

Fun Maximizing Search, (Non) Instance Optimality, and Video Games for Parrots

JÉRÉMY BARBAY, Departamento de Ingeniería Informática y Ciencias de la Computación (DIICC), Facultad de Ingeniería (FI), Universidad de Concepción (UdeC), Chile



Fig. 1. Two Quaker Parrots playing InCA-ClickInOrder on a dense array in one dimension: they have to click the values represented on the screen in decreasing order, for various representation mode of the values. In Fig. 2. Two Quaker Parrots playing video games higher levels of difficulty, the values are masked by on cell phones in *masked mode*, where the experimenter does not see the screen and only hears the amount of time, the values are displayed on a feedback from the application indicating which sparse grid, and/or on a grid in two dimensions. type of reward to give the subjects, to insure that Finding a level of difficulty which is not too hard the subjects do not get any (voluntary or involuntary but still challenging is a difficult task, currently tary) hints from the experimenter, hence eliminating the risk of a *Clever Hans* effect [17].

Computerized Adaptive Testing (CAT) measures an examinee's ability while adapting to their level. Both too many questions and too many hard questions can make a test frustrating. Are there some CAT algorithms which can be proven to be theoretically better than others, and in which framework? We show that slightly extending the traditional framework yields a partial order on CAT algorithms. For uni-dimensional knowledge domains, we

Author's address: Jérémy Barbay, jeremy@barbay.cl, Departamento de Ingeniería Informática y Ciencias de la Computación (DIICC), Facultad de Ingeniería (FI), Universidad de Concepción (UdeC), Edmundo Larenas 219, Concepción, Region Biobio, Chile.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.

XXXX-XXXX/2024/3-ART \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

analyze the theoretical performance of some old and new algorithms, and we prove that none of the algorithms presented are instance optimal, conjecturing that no instance optimal can exist for the CAT problem.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Adaptive Testing, Instance Optimality, Optimality Factor, Sorted Search.

ACM Reference Format:

Jérémy Barbay. 2024. Fun Maximizing Search, (Non) Instance Optimality, and Video Games for Parrots. 1, 1 (March 2024), 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

Motivation. Computerized Adaptive Testing (CAT) is a form of computer-based test that adapts to the ability level of the test's subject, in which the next item or set of items selected to be administered depends on the correctness of the subject's responses to the most recent items administered. Even though it was originally designed for humans, we are interested in applying the concept in the context of video games for Other Animals Than Humans (OATHs), such as in video games for Dogs [13], Cats [18] or Quaker Parrots [7]. Of particular interest is the use of such algorithms in order to automatize the search for the right level of difficulty for each subject on a particular day without depending on any technical knowledge from their guardian. This is a difficult task when this ideal level of difficulty can and will evolve with time, going up when playing regularly, and going down after a long period without playing.

Problem. On one hand, failing to be able to answer correctly too many questions can be frustrating for the subject, who might get discouraged and start answering questions randomly or altogether abort the test, especially if the subject is a human child or from another species than human. On the other hand, having too many questions in a test can be both inefficient and frustrating, even if many can be answered correctly by the subject.

Research Questions. Which framework could/should we use to compare such CAT algorithms? Are there some CAT algorithms which are provably better than others in such frameworks?

Hypothesis. Slightly extending with an additional measure of the number of test questions answered correctly the traditional worst case and instance optimality frameworks on algorithms (which traditionally only measure the number of tests performed) yields a partial order on CAT algorithms, among which some algorithms dominate others in term of performance.

Proposal. We propose to study CAT algorithms on uni-dimensional knowledge domain (i.e. where the knowledge of the subject is measured by a single position in a sequence of completely ordered knowledge items), such as for example, for a given integer $\sigma \geq 3$ the ability to compare two values chosen randomly among $[1..\sigma]$, or memorizing a permutation of $[1..\sigma]$ in 1 or 2 dimensions on a dense or sparse grid.

Results. We define a new analysis framework for CAT algorithms, which yields a partial order on CAT algorithms. We analyze in this framework the theoretical performance of various algorithms (some inspired by known sorted search algorithms, and some proposed for this work), and we prove that non of those algorithms is instance optimal, and conjecture that no CAT algorithm can be instance optimal.

Outline of the Article. After describing more formally the motivation, the problem and giving some basic algorithms as examples of solutions in Section 1, we describe in Section 2 how we extend existing theoretical frameworks to this particular context, and we define and analyze some new algorithms in

such frameworks in Section 3. We conclude with a summary and some perspective on future work (Section 4).

1 BACKGROUND

Even though CAT algorithms were introduced in order to improve the learning experience of humans, we are interested in their application in the field of Ethology [5], in order to improve the study of the sensory and cognitive abilities of Other Animals Than Humans (OATHs). We describe some motivating examples in Section 1.1 and some naive solutions in Section 1.2, which performance we will later study and compare to that of new algorithms (in Section 3).

1.1 Motivation

Even considering that humans are but one species among others, working with Other Animals Than Humans (OATHs) present distinct challenges from working with humans. We describe some parameterized Digital Life Enrichment Activities for OATHs in Section 1.1.1 to illustrate how those differ from traditional “video games” for humans, and how we formalize the concept of difficulty of a given parameterization of a Digital Life enrichment activity in Section 1.1.2.

1.1.1 Examples of Video Games for Other Animals Than Humans (OATHs). Life enrichment activities have proven to be a very effective way to ethically measure the sensory and cognitive abilities of various non-human species. With the advancement of technology, these activities have been modernized into what we know today as digital life enrichment applications. In 1990, the NASA/LRC Computerized Test System [14] was demonstrated to produce a flexible but powerful environment for the investigation of behavioral and psychological processes. This allowed rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*) from different populations and locations to be tested under comparable conditions. The authors even mention that “*the animals readily started to work even when the reward was a small pellet of chow very similar in composition to the chow just removed from the cage*”, and that “*the tasks have some motivating or rewarding of their own*”. Obtaining data from different sources for the same experiment has become easier with the current technological advancement, sharing the results of a study became easier with the advent of the internet, and replicating experiments with physical to digital media becomes easier with the use of touch screens.

What is More. Al Aïn et al. [1] tested the discrimination abilities of African Grey (*Psittacus erithacus*) parrots on discrete and continuous amounts. Barbay et al. [7] replicated and extended Al Aïn et al.’s study [1] via the use of a digital life enrichment application called What is More, used by the subjects through a touchscreen, in a way which promoted the OATH subjects’ agency and allowed to gather a larger volume of data points in a smaller amount of time than in Al Aïn et al.’s original experimental protocol [1]. The application is highly parameterized, so that the level of difficulty, or even parameters unrelated to the skills being tested, can be adjusted to the specificities of both the species (e.g. Dog, Cat, Quaker Parrot) and of the individual being tested (e.g. subject previously trained vs new subject, color blind individual, etc.). The task to choose and adapt such parameters requires some knowledge both of the mechanism of the application and of the experimental protocol. Letting this task fall upon the experimenter restricts who can be an experimenter (e.g. someone with a scientific training) and excludes the possibility to enroll other persons, such as technical staff in zoological parks and citizens acting as guardians of potential subjects, in citizen science projects [6]. In particular, a system automatizing the

selection and evolution of such parameters will be essential to any citizen science project based upon guardians guiding their proteges through the use of digital life enrichment applications.

Click in Order. Inoue and Matsuzawa [8] investigated the working memory of chimpanzees on two-dimensional permutations. With a touchscreen that showed the Arabic numerals from 1 to 9 in random positions among 40 different locations on the screen, the subjects were trained to select the correct ascending sequence of numerals. The *masking task* consists of replacing the numbers with white squares after the first numeral gets selected. Then, the *limited hold memory task* was introduced to the chimpanzees; this consisted of giving a certain amount of time before covering the numbers. Overall, the results showed that the young chimpanzees performed better than both adults and human subjects. Silberberg and Kearns [15] recreated the setup of the experiments held by Inoue et al. [8] to show that when given enough practice, humans can achieve the performance shown by the young chimpanzees. We are currently designing, developing, and validating a simple open-source web solution called **Click In Order** (see Figurefig:teaser-ClickInOrder for a picture of two Quaker parrots playing this application) to replicate and extend the software used in both studies [8, 15]. This application can be configured to use either the same numerical representations as in the previous studies, or other numerical representations such as a number of dots, a disk of size matching the value, or a rectangle filled with a quantity of apparent liquid proportional to the value.

All applications described above are parameterized, which allows the experimenter to adjust the difficulty of the application to the subject’s abilities. There are various reasons for such adjustment: one objective can be to determine the limits of the subject’s abilities, another one can be to maintain the application entertaining [19] for the subjects. Without aiming for universality, we describe some ways to formalize such parameterization of the difficulty.

1.1.2 Difficulty Matrices. As a first approach, let’s consider only *quantitative* parameters, such as the size of the set of values from which to select the maximum in the application **What is More**: even though *qualitative* parameters (such as the display modes of values in **What is More** and **Click in Order**) do contribute to the difficulty, as a first approach they can just be seen as different “games”, and letting the subject choose the value of such parameter can be seen as an experiment about whether this increased agency prompts an increase in motivation and interest in participating in the experiment.

For *quantitative* parameters, given a specific subject to test, we formalize the concept of difficulty of a Digital Life enrichment activity as a matrix where each entry corresponds to the probability that the subject will successfully answer questions at the corresponding level of difficulty.

The difficulty matrix is uni-dimensional when varying the values of a single parameter: this is the simplest case, and a starting point for the study of the concept of difficulty matrices. Barbay et al. [7] basically computed for each of the two subjects 4 such uni-dimensional matrices, one for each of the 4 display modes for the task of selecting the maximum value out of a set of 2,3, 4 or 5 values displayed, showing that the probability of failing the test was increasing with the number of values displayed for all display modes.

Figure 1 represent the accuracy values from Barbay et al.’s experiments [7], drawing 4 arrays (one for each of 4 display modes) of 4 values (one for each set size).

The values in the difficulty matrix decrease with the difficulty. Finding the parameterization of the activity so that to insure a desired success rate (e.g. 80%) corresponds to finding the insertion rank of the success rate in a sorted array. This is a classical algorithmic problem, **SORTED SEARCH**, for which

Set size	Dice	Heap	Disc	Rect	Total
2	$84(3e^{-52})$	$88(1e^{-53})$	$86(7e^{-45})$	$88(1e^{-97})$	$87(3e^{242})$
3	$74(1e^{-54})$	$73(1e^{-21})$	$81(1e^{-39})$	$82(3e^{-112})$	$78(6e^{221})$
4	$53(8e^{-09})$	$66(1e^{-12})$	$60(5e^{-13})$	$71(4e^{-32})$	$63(8e^{-60})$
5	$60(9e^{-21})$	$58(3e^{-12})$	$52(5e^{-06})$	$67(4e^{-38})$	$62(9e^{-72})$

Table 1. Average accuracy values of a subject for the task of selecting the maximal value out of a set of 2,3,4 or 5 distinct values, for four distinct display modes. Each entry is in the format $a\%(p)$ where a is the accuracy reported, and p the probability to achieve such accuracy by selecting answers uniformly at random. Each column corresponds to a single difficulty matrix. Note how the accuracy always goes down when the difficulty (the set size) augments. Data compiled from that of Barbay et al. [7].

many classical algorithmic solutions are known: we describe a few quickly in the next section. We will see (in Section 1.2) that those can ask (too) many difficult questions while searching for the insertion rank, which motivated the search and study of some new algorithms.

1.2 Naive Solutions

Given a (virtual) one dimension difficulty array D (which values are unknown but can be computed) monotonically decreasing, and a difficulty objective t , we need algorithms to find the *insertion rank* of t in D . We describe the adaptation of such algorithms to our context and discuss in Section 1.3 how (in)adequate classical theoretical frameworks are to evaluate such algorithms for the application discussed in Section 1.1.

Sequential Search. is the classical search algorithm [12] starting from the lowest index l in D and comparing each value of D from this index with the difficulty threshold t until either a position $p + 1$ in D is reached such that $D[p + 1] \geq t$, i.e. $D[p] > t \geq D[p + 1]$, or the last position r of D is such that $D[r] > t$.

Binary Search. is another classical search algorithm [12]. In our context, the algorithm starts by comparing t with the value of lowest index $D[l]$, returning l if $D[l] < t$. If not, as long as the lowest index l is at least one less than the highest index r , it then compares the threshold with the value at the position $\lfloor \frac{l+r}{2} \rfloor$ and recurse in the half of the matrix which might contain values smaller than t , and returns the insertion point when it stops the recursion.

Doubling Search. [3] (also called **Exponential Search** and many other names) is an adaptive variant of **Binary Search**, which first “gallops” by performing a **Sequential Search** for t on the sub array of D which indices are powers of two. Once found the insertion rank of t in this sub-array, it performs a **Binary Search** in the corresponding interval in D , considering all indices in this interval.

A theoretical framework permits to predict the relations between the performances of various algorithms on yet unknown instances. Typically, one considers the asymptotic worst case number of operations performed. For the application described in Section 1.1, this is not sufficient.

1.3 (Inadequacy of) Traditional Analysis Frameworks

Given a difficulty array D , and a difficulty objective t , each algorithm must be evaluated in function not only of the number of values of the array computed (i.e. the number of questions made to the subject), but also about the number of comparisons with t which result was negative (i.e. the question was too difficult for the subject).

Sequential Search. [11] results in $p + 1$ tests to the subject, among which only 1 being too difficult. It is optimal in the number of “negative tests”, but quite inefficient in the total number of tests.

Binary Search. [11] results in $1 + \log_2(r - l + 1q)$ tests to the subjects, among which in the worst case $\log_2(r - l + 1)$ are “negative tests”. It is optimal (in the worst case over instances of fixed size $r - l$) in the overall number of tests performed, but potentially quite frustrating to the subject, all tests but one being “too hard”.

Doubling Search. [3] results in $1 + 2 \log_2(p - l + 1)$ tests to the subjects, among which in the worst case $1 + \log_2(p - l + 1)$ are “negative tests”. It is within a constant factor of being optimal (in the worst case over instances of fixed input size $r - l$ and output p) in the overall number of tests performed, but potentially quite frustrating to the subject, with many tests in the last sequence being “too hard”.

Being evaluated with two criteria, one algorithm is better than another one only if the first one is better than the second one in both criteria: it is a basic principle in computational geometry and yields a partial order on algorithms. We formalize its application to the context of CAT algorithms in the next section.

2 NEW THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The concept of a partial order on algorithms and data structures is far from new: comparing algorithms in terms of both memory usage and running time yields a partial order, and so does comparing data structures in terms of supporting time for two or more operations (one “sacrifices” the supporting time of one operation in order to reduce the supporting time of others) or in terms of both space and supporting time. We describe it here shortly in the context of CAT algorithms, by defining the frustration potentially generated in a subject by a CAT algorithm as a two dimensional point (Section 2.1), and by defining terms covering the various possible relations between such points (Section 2.2).

2.1 Measure of Frustration

Given a CAT algorithm A , a subject S and a knowledge threshold t , we merely define the frustration of the subject S as a point in two dimensions, which coordinates are given by the total number of test performed, and by the number of tests answered negatively by the subject:

Definition 1 (Measure Φ of Frustration). Given a CAT algorithm A , a subject S and a knowledge threshold t , the frustration $\Phi(A, S, t)$ generated by the algorithm A in the subject S while aiming for the knowledge threshold t is a pair composed of

- the total number of tests presented to the subject S by the algorithm A while aiming for the knowledge threshold t , and of
- the number of tests answered negatively by the subject among those.

The reason to explicitly focus on the frustration (rather than, say, the “fun”) is so that the goal of finding better algorithms still corresponds to *minimizing* the complexity measure, as in traditional

complexity analysis. The difference with traditional analysis is that the order between algorithms is partial.

2.2 Comparing CAT Algorithms for Fun

We chose to define formally the way to compare algorithms in function of their fun factor rather than in term of the frustration potentially generated:

Definition 2 (More or Less Fun). Given two CAT algorithms A and B , of measures of frustration $\Phi(A) = (\text{negative}_A, \text{total}_A)$ and $\Phi(B) = (\text{negative}_B, \text{total}_B)$, i.e. where A yields negative_A failed answers out of total_A and B yields negative_B failed answers out of total_B :

- A is *More Fun* than B , noted $A \supset B$ if $\text{negative}_A < \text{negative}_B$ and $\text{total}_A < \text{total}_B$;
- A is *Less Fun* than B , noted $A \subset B$ if $\text{negative}_A > \text{negative}_B$ while $\text{total}_A = \text{total}_B$; or $\text{total}_A > \text{total}_B$ while $\text{negative}_A = \text{negative}_B$;
- A is *Fun Non Comparable* than B , noted $A \# B$, otherwise.

3 NEW ALGORITHMS

The classical algorithms described in Section 1.2 are parts of a partial order over all TAC algorithms. We describe two additional algorithms, one with an interesting property concerning the number of negative tests performed (Section 3.1), and the other one expressly designed to perform poorly in this regard (Section 3.2), in such a way to allow to prove some interesting results in Section 3.3.

3.1 Fun Search

The TAC algorithm Fun Search (formalized in Algorithm 1) is an adaptive variant of the algorithm Doubling Search where, instead of performing a Binary Search in the interval found through sequential search on a sub-sequence of the items (i.e. a “gallop”), it performs another Fun Search in such interval.

Algorithm 1 Fun

Gallop from small value to find a range $[l..r]$ of position such that l corresponds to a known item and r to an unknown one.

while $r - l > 1$ **do**

Gallop up from l until finding a range $[l'..r']$ of position such that l' corresponds to a known item and r' to an unknown one

$(l, r) \leftarrow (l', r')$

end while

Return l

This results in an interesting property concerning the number of negative tests performed: it is adaptive to the number of “ones” in the binary writing of the output:

PROPERTY 1. *Given a domain knowledge of size n and a knowledge threshold p for the subject, the CAT algorithm Fun (listed as Algorithm 1) yields as many negative tests as the number ones of ones in the*

binary writing of the knowledge threshold p . More formally:

$$\Phi(\text{Fun}, n, p, \text{ones}) = (\text{ones}, 1 + 2 \log_2 p) \subset (\log_2 n, 1 + \log_2 n)$$

3.2 Frustrating Search

The TAC algorithm `Frustrating Search` (formalized in Algorithm 2) is expressly designed to perform poorly regarding the number of negative tests performed, in such a way to allow to prove some interesting results in Section 3.3.

Algorithm 2 Frustrating

Gallop from small value to find a range $[l..r]$ of position such that l corresponds to a known item and r to an unknown one.

while $r - l > 1$ **do**

Gallop down from r until finding a range $[l'..r']$ of position such that l' corresponds to a known item and r' to an unknown one

$(l, r) \leftarrow (l', r')$

end while

Return l

The analysis of the frustration potentially caused by such an algorithm is similar to that of `Fun Search`:

PROPERTY 2. *Given a domain knowledge of size n and a knowledge threshold p for the subject, the CAT algorithm `Frustrating` (listed as Algorithm 2) yields as many negative tests as the number zeroes of zeroes in the binary writing of the knowledge threshold p . More formally:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\text{Frustrating}, n, p, \text{zeroes}) &= (\text{zeroes}, 1 + 2 \log_2 p) \\ &\subset (\log_2 n, 1 + \log_2 n) \end{aligned}$$

As one can see, the TAC algorithm `Frustrating Search` performs as many tests in total than the algorithm `Fun Search`, but it yields the largest amount of negative tests when the knowledge threshold is low, which is exactly when the algorithm `Fun Search` yields the smallest amount of negative tests: hence the name.

The combination of the analysis of the CAT algorithms `Fun Search` and `Frustrating Search` yields some interesting conclusions about the frustration-based complexity of the CAT problem itself.

3.3 Frustration-based Complexity of CAT

The CAT algorithm `Fun Search` is *More Fun* than `Doubling Search`, and asymptotically more so than `Binary Search`. Incidentally, so is the algorithm `Frustrating Search`! Both are incomparable with the algorithm `Sequential Search`, which performs optimally in terms of the amount of negative tests but worst in terms of the total amount of tests. Can anything be told from those results about the frustration-based Complexity of the problem itself?

PROPERTY 3. *The optimality ratio of both CAT algorithms Fun Search and Frustrating Search is within $\Omega(\lg(p - l))$: those algorithms are not instance optimal.*

PROOF. The worst case of each algorithm is the best case of the other one, and the ratio between their complexity in terms of the number of negative tests performed is maximized when the output is 0. \square

Can one define an instance optimal [2] CAT algorithm? We conjecture that no such algorithm exists:

CONJECTURE 3. *No CAT algorithm can be instance optimal.*

4 CONCLUSION

Results. Computerized Adaptive Testing (CAT) measures an examinee’s ability while adapting to their level. Both too many questions and too many hard questions can make such a sequence of tests frustrating. We defined a framework which yields a partial order on CAT algorithms, studied CAT algorithms inspired from classical solution to the SORTED SEARCH problem and defined two new CAT algorithms, which are output-adaptive in different ways, proving that none of them can be instance optimal. A preliminary analysis seems to suggest that no CAT algorithm can be instance optimal.

Discussion. Our results are works in progress: the concepts of instance optimality and of optimality ratio in a two dimensional partial order framework on algorithm should be more formally defined.

Directions for Future Work.

- Implement the CAT algorithm Fun Search, and test it with both Human and OATHs subjects, evaluating and comparing its ability to test the subjects without frustrating them too much with that of other algorithms, such as Binary Search, Doubling Search, or even Sequential Search (the later might causes some ethical issues!).
- Define and study two dimensional Testing Domain (i.e. two dimensional difficulty matrices): the marriage before conquest algorithm originally defined by Kirkpatrick and Seidel [9, 10] to compute MAXIMA SETS and CONVEX HULLS in two dimensions, later proved to be *input order oblivious instance optimal* by Afshani et al. [16], seems a good candidate:
 - choose one dimension
 - run the one dimensional algorithm (adaptive to number of ones?) at the half in this dimension
 - run the one dimensional algorithm (adaptive to number of ones?) at the threshold in the other dimension
 - this draws a rectangle of “easy” tests, and divides the space in two sub instances. Generalizing the approach to even higher dimension will have real applications too!
- Another extension of interest is related to iterated search algorithms (e.g. finger search trees [4]): in practice, one could use the result from the same subject on the previous testing day as a starting point of the search, or a point slightly lower (proportionally to the amount of time passed since the last testing), and hopefully yield an amount of tests proportional to the change in level of the subject.

REFERENCES

- [1] Syrina Al Aïn, Nicolas Giret, Marion Grand, Michel Kreutzer, and Dalila Bovet. 2008. The discrimination of discrete and continuous amounts in African grey parrots (*Psittacus Erithacus*). *Animal cognition* 12 (09 2008), 145–54. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-008-0178-8>

- [2] Jérémy Barbay[†]. 2021. From Adaptive Analysis to Instance Optimality. In *Beyond the Worst-Case Analysis of Algorithms*, Tim Roughgarden (Ed.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Chapter 3, 52–71. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108637435.005>
- [3] Jon Louis Bentley and Andrew Chi-Chih Yao. 1976. An almost optimal algorithm for unbounded searching. *Information Processing Letters (IPL)* 5, 3 (1976), 82–87.
- [4] Gerth Støltling Brodal. 1998. Finger search trees with constant insertion time. In *Proceedings of the ninth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms (SODA)* (San Francisco, California, United States). Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, unknown, 540–549.
- [5] Collective. 2024. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethology>. Last accessed on [2023-04-16 Sun].
- [6] Collective. 2024. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizen_science. Last accessed on [2024-02-26 Mon].
- [7] Jérémy Barbay, Fabián Jaña-Ubal, and Cristóbal Sepulveda-Álvarez. 2022. Measuring Discrimination Abilities of Monk Parakeets Between Discreet and Continuous Quantities Through a Digital Life Enrichment Application. In *Proceedings of the Conference Animal Computer Interaction (ACI)*. ACM Digital Library, Association for Computing Machinery 1601 Broadway, 10th Floor New York, NY, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3565995.3566040>
- [8] Sana Inoue and Tetsuro Matsuzawa. 2007. Working memory of numerals in chimpanzees. *Current Biology* 17, 23 (2007), R1004–R1005.
- [9] David G. Kirkpatrick and Raimund Seidel. 1985. Output-size Sensitive Algorithms for Finding Maximal Vectors. In *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 89–96.
- [10] David G Kirkpatrick and Raimund Seidel. 1986. The Ultimate Planar Convex Hull Algorithm? *SIAM Journal of Computing (SJC)* 15, 1 (1986), 287–299.
- [11] Donald Ervin Knuth. 1968. *The art of computer programming / Donald E. Knuth*. Addison-Wiley, Reading, Mass., ., New York. 3 v. : pages.
- [12] Donald E. Knuth. 1998. *Art of Computer Programming, Volume 3: Sorting and Searching (2nd Edition)*. Addison-Wesley Professional, <http://www.amazon.ca/exec/obidos/redirect?tag=citeulike09-20&path=ASIN/0201896850>.
- [13] Eli B. McGraw, Cristina Bosco, Lisa Brey, and Christena Nippert-Eng. 2024. Dogs or Not Dogs? Examining ACI Authors’ Reporting on Animal Participants’ Willingness to Engage in Research: A Spotlight on Mediated and Contingent Consent. In *Proceedings of the Conference Animal Computer Interaction (ACI)*. unknown, unknown, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3637882.3637888>
- [14] W. K. Richardson, D. A. Washburn, W. D. Hopkins, E. S. Savage-Rumbaugh, and D. M. Rumbaugh. 1990. The NASA/LRC computerized test system. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers* 22 (1990), 127–131. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03203132>.
- [15] Alan Silberberg and David Kearns. 2009. Memory for the order of briefly presented numerals in humans as a function of practice. *Animal cognition* 12 (03 2009), 405–7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-008-0206-8>
- [16] Peyman Afshani, Jérémy Barbay, and Timothy M. Chan. 2017. Instance-Optimal Geometric Algorithms. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 64, 1, Article 3 (2017), 38 pages.
- [17] Michael Trestman. 2015. Clever Hans, Alex the Parrot, and Kanzi: What can exceptional animal learning teach us about human cognitive evolution? (2015).
- [18] Rui Trindade, Micaela Sousa, Cristina Hart, Nádia Vieira, Roberto Rodrigues, and João França. 2015. Purrfect Crime: Exploring Animal Computer Interaction through a Digital Game for Humans and Cats. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Seoul, Republic of Korea) (*CHI EA ’15*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 93–96. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2702613.2728660>
- [19] Dwight Tse, Jeanne Nakamura, and Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi. 2019. Beyond challenge-seeking and skill-building: Toward the lifespan developmental perspective on flow theory. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 15 (02 2019), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2019.1579362>