



# Unruly octopuses are the rule: *Octopus vulgaris* use multiple and individually variable strategies in an episodic-like memory task

Lisa Poncet, Coraline Desnous, Cécile Bellanger, Jozet-Alves Christelle

## ► To cite this version:

Lisa Poncet, Coraline Desnous, Cécile Bellanger, Jozet-Alves Christelle. Unruly octopuses are the rule: *Octopus vulgaris* use multiple and individually variable strategies in an episodic-like memory task. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 2022, 225 (19), 10.1242/jeb.244234 . hal-03788394

**HAL Id: hal-03788394**

**<https://univ-rennes.hal.science/hal-03788394>**

Submitted on 26 Sep 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Unruly octopuses are the rule: *Octopus vulgaris* use multiple and individually variable strategies in an episodic-like memory task

**Running title: Octopuses in an episodic-like memory task**

Poncet Lisa<sup>1,2</sup>, Desnous Coraline<sup>1,2</sup>, Bellanger Cécile<sup>1,2</sup>, Jozet-Alves Christelle<sup>1,2@</sup>

1. Normandie Univ, Unicaen, CNRS, EthoS, 14000 Caen, France

2. Univ Rennes, CNRS, EthoS (Éthologie animale et humaine) - UMR 6552, F-35000 Rennes, France

@ Corresponding author: christelle.alves@unicaen.fr

## Key-words

Octopus, Episodic-like memory, Foraging strategies, Individual variability

## Summary statement

When trained in an episodic-like memory task, common octopuses favour individual foraging strategies rather than keeping track of time to solve the task as cuttlefish do.

## Abstract

Episodic-like memory has mainly been studied through experimental tasks in which subjects have to remember what they ate, where and when or in which context. Seemingly quite common in mammals and corvids, episodic-like memory abilities have also been demonstrated in the common cuttlefish, a cephalopod mollusc. To explore if this ability is common to all cephalopods or if it has emerged to face specific ecological constraints, we conducted an episodic-like memory task with seven *Octopus vulgaris*. Only one individual learnt the replenishing rates during the training and subsequently showed episodic-like memory abilities, whereas the other individuals favoured simpler foraging strategies, such as avoidance of familiarity and alternation, use of win-stay strategy and risk-sensitivity. A high

variability in the use of these strategies was observed between and within individuals throughout the training. Since octopuses seem to live under lighter environmental pressure than cuttlefish, they may not need to rely on episodic-like memory abilities to optimize foraging as cuttlefish do. These results highlight the differences in the use of complex cognitive abilities between cuttlefish and octopuses, which might be linked with different environmental and predatory constraints.

## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank Nicola S. Clayton and Alexandra K. Schnell for their comments on the experimental design, as well as the staff of the marine station (CREC, Unicaen, France) for their help.

## **Author contributions**

C.J.A., C.B. and L.P. designed the studies. L.P. and C.D. collected the data and ran the analyses. L.P. wrote the article. All authors discussed the results, revised the manuscript and gave final approval of the version to be published and agree to be held accountable for its content.

## **Funding**

This work was supported by a grant to C.J.A. from the ANR (French National Agency for Research; COMeTT project: ANR-18-CE02-0002)

## **Competing interests**

The authors declare no competing interests.

## **Data availability**

Data are available on figshare.com: DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.19249079

## Introduction

Episodic-like memory is the ability of an animal to remember the content (“what”), the spatiotemporal context (“where”, and “when” or “which”) and the source (contextual details such as the sensory modality of the content, the emotional valence, etc.) of a single event (Clayton et al., 2003). The ability to remember, in an integrated manner, the what, where and when (how long time ago) of an event has been shown in several taxa, including corvids (Clayton and Dickinson, 1998; Zinkivskay et al., 2009), rodents (Babb and Crystal, 2006) and apes (Ban et al., 2014; Martin-Ordas et al., 2010). Amongst invertebrates, common cuttlefish also show episodic-like memory abilities (Jozet-Alves et al., 2013). In this experiment, cuttlefish ability to remember what they ate (shrimp or crab), where (position of the target) and how long ago (one or three hours) was tested. Identical targets at distinct locations (unique locations on each day) were associated with each prey type. Whereas the less preferred crab supply was replenished after any delay, the preferred shrimp supply replenished only after a long delay (three hours). Cuttlefish quickly learnt to go to the target delivering the preferred shrimp after a long but not after a short delay. Cuttlefish showed great capacities for the task, understanding the rules of the task in about 20 trials (Jozet-Alves et al., 2013). A subsequent study confirmed the impressive memory abilities of cuttlefish, showing that their episodic-like memory does not fade, even in old age (Schnell et al., 2021a). Another recent study showed that cuttlefish possess the ability to retrieve the sensory modality (seeing or smelling a prey) of a past event (Billard et al., 2020b), indicating that cuttlefish can bind the source of a memory in addition to remembering the content and the spatiotemporal context of their memory.

We can wonder why cuttlefish possess episodic-like memory abilities. The first hypothesis is that this ability is shared with other large-brained cephalopod species as the result of their shared phylogeny. The second hypothesis is that episodic-like memory has emerged in cuttlefish to cope with specific ecological challenges such as explained in the ecological intelligence hypothesis (Byrne, 1997; Milton, 1981) and in the predator-prey interaction hypothesis (van der Bijl and Kolm, 2016). Indeed, cuttlefish have to be constantly aware of predators while hunting, which requires time and energy and thus impact fitness. Their preys are often spatiotemporally dispersed in patches which often do not offer shelters. Thus, when cuttlefish cannot minimize their risks by hunting from a hide, they may have to

use an array of cognitive skills to find preys at the right place and time, such as spatial memory (Jozet-Alves et al., 2014), value-based decision making (Kuo and Chiao, 2020) or overcoming immediate gratification in order to obtain better preys (Schnell et al., 2021b). However, rather than being a coping ability to ecological challenges, we can also hypothesize that episodic-like memory in cuttlefish could be a mere by-product of the evolution of its complex cognition. It would have emerged from other abilities required by the cuttlefish to hunt and avoid predators, without any peculiar need for episodic-like memory itself.

Octopuses appear as worthwhile species to explore the evolution of episodic-like memory abilities in cephalopods. Indeed, some species, such as *Octopus vulgaris*, live in a similar environment than cuttlefish, as they both are shallow depth bottom dwellers (Hanlon and Messenger, 2018), but possess different means to handle their environmental constraints. Indeed, due to their lack of internal shell and their highly prehensile arms, octopuses possess a wider range of means of defence. While cuttlefish mainly use crypsis for defence, octopuses can also hide in crevices, arrange a shelter, cover themselves in rocks and shells in order to avoid attacks, or defend themselves aggressively against predators (Hanlon and Messenger, 2018). Consequently, octopuses may wander more easily in the open instead of relying on strategies minimizing the time spent out of safety as cuttlefish do. Moreover, thanks to their complex arms, octopuses' food diet is broader than cuttlefish's as octopuses can consume bivalves and gastropods, in addition to decapods, fishes and other cephalopods (Anderson et al., 2008; Mather et al., 2012). Thus, while cuttlefish hunt moving preys living in patches, which may come back to suitable patches quickly, octopus, on other hand, forage partly on sessile preys such as bivalves, which replenish on very long timescales. Whereas remembering what was eaten where and when might be useful for cuttlefish, it might be unnecessary for octopuses. Instead, octopuses might rely on simpler foraging strategies based on rules of thumb to optimize foraging efficiency. They could depend on the following strategies (Levine, 1959): a) Familiarity is a memory process which use a signal-detection function whereby elements exceeding a fixed criterion are recognized as having been perceived before (Yonelinas, 2001). While foraging, individuals relying on this strategy will favour places they already visited rather than exploring new ones; b) Risk-sensitivity is the foragers' response to variance in food reward rate when choosing what to eat (Young et al., 1990). Risk-averse individuals will favour food rewards always available but

of less quality, while risk-prone individuals will look for food rewards of higher quality but randomly available; c) Spontaneous alternation is the tendency to explore places that have been least recently explored (Ramey et al., 2009); and d) win-stay/win-shift strategies are used when subjects either repeat (stay) or avoid (shift) their last choice, depending on whether the choice was previously rewarded (win) or not (Kamil, 1983).

In order to assess whether octopuses keep track of time when different food sources vary in space and time or whether they favour simpler foraging strategies, we first evaluated their ability to learn replenishing rates of preferred versus less-preferred food items (procedure adapted from Jozet-Alves et al., 2013). Octopuses succeeding this task were subsequently tested to assess their episodic-like memory abilities (what-when-where experiment, adapted from Jozet-Alves et al., 2013). Given octopuses' ecology, we expected them to favour simpler foraging strategies rather than relying on time tracking strategies as cuttlefish do, which could indicate that cuttlefish complex memory abilities might have arisen from their ecological and predator-prey interactions specificities.

## Materials and methods

### Ethical statement

Experiments were conducted in accordance with the directive 2010/63/EU (European parliament) and with the French regulation applied to the protection and use of animals in research experiments. Procedures were approved (#22429 2019101417389263 v2) by the ethical committee of Normandy region (Comité d’Ethique de NORmandie en Matière d’EXpérimentation Animale, CENOMEXA; agreement number 54).

### Subjects

The subjects used in the experiments were sub-adult common octopuses (*Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier). Octopuses were collected in the Mediterranean Sea by specialized fishermen (Carrodano, Poissons vivants, La Ciotat, France) in September 2020 (batch 1, n=3) and January 2021 (batch 2, n=4) (see Table 1 for names and sex). They were transported to the marine station of the University of Caen (Centre de Recherche en Environnement Côtier, Luc-sur-Mer, France). Their size (dorsal mantle length) ranged from 5 to 10 cm at the beginning of the experiment, to 15 to 20 cm at the end. They were individually housed firstly in glass tanks of 50x50x50 cm and transferred in glass tanks of 100x50x50cm or 120x40x50cm as they grew. Octopuses were maintained in circulated semi-artificial seawater (salinity: 37 g/L, Instant Ocean Salt – Aquarium systems; temperature:  $17\pm1^{\circ}\text{C}$ ;  $7.8<\text{pH}<8.2$ ;  $[\text{NH}_3 + \text{NH}_4^+] < 0,25 \text{ mg/L}$ ;  $[\text{NO}_2] < 0,2 \text{ mg/L}$ ;  $[\text{NO}_3] < 50 \text{ mg/L}$ ), with artificial lighting following the natural light cycle. A sand bed, pebbles, shells and a shelter in the form of a terracotta pot or a PVC tube were provided in each tank. Octopuses were fed daily outside of the experimental trials with live crabs (*Hemigrapsus sanguineus* or *Carcinus maenas*), thawed or live shrimps (*Crangon crangon*), pieces of thawed fish (mackerel *Scomber scombrus*, pollock *Theragra chalcogramma*, herring *Clupea harengus* and whiting *Merlangius merlangus*). Mussels (*Mytilus edulis*) were always available in the home tanks.

### Procedure

Experiments were conducted in the home tank of each animal. Octopuses were pre-trained and tested for food preference, before starting the replenishing rate training (see Supplementary Materials for details).

### ***Replenishing rate training***

Octopuses were trained to learn that two different prey types (preferred *versus* less-preferred prey types; determined for each individual during the food preference test) were available at specific locations and after specific delays (1h or 3h delay; Fig. 1). Octopuses were tested five days a week, one trial per day, each trial consisting of two presentations separated by either a short (one hour) or a long (three hours) delay. During each presentation, octopuses were simultaneously presented with two closed opaque pots. Each pot contained a different prey item. The position and the content of the two pots were kept the same throughout the trials (“where” and “what” components were fixed for an individual for all the replenishing rate training).

During the first presentation of a trial, the octopus could open and consume the content of each pot, and the pots were removed after 30 minutes. At the end of this delay, if octopuses did not open or consume the content of both pots (a partial consumption of the less preferred food item was tolerated), the experiment was postponed to the next day. The second presentation was conducted after either a short delay (1h) or a long delay (3h). Delays (either short or long) were pseudorandomized, so the same delay could not be repeated more than three days in a row. Pots were replenished according to the elapsed time since the first presentation. Following a short delay (1h), only the pot containing the less-preferred food item was replenished. Following a long delay (3h), both pots were replenished. The octopus could only consume the content of one pot, the second pot being removed with a small net right after the choice. A choice was considered correct when an individual chose the pot containing the less-preferred food after a short delay, and the pot containing the preferred food after a long delay.

The acquisition criterion was fixed at eight correct choices out of ten consecutive trials, as set by Jozet-Alves *et al.* (2013). The maximum number of training trials was set to 40, corresponding to the double of trials cuttlefish needed to reach the acquisition criterion during previously published experiments (Jozet-Alves *et al.*, 2013; cuttlefish learnt the



replenishing rate in  $21 \pm 4$  trials). However, since the first batch of octopuses ( $n=3$ ) did not reach the criterion in 40 trials, a second batch of octopuses ( $n=4$ ) was subsequently constituted and the maximum number of training trials was set at 80. In the case of an octopus reaching seven correct responses out of ten consecutive trials at its 40<sup>th</sup> (first batch) or 80<sup>th</sup> (second batch) trial, three supplementary trials were conducted to test whether the octopus would reach the learning criterion within this extended period of training.

### ***Episodic-like memory task***

Individuals which reached the acquisition criterion of the replenishing rate training within the pre-set number of trials were tested in the episodic-like memory task. This task was similar to the replenishing rate training task, except that the pots were randomly placed in any location in the tank and this location changed between each trial, while staying the same across the two presentations of a trial. During each trial, octopuses had to remember what prey was in each pot (what-where) and what time elapsed since the first presentation: spatiotemporal information was thus unique. We considered that octopuses showed episodic-like memory ability when they realized ten correct choices out of twelve consecutive trials (binomial test,  $p=0.039$ ), with the maximum number of trials sets at 40 trials.

### **Analysis**

Data were analysed using R software (v. 3.5.1), using binomial tests for food preference tests and choices of octopuses. To investigate the favoured strategies, we analysed choices in the second presentation for both batches as well as individual choices of octopuses during the replenishing rate training. Only the first 40 training trials were considered and analysed since we wanted to compare all octopuses, whether they were from the first batch (*i.e.* trained for 40 trials) or from the second batch (*i.e.* trained for 80 trials). Two-tailed exact Fisher tests were used to compare the use of one strategy between the first and the last 20 trials of training. It should be noted that for alternation and win-shift/win-stay strategies, the choice on the first trial was excluded of the analyses, since there was no previous reference trial. Therefore, we analysed 39 trials and compared the first 20 trials with the last 19 trials of training for these strategies. To simplify the understanding of the following sections, we will

use the expressions “40 trials” and “first and last 20 trials” as a way of speaking for all strategies.

In addition to replenishing rate learning, four strategies were explored in the second presentation of all trials: a) familiarity, b) risk-sensitivity, c) spontaneous alternation and d) win-stay/win-shift. They can be split into two subcategories: within trial strategies, where choices in the second presentation depend on the outcome of the first presentation, such as familiarity and risk-sensitivity; and between trials strategies, where choices in the second presentation of a trial depend on the outcome of the second presentation of the previous trial, such as spontaneous alternation and win-stay/win-shift. More precisely, each strategy was defined as the following: a) Familiarity (Fig. 2A) was observed when subjects chose the most familiar pot during the second presentation, which was the last opened (*i.e.* second opened) pot during the first presentation; b) Risk sensitivity (Fig. 2B) was observed when subjects chose preferentially one prey over the other during the second presentation of a trial. During this presentation, the less-preferred prey was always available no matter the delay, hence less risky, whereas the preferred prey was available half of the time (absent after a delay of one hour, and present after a delay of three hours), hence riskier. c) Spontaneous alternation (Fig. 2C) was observed when subjects alternated their choice between pots during the second presentation between each trial. d) Win-shift/win-stay (Fig. 2D) was observed when subjects which won (obtained food in a given pot) during the second presentation of a first trial shifted their choice for the other pot (win-shift) or maintained their choice for the same pot (win-stay) during the second presentation of the next trial. The lose-shift/lose-stay counterpart of this strategy was not studied since instances of “lose” were statistically scarce ( $1/4^{\text{th}}$  of the trials if subjects chose by chance).

## Results

### Food preference

All octopuses presented a significant preference for crabs (binomial test,  $p < 0.039$ ; Table 1). Less-preferred preys varied between individuals, with some octopuses tested with thawed fishes (whiting, mackerel or pollock), others with fresh shrimps or shelled mussels.

### Replenishing rate training and episodic-like memory task

In the first batch (maximum number of training trials sets at 40), none of the three octopuses reached the established learning criterion (*i.e.* eight correct choices out of ten consecutive trials). In the second batch (maximum number of training trials sets at 80), only one individual (Teddy) out of four reached the learning criterion in 43 trials (Fig. S2). One individual (Tickle) reached seven correct responses out of ten successive trials at its last trial (80<sup>th</sup>), but its performance did not improve in the three supplementary trials.

Only Teddy was subsequently tested in the episodic-like memory task. It reached the acquisition criterion and thus succeeded in the task in 21 trials.

### Strategies

If we consider the first 40 trials of training of all individuals (Fig. 3A), octopuses showed a significant avoidance of familiarity (109 familiarity choices out of 280 presentations, binomial test,  $p < 0.001$ ); they showed significant constancy rather than alternation (114 alternations out of 272 presentations, binomial test,  $p = 0.009$ ); and they significantly favoured win-stay over win-shift strategy (118 choices consistent with win-stay strategy out of 198 “win” presentations; binomial test,  $p = 0.008$ ). However, no significant preference could be observed for the less or more risky option (154 choices of the risky option out of 280 presentations; binomial test,  $p = 0.107$ ). Nevertheless, when distinguishing the first and the last 20 trials of training (Fig. 3B), octopuses were significantly more risk-prone during the first 20 trials than the last 20 (87/140 vs 67/140, two-tailed exact Fisher test,  $p = 0.022$ ). We

can note there that the preference for one prey over the other was not significant for the first pot opened during the first presentation (149/280, binomial test,  $p=0.310$ ).

At the individual level, high variability in the strategies used was observed (Table 2, Fig. 4).

The octopus **Suricate** showed no significant use of familiarity (23/40, binomial test,  $p=0.430$ ); but it presented a significant risk-aversion (10/40, binomial test,  $p=0.002$ ); it showed constancy by choosing the same pot for nine consecutive trials in the last ten trials of its training (binomial test,  $p=0.004$ ); and it significantly used win-stay strategy during its training (24/35, binomial test,  $p=0.041$ ).

The octopus **Abe** showed significative avoidance of familiarity (12/40, binomial test,  $p=0.017$ ); it presented a strong risk-proneness (31/40, binomial test,  $p<0.001$ ), combined with a clear preference for its preferred prey even when choosing the first pot to open during the first presentation (29/40, binomial test,  $p=0.006$ ); it showed constancy by choosing the same pot for ten consecutive trials in the second half of its training (binomial test,  $p=0.002$ ); but it did not significantly use win-stay nor win-shift strategies during its training (13/25, binomial test,  $p=1$ ).

The octopus **Pipoune** showed a significative avoidance of familiarity (13/40, binomial test,  $p=0.039$ ) which was delay-dependant: it avoided the familiar pot only after a long delay but not after a short one (3/20 vs 10/20, two-tailed exact Fisher test,  $p=0.041$ ); it presented risk-sensitivity, with this sensitivity reversed between the first 20 and the last 20 trials of training (16/20 vs 5/20, two-tailed exact Fisher test,  $p<0.001$ , Fig. S3): it was risk-prone during the first 20 trials (16/20, binomial test,  $p=0.012$ ), then risk-averse for the following 20 trials (5/20; binomial test,  $p=0.041$ ); it showed constancy by choosing the same pot nine times out of ten consecutive trials in the second third of its training (binomial test,  $p=0.021$ ); but it did not significantly use win-stay nor win-shift strategies during its training (20/29, binomial test,  $p=0.061$ ).

The octopus **Coquille** showed avoidance of familiarity, by choosing the unfamiliar pot nine times out of ten consecutive trials in the last ten trials of its training (binomial test,  $p=0.021$ ); it presented a significant risk-proneness in the first 20 trials of training (15/20, binomial test,  $p=0.042$ ), but it seemed to disappear in the following 20 trials (15/20 vs 8/20, two-tailed exact Fisher test,  $p=0.054$ , Fig. S3), with no significant risk-sensitivity displayed anymore (8/20, binomial test,  $p=0.503$ ); it showed alternation by choosing a different pot during ten

consecutive trials in the second 20 trials of its training (binomial test,  $p=0.002$ ); but it did not significantly use win-stay nor win-shift strategies during its training (10/26, binomial test,  $p=0.327$ ).

The octopus **Rosy** showed no significant use of familiarity (19/40, binomial test,  $p=0.875$ ); neither than it presented risk-sensitivity (25/40, binomial test,  $p=0.154$ ); it showed constancy by choosing the same pot nine times out of ten consecutive trials in the second 20 trials of its training (binomial test,  $p=0.021$ ); but it did not significantly use win-stay nor win-shift strategies during its training (13/27, binomial test,  $p=1$ ).

The octopus **Tickle** showed significant avoidance of familiarity (13/40, binomial test,  $p=0.038$ ); it presented risk-aversion, by choosing the “safe” pot with its less-preferred food for 16 times out of 20 consecutive trials between its 10<sup>th</sup> to its 30<sup>th</sup> training trial (binomial test,  $p=0.012$ ); but it did not significantly use constancy nor alternation (19/39, binomial test,  $p=1$ ); neither than it used win-stay nor win-shift strategies during its training (16/30, binomial test,  $p=0.856$ ).

The octopus **Teddy** showed no significant use of familiarity (22/40, binomial test,  $p=0.636$ ); but it presented risk-proneness (27/40, binomial test,  $p=0.038$ ); it presented constancy by choosing the same pot 15 times out of 20 consecutive trials in the second 20 trials of its training (binomial test,  $p=0.041$ ); and it significantly used win-stay strategy during its training (19/26, binomial test,  $p=0.029$ ).

## Discussion

In our study, seven common octopus (*Octopus vulgaris*) were tested in a task requiring them to keep track of time with different food sources varying in space and time. Most octopuses (six out of seven) relied on less-cognitively demanding strategies than keeping track of time during the replenishing rate learning task. Only one octopus learnt the replenishing rates of different prey types and was able to use these rules to solve an episodic-like memory task. When analysing the strategies used by tested octopuses during the replenishing rate training, such as familiarity, risk-proneness, spontaneous alternation and win-stay, we observed an above all high interindividual variability.

We conducted this experiment to determine whether episodic-like memory is an ability shared by modern cephalopods, and thus present in both cuttlefish and octopuses, or if it is rather a distinctive ability of cuttlefish to cope with specific ecological constraints. One individual (Teddy) learnt the replenishing rate of the different food items and subsequently succeeded in the episodic-like memory task. This may indicate that *Octopus vulgaris* might possess the neural prerequisites for episodic-like memory. Both cuttlefish and octopuses possess a central nervous system with similar brain shape and structures (Wang and Ragsdale, 2019). The vertical lobe is notably thought to be the place of higher cognitive functions (Shigeno et al., 2018), and it could be the basis of episodic-like memory abilities for both species. If this is the case, we could hypothesize that episodic-like memory may be an ability shared by cephalopods in general. As stated in the ecological intelligence hypothesis (Byrne, 1997; Milton, 1981) and in the predator-prey interaction hypothesis (van der Bijl and Kolm, 2016), such cognitive skill might be necessary to cope with the ecological constraints shared by cephalopods. Indeed, as they all evolve under high predatory pressure without a shell to protect themselves, they need to sustain their exponential growth by finding substantial amounts of food. However, other complex cognitive skills might allow them to efficiently find prey and avoid predators, and we cannot rule out the possibility that episodic-like memory might not be necessary and might rather be a simple by-product of the evolution of other cognitive abilities.

Nevertheless, we have to note that only one individual relied on episodic-like memory abilities whereas most octopuses relied on other simple foraging strategies. We can only

speculate why most tested octopuses did not learn the replenishing rate task successfully. First of all, we consider the inability of most octopuses to learn the replenishing rates was not due to a lack in the number of training trials. Indeed, with the first batch of octopuses, we conducted two times more trials (*i.e.* 40) than needed by cuttlefish to learn the replenishing rates in previous studies (*i.e.* 20 trials on average in Jozet-Alves et al., 2013 and Schnell et al., 2021b), and doubled this number of trials (*i.e.* 80) with the second batch. In this second batch, one octopus reached the learning criterion in 43 trials precisely, but the three other octopuses which were given twice this number of trials did not show any signs of replenishing rates learning. Secondly, the fact that mussels were available at all times in the tank may have hindered the motivation to learn the replenishing rates. It might have lowered the pressure of finding food, thus favouring random and simpler foraging strategies. However, this hypothesis is unlikely, as we observed that during the first months of the experiment, octopuses almost never consumed mussels, and while the quantity of consumed mussels slowly rose over the months, it stayed a quite rare occurrence. Moreover, we observed that crabs always keenly drew octopuses' attention during our experiment, even when they have been fed shortly before. Indeed, cephalopods seem to possess strong hedonic motivation for their preferred food, like cuttlefish refraining from eating a less-preferred food available at all times when they know that their preferred food will be ensured at the end of the day (Billard et al., 2020a).

Another possibility would be that octopuses may not spontaneously encode the temporal component of their episodic-like memories in terms of "how long ago" or may, but with a low accuracy: they might not, or hardly, detect the difference of elapsed delays of one or three hours. "How long ago", known as temporal distance, is often used to study the temporal feature of episodic-like memory (*e.g.* Babb and Crystal, 2006; Clayton and Dickinson, 1998; Feeney et al., 2009), but it is not the only way to encode time. Indeed, time can be perceived in terms of temporal distance ("How long ago"), by evaluating the elapsed time between the encoding of an event and its retrieval; but also in terms of temporal location ("When"), by relying on information linked with the encoding time; or in term of temporal order (or relative times), by retrieving the succession of events (Friedman, 1993; Friedman, 2007). While humans thrive in all these temporal perceptions, animals may favour one over the other. For example, black-capped chickadees rely more easily on temporal

locations than distances (Feeney et al., 2011), rats seem to have difficulties to use temporal locations (Roberts et al., 2008; Zhou and Crystal, 2009), but easily remember the temporal order of events (Fortin et al., 2002), and rhesus monkey cannot perceive temporal distances (Hampton et al., 2005), but can recall the temporal order of events (Templer and Hampton, 2013). The possible absence of temporal distance perception in octopuses would not rule out their potential to use episodic-like memory, as it can be observed through other temporal modalities as well: indeed, episodic-like memory abilities were tested in rodents using temporal distance (Babb and Crystal, 2006), temporal location (Zhou and Crystal, 2009) and temporal order (Dere et al., 2005). These different experimental approaches could be tested with octopuses to explore their episodic-like memory abilities. They would offer an insight into time perception in octopuses, to observe if octopuses really do not keep track of elapsed time, or if our experiment could not bring to light this ability.

Finally, our last supposition is that octopuses, instead of relying on episodic-like memory abilities, rather favour simpler foraging strategies that do not require a heavy cognitive load. When exploring these foraging strategies in our two batches of octopuses, we observed a group-level avoidance of familiarity, with octopuses favouring the least familiar pot (i.e. choosing the same pot first during both presentations of a trial); a general risk-proneness at the beginning of the training, with octopuses favouring the pot containing the more preferred prey which was available half of the time; a general constancy, with octopuses favouring the same pot in the second presentation over trials; and a general win-stay strategy, with octopuses favouring the pot which provided them a reward in the previous trial. Nevertheless, analysing the use of different strategies at the group level might not be ideal, since we observed a remarkable interindividual variability, with each octopus using and combining strategies in a different way from others. Coquille, for example, was the only individual using spontaneous alternation rather than constancy when choosing; Suricate and Teddy were the only ones significantly using win-stay strategy; Rosy relied mostly on random choices; or Teddy was the only one to learn the replenishing rates. Pipoune showed even more distinctive traits: firstly, it used familiarity only after long delays, maybe because it favoured other strategies when the memory trace was stronger (*i.e.* after a short delay). Indeed, it used constancy, but also risk-sensitivity. Secondly, it shifted its risk-proneness to risk-aversion. Empirical studies on risk-sensitivity in vertebrates indicate that when risk come



from the variability in the amount or presence of reward, animals are most frequently risk-averse or risk-indifferent (Kacelnik and Bateson, 1996). We can thus consider that Pipoune may have required 10 to 20 trials to learn that its preferred food was riskier than its less-preferred food, then it shifted to risk-aversion. To sum up, instead of using episodic-like memory abilities to optimize their food intake and succeed in the task, octopuses rather relied on individually variable strategies which seemed equally relevant to satisfy their food needs.

In the wild, foraging strategies are a complex trade-off between predatory and starvation risk: risk-prone individuals may enhance their chances to find more or better food but may also enhance the risk to find no food at all, while risk-averse individuals may more easily find food but of a lesser quantity and quality; individuals which use familiarity, constancy or win-stay strategies may enhance their chances to find food but may also enhance the chances of a predator to predict their coming (Stephens and Krebs, 1986). Field studies show that common octopuses use different foraging strategies, with some being opportunistic and others selective, and interindividual variability is also observed among selective individuals as they are specialized in different types of preys (Anderson et al., 2008; Mather et al., 2012). Interindividual variability in foraging strategies is in fact a common trait of various predatory species (*e.g.* seabirds (Ceia and Ramos, 2015), seals (Cherel et al., 2009), fishes (Szopa-Comley et al., 2020), squids (Lorrain et al., 2011)). The use of one strategy over the other is often considered to be linked to the physiological status of an individual and its prior experiences (Kacelnik and Bateson, 1996). However, the foraging specialization of wild octopuses did not seem to be explained by environment or the status of the individual only (Mather et al., 2012). It seems to be also the case in our experiment, since the observed differences were not explained by any physiological or behavioural parameters such as sex, size, batch or food preference. Differences in strategies may rather come from intrinsic parameters such as personality traits, as hypothesized by Mather and her colleagues (2012).

High individual variabilities, even outside foraging, seem to be common in, if not characteristic of, octopuses. Octopuses show clearly distinguishable personality traits, through differences in activity level, reactivity, boldness and aggressivity (Mather and Anderson, 1993; Pronk et al., 2010; Sinn et al., 2001). When looking at playful behaviour, octopuses demonstrate various interactions with objects, with some individuals showing

possessiveness and playful interactions, and others simply ignoring them (Kuba et al., 2003; Kuba et al., 2006). The personality profile of each individual might affect its cognitive performances (Carere and Locurto, 2011), and thus individual differences are striking in cognitive tasks, such as in the number of trials octopuses need to reach a learning criterion in a discrimination task (*e.g.* 224 to 1463 (n=4, Bublitz et al., 2017)); in the number of successful reversals in reversal experiments (*e.g.* 4 to 13 (Bublitz et al., 2021)); or in the number of days to figure out problem-solving tasks, such as retrieving through a hole and opening a container (*e.g.* in 3 to 24 days (n=7; Richter et al., 2016)).

Inter-individual variability can be an advantage as it provides unpredictability, which is a major, although often overlooked, modulator of predator-prey interactions (Chang et al., 2017; Pettoirelli et al., 2015). Indeed, variability in the foraging behaviour of octopuses may prevent preys to predict their attacks, and also prevent predators to anticipate the coming of their cephalopod prey. Individual variability seem to enhance the persistence of a species in an environment under predatory pressure (Morozov et al., 2013), but also seem to favour the dispersal and colonization of new environments (Nanninga and Berumen, 2014), which might thus have promoted the development of *Octopus vulgaris* in diverse and world-distributed environments (De Luca et al., 2014). In the common cuttlefish, variability in foraging strategies has also been documented. However, this variability seems mainly driven by age and environmental predictability: in the wild, juveniles appear more selective than adults which present generalist and opportunistic behaviours (Neves et al., 2009; Pinczon du Sel et al., 2000). A lab-conducted experiment showed that cuttlefish have a selective foraging behaviour when exposed to a predictable feeding schedule, and they switch to an opportunistic and less-risky strategy when the environment become unpredictable (Billard et al., 2020a). Contrary to octopuses, cuttlefish seem to display a low level of inter-individual variability in foraging strategies under the same physiological and environmental conditions.

The need to optimize the time spent exposed to predators while foraging might have been the main driver of the emergence of episodic-like memory in cuttlefish, while octopuses seem to cope with their environmental constraints by displaying a wide range of foraging strategies varying both within and between individuals. Octopuses and cuttlefish have evolved different lifestyles and cognitive strategies to deal with the environmental challenges they are exposed to, while possessing the same fundamental brain architecture

(Wang and Ragsdale, 2019). Comparative studies undertaken in cuttlefish and octopuses show how necessary it is to integrate ecological, cognitive and neurobiological data to understand how complex cognition has emerged.

## References

- Anderson, R. C., Wood, J. B. and Mather, J. A.** (2008). Octopus vulgaris in the Caribbean is a specializing generalist. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **371**, 199–202.
- Babb, S. J. and Crystal, J. D.** (2006). Episodic-like memory in the rat. *Curr. Biol.* **16**, 1317–1321.
- Ban, S. D., Boesch, C. and Janmaat, K. R.** (2014). Tai chimpanzees anticipate revisiting high-valued fruit trees from further distances. *Anim. Cogn.* **17**, 1353–1364.
- Billard, P., Schnell, A. K., Clayton, N. S. and Jozet-Alves, C.** (2020a). Cuttlefish show flexible and future-dependent foraging cognition. *Biol. Lett.* **16**, 20190743.
- Billard, P., Clayton, N. S. and Jozet-Alves, C.** (2020b). Cuttlefish retrieve whether they smelt or saw a previously encountered item. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 1–7.
- Bublitz, A., Weinhold, S. R., Strobel, S., Dehnhardt, G. and Hanke, F. D.** (2017). Reconsideration of Serial Visual Reversal Learning in Octopus (*Octopus vulgaris*) from a Methodological Perspective. *Front. Physiol.* **8**,.
- Bublitz, A., Dehnhardt, G. and Hanke, F. D.** (2021). Reversal of a Spatial Discrimination Task in the Common Octopus (*Octopus vulgaris*). *Front. Behav. Neurosci.* **117**.
- Byrne, R. W.** (1997). The technical intelligence hypothesis: an additional evolutionary stimulus to intelligence? *Machiavellian Intell. II Ext. Eval.*
- Carere, C. and Locurto, C.** (2011). Interaction between animal personality and animal cognition. *Curr. Zool.* **57**, 491–498.
- Ceia, F. R. and Ramos, J. A.** (2015). Individual specialization in the foraging and feeding strategies of seabirds: a review. *Mar. Biol.* **162**, 1923–1938.
- Chang, C., Teo, H. Y., Norma-Rashid, Y. and Li, D.** (2017). Predator personality and prey behavioural predictability jointly determine foraging performance. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 1–8.
- Cherel, Y., Kernaléguen, L., Richard, P. and Guinet, C.** (2009). Whisker isotopic signature depicts migration patterns and multi-year intra-and inter-individual foraging strategies in fur seals. *Biol. Lett.* **5**, 830–832.
- Clayton, N. S. and Dickinson, A.** (1998). Episodic-like memory during cache recovery by scrub jays. *Nature* **395**, 272–274.
- Clayton, N. S., Bussey, T. J. and Dickinson, A.** (2003). Can animals recall the past and plan for the future? *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **4**, 685–691.
- De Luca, D., Catanese, G., Procaccini, G. and Fiorito, G.** (2014). An integration of historical records and genetic data to the assessment of global distribution and population structure in *Octopus vulgaris*. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **2**, 55.
- Dere, E., Huston, J. P. and Silva, M. A. D. S.** (2005). Integrated memory for objects, places, and temporal order: evidence for episodic-like memory in mice. *Neurobiol. Learn. Mem.* **84**, 214–221.

- Feeney, M. C., Roberts, W. A. and Sherry, D. F.** (2009). Memory for what, where, and when in the black-capped chickadee (*Poecile atricapillus*). *Anim. Cogn.* **12**, 767–777.
- Feeney, M. C., Roberts, W. A. and Sherry, D. F.** (2011). Mechanisms of what-where-when memory in black-capped chickadees (*Poecile atricapillus*): Do chickadees remember “when”? *J. Comp. Psychol.* **125**, 308.
- Fortin, N. J., Agster, K. L. and Eichenbaum, H. B.** (2002). Critical role of the hippocampus in memory for sequences of events. *Nat. Neurosci.* **5**, 458–462.
- Friedman, W. J.** (1993). Memory for the time of past events. *Psychol. Bull.* **113**, 44–66.
- Friedman, W. J.** (2007). The meaning of “time” in episodic memory and mental time travel. *Behav. Brain Sci.* **30**, 323–323.
- Hampton, R. R., Hampstead, B. M. and Murray, E. A.** (2005). Rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*) demonstrate robust memory for what and where, but not when, in an open-field test of memory. *Learn. Motiv.* **36**, 245–259.
- Hanlon, R. T. and Messenger, J. B.** (2018). *Cephalopod behaviour*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jozet-Alves, C., Bertin, M. and Clayton, N. S.** (2013). Evidence of episodic-like memory in cuttlefish. *Curr. Biol.* **23**, R1033–R1035.
- Jozet-Alves, C., Darmaillacq, A.-S. and Boal, J. G.** (2014). *Navigation in cephalopods*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Kacelnik, A. and Bateson, M.** (1996). Risky theories—the effects of variance on foraging decisions. *Am. Zool.* **36**, 402–434.
- Kamil, A. C.** (1983). Optimal Foraging Theory and the Psychology of Learning. *Am. Zool.* **23**, 291–302.
- Kuba, M., Meisel, D. V., Byrne, R. A., Griebel, U. and Mather, J. A.** (2003). Looking at play in *Octopus vulgaris*. *Berl. Paläontol. Abh.* **3**, 163–169.
- Kuba, M. J., Byrne, R. A., Meisel, D. V. and Mather, J. A.** (2006). When do octopuses play? Effects of repeated testing, object type, age, and food deprivation on object play in *Octopus vulgaris*. *J. Comp. Psychol.* **120**, 184.
- Kuo, T.-H. and Chiao, C.-C.** (2020). Learned valuation during forage decision-making in cuttlefish. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* **7**, 201602.
- Levine, M.** (1959). A model of hypothesis behavior in discrimination learning set. *Psychol. Rev.* **66**, 353–366.
- Lorrain, A., Argüelles, J., Alegre, A., Bertrand, A., Munaron, J.-M., Richard, P. and Cherel, Y.** (2011). Sequential isotopic signature along gladius highlights contrasted individual foraging strategies of jumbo squid (*Dosidicus gigas*). *PLoS One* **6**, e22194.
- Martin-Ordas, G., Haun, D., Colmenares, F. and Call, J.** (2010). Keeping track of time: evidence for episodic-like memory in great apes. *Anim. Cogn.* **13**, 331–340.

- Mather, J. A. and Anderson, R. C.** (1993). Personalities of octopuses (*Octopus rubescens*). *J. Comp. Psychol.* **107**, 336.
- Mather, J. A., Leite, T. S. and Batista, A. T.** (2012). Individual prey choices of octopuses: Are they generalist or specialist? *Curr. Zool.* **58**, 597–603.
- Milton, K.** (1981). Distribution Patterns of Tropical Plant Foods as an Evolutionary Stimulus to Primate Mental Development. *Am. Anthropol.* **83**, 534–548.
- Morozov, A., Pasternak, A. F. and Arashkevich, E. G.** (2013). Revisiting the role of individual variability in population persistence and stability. *PLoS One* **8**, e70576.
- Nanninga, G. B. and Berumen, M. L.** (2014). The role of individual variation in marine larval dispersal. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **1**, 71.
- Neves, A., Sequeira, V., Vieira, A. R., Paiva, R. and Gordo, L. S.** (2009). Feeding habits of the cuttlefish *Sepia officinalis* during its life cycle in the Sado estuary (Portugal). *Hydrobiologia* **636**, 479–488.
- Pettorelli, N., Hilborn, A., Duncan, C. and Durant, S. M.** (2015). Individual variability: the missing component to our understanding of predator–prey interactions. In *Advances in ecological research*, pp. 19–44. Elsevier.
- Pinczon du Sel, G., Blanc, A. and Daguzan, J.** (2000). The diet of the cuttlefish *Sepia officinalis* L.(Mollusca: Cephalopoda) during its life cycle in the Northern Bay of Biscay (France). *Aquat. Sci.* **62**, 167–178.
- Pronk, R., Wilson, D. R. and Harcourt, R.** (2010). Video playback demonstrates episodic personality in the gloomy octopus. *J. Exp. Biol.* **213**, 1035–1041.
- Ramey, P. A., Teichman, E., Oleksiak, J. and Balci, F.** (2009). Spontaneous alternation in marine crabs: Invasive versus native species. *Behav. Processes* **82**, 51–55.
- Richter, J. N., Hochner, B. and Kuba, M. J.** (2016). Pull or Push? Octopuses Solve a Puzzle Problem. *PLOS ONE* **11**, e0152048.
- Roberts, W. A., Feeney, M. C., MacPherson, K., Petter, M., McMillan, N. and Musolino, E.** (2008). Episodic-like memory in rats: is it based on when or how long ago? *Science* **320**, 113–115.
- Schnell, A. K., Clayton, N. S., Hanlon, R. T. and Jozet-Alves, C.** (2021a). Episodic-like memory is preserved with age in cuttlefish. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **288**, 20211052.
- Schnell, A. K., Boeckle, M., Rivera, M., Clayton, N. S. and Hanlon, R. T.** (2021b). Cuttlefish exert self-control in a delay of gratification task. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **288**, 20203161.
- Shigeno, S., Andrews, P. L., Ponte, G. and Fiorito, G.** (2018). Cephalopod brains: an overview of current knowledge to facilitate comparison with vertebrates. *Front. Physiol.* **9**, 952.
- Sinn, D. L., Perrin, N. A., Mather, J. A. and Anderson, R. C.** (2001). Early temperamental traits in an octopus (*Octopus bimaculoides*). *J. Comp. Psychol.* **115**, 351.
- Stephens, D. W. and Krebs, J. R.** (1986). *Foraging Theory*. Princeton University Press.

- Szopa-Comley, A. W., Duffield, C., Ramnarine, I. W. and Ioannou, C. C.** (2020). Predatory behaviour as a personality trait in a wild fish population. *Anim. Behav.* **170**, 51–64.
- Templer, V. L. and Hampton, R. R.** (2013). Cognitive mechanisms of memory for order in rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*). *Hippocampus* **23**, 193–201.
- van der Bijl, W. and Kolm, N.** (2016). Why direct effects of predation complicate the social brain hypothesis. *BioEssays* **38**, 568–577.
- Wang, Z. Y. and Ragsdale, C. W.** (2019). Cephalopod nervous system organization. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Neuroscience*, .
- Yonelinas, A. P.** (2001). Components of episodic memory: the contribution of recollection and familiarity. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.* **356**, 1363–1374.
- Young, R. J., Clayton, H. and Barnard, C. J.** (1990). Risk-sensitive foraging in bitterlings, *Rhodeus sericus*: effects of food requirement and breeding site quality. *Anim. Behav.* **40**, 288–297.
- Zhou, W. and Crystal, J. D.** (2009). Evidence for remembering when events occurred in a rodent model of episodic memory. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **106**, 9525–9529.
- Zinkivskay, A., Nazir, F. and Smulders, T. V.** (2009). What–where–when memory in magpies (*Pica pica*). *Anim. Cogn.* **12**, 119–125.

## Legends of figures


**Table 1: Food preference of each octopus.** Food preference was assessed by presenting two different prey types to octopuses during 12 consecutive trials. Octopuses chose a prey item by grabbing it and eating it. Numbers within brackets correspond to the number of times a prey item was chosen during the test. Asterisks indicate a significant preference for crabs (binomial test, \*  $p=0.039$  ( $<0.05$ ), \*\*  $p=0.006$  ( $<0.01$ )).

Subject	Suricate	Abe	Pipoune	Coquille	Rosy	Tickle	Teddy
Batch	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Sex	Male	Female	Female	Female	Female	Female	Female
Preferred prey	Crab (10)*	Crab (10)*	Crab (11)**	Crab (10)*	Crab (11)**	Crab (10)*	Crab (11)**
Less preferred prey	Whiting (2)	Shelled mussel (2)	Mackerel (1)	Shrimp (2)	Shrimp (1)	Pollock (2)	Shrimp (1)


**Table 2: Strategies used by each individual** (see methods and Fig.2 for description of the strategies). The use of four different foraging strategies was analysed during the 40 training trials of each octopus: familiarity (“3h” indicates a significant use of the strategy only after the three-hours delay), risk-sensitivity (numbers between brackets indicate during which part of training the strategy was used ([2-21] for first 20 trials, [22-40] for the last 19 trials of training), alternation and win-stay strategies.

Individual Strategy	Suricate	Abe	Pipoune	Coquille	Rosy	Tickle	Teddy
Familiarity		Familiarity avoidance	Familiarity avoidance (3h)	Familiarity avoidance		Familiarity avoidance	
Risk-sensitivity	Averse	Prone	Prone [2-21] Averse [22-40]	Prone [2-21]		Averse	Prone
Alternation	Constancy	Constancy	Constancy	Alternation	Constancy		Constancy
Win-stay	Win-stay						Win-stay






**Figure 1: Organization of a training trial.** During the presentation 1 of each trial, octopuses open both opaque pots to consume their preferred food ( $A^+$ ) and their less-preferred food ( $B^-$ ). After either a short (1h) or a long (3h) delay, both pots are presented a second time. After a one-hour delay, the pot previously containing  $A^+$  is empty, thus octopuses must go to the pot containing  $B^-$  to realize a successful choice. After a three-hours delay, food was available in both pots, and choosing the pot containing  $A^+$  was considered a successful choice. The position of the pots remained unchanged within trials. The position was altered between trials for the episodic-like memory task, but not for the replenishing rate task.




**Figure 2: Representation of strategies used by octopuses during the replenishing rate training.** A) Use of familiarity. During the presentation 1, octopuses choose a first pot, then a second one. On the presentation 2, they choose the pot lastly visited. B) Use of alternation.

Octopuses choose one pot on the presentation 2 of a trial (1), and then choose the opposite pot on the presentation 2 on the following trial (2). C) Use of risk-sensitivity. During presentation 2, the pot containing the less-preferred food is less risky (B-) than the pot containing the preferred food ( $A^+/\emptyset$ ), since the less-preferred food is always available whereas the preferred food is available randomly if delays cannot be discriminated. The representation shows the choice of a risk-prone individual. D) Use of a win-stay strategy. On the presentation 2, pots can either be a “win”, when replenished, or a “lose”, when empty. When octopuses open a pot with food inside on the second presentation during a trial (1; “win”), then on the second presentation on the following trial (2) they chose the same pot as the previous trial (“stay”), they use win-stay strategy.



**Figure 3: Percentage of octopuses ( $n=7$ ) using each strategy during the replenishing rate training** (see methods and Fig.2 for description of these strategies). A) Use of each strategy throughout the 40 training trials. B) Use of each strategy throughout the training divided between the first and the last 20 trials. Risk-sensitivity is expressed in number of risky choices. Over their training, octopuses significantly avoided the use of familiarity, favoured constancy rather than alternation, and favoured win-stay rather than win-shift strategy. Individuals did not seem to show risk-sensitivity when taking the 40 trials of training together, but risk-proneness was observed in the first 20 training trials ([1-20]) then disappeared in the following 20 trials ([21-40]). The other strategies were not observed in the first 20 training trials, but they were employed in the following trials. Asterisks represent significant difference from chance (*i.e.* dotted line; binomial test, \*  $p<0.05$ , \*\*  $p<0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p<0.001$ ).



**Figure 4: Individual use of each strategy during the replenishing rate training** (see methods and Fig.2 for description of these strategies). A) Use of familiarity; B) Use of risk-sensitivity (in number of risky choices); C) Use of alternation; D) Use of win-stay. During the 40 training trials, each individual favoured different strategies, with a high inter-individual variability. Asterisks represent significant difference from chance (dotted line: chance level; binomial test, \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ).

## Supplementary materials

### *Pre-training method*

The pre-training (constituted of five consecutive steps, Figure S1) consisted in training octopuses to open two pots within 30 minutes two times a day to obtain a food reward. Plastic pots (70mm x Ø35mm) opacified with grey tape (from step 2) and hermetically closed with Parafilm® (from step 3) were used during the experiment.

First step: Octopuses were presented with one open transparent pot containing a crab they should grab and eat. Two trials were conducted per day. When octopuses ate the content of at least one pot for three consecutive training days, they went to step 2.

Second step (no access to visual cues): Octopuses were presented with one open pot surrounded by opaque tape containing a crab they should grab and eat. Three trials were conducted per day. When octopuses ate the content of the three pots within a day, they went to step 3.


Third step (no access to visual and olfactory cues): Octopuses were presented with one pot surrounded by opaque tape and tightly covered with Parafilm®. Three trials were conducted per day. When octopuses opened the three closed opaque pots within a day, they went to step 4.

Fourth step (no access to visual cues): Two open opaque pots were simultaneously presented in the tank (random positions along trials). Each pot contained a different prey, from the two prey items used for the preference test. When octopuses retrieved food items from the two pots in less than 30 minutes, two times a day for at least four out of five consecutive training days, they went to step 5.


Fifth step (no access to visual and olfactory cues): The procedure used was the same than the one used during step 4, excepting that pots were closed with Parafilm®. The octopus had to consume the food of the two pots in less than 30 minutes, two times a day for at least four out of five consecutive training days to start the replenishing rate training.

### Food preference test

Prey preferences of each individual subject was tested between the step 3 and 4 of pre-training. General avoidance of certain types of food was noted during pre-training. Only preys which were not avoided were randomly tested two by two during the food preference tests. Two different prey types were placed at the tip of two steel wires and simultaneously presented at equal distances to the octopus (about 10 cm), with the right/left position of each prey type randomized between trials. The octopus chose a prey item by grabbing it and eating it. Preference was assessed when octopuses choose one type of food over the other in at least 10 out of 12 consecutive trials (binomial test,  $p=0.039$ ).




**Figure S1: Sequence of pretraining steps and the food preference test.** 1) Step 1: Octopuses learn to grab a crab inside a transparent open pot; 2) Step 2: Octopuses learn to grab a crab inside an opaque pot; 3) Step 3: Octopuses learn to open a closed opaque pot to eat a crab; FPT: Food preference test during which octopuses are given 12 times a choice between two types of food to determine their preference; 4) Step 4: Octopuses learn to eat preys out of two open opaque pots in less than 30 minutes two times a day, at least four out of five consecutive training days; 5) Step 5: Octopuses learn to eat the preys out of two closed opaque pots in less than 30 minutes two times a day, at least four days out of five consecutive days.



**Figure S2: Number of successful choices in the last ten trials of the replenishing rate**

**training and the episodic-like memory task.** None of the individuals, except Teddy, reached the learning criterion of eight successful responses out of ten consecutive trials during the replenishing rate training. Subsequently, only Teddy was tested in the episodic-like memory task, and reached the acquisition criterion of 10 out of 12 successive trials. The asterisk represents a number of success significantly different from chance (i.e. dotted line; binomial test, \*  $p < 0.05$ ).



**Figure S3: Individual use of risk-sensitivity (in number of risky choices) during the first 20 and the last 20 trials of replenishing rate training** (see methods and Fig.2 for description of risk-sensitivity). High inter-individual and intra-individual variability in risk-sensitivity was observed: some individuals did not show any risk-sensitivity throughout the training (Rosy, Tickle), while other showed a steady risk-proneness (Teddy) or risk-aversion (Suricate); and some others showed risk-proneness during the first 20 training trials and reversed to risk-aversion or risk-indifference during the last 20 training trials (Pipoune, Coquille). Asterisks represent significant difference from chance (*i.e.* dotted line; binomial test, ■  $0.06 < p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ ).