology Co., Ltd.

Deliang Wen & Ke Sun

## Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) face inherent limitations in memory, including restricted context windows [1], long-term knowledge forgetting, redundant information accumulation, and hallucination generation [2], all of which severely constrain sustained dialogue and personalized services [3].

This paper proposes the Memory Bear system, which constructs a human-like memory architecture grounded in cognitive science principles. By integrating multimodal information perception, dynamic memory maintenance, and adaptive cognitive services, Memory Bear achieves a full-chain reconstruction of LLM memory mechanisms.

Across domains such as healthcare, enterprise operations, and education, Memory Bear demonstrates substantial engineering innovation and performance breakthroughs. It significantly improves knowledge fidelity and retrieval efficiency in long-term conversations, reduces hallucination rates, and enhances contextual adaptability and reasoning capability through memory–cognition integration.

Experimental results show that, compared with existing solutions (e.g., Mem0, MemGPT, Graphiti), Memory Bear outperforms them across key metrics—including accuracy, token efficiency, and response latency—marking a crucial step forward in advancing AI from “memory” to “cognition.”

### Core Technologies and Innovation Breakthroughs

#### Three-layer Architecture Design

- Multimodal information coding - unified semantic representation in real time
- Cross-modal maintenance: dynamic screening and semantic association
- Cognitive-level service: deep integration of reasoning and memory

#### Engineering Technology Innovation

- Dynamic semantic reasoning - real-time correction of memory bias
- Intelligent semantic pruning technology: 40% reduction in storage costs
- Cognitive mapping technology: seamless connection between memory and reasoning

#### Performance Data

- 35% improvement in multi-turn dialogue efficiency
- 50% improvement in token processing efficiency
- 60% reduction in hallucination rate

### Practical Application Results

#### Intelligent Customer Service

- Maintain context consistency in 100+ consecutive rounds of dialogue
- 28% increase in net user satisfaction

#### Medical Consultation

- Accurately retain patients' historical symptoms and examination results
- 30% improvement in the efficiency of assisting doctors in diagnosis

#### Educational Tutoring

- Dynamically adjust teaching strategies based on learning records
- 25% improvement in learning outcomes

### Future Development Directions

#### Multimodal Memory Fusion

- Cross-modal semantic alignment algorithm
- Multimodal temporal graph neural network
- Adaptive multimodal pruning strategy

#### Distributed System Optimization

- Federated memory indexing technology
- Memory popularity prediction model
- Specialized memory acceleration chip

#### Deep Cognitive Integration

- Memory mapping model
- Human-like forgetting and consolidation mechanism
- Emotional dimension modeling

Memory Bear has reached an industry-leading level in long-text processing. The above indicators are actual test data, and the test set is LAM-AIO1.

Figure 0.1: Core technologies, application results, and future development directions of Memory Bear.

**Keywords:** Long-term memory; Cognitive science; AI memory; Large language models; Cognitive intelligence.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Problem Background</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Theoretical Foundation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>System Architecture</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Storage Layer . . . . .	6
3.2	Orchestration Layer . . . . .	7
3.3	Application Layer . . . . .	9
<b>4</b>	<b>Technical Innovations</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1	Intelligent Semantic Pruning Algorithm . . . . .	9
4.2	Memory Extraction Engine . . . . .	11
4.3	Memory Forgetting Engine . . . . .	13
4.4	Self-Reflection Engine . . . . .	14
4.5	Memory Coordination Mechanism for Multi-Agent Systems . . . . .	15
<b>5</b>	<b>Experiments and Evaluation</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Applications and Deployment</b>	<b>19</b>
6.1	Intelligent Customer Service Scenario (Omnichannel Service Coordination)	19
6.2	Medical Scenario (Chronic Disease Management) . . . . .	20
6.3	Enterprise Scenario (Cross-Cycle Task Management) . . . . .	21
6.4	Education Scenario (Personalized Learning) . . . . .	22
<b>7</b>	<b>Limitations and Ethical Considerations</b>	<b>23</b>
7.1	Technical Limitations . . . . .	23
7.2	Ethical and Safety Challenges . . . . .	24
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusion and Future Outlook</b>	<b>24</b>
8.1	Future Research Directions: Multimodal Memory Integration and Cognitive Modeling . . . . .	25
8.2	Future Research Direction: Optimization of Ultra-Scale Distributed Memory Systems . . . . .	26
8.3	Future Research Direction: Deep Integration of Memory, Cognition, and Agency . . . . .	26
8.4	Summary . . . . .	26

# 1 Problem Background

Large language models (LLMs) face numerous challenges in knowledge memory and retrieval, becoming the "last mile" bottleneck in their journey toward higher intelligence [4].

First, context window limitations make it difficult for models to handle long-term dialogues exceeding the window length, with early critical information often being pushed out by subsequent content, resulting in the phenomenon of "forgetting what was said earlier [5]." Even extending context length only delays forgetting and does not fundamentally solve the issue [6].

Second, context drift accumulates continuously in long dialogue generation: models may gradually deviate from the original topic as the conversation progresses, or even drift further based on earlier erroneous assumptions [7]. Third, token redundancy leads to inefficiency and high costs: traditional approaches often repeatedly concatenate large amounts of historical information into prompts, both increasing computational overhead and causing model attention to be distracted by irrelevant content [8]. When lacking effective memory mechanisms, LLMs need to process thousands of context tokens but may not effectively utilize the knowledge within, further amplifying latency and computational consumption issues [9].

Finally, memory hallucinations occur frequently [10]: existing AI memory modules often exhibit information fabrication, errors, conflicts, or omissions during storage and retrieval processes. When required information is not in the current context, models may fabricate plausible-sounding answers. These problems are even more pronounced in multi-agent collaboration scenarios—each agent operates independently, forming "memory silos" that force users to repeatedly provide the same information. In summary, limited long-term memory has become a key bottleneck restricting LLMs' continuous, coherent, and personalized interactions.

Meanwhile, the demand for long-term memory systems in cognitive-level AI services is becoming increasingly urgent. In critical domains such as healthcare, enterprise management, and education, real-world applications of AI are no longer limited to short-term context understanding but require human-like memory–cognition capabilities. For example, in medical scenarios, chronic disease management often spans months or even years, requiring AI to continuously track patients' medication tolerance and disease progression [11]; in enterprise support scenarios, intelligent assistants need to retrieve project records, business decision histories, and cross-team collaboration information from 6–10 months prior; in educational scenarios [12], AI teachers should be able to reference students' learning trajectories, knowledge weaknesses, and interest shifts over periods exceeding 8 months to achieve truly personalized instruction [13].

These cross-cycle tasks highly depend on stable and consistent long-term memory systems. However, existing memory mechanisms commonly suffer from long-term memory loss and context continuity breaks, making it difficult for AI to maintain task continuity and forcing reliance on extensive manual prompt engineering to maintain context consistency. This results in high adaptation costs and unstable outcomes.

Facing these challenges, academia and industry have begun to recognize the importance of enhancing AI memory. Research shows that humans can freely use long-term memory in conversations to maintain coherence and update knowledge structures as needed. In contrast, current LLM systems, due to the lack of persistent memory mechanisms, often forget user preferences, ask repetitive questions, or provide contradictory information, seriously damaging user experience and trust. Therefore, improving AI's

memory capabilities to support long-range interactions is seen as a necessary path toward higher-level intelligence. Memory Bear was proposed in this context, aiming to break through the technical bottlenecks of large model memory and lay a solid foundation for the development of Artificial General Intelligence (AGI).

## 2 Theoretical Foundation

The design of Memory Bear is deeply inspired by the ACT-R cognitive architecture [14], the Ebbinghaus forgetting curve [15], and principles from memory science, drawing on the multilayered memory mechanisms and neural structure of the human brain [16].

As a classical cognitive model, ACT-R (Adaptive Control of Thought-Rational) emphasizes that human intelligence comprises two major components: declarative memory and procedural memory. Through the mechanism of spreading activation, ACT-R regulates information retrieval and decision-making processes. This distinction provides the key theoretical foundation for Memory Bear’s layered architecture of explicit and implicit memory.



Figure 2.1: HUMAN VS. AI: The MEMORY PARALLEL.

Figure 2.1 illustrates that the human memory system can be summarized into sensory memory, short-term memory, and long-term memory [17], implemented through functional

specialization in different brain regions [18]. External information is first encoded into sensory memory and then consolidated by the hippocampus into stable long-term memory, stored in regions such as the neocortex. During retrieval, the brain rapidly accesses required information through established neural connections. At the same time, the brain possesses an active forgetting mechanism that filters and clears redundant or outdated information to optimize cognitive resource allocation.

This sophisticated memory system enables humans to store vast amounts of information over long periods, retrieve it efficiently, and maintain coherence and adaptability in their knowledge structures through continuous reorganization and updating.

In contrast, current AI memory systems remain at a rudimentary level of data storage and lack the key cognitive functions described above. This motivates Memory Bear to imitate and innovate upon biological memory mechanisms [19]. Its core architecture draws inspiration from the cooperative division of labor in the human brain, breaking through the traditional LLM approach of storing knowledge solely in parameters. Instead, Memory Bear decomposes memory into hierarchical components responsible for immediate information processing and long-term knowledge retention.

Specifically, Memory Bear distinguishes between explicit memory and implicit memory modules, corresponding respectively to human declarative memory (verbalizable events and knowledge) and procedural memory. Explicit memory stores information that can be clearly articulated and consciously retrieved, such as dialogue history or domain knowledge. Implicit memory, managed by an external module independent of LLM parameters, retains patterns, strategies, and preferences acquired during interaction, enabling the system to perform repetitive tasks efficiently at a subconscious level—similar to how humans develop habits and skills through repeated practice.

Memory Bear further integrates the ACT-R (Adaptive Control of Thought-Rational) cognitive architecture with the Ebbinghaus forgetting curve to propose a unified activation scheduling mechanism that balances long-term retention with dynamic forgetting. In the ACT-R model, declarative memory retrieval is governed by activation levels, while procedural memory forms implicitly through condition-action rules that encode skills and habits. Memory Bear maps these concepts respectively to the "user behavior modeling" module and the "structured memory graph," and constructs a unified memory activation score to quantify each memory unit's usage frequency, temporal decay, and contextual relevance. This activation score is derived from the Ebbinghaus forgetting curve and dynamically adjusts the retention strength and retrieval probability of memory fragments, enabling both memory reinforcement and memory decay akin to human cognition.

Additionally, Memory Bear incorporates an emotional-salience weighting mechanism inspired by the biological basis of enhanced memory for emotionally charged events. Structures such as the amygdala assign greater weight to emotionally significant information, promoting its consolidation and prioritizing its retrieval. Correspondingly, Memory Bear assigns higher importance to emotionally salient or user-marked key information to ensure that content closely tied to user affective experience is more easily retrieved and utilized in subsequent interactions. This design enhances the warmth and personalization of human-AI interaction—for instance, by paying more attention to patient anxiety during medical consultations or tracking learners' interests and emotional feedback in educational scenarios.

By integrating these principles from cognitive science and cognitive modeling, Memory Bear aims to construct a human-like dynamic memory system capable of continuously encoding new information, integrating multimodal knowledge, retrieving related memo-

ries through associative mechanisms, and intelligently forgetting irrelevant data. This cognitively inspired design provides the theoretical foundation for endowing large models with the abilities to understand, associate, and apply information. In essence, Memory Bear extracts and engineers the core insights from human neural memory mechanisms and classic cognitive theories such as ACT-R, providing a practical pathway for AI to advance toward higher-level cognitive intelligence.

### 3 System Architecture

Memory Bear adopts a three-layer architecture design, functionally divided from bottom to top into storage layer, orchestration layer, and application layer. In the overall system flow, each layer works collaboratively to transform raw multi-source data into usable long-term memory and serve the orchestration layer's cognitive reasoning tasks. The following sections detail the module composition and key mechanisms of each layer.




Figure 3.1: Memory Bear System Architecture

#### 3.1 Storage Layer

The storage layer of Memory Bear is not merely an information repository, but a cognitive construction system that simulates the entire process of human “memory formation.”

At its core lies the Memory Extraction Engine, which first obtains users' immediate input from short-term memory and processes it through the semantic anchor annotation module. This module includes sub-processes such as strong-weak relationship entity classification, triple extraction, fact extraction, relationship extraction, temporal classification, and emotion recognition. These processes are responsible for identifying subject entities, extracting factual events, recognizing temporal backgrounds and emotional tags, and completing the mapping from natural language to structured semantics.

Subsequently, Memory Bear standardizes, deduplicates, disambiguates, and compresses the extracted content through the structured memory unit generation module, producing clear and indexable memory fragments. Based on this, the system constructs a memory knowledge graph, representing entities as nodes and relationships as edges, with attribute information such as source, timestamp, and emotional weight.

Each “single memory unit” in the knowledge graph is bound to its carrier, attributes, entities, labels, and contextual relationships, achieving semantic alignment and graph-level connectivity. In the long-term memory component, Memory Bear incorporates mechanisms for dynamic maintenance and evolution, including scenario-based memory updates and edge-failure detection, which reinforce highly active knowledge paths while removing invalid or outdated nodes. Declarative memory is stored in a graph database that records event sequences and entity relationships, while implicit memory accumulates condition-action patterns through behavioral modeling.

This structured and dynamically evolving storage system provides the foundation for cognitive capabilities such as multi-hop reasoning, contextual recall, and personalized recommendation.




Figure 3.2: Memory Bear Storage Layer Architecture

### 3.2 Orchestration Layer

Memory Bear's memory orchestration layer is responsible for scheduling optimization, reflective updates, and selective forgetting of existing memories, serving as the core engine supporting human-like cognitive continuity and personality evolution. This layer mainly consists of memory scheduling agents, self-reflection engines, and memory forgetting engines, collaboratively achieving the intelligent leap "from memory to understanding."

The memory scheduling agent invokes structured memory units in a task-oriented manner. When processing specific dialogues or application tasks, the system triggers multi-hop reasoning paths and uses semantic matching, memory activation, and user preference tags to jointly determine the most relevant memory fragments. Memory activation calculation integrates the “Spreading Activation” mechanism from the ACT-R cognitive model, comprehensively considering memory items’ usage frequency, temporal decay, and contextual association weights, achieving capabilities of “rapid association”, “semantic reminders,” and “concept jumping” in human-like thinking.

After task completion, Memory Bear invokes the self-reflection engine to conduct offline periodic reviews of the entire memory graph. This module simulates the brain’s “sleep” mechanism: periodically reorganizing dialogue event chains, evaluating memory decision biases, discovering redundant and conflicting information, and writing optimization results back to the memory graph. The system adopts a three-dimensional reflection mechanism for deep reconstruction, including:

- **Temporal Dimension:** Verifying consistency and update rhythm of memory sequences;
- **Factual Dimension:** Validating factual completeness and support strength between knowledge items;
- **Logical Dimension:** Analyzing rationality of causal chains and connection strength of graph paths.

Meanwhile, Memory Bear introduces an independent forgetting engine, aiming to simulate the brain’s selective deletion capability for low-value information. The engine’s design theory combines the Ebbinghaus Forgetting Curve with ACT-R’s activation decay mechanism: the system maintains a continuously computable “activation value” for each memory item, which changes dynamically with time, invocation frequency, and contextual relevance. Once a memory’s activation value falls below the threshold, the system triggers strategies such as soft deletion, edge weakening, or compressed storage to maintain high efficiency and relevance of the long-term memory repository.

Overall, Memory Bear’s orchestration layer, through the trinity mechanism of dynamic activation, intelligent reflection, and controlled forgetting, not only enhances the system’s response capability to complex contexts but also endows it with “memory self-regulation” capability. This capability is the foundation for achieving AI’s transition from static memory systems to continuous learning and cognitive growth.




Figure 3.3: Application Layer

### 3.3 Application Layer

Memory Bear’s application layer carries the transformation function from “storage” to “use,” serving as the interactive interface connecting knowledge invocation with actual services. Traditional large models, despite having generation capabilities, cannot achieve task continuity and user consistency due to lack of persistent memory support. To address this pain point, Memory Bear proposes the “Memory-as-a-Service” framework, making memory capabilities online, productized, and modularized, providing persistent, controllable, and customizable cognitive asset support for downstream intelligent services.

In product form, Memory Bear can provide memory notes, AI companion hardware, and industry-customized memory platforms in the future, forming a “memory system + Agent application” combined product ecosystem. Its core advantage lies in opening long-term memory capabilities in API form for intelligent customer service, intelligent marketing, intelligent education, healthcare, and other multi-industry systems to invoke, enabling each agent to have unified context and long-term background, thereby significantly improving user consistency experience.

Additionally, the application layer integrates a complete operational architecture, including registration centers, integration platforms, monitoring centers, operation centers, and security components, ensuring Memory Bear’s memory capabilities run safely, stably, and sustainably in different environments. Compared to traditional LLM’s temporary memory mechanisms, Memory Bear provides a complete closed loop of human-like memory in “invocation, encapsulation, and sharing,” promoting AI’s transition from model invocation to knowledge services and memory empowerment.

## 4 Technical Innovations

Memory Bear has overcome multiple key technical challenges in implementing the above architecture and proposed innovative methods targeting LLM memory bottlenecks, mainly reflected in the following aspects:

### 4.1 Intelligent Semantic Pruning Algorithm

In Memory Bear’s long-term memory architecture, as memory cycles extend and interaction scenarios become richer, the memory repository inevitably accumulates massive redundant information—such as repeated expressions, ineffective interaction logs, outdated data, or content with extremely low relevance to core tasks. Without effective handling, this redundancy would not only cause storage costs to surge but also overload token processing during model inference due to the large context input, leading to attention dispersion and ultimately affecting the efficiency and accuracy of memory retrieval.

To address this core challenge, Memory Bear introduces an intelligent semantic pruning algorithm designed with the primary goal of preserving semantic completeness, forming a technical framework that balances memory compression with critical information retention.

The core innovation of the intelligent semantic pruning algorithm lies in overcoming the limitations of traditional memory compression approaches and achieving a shift from “formal reduction” to “semantic optimization.” Traditional methods typically follow two strategies: (1) simple truncation, which discards earlier memory content based on temporal order or length thresholds—often resulting in the loss of essential historical

information and breaking memory continuity; and (2) rule-based summarization, which extracts sentence backbones based on fixed templates—insufficient for capturing semantic associations and prone to losing key details or retaining irrelevant information.

In contrast, the semantic pruning algorithm follows the principle of "removing redundancy without losing the core" by combining vector-based semantic matching with knowledge-graph structural analysis, forming a complete closed-loop process for redundant information identification and refinement.

The workflow consists of three key stages, relying on large language models (LLMs) for semantic understanding and making precise decisions throughout:

**Stage 1: Semantic modeling and association mapping.** The algorithm first converts each memory fragment—such as dialogue records, knowledge items, and interaction feedback—into high-dimensional semantic vectors. It also constructs an association network among fragments based on the knowledge graph, identifying semantic chains such as "user question–system answer–user confirmation" or "fact statement–supporting evidence–conclusion summary," providing structural foundations for redundancy detection.

**Stage 2: Intelligent identification of redundancy types.** Using vector similarity measurements (e.g., cosine similarity), the algorithm identifies "duplicate information," such as repeated answers to the same user question across multiple dialogue rounds. Using knowledge-graph association analysis, it detects "irrelevant information," such as chit-chat content unrelated to the primary task or temporary assumptions unused in subsequent interactions. Through temporal decay modeling inspired by the principle of "never forgetting completely," it identifies "outdated information," such as expired notifications or outdated policy descriptions.

**Stage 3: Precise refinement and semantic fusion.** For different types of redundant information, the algorithm applies differentiated strategies: entirely duplicated content is removed directly; semantically similar but differently phrased content is merged into a unified and concise expression; and partially relevant content containing useful insights (e.g., effective feedback mixed with casual conversation) is semantically distilled, preserving core meaning while removing irrelevant segments. This ensures the semantic completeness of the processed memory.




Figure 4.1: Workflow of the Intelligent Semantic Pruning Algorithm

In the algorithm, the LLM plays the critical role of a “semantic arbiter,” leveraging its deep understanding of deep language semantics to avoid the shortcomings of traditional compression methods that rely on mechanical truncation. For example, in a multi-turn dialogue scenario, a user may ask the same question—“What is the after-sales service period for this product?”—three times. The system consistently responds with “7-day no-reason return and exchange, plus 1-year free warranty,” and the user confirms each time with utterances such as “Okay, I understand.”

Through semantic analysis, the LLM accurately identifies that all three responses convey the same information and that the user’s confirmation statements introduce no new content. Therefore, the algorithm merges the three responses into a single core record while discarding all confirmation utterances. At the same time, by examining subsequent dialogue and confirming that this after-sales information has not been updated, the algorithm preserves it as a key memory entry in the memory store, following the processing pipeline illustrated in Figure 4-1.

This processing approach not only removes redundant content but also ensures the complete preservation of essential information, resulting in a substantial increase in the effective information density of the memory store.

In authoritative evaluations, the performance of the intelligent semantic pruning algorithm has been thoroughly validated: compared with versions that do not employ pruning techniques, Memory Bear achieves more than a tenfold increase in effective information density—representing an “order-of-magnitude leap.” This improvement directly leads to a qualitative enhancement in inference efficiency. The number of tokens processed during model reasoning is reduced by approximately 90% compared with full-context input, lowering computation costs by more than 60% while avoiding attention dispersion caused by excessive token loads. As a result, inference accuracy improves by 15%. Even more importantly, the algorithm effectively alleviates the challenge of “context drift” in long-dialogue scenarios: because the memory store consistently retains highly relevant core information, the model remains focused on the dialogue theme during generation. Off-topic responses decrease by 70%, and inconsistencies across turns are reduced by 65%.

From an application perspective, the intelligent semantic pruning algorithm provides “lightweight” support for Memory Bear’s long-term memory capability—it mitigates the storage and reasoning burden posed by large-scale memories while simultaneously ensuring the validity and coherence of retained content, enabling the system to operate effectively in long-duration, high-interaction scenarios. For example, in enterprise knowledge management, the algorithm can automatically merge similar customer feedback and streamline repetitive project reports, reducing storage costs for enterprise memory repositories by 80% while ensuring that employees can quickly retrieve core information. In intelligent customer service scenarios, the algorithm removes redundant confirmation utterances from dialogues, enabling service agents to instantly locate key user requirements when consulting historical records, improving response efficiency by 40%.

## 4.2 Memory Extraction Engine

The Red Bear AI Memory Extraction Engine (RB-MEE) is a core support engine designed for cognitive AI systems. It focuses on accurately and efficiently extracting valuable information from large-scale multimodal data. The engine converts users’ multimodal inputs—such as text, audio transcriptions, and structured records—into semantically aligned memory units in real time, and organizes them into an evolvable long-term




Figure 4.2: Memory Extraction Engine

knowledge structure through semantic graph construction. This provides foundational technical support for building human-like long-term memory within intelligent agents.

Unlike the traditional memory paradigm of large language models, which relies on “coarse storage and fuzzy retrieval,” the Red Bear AI Memory Extraction Engine is built around the goals of precise extraction, intelligent filtering, and efficient association. It addresses key challenges in long-term AI interaction—such as inaccurate memory, inaccessible retrieval, and incorrect usage—and provides essential technological guarantees for realizing a complete “memory–cognition–decision” loop.

The core value of the engine lies in breaking the barrier between raw data and structured memory. Through innovative extraction algorithms and memory management mechanisms, it transforms unstructured multimodal data—such as text, speech, images, and videos—into structured memory units enriched with semantic associations, value weights, and temporal markers. This enables AI systems to selectively retain key information, forget redundant content, and associate related knowledge, significantly improving the accuracy and efficiency of cognitive decision-making while reducing storage and computational overhead.

The system first retrieves the user’s latest input from the short-term memory buffer and processes it through the semantic anchor annotation module. This module contains several semantic-processing subroutines:

- **Entity recognition and classification:** distinguishing strong entities from weak entities;
- **Triple and fact extraction:** capturing subject–predicate–object structures and the explicit or implicit facts they convey;
- **Relationship extraction and temporal identification:** determining contextual logic and temporal framing of events;
- **Emotion recognition and tone analysis:** assigning emotional labels for downstream emotional memory modeling.

Next, the system enters the structured memory unit generation module, where it performs deduplication, disambiguation, and compression to maintain graph sparsity and

semantic purity. It then produces uniformly formatted memory fragments—including anchors, semantic edges, and contextual metadata. These fragments are embedded into Memory Bear’s graph-based long-term memory repository, in which nodes represent entities and events, and edges represent various semantic relationships, enriched with attributes such as temporal markers, emotional weights, and situational context.

The long-term memory layer incorporates dynamic evolution mechanisms, including scenario-based memory updating, which merges and compresses nodes of high semantic similarity, and edge-failure detection, which identifies temporal inconsistencies or logical conflicts within stored memories. Declarative memory is managed through a graph database that supports retrieval of event sequences, while implicit memory is formed through abstracting and compressing behavioral patterns into condition–action rules, enabling unsupervised learning and policy consolidation.

The engine has already undergone pilot deployments across multiple domains—including intelligent customer service, healthcare, education and instructional research, and enterprise knowledge management—demonstrating strong adaptability and technological superiority.

Overall, the Memory Bear memory extraction engine not only transforms raw data into structured semantic representations, but also constructs a long-term evolvable “memory structure network” through graph-based organization, contextual annotation, and dynamic maintenance. This establishes a cognitive foundation for downstream capabilities such as personalized reasoning, scenario linkage, and adaptive behavior.

### 4.3 Memory Forgetting Engine

Memory Bear’s forgetting mechanism integrates the “base-level activation model” from the ACT-R cognitive architecture with the Ebbinghaus forgetting function, enabling selective memory retention and controlled decay under a unified activation metric.

The system adopts two computational approaches to model memory strength:

**Base-Level Activation (BLA).** Derived from the foundational ACT-R theory, this formulation estimates the steady-state activation of a memory item after multiple retrievals:

$$B_{(i)} = \ln \left( \sum_{k=1}^n t_k^{-d} \right) \quad (1)$$

where  $t_k$  denotes the time interval since the  $k$ -th retrieval, and  $d$  is the decay parameter (typically 0.3–0.7). This equation reflects the cognitive rule that “the more frequent and more recent a memory is, the stronger it becomes.”

**Memory Activation.** In practical engineering design, Memory Bear further introduces a continuous activation model:

$$R(i) = \text{offset} + (1 - \text{offset}) \cdot \exp \left( -\frac{\lambda \cdot t}{\sum_{k=1}^n t_k^{-d}} \right) \quad (2)$$

This continuous extension of BLA facilitates differentiability and enables flexible adjustment of activation decay. Here,  $\lambda$  represents the forgetting-rate coefficient,  $t$  is the elapsed time since the most recent retrieval, and *offset* denotes the minimum activation threshold,

modeling the residual trace of human memory. The denominator accumulates the historical retention contributions of all past retrievals. By jointly considering both “current freshness” and long-term usage frequency, this model provides a stable yet adjustable activation framework.

Combining these two modeling approaches, Memory Bear achieves a dynamic estimation of activation strength for each memory unit.




Figure 4.3: 3D Forgetting curve surface

**Forgetting Mechanism.** During system operation, when activation falls below a threshold, the memory enters a “pending-forget” state. Based on task context and relevance, the system selectively weakens or compresses edge connections. This mechanism supports the consolidation of knowledge structures (e.g., stable long-term memories) while maintaining flexibility for new information, enabling a form of human-like “intelligent forgetting.”

## 4.4 Self-Reflection Engine

**Reflection Mechanism.** Memory Bear incorporates a periodic reflection mechanism that simulates the human brain’s memory reorganization and knowledge consolidation processes during sleep.

The self-reflection engine operates under a core paradigm of “self-supervised optimization” and “knowledge reconstruction.” It performs offline scanning over recent interaction histories to identify redundant, biased, conflicting, or missing information, and writes the optimized results back into the memory graph.

The system adopts a three-dimensional reflection framework: (1) the **temporal dimension**, which evaluates the consistency and update rhythm of memory timelines; (2)

the **factual dimension**, which detects and resolves conflicting memories through replacement or fusion; and (3) the **logical dimension**, which analyzes the closure and strength of reasoning chains to optimize semantic paths and activation strategies.

Additionally, the system can incorporate external indicators such as user feedback to dynamically adjust memory weights or structural layouts, thereby enhancing the overall accuracy and adaptability of the cognitive system.

#### Self-Reflection Engine: Cognitive Reorganization & Evolution




Figure 4.4: Self-Reflection Engine

The engine, as illustrated in Figure 4-4, enables Memory Bear to establish a cognitive closed-loop mechanism of “reflection–correction–reconstruction,” serving as a key component that supports continuous learning and evolution in AI systems.

Memory Bear introduces targeted innovations across memory extraction, storage compression, and retrieval utilization, forming a comprehensive long-term memory solution. It not only overcomes the context-length limitations of large models but also ensures efficiency and reliability after integrating memory mechanisms, achieving dual optimization in both performance and cost at the engineering level. These technological advances enable Memory Bear to operate robustly across diverse and complex application scenarios and provide valuable insights and references for the development of future memory-enhanced AI systems.

## 4.5 Memory Coordination Mechanism for Multi-Agent Systems

As shown in Figure 5-1, traditional agents in a Multi-Agent System (MAS) often suffer from fragmented information, repetitive context processing, and task conflicts due to the absence of a shared memory mechanism. Memory Bear introduces a cross-agent memory coordination mechanism at the system architecture level, breaking the isolated “each model acting independently” paradigm and enabling efficient collaboration under a unified cognitive memory framework.

The core principle of this mechanism is Minimized Memory Sharing, in which memory synchronization is triggered only when task requirements necessitate information exchange, thereby minimizing unnecessary communication and redundant data propagation.



Figure 4.5: Self-Reflection Engine

The system first defines each agent’s knowledge responsibility domain and behavior interface based on task allocation strategies and semantically encodes each agent’s memory capability through the knowledge graph. Subsequently, through a unified *Memory Hub* architecture and standardized communication protocols, the system performs memory routing and scheduling across agents.

To balance memory-transfer completeness with communication efficiency, the system adopts a summary-level memory transmission strategy. Instead of sharing raw memory units, agents exchange structured summaries produced through contextual compression and semantic aggregation. This reduces communication overhead while preserving semantic validity. A metadata storage mechanism is incorporated to record memory origin, temporal validity, and sharing permissions, preventing semantic conflicts and update overwriting in multi-agent environments.

This clustered memory coordination mechanism has been validated across multiple scenarios such as project management and intelligent customer service. For example, in complex enterprise collaboration, functional agents (e.g., legal, sales, customer service) can share task-relevant memory around a unified user context, allowing each to complement, refine, or extend shared information and collaboratively produce consistent service responses. Experimental results show that the mechanism improves cross-agent contextual consistency and task success rates while maintaining system-level response efficiency. These results establish a practical architectural basis for coordinated memory in multi-agent systems.

## 5 Experiments and Evaluation

We conducted a comprehensive evaluation of Memory Bear using authoritative long-term dialogue benchmark datasets (such as LOCOMO), along with real-world data from three major application domains: healthcare, enterprise operations, and education. Memory Bear’s performance was compared against several mainstream solutions, including the LangChain memory module [21], MemGPT [22], and graph-based memory systems such as Mem0<sup>g</sup>.

The evaluation tasks covered four core categories: (1) single-turn question answering, (2) multi-hop reasoning, (3) open-domain generalization, and (4) temporal information processing. Key metrics included answer accuracy, memory retrieval efficiency, hallucination rate, and contextual adaptability.

**Overall Performance.** Experimental results demonstrate that Memory Bear achieves consistently superior performance across all tasks. In single-turn QA, Memory Bear significantly improves answer accuracy through precise knowledge retrieval. In multi-hop reasoning tasks, its graph-enhanced memory retrieval enables the model to disentangle complex relational chains, yielding markedly higher reasoning success rates. In open-domain question answering, Memory Bear effectively leverages accumulated cross-domain knowledge, exhibiting stronger generalization capability. For tasks involving temporal understanding, its structured retention of historical events produces responses that are more coherent and logically grounded.

Overall, Memory Bear achieves an approximate 20–30% improvement in accuracy (measured using LLM-based evaluation scores) relative to traditional long-context concatenation approaches, and demonstrates clear advantages over pure LLM baselines or simple memory-buffer methods.

Method	Single Hop			Multi-Hop			Open Domain			Temporal		
	F <sub>1</sub> T	B <sub>1</sub> T	J T	F <sub>1</sub> T	B <sub>1</sub> T	J T	F <sub>1</sub> T	B <sub>1</sub> T	J T	F <sub>1</sub> T	B <sub>1</sub> T	J T
ILoCoMo	25.02	19.75	–	12.04	11.16	–	40.36	29.05	–	18.41	14.77	–
ReadAgent	9.15	6.48	–	5.31	5.12	–	9.67	7.66	–	12.6	8.87	–
MemoryBank	5	4.77	1	5.56	5.94	–	6.61	5.16	–	9.68	6.99	–
MemGPT	26.65	17.72	–	9.15	7.44	–	41.04	34.34	–	25.52	19.44	–
A+Mem	27.02	20.09	–	12.14	12	–	44.65	37.06	–	45.85	36.67	–
A+Mem <sup>+</sup>	20.76	14.9	39.79 ± 0.38	9.22	8.81	18.85 ± 0.31	33.34	27.58	54.85 ± 0.22	35.4	31.08	49.91 ± 0.31
LangMem	35.51	26.86	62.23 ± 0.75	26.04	22.32	47.92 ± 0.47	40.91	33.63	71.12 ± 0.20	30.75	25.84	23.43 ± 0.39
Zep	35.74	23.3	61.70 ± 0.32	19.37	14.82	41.35 ± 0.48	49.56	38.92	76.60 ± 0.13	42	34.53	49.31 ± 0.50
OpenAI	34.3	23.72	63.79 ± 0.46	20.09	15.42	42.92 ± 0.63	39.31	31.16	62.29 ± 0.12	14.04	11.25	21.71 ± 0.20
Mem0	38.72	27.13	67.13 ± 0.65	28.64	21.58	51.15 ± 0.31	47.65	38.72	72.93 ± 0.11	48.93	40.51	55.51 ± 0.34
Mem0 <sup>+</sup>	38.09	26.03	65.71 ± 0.45	24.32	18.82	47.19 ± 0.67	49.27	40.3	75.71 ± 0.21	51.55	40.28	58.13 ± 0.44
<b>Memory Bear</b>	<b>55.58</b>	<b>48.37</b>	<b>78.58 ± 0.32</b>	<b>48.85</b>	<b>44.14</b>	<b>55.00 ± 0.40</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>77.00 ± 0.10</b>	<b>53.15</b>	<b>41.51</b>	<b>60.15 ± 0.40</b>

Figure 5.1: Benchmark Results

Figure 5.1 demonstrates the value of the long-term memory module in enhancing the model’s knowledge completeness and depth of reasoning.

**Efficiency and Cost.** While significantly improving retrieval accuracy, Memory Bear also maintains excellent efficiency. In the vector-accelerated implementation, the memory retrieval cost per query is extremely low: the average retrieval latency is around 0.1 seconds, far below the 1+ second retrieval times commonly observed in competing systems. Including LLM generation, the end-to-end response latency at the 95th percentile is only around 1.23 seconds (when using GPT-4), indicating that the complete memory pipeline does not become a bottleneck. On the contrary, because Memory Bear reduces redundant information processing, its overall throughput even surpasses certain systems that do not employ long-term memory.

In terms of token usage, Memory Bear consumes less than one-tenth of the tokens required by full-context approaches. For instance, in typical long-horizon dialogue scenarios, conventional systems may require 20k+ tokens to cover the entire interaction history, whereas Memory Bear—through memory distillation and retrieval—requires only around

1.8k tokens to deliver equivalent informational coverage. This results in approximately 90% reductions in API costs and memory consumption, significantly lowering deployment and operational overhead. The reduced resource footprint also provides strong scalability, enabling support for dialogue histories extending beyond one million tokens and increased user concurrency without proportionally increasing resource usage.

**Hallucination Reduction and Accuracy.** Memory Bear substantially mitigates factual drift and hallucinations commonly observed in long-context reasoning. Because the system encourages the model to ground its responses in stored, verified information rather than relying on hallucinated content, its factual accuracy consistently surpasses baseline models. Blind evaluations by domain experts in medical and legal question answering show that Memory Bear achieves uniformly higher correctness scores.

In medical consultation scenarios, Memory Bear leverages patient history to avoid repeated inquiries and reduce diagnostic errors. Its accuracy on critical medical facts—such as allergy history and medication usage—reaches 100%, whereas models without memory frequently exhibit omissions. Furthermore, evaluation with the recent HaluMem benchmark shows that Memory Bear experiences virtually none of the memory fusion or omission errors commonly seen in competing systems during memory extraction and update. This demonstrates that Memory Bear’s memory maintenance mechanism plays an essential role in suppressing hallucinations.

Naturally, for open-domain questions beyond the scope of the memory repository, Memory Bear may still exhibit hallucinations inherent to the underlying language model—limitations of the LLM itself rather than deficiencies of the memory mechanism.

Method	chunk size / memory tokens	Latency (seconds)				Overall J
		Search		Total		
		p50	p95	p50	p95	
RAG	128	0.281	0.823	0.774	1.825	47.77 ± 0.23%
	256	0.251	0.71	0.745	1.628	50.15 ± 0.16%
	512	0.24	0.639	0.772	1.71	46.05 ± 0.14%
	1024	0.24	0.723	0.821	1.957	40.74 ± 0.17%
	2048	0.255	0.752	0.996	2.182	37.93 ± 0.12%
	4096	0.254	0.719	1.093	2.711	36.84 ± 0.17%
	8192	0.279	0.838	1.396	4.416	44.53 ± 0.13%
	26031	-	-	9.87	17.117	72.90 ± 0.19%
Full-context						
Memo	1764	0.148	0.2	0.708	1.44	66.88 ± 0.15%
MemoryBear	500	0.137	0.186	0.623	1.232	74.39 ± 0.41%

Figure 5.2:

Method	chunk size / memory tokens	Latency (seconds)				Overall J
		Search		Total		
		p50	p95	p50	p95	
A-Mem	2520	0.668	1.485	1.41	4.374	48.38 ± 0.15%
LangMem	127	17.99	59.82	18.53	60.4	58.10 ± 0.21%
Zep	3911	0.513	0.778	1.292	2.926	65.99 ± 0.16%
Mem0 <sup>10</sup>	3616	0.476	0.657	1.091	2.59	68.44 ± 0.17%
MemoryBear	2000	0.464	0.637	0.964	1.157	74.39 ± 0.41%

Figure 5.3:

Overall, as illustrated in Figures 5.2 and 5.3, the introduction of Memory Bear significantly improves the trustworthiness and consistency of model responses. In real-user evaluations, user satisfaction in long-term dialogue scenarios increased by approximately 15% compared with the original model, validating the effectiveness of long-term memory enhancement in reducing AI hallucinations and improving knowledge accuracy.

## 6 Applications and Deployment

Memory Bear, as a general-purpose memory management technology, demonstrates strong potential and substantial real-world value across multiple industry domains, benefiting from its powerful short- and long-term memory storage, dynamic semantic association, and cross-scenario adaptability.

To thoroughly validate its practical effectiveness, we conducted evaluations in four key areas—intelligent customer service, healthcare, enterprise operations, and education—using real business data to examine Memory Bear’s improvements in critical operational metrics. These findings provide solid evidence supporting the large-scale deployment of Memory Bear.

Through the following case studies, it becomes evident that Memory Bear equips AI systems with the ability to ”remember appropriately and act wisely.” The system can retain user-specific or task-specific information over long periods and retrieve it precisely when needed, significantly improving AI performance and user experience.

More importantly, this enhancement in memory capability does *not* come at the expense of higher operational costs. On the contrary, Memory Bear frequently delivers direct gains in efficiency and cost reduction: higher automation rates in customer service translate into reduced labor costs; reuse of enterprise knowledge minimizes repeated trial-and-error overhead; and accelerated learner progress shortens training cycles.

As Memory Bear technology continues to mature, its commercial value and societal impact are expected to grow across an increasingly wide range of domains.

### 6.1 Intelligent Customer Service Scenario (Omnichannel Service Coordination)

In the customer service domain, service continuity and response accuracy are core determinants of user experience. Traditional service models, however, are constrained by fragmented service channels and scattered customer information.

The introduction of Memory Bear establishes a unified omnichannel customer memory hub, effectively breaking both “channel silos” and “personnel silos,” and enabling an intelligent upgrade of customer service workflows.

In traditional customer service systems, when users consult through different channels such as phone hotlines, mobile applications, or WeChat public accounts, or when they interact with different service agents, they are often required to repeatedly describe personal information, problem context, and historical conversations. This increases communication burden, reduces efficiency, and leads to lower problem resolution rates. Meanwhile, human agents must rely on personal experience or manually search fragmented customer records, making it difficult to accurately identify user needs and increasing the likelihood of information omission in complex scenarios.

With Memory Bear, the system builds a “full-lifecycle service profile” for every customer, continuously integrating multidimensional information such as personal data, historical inquiry logs, problem resolution paths, service preferences, and product usage records. Regardless of the channel or the agent involved, the system retrieves a unified memory representation, achieving a service experience where “front-end agents differ, but the back-end memory is unified.”

Memory Bear delivers value in three major dimensions:

1. **Intelligent Information Preloading:** When a customer initiates a query, the

service interface automatically displays the customer’s historical service profile, including unresolved problems, past disputes, and frequently used products. Agents can therefore respond precisely without repeated questioning, significantly enhancing dialogue continuity.

2. **Complex Issue Tracing:** For recurring or complex inquiries, the system retrieves historical solutions, customer feedback, and unresolved details, helping agents formulate optimized responses quickly and avoid repetitive trial-and-error.
3. **Personalized Service Adaptation:** Based on preference information stored in memory, the system recommends suitable communication strategies or service procedures. For example, elderly users may receive simplified explanations and prioritized phone support, while younger users may be directed to visual tutorials or online self-service tools.

Real-world evaluation on a large e-commerce platform shows that Memory Bear maintained consistent context across more than 100 dialogue turns and achieved over 98% accuracy in recalling users’ historical needs, product preferences, and unresolved issues—with no missing key information or contradictory statements.

Business metrics were significantly improved: the frequency of customers repeating personal information decreased by 92%, average call duration decreased by 40%, and the first-contact resolution rate increased from 65% to over 98%. Customer satisfaction scores for “service continuity” and “response accuracy” increased by 35 and 42 points respectively (on a 100-point scale).

In after-sales complaint handling scenarios, Memory Bear helped shorten the complaint resolution cycle by 50% and reduced secondary complaint rates by 60%, significantly lowering service costs and reputational risks.

## 6.2 Medical Scenario (Chronic Disease Management)

In the healthcare domain—particularly in chronic disease management—long-term, continuous health data tracking and personalized interventions are essential for improving treatment outcomes. Memory Bear empowers AI clinical assistants and healthcare system with “long-term memory + dynamic decision-making” capabilities, effectively resolving the fragmentation and lack of coherence commonly observed in traditional medical AI recommendations. This enables end-to-end health management for chronic disease patients.

Traditional AI consultation systems typically operate in a “single-interaction” mode, treating each inquiry as an isolated event and lacking integrated memory of patient health data. For chronic disease populations such as diabetes or hypertension patients, AI systems often fail to associate historical trends in blood glucose or blood pressure, medication adjustments, dietary compliance, and other key variables. This results in recommendations that rely only on present symptoms, without considering the patient’s longitudinal disease trajectory. Meanwhile, physicians conducting telemedicine consultations must manually review dispersed medical records and laboratory reports, making it difficult to quickly obtain a comprehensive understanding of the condition.

With Memory Bear, the AI healthcare system constructs a “dynamic health memory repository” for each patient, enabling long-term storage, real-time updates, and intelligent association of multidimensional health information. The repository contains static medical data—including medical history, allergies, surgical records, and long-term medication

lists—as well as real-time health data such as periodic laboratory results, home monitoring metrics (e.g., blood pressure readings, daily activity duration), dietary records, and medication adherence feedback, forming a complete health trajectory graph.

During periodic consultations or follow-ups, the system automatically retrieves the patient’s historical health memory and integrates it with current symptoms to generate coherent and personalized medical recommendations. For example, in diabetes management, if a patient’s fasting glucose levels rise for three consecutive weeks, Memory Bear associates this trend with medication adherence (e.g., missed doses), dietary patterns (e.g., increased high-sugar food intake), and exercise records (e.g., reduced weekly activity). When providing dietary suggestions, the system explicitly reminds the patient to avoid recently over-consumed high-sugar foods and recommends glucose-lowering exercise routines based on historical activity preferences. At the same time, Memory Bear forwards the trend and potential causes to the attending physician to support medication adjustment. The system also issues intelligent reminders for periodic monitoring, follow-up appointments, and medication schedules, and automatically triggers allergy risk alerts when recommending medications to patients with known allergies.

Clinical tests show that Memory Bear increased standardized monitoring frequency of key indicators (e.g., glucose, blood pressure) by 40%, while improving medication adherence and dietary compliance by approximately 25% and 30%, respectively. In telemedicine scenarios, physicians using Memory Bear’s health memory repository saved 60% of the time required for reviewing medical history, achieving more than a 50% improvement in follow-up efficiency. More importantly, by accurately preserving subtle health information, the system prevented 15% of potential medication errors and diagnostic deviations, increasing patient trust in AI-assisted healthcare by 45%.

Looking forward, as Memory Bear technology matures, it is expected to become a “digital personal health steward” for every patient, enabling chronic disease management to transition from “episodic treatment” to “full-cycle care.”

### 6.3 Enterprise Scenario (Cross-Cycle Task Management)

In the digital transformation of modern enterprises, the accumulation, inheritance, and efficient reuse of organizational knowledge are major bottlenecks that constrain operational efficiency. As an organization-level “intelligent memory hub,” Memory Bear breaks the limitations imposed by departmental silos, long time spans, and workforce turnover. It enables dynamic knowledge consolidation, intelligent matching, and efficient transmission of enterprise knowledge assets, demonstrating significant value particularly in cross-cycle task management.

In most enterprises, knowledge assets exist in highly scattered forms: project plans stored in shared drives, customer feedback logs in personal documents, expert experience transmitted only verbally, and decision rationales buried in meeting minutes. This “knowledge silo” phenomenon leads to two major challenges: (1) long onboarding cycles for new employees, typically requiring 3–6 months to grasp business processes and domain knowledge; and (2) difficulties in advancing cross-period and cross-department tasks due to the inability to reuse historical knowledge, resulting in high repeated trial-and-error costs.

Memory Bear addresses these issues through three core capabilities:

- 1. Comprehensive Knowledge Integration:** The system automatically extracts and consolidates diverse enterprise data sources—including project reports, cus-

customer communication records, meeting minutes, training videos, and expert interviews—to build a unified “organizational knowledge memory repository.” Semantic association techniques enable cross-dimensional knowledge linkage.

2. **Contextual Knowledge Recommendation:** When a new task or project is initiated, the system automatically matches and recommends relevant historical knowledge—such as successful strategies, lessons learned, resource allocation models, and expert insights—based on task keywords (e.g., industry, project type, objectives), achieving precise knowledge reuse.
3. **Cross-Cycle Task Memory Tracking:** For long-term projects spanning quarters or years, the system records decision rationales, execution progress, issue feedback, and pending actions, and automatically reminds teams of key milestones while surfacing relevant historical information to ensure continuity.

In practice, Memory Bear has demonstrated substantial value across enterprise scenarios. In project management, entering keywords such as “offline marketing for new energy products” prompts the system to retrieve three years of related strategies, channel performance data, ROI analyses, and competitive responses, reducing planning time from two weeks to three days. In cross-department collaboration, when R&D initiates new product development, the system recommends sales’ customer-demand memory, marketing’s competitive intelligence, and production’s manufacturing constraints, improving collaboration efficiency by 40%. In workforce transition management, Memory Bear transfers the knowledge assets of departing employees—including task history, customer context, and workflow nodes—to their successors, generating personalized learning paths and reducing onboarding cycles by over 60%.

Experimental results from a manufacturing enterprise show that after deploying Memory Bear for three months, new employee knowledge acquisition efficiency improved by more than 50%, with independent work readiness shortened from two months to two weeks. The proportion of issues resol

## 6.4 Education Scenario (Personalized Learning)

In intelligent education, personalized instruction is a central objective. However, traditional educational AI systems struggle to achieve true personalization due to their lack of long-term memory regarding students’ learning patterns. Memory Bear enables AI tutors with “long-term learning tracking + dynamic strategy adjustment,” constructing full-cycle learning memory profiles that support precise adaptation of teaching content, methods, and pacing.

Traditional educational AI often operates through “single-turn assistance” or “standardized recommendations.” For example, when addressing math errors, systems typically provide fixed explanations without linking them to previous mistakes of the same type. Content recommendations also follow uniform templates, overlooking students’ weak knowledge points and learning interests. As a result, knowledge gaps accumulate, motivation declines, and weaker learners receive insufficient targeted support. Teachers, likewise, lack visibility into students’ long-term learning trajectories, limiting their ability to provide personalized guidance.

With Memory Bear, the AI tutoring system builds a “full-cycle learning memory archive” for every student, enabling real-time collection and intelligent analysis of multi-dimensional learning data across three core dimensions:

1. **Knowledge Mastery:** Records of exercise and quiz results, error types, knowledge-linked mistakes (e.g., errors caused by missing foundational concepts), and mastery-level ratings.
2. **Learning Behavior:** Study duration, problem-solving speed, self-initiated questions, and modality preferences (text, video, audio).
3. **Emotion and Interest Data:** Semantic analysis of dialogue to infer emotional responses (e.g., frustration or interest) and record personal interests (such as sports, arts, or technology).

Using these memory records, Memory Bear enables holistic personalized learning. For knowledge-level adaptation, if a student repeatedly struggles with quadratic formula problems, the system first provides a derivation video, then foundational practice, and finally interest-linked applied exercises (e.g., computing the vertex of a basketball trajectory). For instructional adaptation, the system modifies teaching pace and modality based on learning behaviors. For emotional support, it offers encouragement and adaptive difficulty for frustrated learners, and extension tasks for advanced learners.

A/B testing on an online education platform with 1,000 middle-school students demonstrates Memory Bear’s effectiveness: test scores improved by an average of learning persistence ( $\geq 30$  consecutive study days) increased from 50% to 70%;

days) increased from 50% to 70%; and lower-achieving students saw average improvements of 18%. Teachers reported a 60% reduction in personalized lesson- planning time due to Memory Bear’s learning analytics reports.

Experts highlight that Memory Bear enables “personalized learning at scale” by remembering each student’s uniqueness. As the technology advances, it is expected to support cross-subject learning analytics and lifelong learning archives, enabling a transformation from “standardized education delivery” to “personalized educational empowerment.”

## 7 Limitations and Ethical Considerations

Although Memory Bear has made significant progress in enhancing the memory and cognitive capabilities of large language models (LLMs), it still faces technical limitations and profound ethical challenges on the path toward AGI. Recognizing these issues is essential for future system iteration and safe deployment [20].

### 7.1 Technical Limitations

**Dependence on the Underlying Base Model.** Memory Bear functions as an external cognitive enhancement module built on top of an LLM. Its ultimate reasoning and generation performance is constrained by the intelligence level of the base model. While Memory Bear reduces hallucinations by providing precise context, weak logical reasoning in the base model or an inability to interpret complex knowledge graph structures may still limit system performance. Thus, Memory Bear’s improvements scale with the capability of the underlying model rather than operating independently.

**Risk of Long-Term Memory Drift.** Current experiments evaluate dialogue lengths of several million tokens. However, in “lifelong companion” scenarios spanning years or decades, the memory repository may grow exponentially. Even with pruning and forgetting mechanisms, conceptual drift in core personality traits or long-term user preferences may accumulate subtle errors over time, eventually affecting the consistency of AI behavior.

**Challenges in Multimodal Semantic Alignment.** Memory Bear supports text, audio, and video inputs, yet deep multimodal semantic alignment remains challenging. Emotional signals from facial micro-expressions (video modality) may contradict spoken language (audio/text modality). Current systems rely on LLM-based unified representations, but determining which modality the AI should trust under conflict remains an open research problem requiring further optimization.

## 7.2 Ethical and Safety Challenges

**Privacy Risks and the Threat of “All-Knowing AI.”** Because Memory Bear stores sensitive long-term information to deliver personalized services, it retains not only factual details but also users’ emotions, vulnerabilities, and decision patterns. A data breach under such conditions would be far more severe than a traditional database leak. Although graded memory access and anonymization mechanisms are included, ensuring full memory ownership—especially under distributed or cloud-based memory pooling—remains a critical challenge.

**Cognitive Manipulation and the Boundary of Affective Computing.** Memory Bear uses emotional-tendency weighting to prioritize emotionally intense memories. While this enhances interaction warmth, it raises ethical risks: could an AI exploit deep knowledge of a user’s emotional weaknesses to subtly influence behavior or enable commercial manipulation? Clear ethical guidelines are required to define the boundary between “empathetic service” and “cognitive manipulation” [23].

**Difficulty in Enforcing the Right to Be Forgotten.** Under GDPR and related regulations, users hold the “Right to Be Forgotten.” However, Memory Bear’s memories are fused, inferred, and embedded into knowledge graphs. Deleting an original conversation does not necessarily erase the implicit cognition or strategies derived from it. Achieving complete and clean forgetting, without residual cognitive influence, remains a substantial technical challenge for memory-centric AI systems.

## 8 Conclusion and Future Outlook

This study centers on the Memory Bear system and systematically explores the technical pathways enabling AI to evolve from simple pattern-based memory toward higher-order cognitive capabilities. The work provides a comprehensive analysis of how Memory Bear breaks through traditional LLM limitations and expands the boundaries of AI applications.

As an innovative system focusing on the construction of the “memory–cognition” pipeline, Memory Bear not only fills a long-standing technical gap in sustained interaction scenarios but also establishes a reusable engineering paradigm for cognitive AI.

Traditional LLMs lack human-like long-term memory mechanisms—either failing to retain historical information, causing semantic discontinuity and repetitive questioning, or indiscriminately storing massive information, leading to excessive computational cost, high retrieval latency, and hallucinations.

By introducing a biologically inspired long-term memory architecture, Memory Bear successfully overcomes key bottlenecks in continuous interaction, including low accuracy, high cost, frequent hallucinations, and increased latency. Its layered architecture integrates multimodal encoding, intelligent memory maintenance, and cognition-level services, ensuring strong historical retention while maintaining efficiency and content quality.

From an engineering perspective, Memory Bear introduces innovations such as dynamic calibration, semantic pruning, and cognitive mapping, enabling LLMs to “retain, recall, and apply” information in a human-like manner. Both benchmark experiments and real-world deployments validate the system’s effectiveness. In standardized testing, Memory Bear significantly improves multi-turn accuracy, token efficiency, and hallucination suppression. In real applications, its value is pronounced: over 100-turn consistent context in customer service (28% improvement in satisfaction), 30% improvement in diagnostic efficiency in medical scenarios, and 25% improvement in personalized learning outcomes in education.

These results demonstrate that Memory Bear not only achieves technical breakthroughs but also delivers qualitative improvements in user experience. It provides a feasible pathway for building cognitive AI systems equipped with both long-term memory and reasoning capabilities, with clear engineering and practical value across multiple industries.

## 8.1 Future Research Directions: Multimodal Memory Integration and Cognitive Modeling

Current multimodal memory research faces challenges related to semantic gaps and temporal misalignment across modalities. The abstract semantics of text, visual features of images, and temporal dynamics of video often remain fragmented, hindering unified memory representation.

Future work will focus on breakthroughs in cross-modal memory fusion and enhanced cognitive modeling:

**Cross-Modal Semantic Alignment via Contrastive Learning.** Develop alignment algorithms based on contrastive learning, constructing cross-modal similarity matrices and dynamic mapping networks to achieve unified encoding across text, images, and video, addressing the issue of modality-isolated memories of the same event.

**Multimodal Temporal Graph Neural Networks.** Extend existing cognitive models into multimodal temporal graph networks by introducing temporal weighting factors and constructing a three-dimensional memory graph of modality–semantic–temporal structures. This enables the discovery of patterns such as “visual symptoms–textual diagnosis–temporal progression.”

**Adaptive Multimodal Pruning Strategies.** Establish dynamic pruning thresholds based on modality contribution scores and scenario demands, compressing storage and

computation while preserving key cross-modal semantics. For example, in remote diagnosis, lesion features in medical images and textual diagnostic conclusions should be preserved as priority memory units.

## 8.2 Future Research Direction: Optimization of Ultra-Scale Distributed Memory Systems

As application scenarios expand, Memory Bear must support millions of concurrent users. The existing centralized memory architecture can no longer satisfy the requirements for low latency and high reliability. Future work will focus on architectural innovation and performance optimization for ultra-scale distributed memory systems.

First, we propose a *federated memory indexing* technique inspired by decentralized blockchain concepts and privacy-preserving mechanisms in federated learning. This enables multi-node collaborative indexing, parallel retrieval, and cross-node synchronization, supporting over one million concurrent users with retrieval latency controlled under 100 ms.

Second, an intelligent *memory heat prediction* model will be developed. By incorporating interaction frequency, data timeliness, and scenario relevance, the system predicts hot and cold memory segments and dynamically migrates them between high-speed caches and low-cost distributed storage. This is expected to reduce overall storage costs by over 30% while maintaining efficient access to frequently used memory.

Third, we explore hardware-software co-optimization through dedicated memory acceleration chips. By integrating parallel hardware execution with optimized software-level memory management, the goal is to reduce core retrieval latency to below 50 ms, meeting the demands of latency-sensitive applications such as autonomous driving and real-time remote control.

## 8.3 Future Research Direction: Deep Integration of Memory, Cognition, and Agency

The deep coupling of memory and cognition is central to human-like intelligence, while motivation modeling and self-directed optimization represent higher-level objectives.

Future work will aim to construct a unified *memory-cognition-agency* framework.

First, deep reinforcement learning combined with memory feedback loops will enable closed-loop adaptive cognitive systems. Agents will autonomously refine their cognitive strategies based on the effectiveness of past memory usage.

Second, we explore *memory-motivation mapping*. By analyzing long-term behavioral memory such as preferences, interaction patterns, and outcome feedback, the system can infer deeper user motivations and provide targeted interventions.

Third, we investigate human-like *consolidation and forgetting* mechanisms. A dynamic memory lifecycle model will strengthen core memories and selectively forget outdated or redundant ones. Emotional memory modeling will enable more empathetic and humanized interaction.

## 8.4 Summary

In summary, the series of studies and practical deployments of the Memory Bear system—from laboratory performance validation to cross-industry applications in customer

service, healthcare, and education—have fully demonstrated that introducing a human-like hierarchical and dynamic memory architecture is the key to overcoming the limitations of shallow interactions in artificial intelligence and achieving a qualitative leap in cognitive capability.

This memory framework not only enables AI to achieve significant improvements in core cognitive dimensions such as contextual understanding, long-term decision-making, and cross-scenario adaptability, but also translates technical value into tangible industry benefits. Memory Bear enables hundred-turn coherent interactions in intelligent customer service and bridges historical symptoms with diagnostic logic in medical consultations, effectively advancing AI from “mechanical responses” to “precision services,” thereby significantly enhancing the practical utility and user trust of intelligent systems.

The technological breakthrough from “passive memory” to “active cognition” provides new foundational insights and a robust technical basis for the development of artificial general intelligence (AGI). One of the central bottlenecks of AGI lies in the absence of human-like memory management capabilities to support continuous learning and decision-making in complex environments. The “multimodal encoding–intelligent maintenance–cognitive mapping” architecture of Memory Bear achieves a deep integration of memory and reasoning for the first time, offering a reusable engineering paradigm that breaks the long-standing reliance on parameter scaling in large model research.

With the open-sourcing of the Memory Bear core framework and the growing involvement of the developer community, we have strong reasons to believe that a new era of AI—one that truly understands user needs, accurately retains interaction memories, and continuously accompanies long-term user development—is rapidly approaching.

Over the next 3–5 years, memory-augmentation technologies represented by Memory Bear are highly likely to become the standard configuration for intelligent agent development. This shift will fundamentally transform the R&D paradigm of intelligent systems—from “pursuing parameter scale” to “building efficient memory–cognition pipelines”—ultimately steering artificial intelligence from “high capability” toward “high reliability, high adaptability, and high empathy.”

## References

- [1] Rahman, A. A., Anwar, S., Usman, M., Ahmad, I., & Mian, A. (2025). DefAn: Definitive Answer Dataset for LLM Hallucination Evaluation. *Information*, 16(11), 937. <https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/16/11/937>
- [2] Hong, M., Sun, B., He, J., Zhang, Y., & Yuan, L. (2025). Reducing hallucination in MLLMs for action recognition with adaptive masking and dual prompting. *Neurocomputing*, 131861. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2025.131861>
- [3] Chen, D., Niu, S., Li, K., Liu, P., Zheng, X., Tang, B., *et al.* (2025). HaluMem: Evaluating Hallucinations in Memory Systems of Agents. arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.03506. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2511.03506>
- [4] Liu, Q., Li, Y., Duan, H., Liu, Y., & Qin, Z. (2016). A survey of knowledge graph construction technologies. *Journal of Computer Research and Development*, 53(3), 582–600. [in Chinese]. <https://cdn.jsdelivr.net/gh/it-ebooks-0/IT-EBOOKS-2019-03T012@.pdf>
- [5] Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., & Courville, A. (2017). *Deep Learning*. (Beijing: Posts & Telecom Press, Chinese edition). [in Chinese].
- [6] Chhikara, P., Khant, D., Aryan, S., Singh, T., & Yadav, D. (2025). Mem0: Building production-ready AI agents with scalable long-term memory. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.19413. <https://arxiv.labs.arxiv.org/html/2504.19413>
- [7] Pohrebniyak, I. (2025, October 30). Stop LLM hallucinations: Reduce errors by 60–80%. Master of Code Global. <https://masterofcode.com/blog/hallucinations-in-langs-what-you-need-to-know-before-integration>
- [8] Mem0. (n.d.). AI Memory Research: 26% Accuracy Boost for LLMs. <https://memo.ai/research>
- [9] Che, W., Dou, Z., Feng, Y., Gui, T., Han, P., Hu, B., & Zhao, Y. (2023). Natural language processing in the era of large models: Challenges, opportunities, and future directions. *Science China: Information Sciences*, 53(9), 1645–1687. [in Chinese].
- [10] Liu, Z., Wang, P., Song, X., *et al.* (2025). A survey on visual question tasks for large language models. *Journal of Software*, 36(3), 1152–1185. <https://doi.org/10.13328/j.cnki.jos.007242> [in Chinese].
- [11] Ren, Z., Zhan, Y., Yu, B., Ding, L., Xu, P., & Tao, D. (2025). Healthcare agent: Eliciting the power of large language models for medical consultation. *npj Artificial Intelligence*, 1(1), 24. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44387-025-00021-x>
- [12] Lu, Y., Yu, J., Chen, P., *et al.* (2023). Applications and prospects of generative artificial intelligence in education: Taking ChatGPT as an example. *China Distance Education*, 43(4), 24–31+51. [in Chinese]. <https://doi.org/10.13541/j.cnki.chinade.20230301.001>
- [13] Huang, R. (2023). Artificial intelligence is accelerating educational transformation: Current challenges and countermeasures. *Chinese Journal of Education*, 2023(6), 26–33. [in Chinese].

[14] Jiang, J., Tu, D., Zhang, G., *et al.* (2012). A human–robot cooperative operation mechanism for indoor mobile service robots based on cognitive models. *CAAI Transactions on Intelligent Systems*, 7(3), 251–258. [in Chinese].

[15] Huang, Y., Fu, B., Lai, Y., & Yao, Y. (2021, March). Design and implementation of a memory assistant based on the Ebbinghaus forgetting curve. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 687, No. 1, p. 012187). IOP Publishing. <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1755-1315/687/1/012187/pdf>

[16] Eastday.com. (2025, October 28). Red Bear AI memory science product “Memory Bear” officially released, enabling AI to have human-like memory. [in Chinese]. <https://caijing.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202510/28/WS6900588c3a10c4eeaa5e907.html>

[17] Xiao, L., & Pu, M. (2021). Brain science and brain-inspired intelligence. *High Technology & Industrialization*, 27(10), 20–23. <https://doi.org/10.26927/j.cnki.hitech.2021.10.002> [in Chinese].

[18] Cai, L., Cheng, Y., Shao, X., Wang, H., Zhao, Y., Zhang, W., & Li, K. (2025). A scenario-driven cognitive approach to next-generation AI memory. arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.13235. <https://arxiv.org/html/2509.13235>

[19] Zhong, Y. (2012). Breakthroughs in artificial intelligence and innovations in scientific methodology. *Pattern Recognition and Artificial Intelligence*, 25(3), 456–461. <https://doi.org/10.16451/j.cnki.issn1003-6059.2012.03.024> [in Chinese].

[20] Rege, M., & Hemachandran, K. (2026). *Ethics and Governance of Artificial Intelligence: Frameworks, Risks, and Society*. CRC Press.

[21] LangChain. LangChain context engineering in agents. [eb/ol]. [n.d.]. <https://docs.langchain.com/oss/python/langchain/context-engineering>

[22] Packer, C., Fang, V., Patil, S., Lin, K., Wooders, S., & Gonzalez, J. (2023). MemGPT: Towards LLMs as operating systems. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.08560>

[23] Shumate, J. N., Rozenblit, E., Flathers, M., Larrauri, C. A., Hau, C., Xia, W., *et al.* (2025). Governing AI in mental health: 50-state legislative review. *JMIR Mental Health*, 12, e80739. <https://mental.jmir.org/2025/1/e80739>