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Introduction
In our ever changing world, each experienced stimulus differs from the previous. This variation can be explained using two sources: signal noise and exemplars. To overcome the possibly infinite number of stimuli, humans are able to group these unique stimuli into a finite number of categories. In particular, human cognition enables adaptation in many environments, which necessitate a broad range of behaviors which is a function of context. Most unsupervised neural networks cannot deal with such variability. One exception is the family of ART networks, which were proposed to solve the stability - plasticity dilemma (e.g. Carpenter & Grossberg, 1987). These models are able to achieve the desired behavior by using a vigilance procedure. However, this procedure has never been generalized to other classes of unsupervised neural networks, in particular recurrent associative memories. This study proposes a generalization of the vigilance procedure that can be implemented from one-shot binary input learning models (e.g. Hopfield, 1982) to iterative learning real-value patterns models (e.g. Chartier & Proulx, 2005).

Vigilance Procedure
The role of vigilance is to specify whether a novel stimulus belongs to a previously learned category or a new one. To accomplish this, a new stimulus is shown to the network, and it iterates until convergence. The resulting stable state is compared with the initial stimulus using standard correlation: if the correlation between an initial input (x(0)) and its corresponding attractor x(c) is lower than the vigilance parameter’s value (ρ), the new stimulus forms a new category. On the other hand, if the correlation between the stimulus and its corresponding attractor is higher than the vigilance parameter’s value, the new stimulus forms a new category. In this case, the new stimulus modifies the position of the attractor by using the following average between the initial input and the attractor.

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{z(\alpha x(0) + x(c))}{1 + \alpha z} x(0)(1 - z) \]  

where, \( \bar{x} \) is the network’s state used by the given model’s learning rule, \( \alpha (0 < \alpha << 1) \) is a parameter which quantifies the effect of the initial input in \( \bar{x} \) and \( z \) return 1 if the correlation is greater than \( \rho \) and 0 otherwise. Thus, if \( z = 0 \), then \( \bar{x} = x(0) \) (initial stimulus); if \( z = 1 \), \( \bar{x} = (\alpha x(0)+x(c))/(1+\alpha) \) (weighted average of the initial and stable states). This procedure is illustrated in Figure 1.

Conclusion
This study shows how to implement a vigilance procedure into RAMs. Consequently, the vigilance procedure is no longer exclusive to competitive networks, which broadens the application domain of RAMs.
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