



Topics in Cognitive Science 00 (2026) e70058

© 2026 Cognitive Science Society LLC.

ISSN: 1756-8765 online

DOI: 10.1111/tops.70058

This article is part of the topic “2024 Rumelhart Prize Issue Honoring Alison Gopnik,”
Tamar Kushnir and Caren Walker (Topic Editors).

Can Childhood be Used as a Model to Understand the Effects of Psychedelics?

Ethan S. Hurwitz,^a  Jon G. Dean,^b  Caren M. Walker^a 

^a*Department of Psychology, University of California San Diego*

^b*Department of Anesthesiology, University of California San Diego*

Received 13 August 2025; received in revised form 15 March 2026; accepted 29 April 2026

Abstract

Psychedelic drugs have shown promise as a novel therapeutic for a variety of health conditions, yet the mechanisms underlying their clinical benefits remain unclear. A leading hypothesis suggests that psychedelics may enhance cognitive flexibility, a trait impaired in many of these conditions. While existing data from self-report and qualitative-interview studies support this hypothesis, data from experimental studies are limited and inconsistent. Here, we propose a novel cognitive development model that allows us to more precisely define cognitive flexibility as a mechanism underlying the effects of psychedelics. Considering children—a population known to be more cognitively flexible than adults—as a proxy psychedelic group, we identify three specific behaviors that could be used to empirically test this account: (1) changing the strength of, or reliance on, one’s priors; (2) changing one’s search and sampling strategies; and/or (3) changing one’s allocation of attentional resources. Finally, we highlight preliminary findings from a pilot study supporting this framework and providing guidance for future work.

Keywords: Cognitive flexibility; Cognitive development; Psychedelics

Recently, there has been a resurging interest in studying psychedelic drugs, which have shown promise as a novel therapeutic for a variety of conditions (Sessa, 2020). *How* these drugs lead to the observed clinical benefits remains an open question. Emerging evidence from clinical interviews (Noorani, Garcia-Romeu, Swift, Griffiths, & Johnson, 2018) and survey studies (Davis, Barrett, & Griffiths, 2020) suggests a promising cognitive-behavioral

Correspondence should be sent to Ethan S. Hurwitz, Department of Psychology, University of California San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92093-0109, USA. E-mail: ehurwitz@ucsd.edu

account—specifically, that psychedelics increase cognitive flexibility. However, experimental studies using behavioral tasks have yielded inconsistent results (Kuypers et al., 2016; Mason, Mischler, Uthaug, & Kuypers, 2019, 2021) and provide little insight into the underlying cognitive processes (Hass, 2017). To better test this account, it is necessary to examine specific behaviors indicative of increased cognitive flexibility. We propose that identifying these behaviors may stem from an unlikely source: children. Here, we provide an overview of a novel cognitive development model that we believe may provide a mechanistic explanation of the therapeutic effects of psychedelics, and preview findings from a pilot study that offer preliminary support for this model.

1. What are psychedelics?

The term “psychedelics” has conventionally been used to refer to a broad swath of psychoactive drugs characterized by their consciousness-altering properties, and have been utilized for religious and medicinal purposes throughout history (Stamets, 1996; Wasson, 1980).

Psilocybin, *N,N*-dimethyltryptamine, mescaline, and lysergic acid diethylamide comprise the group of “classic psychedelics,” which have a similar primary mechanism of action as agonists at 5-HT_{2A} receptors and elicit profound acute alterations in a variety of mental functions (Nichols, 2004; Vollenweider & Preller, 2020). These functions include changes in cognition, perception, emotional processing and empathy, sense of self and volition, as well as persisting psychological and behavioral changes. Acute effects include visual changes (e.g., brighter and more distinct color perception and complex kaleidoscopic visions), distorted perceptions of time and space, increased heart rate and blood pressure, feelings of fear or anxiety, and decreased psychomotor performance (e.g., Carbonaro, Johnson, Hurwitz, & Griffiths, 2018; Griffiths et al., 2011). A majority of psychedelic users endorse benefiting from taking these drugs, even when used in less controlled and supportive settings, and even when they have an experience characterized by high degrees of anxiety, fear, and difficulty (Carbonaro et al., 2016).

2. Psychedelics as treatment

Around the turn of the century, there began a so-called “psychedelic renaissance” (Sessa, 2012), with clinical trials investigating the therapeutic potential of psychedelic therapy. The emphasis of this research has largely been *whether* psychedelics can be clinically effective, rather than *how* this occurs, and has resulted in a surge of findings indicating unprecedented clinical efficacy for a variety of indications. Psychedelics have been successful in eliciting clinically significant reductions in anxiety and depression (Grob et al., 2011; Ross et al., 2016; Carhart-Harris et al., 2016, 2021; Daws et al., 2022; Doss et al., 2022; Goodwin et al., 2022, 2023; Gukasyan et al., 2022, Raison et al., 2023, Becker et al., 2022), and in some cases complete remission (Griffiths et al., 2016), facilitating a reduction or complete cessation of cigarette (Johnson, Garcia-Romeu, & Griffiths, 2017; Noorani et al., 2018) and alcohol con-

sumption (Bogenschutz et al., 2015, 2022; O'Donnell et al., 2022), reducing the frequency and intensity of cluster headaches (Schindler et al., 2021, 2022) and other chronic pain conditions (Ramachandran, Chunharas, Marcus, Furnish, & Lin, 2018), as well as alleviating body dysmorphism and eating disorders (Peck et al., 2023; Schneier et al., 2023), among others.

Although these indications may initially seem rather broad, they are also all characterized by pathologically rigid cognition (e.g., Chamberlain, Fineberg, Blackwell, Robbins, & Sahakian, 2006; Lee & Orsillo, 2014; Palm & Follette, 2011; Todd, Forstmann, Burgmer, Brooks, & Galinsky, 2015). For example, high trait anxious individuals are more reliant on their preconceptions and established beliefs, failing to update their predictions about the world in response to changes in evidence (Browning, Behrens, Jocham, O'Reilly, & Bishop, 2015; Kraus, Niedeggen, & Hesselmann, 2021). Individuals with depression and anxiety exhibit exogenous attentional biases, such that they tend to narrowly fixate on negative or seemingly threatening stimuli (Abend et al., 2018; Mennen, Norman, & Turk-Browne, 2019). They also show both increased negative and decreased positive interpretation biases, which are resistant to disconfirming information (Everaert, Bronstein, Cannon, & Joormann, 2018). These attentional and interpretation biases can create negative feedback loops, whereby people inappropriately generalize from negative experiences when interpreting novel stimuli, limiting exposure to new information that might result in a revised interpretation of events. These “learning traps” (Rich & Gureckis, 2015) have been proposed to underlie a variety of pathologies (e.g., Teodorescu & Erev, 2014; Dymond, Dunsmoor, Vervliet, Roche, & Hermans, 2015). For example, following a negative social interaction, an individual with social anxiety may form the inaccurate belief that *all* social interactions are low value and become even more withdrawn. As a result, they miss future opportunities for positive social interactions, which could change their beliefs. In fact, both cognitive behavioral therapy and exposure therapy—the conventional nonpharmacological treatments for depression and anxiety—specifically target cognitive rigidity and learning traps by exposing patients to evidence they would not otherwise receive.

This through line linking the conditions most responsive to psychedelic treatment may provide a clue to the mechanism underlying the observed clinical benefits. Indeed, both neural and psychological accounts of the efficacy of psychedelics seem to converge on the same conclusion: that treatment results in increased flexibility, and this flexibility is associated with clinical benefits (e.g., Kuypers, 2018; Davis et al., 2020, 2021; Doss et al., 2021).

3. The role of flexibility

3.1. Neural accounts of flexibility

While the neural effects of psychedelic drugs are widespread, neural accounts of the mechanisms underlying their clinical benefits have largely focused on changes to the default mode network (DMN) and salience network (SN). The DMN is composed mainly of the medial prefrontal cortex, posterior cingulate cortex, parahippocampal cortex, and parts of the inferior parietal lobe (IPL), while the SN is primarily composed of the anterior cingulate cortex

(ACC) and anterior insula (Buckner, Andrews-Hanna, & Schacter, 2008; Fox et al., 2005). Both the DMN and SN are large connector hubs, comprising among the highest number of cortico–cortical connections in the brain (Hagmann et al., 2008), and composed of brain areas with particularly dense expression of 5-HT_{2A} receptors.

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and molecular imaging methods (e.g., positron emission tomography) have demonstrated the impact of psychedelics on these networks, causing changes in structural connectivity by way of increased neural plasticity and flexibility. In line with this account, increases in neuritogenesis (formation of new neurites), spinogenesis (development of new dendritic spines), and synaptogenesis (formation of new synapses between neurons) have been reported after administration of psychedelics both in vivo and in vitro (Ly et al., 2018). Psychedelics have also been shown to increase brain-derived neurotrophic factor expression, a protein integral for these processes (Vaidya, Marek, Aghajanian, & Duman, 1997).

In addition to these changes in structural connectivity, the effects of psychedelics on neural activity and functional connectivity have also been demonstrated. Functional MRI (fMRI) scans taken during acute drug effects have shown notable decreases in the activity and functional connectivity within the DMN and SN (Carhart-Harris et al., 2012, 2017; Hermle et al., 1992; Preller et al., 2020; Tagliazucchi, Carhart-Harris, Leech, Nutt, & Chialvo, 2014). Elsewhere, though, there are overall *increases* in functional connectivity, including between the DMN and SN (Roseman, Leech, Feilding, Nutt, & Carhart-Harris, 2014) and in sensory areas (Preller et al., 2020). Curiously, fMRI scans taken post-acutely reveal increases in within-network DMN functional connectivity as well (Carhart-Harris et al., 2017; Sampedro et al., 2017; Smigielski, Scheidegger, Kometer, & Vollenweider, 2019). These functional changes have been found to persist at 1-week and 1-month post drug administration (Barrett, Doss, Sepeda, Pekar, & Griffiths, 2020), demonstrating increased “communication” between brain regions that are typically more distinct, which is believed to be characteristic of increased neural flexibility (Pang, Dunkley, Doesburg, Da Costa, & Taylor, 2016; Siegel et al., 2024). These acute decreases followed by later increases in within-network DMN connectivity have been likened to a “reset” mechanism, whereby acute disintegration affords post-acute reintegration and connectivity increases beyond baseline, leading to overall improvements in functioning (Carhart-Harris et al., 2017). These changes to neural connectivity and activity provide a compelling descriptive, implementation-level account of the role of increased flexibility in producing the clinical benefits of psychedelics. But by focusing on brain-specific changes, this evidence provides little insight into how or in what ways an individual’s subjective experience is changed as a result of taking these drugs.

3.2. *Psychological accounts of flexibility*

Psychedelics have been found to elicit spontaneous, dose-dependent insight experiences (Carbonaro et al., 2018, 2020; Davis, Xin, Sepeda, Garcia-Romeu, & Williams, 2021), which are correlated with clinical benefits after treatment (Roseman, Nutt, & Carhart-Harris, 2018). Additionally, qualitative analyses of interviews with patients who received psychedelic treatment revealed that these patients attributed their clinical benefits to the vivid insights gained

from their treatment (Noorani et al., 2018). However, these effects are mediated by survey measures designed to assess psychological flexibility (Davis et al., 2020, 2021), suggesting that changes in psychological flexibility may underlie these insight experiences. Further, psychedelics have been shown to increase the personality domain of openness (MacLean, Johnson, & Griffiths, 2011), which is also associated with greater flexibility (Silvia, Nusbaum, Berg, Martin, & O'Connor, 2009).

By focusing on the mind, rather than the brain, psychological accounts can complement the existing neural accounts. However, as these psychological accounts are typically assessed in the context of correlational studies, they cannot provide causal explanations. Further, although psychological studies successfully capture the ways in which participants' subjective experiences are changed, they fail to characterize the cognitive processes resulting in those changes.

3.3. Cognitive flexibility

While both the neural and psychological accounts reviewed above seem to implicate increases in flexibility as a potential mechanism underlying the effects of psychedelics, there exists a “mind–brain gap” in the evidence supporting this theory. Specifically, both approaches fail to explain the cognitive mechanisms underlying the observed clinical benefits. To address this gap, help to link the observed neural changes with psychological survey outcomes, and afford more definitive causal claims, it is necessary to investigate flexibility at the cognitive level.

Cognitive flexibility is a term that was originally used to characterize one's ability to selectively change their conceptual systems in response to exogenous input (Scott, 1962). This was usually described in terms of switching behaviors, for example, learning/adopting new rules in a task and simultaneously maintaining internal representations for multiple concepts or categories, which are related to greater cognitive control and more developed executive functions (e.g., Berg, 1948; Bigler & Liben, 1992; Zelazo, 2006). Notably, though, psychedelics have been found to acutely *impair* executive functions (Barrett, Carbonaro, Hurwitz, Johnson, & Griffiths, 2018), which should *decrease* this type of flexibility. This creates a conceptual puzzle. If cognitive flexibility primarily reflects executive control, and psychedelics acutely impair executive function, then psychedelics should reduce flexibility rather than increase it. Yet, several lines of evidence suggest the opposite pattern—that these experiences can increase openness to alternative interpretations and novel insights. This apparent contradiction suggests that the type of flexibility relevant to psychedelic effects may differ from the classic executive-control account. Rather than reflecting improved task switching or rule maintenance, psychedelics may influence forms of flexibility related to exploration, hypothesis generation, and attention, which result from *weaker* cognitive control and reduced top-down constraint (e.g., Thompson-Schill, Ramscar, & Chrysikou, 2009; Gopnik, 2024). In this sense, increased exploratory flexibility may come at the cost of executive control: the same reduction in top-down constraint that impairs task switching may enable broader hypothesis search and exploration. This leads to individuals being less influenced by prior knowledge (Gopnik et al., 2017), considering a wider range of possible solutions to a problem (Colantonio et al., 2025), choosing to explore even when aware of the costs of doing so (Liquin & Gopnik, 2022), and

having better memory for information outside the scope of directed attention (Deng & Sloutsky, 2016). Our proposed framework refers to this search and attentional cognitive flexibility that is afforded by less developed (or decreased) executive function (Gopnik, 2024).

As cognitive flexibility encompasses several overlapping functions (Miyake et al., 2000), multiple brain areas and networks are involved in these processes. These include the regions described above that are most impacted—in terms of activity and functional connectivity—by the use of psychedelics. For example, activity in the prefrontal cortex (PFC) is generally involved in switching behaviors, with specific types of switching recruiting different areas of the PFC (Kim, Johnson, & Gold, 2012). The IPL is associated with the determination of saliency of new information, relative to existing mental models (Filipowicz, Anderson, & Danckert, 2016). Finally, the ACC is associated with conflict monitoring and cognitive control (Kerns et al., 2004).

Others have previously proposed theoretical models of cognitive flexibility to explain the effects of psychedelics, largely focusing on the role of reduced top-down control (Carhart-Harris & Friston, 2019; Kuypers, 2018). These models have generated preliminary support from both animal studies (Torrado Pacheco, Olson, Garza, & Moghaddam, 2023) and clinical trials with humans (Doss et al., 2021). However, results from experimental work using behavioral tasks have been mixed. These studies have mainly implemented tasks measuring aspects of creativity (i.e., divergent thinking), which are treated as a measure of cognitive flexibility. In these tasks, divergent thinking is operationalized using summary score metrics like fluency (number of responses generated) and originality (overall frequency of generated responses) (Hass, 2017). Some studies found increases in cognitive flexibility during acute drug effects, but only in some tasks administered (Kuypers et al., 2016). Others found an increase on the day after drug administration, which subsided a week later (Mason et al., 2019). While others still found decreases in cognitive flexibility during the acute effects, no changes post drug administration, and evidence of practice effects among participants in their control group (Mason et al., 2021).

4. Cognitive development as a model for cognitive flexibility

As noted above, existing experimental evidence for the effects of psychedelics on cognitive flexibility is both limited and inconsistent. Further, by utilizing coarse measures of flexibility—like summary score metrics which quantify people's responses, rather than the *processes* leading to the production of those responses—these measures provide little insight into the underlying cognitive mechanisms which may afford these changes. Here, we argue that to truly test this account, we must examine the specific behaviors that are known to be indicative of increased cognitive flexibility.

How could such behaviors be identified? One approach is to look to populations known to be more cognitively flexible than baseline adults. If such a population could be identified, it would support testable predictions for the specific ways in which psychedelics might result in increased cognitive flexibility. Fortunately, such a population exists, is widespread, and (relatively) easy to access. Those people are children.

As described above, the most salient neural changes that psychedelics engender are overall increases in global functional connectivity, with specific local decreases within the DMN and SN, increases in neural plasticity, and decreased activity in DMN and prefrontal regions. Children (ages 7–9) have been shown to have lower within-network DMN functional connectivity and fiber density relative to baseline adults, as well as decreased gray matter volume (Supekar et al., 2010). Across a number of studies, these connectivity differences show a distinct linear trend, such that connectivity increases with age between 7 and 35 years (Fair et al., 2007; Sherman et al., 2014; Uddin, Supekar, Ryali, & Menon, 2011). Infancy and early childhood are also periods of development that are characterized by very high degrees of neuroplasticity, including increased synaptogenesis and spinogenesis (Huttenlocher, 1990). These plasticity changes are heterogeneous, with sensory cortices reaching peak shortly after birth and steadily declining over development, while the PFC takes much longer to peak and start declining (Huttenlocher & Dabholkar, 1997). Thus, children also have less developed frontal regions and corresponding executive functions (Thompson-Schill et al., 2009).

In addition to these neural similarities between typically developing children and psychedelic-treated adults, behavioral research also shows that when the adult brain is “made more child-like” in terms of its structural and functional makeup (via injury or a temporary change), they also perform *better* on tasks requiring cognitive flexibility. For example, while divergent thinking decreases into middle and older adulthood (Jaquish & Ripple, 1985), adults with PFC damage exhibit increased performance compared to controls on these tasks (Reverberi, Toraldo, D’Agostini, & Skrap, 2005). Further, adults who receive transcranial direct current stimulation over their PFC exhibit increased creativity (Chrysikou et al., 2013).

One of the more consistent findings reported in cognitive development research is that children’s performance on cognitive tasks tends to be “noisier” than adults’ (Sobel, Tenenbaum, & Gopnik, 2004; Kushnir & Gopnik, 2007; Bonawitz, Denison, Griffiths, & Gopnik, 2014). Children’s immature PFCs result in less developed executive function, inhibition, and constraint (Munakata, Casey, & Diamond, 2004; Carlson, 2005; Davidson, Amso, Anderson, & Diamond, 2006). This behavioral variability has historically been viewed as suboptimal or irrational, dating back to Piaget (Inhelder & Piaget, 1964). Critically, however, these conclusions are only reasonable if children have the same goals and utilities as adults. Recent work suggests this is not the case: Whereas adults tend to prioritize reward maximization (Sumner, Steyvers, & Sarnecka, 2019a), children tend to prioritize exploration of the environment (Sumner et al., 2019b). This protracted period of exploratory learning has been proposed to facilitate humans’ unique cognitive capabilities (Gopnik, 2020), and converging evidence from research with birds and nonhuman mammals suggests that the length of immaturity is correlated with intelligence and relative brain size across species (Bennett & Harvey, 1985; Snell-Rood, 2013; Weisbecker & Goswami, 2010).

Consistent with this proposal, several studies have found that children tend to outperform adults on tasks that benefit from more exploratory or flexible forms of reasoning (e.g., Gualtieri & Finn, 2022; Gopnik et al., 2017; Plebanek & Sloutsky, 2017; Sumner et al., 2019b). The variability observed between children and adults has, therefore, been reconstrued as both systematic and rational, given the differences in exploratory strategies and cognitive flexibility that are afforded by differences in executive function (Denison, Bonawitz, Gopnik, & Griffiths, 2013; Gopnik, 2020; Gelpi, 2021).

In sum, neural and behavioral data suggest that, when compared to baseline adults, both adults treated with psychedelics and children exhibit many of the same differences. Indeed, these differences have been previously noted by both developmental psychologists (e.g., Gopnik, 2016; 2018; in press) and psychedelic scientists (e.g., Carhart-Harris & Friston, 2019). Further, the field of cognitive development has generated a vast body of literature highlighting the differences between the cognition of adults and children, with several examples of children outperforming adults on tasks that require flexible thinking. Therefore, if children are treated as a proxy psychedelic group, the known cognitive differences between children and adults can be leveraged to guide predictions about specific ways that psychedelics might impact cognition that results in increased flexibility.

What, then, are the specific behaviors and cognitive features that allow children to be more flexible and more exploratory? Much of what is understood about these features has been informed by computational approaches to cognition—specifically, those applying the principles of probability theory to characterize human learning. Below, we provide a brief, high-level overview of probabilistic models of cognitive development, before introducing these target features.

4.1. *Probabilistic models of cognition*

In the context of cognitive development, probabilistic models have been used to describe how infants and young children leverage their limited observations to build abstract, structured, causal theories (e.g., Gopnik et al., 2004; Gopnik & Schulz, 2004; Gopnik & Bonawitz, 2015; Perfors, Tenenbaum, Griffiths, & Xu, 2011; Kushnir, Xu, & Benson, 2012). These early developing “intuitive theories”—like scientific theories—allow even the youngest learners to explain, predict, and act on the world (Gopnik, 2012). As we navigate the environment, there are often many potential explanations—or hypotheses—for the phenomena we observe. Probabilistic models apply Bayes’ Rule to formally specify the probability that any particular hypothesis is true. Briefly, the prior probability of a hypothesis (i.e., the a priori probability of the hypothesis being true, prior to observing the data) is weighted by the likelihood of that hypothesis (i.e., the probability of the observed data being generated if the hypothesis were true). Since these probabilities are constantly updated in light of new information, differences in learners’ experiences lead to differences in the hypotheses that are privileged. As such, these models make specific quantitative predictions about how people generate and revise their hypotheses over time (see Gopnik & Wellman, 2012, for detailed evidence supporting this account). Taking this approach also points to specific characteristics of learning in childhood that might lead younger learners to be relatively more flexible than adults (Gopnik, Griffiths, & Lucas, 2015, 2017; Gopnik, 2016; Gualtieri & Finn, 2022).

4.2. *Weaker prior beliefs*

Across a variety of learning problems, both adults and children tend to favor hypotheses that best explain the observed evidence, in ways broadly consistent with Bayesian models of inference (e.g., Bonawitz, Denison, Gopnik, & Griffiths, 2014; Denison et al., 2013; Gopnik

& Wellman, 2012; Tenenbaum, Kemp, Griffiths, & Goodman, 2011). However, children and adults differ in how much their prior knowledge guides their inferences. According to Bayes' Rule, the stronger one's priors, the more their inferences are guided by this prior knowledge, and the less sensitive they become to current evidence. This is true even if the incoming evidence *contrasts* with their existing hypotheses. In fact, part of what makes adults such powerful learners is that we develop strong, context-specific priors, which allow us to make predictions based on what we have experienced in the past. In many cases, adult predictions are broadly consistent with the predictions of resource-rational models, which assume that people make approximately optimal decisions given constraints on time, information, and cognitive resources (e.g., Griffiths, Lieder, & Goodman, 2015; Lieder & Griffiths, 2020).

Given that children have comparatively less knowledge than adults, they necessarily have weaker prior beliefs. As a result, children's inferences are more sensitive to incoming evidence, leading to a more flexible process of belief revision. Indeed, there is growing empirical support for this claim: while adults tend to rely more heavily on their priors and are less likely to update their beliefs, children readily and flexibly update their beliefs in response to counterevidence (e.g., Gopnik et al., 2015; Kimura et al. in prep; Lucas, Bridgers, Griffiths, & Gopnik, 2014; Seiver, Gopnik, & Goodman, 2013). In one such study, Lucas et al. (2014) had children and adults make causal inferences about a novel machine. Participants were told that this machine is activated by objects placed on top of it, but only by specific types of objects called "blickets" (a hidden property). Two sets of participants were shown unambiguous training data, which implied that the machine operated according to a general rule: either disjunction (individual objects are causal, which is the default high prior assumption for adults; e.g., Cheng, 1997; Griffiths & Tenenbaum, 2005) or conjunction (multiple objects combined are causal). A third set of participants were not shown any training data and could thus only rely on their prior beliefs. Next, participants were shown ambiguous test data that was consistent with *both* their default high prior disjunctive theory *and* the initially less likely conjunctive theory. They were then asked to identify which objects from the test data were blickets. For one critical object, it is ambiguous from the test data alone whether or not it is a blicket. This judgment is thus informed by the rule that participants infer for how the machine operates. Participants were also asked to try to activate the machine themselves using the available objects, to see whether they choose a single or multiple objects—which would also be informed by this inference.

Across several experiments, when participants were shown training data that was consistent with a conjunctive cause, the proportion of people who correctly labeled the critical object as a blicket and chose multiple objects decreased with age. Importantly, there were no differences between the children and adults who were not shown any training data: people of all ages inferred that the machine operated according to a disjunctive rule. This implies that the developmental differences observed do not result from differences in prior beliefs, but from how strongly they are weighted relative to new information. That is, children are more willing to switch to an initially unlikely hypothesis when presented with counterevidence (Lucas et al., 2014). These findings are robust and have been replicated in a variety of additional studies (Gopnik et al., 2015, 2017; Walker, Rett, & Bonawitz, 2020).

If we apply these findings to our current framework, it is possible that psychedelics produce their clinical benefits by lowering how strongly adults' prior beliefs are weighted, making other, initially lower-likelihood alternatives comparatively more plausible. This could explain the success of psychedelic-assisted therapy for conditions like depression and anxiety that had previously been unresponsive to treatment (Grob et al., 2011; Ross et al., 2016; Carhart-Harris et al., 2016, 2021; Becker et al., 2022; Daws et al., 2022; Doss et al., 2022; Goodwin et al., 2022, 2023; Gukasyan et al., 2022, Raison et al., 2023), as well as conditions characterized by obstinate mental models, such as obsessive-compulsive disorder and eating disorders (Moreno, Wiegand, Taitano, & Delgado, 2006; Peck et al., 2023; Schneier et al., 2023). It also provides behavioral evidence for previously proposed cognitive models of the effects of psychedelics, such as the relaxed beliefs under psychedelics (REBUS) model (Carhart-Harris & Friston, 2019). Importantly, however, the findings reviewed here can be explained either by the fact that children have weaker priors *or* because children employ a broader sampling strategy. These possibilities are not mutually exclusive.

4.3. Hypothesis sampling

While probabilistic models of cognition provide a computational-level account describing how Bayes' Rule could be used to make inferences, the process of Bayesian inference is computationally costly, and the space of possible hypotheses to evaluate is intractably large (Gittins & Jones, 1979; Griffiths, Vul, & Sanborn, 2012; Sanborn, Griffiths, & Navarro, 2010). In practice, therefore, people are thought to *approximate* Bayesian inference by stochastically sampling candidate hypotheses to evaluate from a probability distribution over possible hypotheses (e.g., Griffiths et al., 2015; Lieder & Griffiths, 2020; Sanborn, 2017; Sanborn & Chater, 2016; Thomas, Dougherty, Sprenger, & Harbison, 2008; Vul & Pashler, 2008). Importantly, this sampling process is not random. Instead, hypotheses are sampled with frequencies proportional to their probability. After sampling and evaluating a hypothesis, its probability will be updated, the probability distribution over all hypotheses will be adjusted, and a new hypothesis can then be sampled from this updated distribution.

The process of searching and sampling from a hypothesis space might unfold in a variety of different ways: Search can be narrow, "exploiting" high likelihood hypotheses that only differ incrementally, or broad, "exploring" the entire space and potentially arriving at novel solutions that are ultimately better than local alternatives. In the context of computer science, balancing exploitation and exploration is particularly relevant for optimization. Efforts to resolve this tradeoff between finding the best solution while spending the fewest resources have led to several potential algorithmic accounts, all of which have a property in common: Effective exploitation of an environment's reward structure requires *first* understanding that reward structure. Thus, exploration is initially prioritized and reduces over time as information is accumulated (Kirkpatrick, Gelatt, & Vecchi, 1983). It has been proposed that similar changes in search strategies occur across human development (Gopnik, 2020, 2024; Meder, Wu, Schulz, & Ruggeri, 2021), and development itself has been framed as a process of parameter optimization (Giron et al., 2023).

Adults tend to privilege efficiency and seek to maximize their utility (Dennett, 1989; Gergely, Nádasdy, Csibra, & Bíró, 1995; Jara-Ettinger, Gweon, Schulz, & Tenenbaum, 2016). Guided by all the information they have accumulated throughout their life, adults initially sample a high prior hypothesis and strategically modify it such that successive samples are all relatively similar. As a result, adults tend to base their decisions on just a few samples (Goodman, Tenenbaum, Feldman, & Griffiths, 2008), and it is often the case that taking a single sample is the optimal strategy (Vul, Goodman, Griffiths, & Tenenbaum, 2014). These exploitive strategies lead to quick, “good enough” solutions. However, they leave one susceptible to being stuck in a local optima, whereby their current hypothesis may be better than all local alternatives but much worse than alternatives that are further away (Gopnik, 2020).

Children, on the other hand, tend to engage in directed and systematic exploration (e.g., Schulz, Wu, Ruggeri, & Meder, 2019; Meder et al., 2021), even when this behavior is associated with greater cost (Liquin & Gopnik, 2022). These developmental differences in search behavior are ultimately guided by different goals: exploration of unfamiliar options typically results in poorer short-term performance, supporting long-term information gain, while exploitation of known options leads to maximizing immediate rewards at the cost of acquiring new knowledge.

This behavioral pattern in which adults are more exploitive and children are more exploratory has been documented in causal inference tasks (e.g., Gopnik, 1996, 2012; Lapidow & Walker, 2020), as well as in general reinforcement learning paradigms, where one freely acts in an environment and can choose to continue exploring or exploit known rewards (Blanco & Sloutsky, 2020, 2021; Liquin & Gopnik, 2022; Schulz, Konstantinidis, & Speekenbrink, 2018; Sumner, Steyvers, & Sarnecka, 2019a; Sumner et al., 2019b). Schulz et al. (2019), and later Giron et al. (2023), utilized a spatially correlated multiarmed bandit paradigm (Wu, Schulz, Speekenbrink, Nelson, & Meder, 2017) to investigate developmental differences in search strategies and the factors that influence them. On a series of trials, participants were presented with an 8×8 tile grid, where each tile had an initially unknown reward value. By clicking to reveal and earn a hidden tile’s reward, or selecting a tile with a known reward, the goal was to earn as many points as possible given a limited number of clicks. The authors were specifically interested in three components of search behaviors—random exploration, directed exploration, and generalization—and examined how each of these components may be related to developmental changes in search strategies. Across experiments, children engaged in more directed exploration than adults—placing a higher value on resolving uncertainty—and generalized less often, with no differences observed in random exploration behavior (Schulz et al., 2019; Giron et al., 2023). Thus, the differences in explore—exploit behaviors outlined above likely reflect a developmental change in the *process* of belief revision via changes in search strategies, rather than a change in the weighting of the priors alone.

Again, applying these findings to our novel framework, psychedelics may serve to modify adults’ search strategies, making them (at least temporarily) broader and more exploratory. If so, they may be more likely to escape the negative feedback loops and learning traps that occur as a result of rigidly held mental models. This could also explain how psychedelic treatment leads to increases in creativity (Harman et al., 1966; Spitzer et al., 1996) and insight

experiences (Carbonaro et al., 2018, 2020; Davis et al., 2021), which are correlated with improvements in symptoms of depression (Roseman et al., 2018) and addiction (Noorani et al., 2018).

4.4. Exogenous attention

The cognitive features discussed so far describe differences in how children and adults “search” their *internal* environment, or hypothesis space. However, prior work has also provided evidence for differences in how children and adults search their external environment, via differences in exogenous attention. Specifically, adults rely on selective attention, a top-down process that narrowly concentrates attentional resources on goal-relevant aspects of a task (Deng & Sloutsky, 2016). As a consequence, they learn to ignore goal-irrelevant input, a phenomenon known as learned inattention (Heckler, Kaminski, & Sloutsky, 2006). This behavior is thought to be an indicator of learning, as adults optimize allocation of their attentional resources to input they believe will best facilitate learning and success (Yim, Best, & Sloutsky, 2011). However, learned inattention can also be costly when goal switching, or in cases in which the goal-relevant input is misinterpreted. Children, on the other hand, show much more diffuse allocation of attentional resources (Gopnik, 2009). This allows them to pick up on various relevant cues in their environment that adults may miss (e.g., Blanco & Sloutsky, 2020; Plebanek & Sloutsky, 2017; Rich & Gureckis, 2015; Tandoc, Nadenlla, Pham, & Finn, 2024).

In one study highlighting developmental differences in the allocation of attentional resources, Plebanek and Sloutsky (2017) showed participants a series of overlapping shapes. Each image contained one shape that was cued and another that was uncued. Within a trial, participants would first see a target stimulus for 1000 ms, followed by a mask for 500 ms, and then a test stimulus for 1000 ms. In the test stimulus, either the cued shape changed from the target stimulus, the uncued shape changed, or the test stimulus was identical to the target. After each trial, participants made familiarity judgments for the cued shapes. They also made change detection judgments for the test stimuli, where they were asked whether or not the test stimulus was identical to the target. The authors found an interaction between age and trial type. While adults had greater change detection accuracy for trials where the cued shape changed, children had greater change detection accuracy for trials where the uncued shape changed. That children outperformed adults on trials where the uncued shape changed indicates that they were allocating their attentional resources more broadly than adults (Plebanek & Sloutsky, 2017).

This difference in the allocation of attentional resources is related to differences in inhibition and control afforded by PFC development (Thompson-Schill et al., 2009). However, it may also be influenced by adults’ higher weighted priors, and/or their tendency to engage in more local perceptual sampling (Gelpi, 2021). By broadening the allocation of one’s attentional resources, similarly to broadening one’s hypothesis sampling strategies, psychedelics may serve to increase exposure to new evidence that could result in belief revision. Like the other features of flexibility outlined above, such a change in exogenous attention may provide an avenue to bypass or overcome learning traps, leading them to positive outcomes.

5. Pilot study

The currently proposed model for the effects of psychedelics leverages what is known about the cognitive differences between children and adults to make specific, testable predictions for how psychedelics may affect cognition to increase flexibility. To summarize, psychedelics may (1) reduce the weighting of one's priors; (2) change one's search and sampling strategies, making them broader and more exploratory; and/or (3) change one's allocation of attentional resources, making them more diffuse. In each case, we would expect that adults treated with psychedelics would exhibit more of these characteristics relative to baseline.

To illustrate how these hypotheses can be tested experimentally, we briefly describe a small pilot study designed to adapt several developmental paradigms for use in psychedelic research. We have begun to empirically test these specific hypotheses in this pilot work. In an initial study, data from nine adult participants were collected in the context of a larger clinical trial examining psilocybin's ability to alleviate chronic phantom limb pain (Hurwitz, 2024). Here, participants with chronic phantom limb pain were enrolled and randomly assigned to receive either a high dose of psilocybin (25 mg p.o.) or a niacin control (100 mg p.o.). Niacin (Vitamin B3) was used as an active control because it mimics some of the physiological sensations associated with the onset of the effects of psilocybin, including body temperature changes and a tingling sensation. All cognitive flexibility tasks were conducted the day after the experimental drug session, and all but one of the tasks implemented the same experimental paradigms that had previously been used to identify differences between children and adults described above (Lucas et al., 2014; Gopnik et al., 2017; Plebanek & Sloutsky, 2017; Schulz et al., 2018; Giron et al., 2023; Liquin & Gopnik, 2022). We also included one novel paradigm developed for the pilot study. Below, we preview some of the key findings from a subset of these tasks. A full overview of the experimental design and analyses from all cognitive flexibility tasks administered can be found elsewhere (Hurwitz, 2024). Although the small size of this pilot study precludes drawing conclusions from behavioral data (psilocybin, $n = 5$; niacin control, $n = 4$), these preliminary findings provide guidance for which hypotheses may be most promising to pursue in larger preregistered experiments.

First, participants in the psilocybin condition appear to be more sensitive than niacin controls to incoming evidence that contrasts with their strongly held beliefs. Using the blicket detector paradigm developed by Lucas et al. (2014) and explained above, participants in the psilocybin condition (2/5), like children in the original work, were more likely than controls (0/4) to identify the critical ambiguous object as a "blicket." Participants in the psilocybin condition (5/5) were also more likely than controls (1/4) to choose multiple objects when prompted to activate the machine themselves. Together, this suggests that participants in the psilocybin condition successfully inferred and applied the less intuitive conjunctive rule, while those in the control condition did not. Although additional data were needed, these preliminary findings are at least consistent with the predictions of the proposed framework: that psilocybin reduces the weighting of one's priors.

Second, using a novel serial production task (Hurwitz, 2024), participants in the psilocybin group exhibited broader and more exploratory search strategies relative to the control group.

In this task, participants complete multiple trials where they attempt to guess a secret target word. They are initially given no information as to what the target word might be and generate a series of guesses to try and identify it. Participants receive feedback after submitting each guess on how similar their guess is to the secret target word in semantic space, as measured by the cosine between any two word vectors generated by the Global Vectors for Word Representation (GloVe; Pennington, Socher, & Manning, 2014). Given this design, participants must, therefore, continuously update the constraints (imposed by their own previously generated guesses) on their subsequent guesses. Search strategies are quantified by the average similarity between sequentially generated responses—with higher average similarity corresponding to local, more exploitive, search strategies, and lower average similarity corresponding to broader, more exploratory, search strategies. Participants in the psilocybin condition ($M = 0.40$) had a lower average sequential response similarity than those in the niacin condition ($M = 0.44$), indicating that they were employing more exploratory search strategies. These search strategies were also related to participants' self-reported clinical benefits, with more exploratory search behavior associated with lower pain at 1 ($\beta = 49.3$), 2 ($\beta = 45.7$), and 4 weeks ($\beta = 28.7$) after their experimental drug session. Here, the positive slopes indicate that as the average sequential response similarity increased (i.e., greater cognitive rigidity), phantom limb pain increased in turn.

Search strategies were also assessed using a spatially correlated multiarmed bandit paradigm (Wu et al., 2017). Following prior work (e.g., Schulz et al., 2019; Giron et al., 2023), computational models were used to characterize different components of exploration, including the extent to which participants preferentially sampled uncertain options, generalized information across the environment, and engaged in random sampling. Each component was formalized by a parameter in the models, and higher parameter values indicated participants exhibiting greater incidences of that behavior. Results suggested that participants in the psilocybin condition adopted broader search strategies than those in the niacin condition. In particular, they showed greater directed exploration ($M_{\text{psilocybin}} = 0.22$, $M_{\text{niacin}} = 0.18$) and reduced generalization across options ($M_{\text{psilocybin}} = 0.83$, $M_{\text{niacin}} = 1.13$), a pattern that resembles the exploratory strategies observed in children in earlier studies using the same paradigm. Random exploration did not differ between conditions ($M_{\text{psilocybin}} = 0.03$, $M_{\text{niacin}} = 0.04$). These preliminary findings are consistent with the proposed framework, suggesting that psilocybin shifts search behavior toward broader, more exploratory sampling of the environment.

Finally, there was no evidence that psilocybin impacted the allocation of attentional resources. Using a change detection paradigm (Plebanek & Sloutsky, 2017), where change detection accuracy was measured using A' (a nonparametric equivalent of d'), we found that participants in both the psilocybin and control conditions had similar accuracy for cued ($M_{\text{psilocybin}} = 0.96$, $M_{\text{niacin}} = 0.93$) and uncued ($M_{\text{psilocybin}} = 0.77$, $M_{\text{niacin}} = 0.78$) images. The performance of participants in both conditions was similar to that of adults in the original work. Given that the perceptual effects of psychedelics occur during acute drug effects, it is not necessarily surprising that no initial evidence for attentional shifts were found a day later. It is, however, possible that any effects on exogenous attention may occur solely during acute drug effects, which warrants further study.

6. Conclusion

Over the last decade, psychedelics have become an increasingly popular novel treatment option for a variety of clinical indications. There is a preponderance of evidence indicating that psychedelics can afford substantial clinical benefits, even resulting in complete remission in some instances, yet the mechanisms underlying these effects have received comparatively less attention. Evidence from both neuroimaging and psychological survey studies suggests that cognitive flexibility may be key to understanding these effects. However, few studies have prospectively tested specific hypotheses for what may be driving the observed clinical benefits, and fewer still in ways that would afford causal conclusions to be drawn. To truly test this account, specific behaviors known to be symptomatic of increased cognitive flexibility must be examined. Here, we have proposed a cognitive development model, whereby children—a group known to be more cognitively flexible than adults—are treated as a proxy psychedelic group to generate predictions for such behaviors.

After providing an overview of three potential features of increased cognitive flexibility, we previewed the findings from our initial pilot data, formally testing these predictions. These pilot results are broadly consistent with the predictions of the proposed framework, suggesting that adults treated with psilocybin may exhibit more flexible patterns of behavior resembling those observed in children, such as reduced reliance on prior assumptions and more exploratory search strategies. However, given the small sample size, these results should be interpreted primarily as an illustration of how developmental paradigms can be adapted to test specific cognitive mechanisms in future preregistered experiments. By better understanding the mechanisms underlying psychedelic therapy, it will be possible to identify which individuals and clinical conditions may be most receptive to this therapeutic practice. Additionally, it will allow for the development of alternative treatments targeting the same mechanism for individuals who are not suited for psychedelic therapy.

While the analogy between childhood and the psychedelic state is useful for generating new hypotheses about how psychedelics influence flexibility, it is necessarily imperfect. Development unfolds over years, whereas the acute effects of psychedelics occur over hours, with some residual effects lasting longer. Nonetheless, the comparison highlights a shared shift toward broader exploration and reduced reliance on prior assumptions. This perspective raises important questions about the mechanisms underlying such changes, including whether psychedelics alter how individuals pursue existing goals or instead shift the value placed on exploration itself. Clarifying these mechanisms, and identifying where the similarities and differences between these populations lie, will be essential for understanding how psychedelics reshape learning. Taken together, the framework and preliminary evidence outlined here provide a starting point for systematically investigating these questions in future work.

Acknowledgments

This project was directly inspired by Rummelhart awardee, Dr. Alison Gopnik. Her groundbreaking research served as the foundation for the ideas explored in this project. The authors

would also like to thank Dr. Erik Brockbank and Dr. Elizabeth Lapidow for their input when developing the ideas for this project, Nildo Junior for their assistance in task design, and the members of the UCSD Center for Psychedelic Research and the Early Learning and Cognition Lab for critical contributions throughout the project.

References

- Abend, R., de Voogd, L., Salemink, E., Wiers, R. W., Pérez-Edgar, K., Fitzgerald, A., White, L. K., Salum, G. A., He, J., Silverman, W. K., Pettit, J. W., Pine, D. S., & Bar-Haim, Y. (2018). Association between attention bias to threat and anxiety symptoms in children and adolescents. *Depression and Anxiety*, *35*(3), 229–238.
- Barrett, F. S., Carbonaro, T. M., Hurwitz, E., Johnson, M. W., & Griffiths, R. R. (2018). Double-blind comparison of the two hallucinogens psilocybin and dextromethorphan: Effects on cognition. *Psychopharmacology*, *235*(10), 2915–2927.
- Barrett, F. S., Doss, M. K., Sepeda, N. D., Pekar, J. J., & Griffiths, R. R. (2020). Emotions and brain function are altered up to one month after a single high dose of psilocybin. *Scientific Reports*, *10*(1), 2214.
- Becker, A. M., Holze, F., Grandinetti, T., Klaiber, A., Toedtli, V. E., Kolaczynska, K. E., Duthaler, U., Varghese, N., Eckert, A., Grünblatt, E., & Liechti, M. E. (2022). Acute effects of psilocybin after escitalopram or placebo pretreatment in a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, crossover study in healthy subjects. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, *111*(4), 886–895.
- Bennett, P. M., & Harvey, P. H. (1985). Brain size, development and metabolism in birds and mammals. *Journal of Zoology*, *207*(4), 491–509.
- Berg, E. A. (1948). A simple objective technique for measuring flexibility in thinking. *Journal of General Psychology*, *39*(1), 15–22.
- Bigler, R. S., & Liben, L. S. (1992). Cognitive mechanisms in children's gender stereotyping: Theoretical and educational implications of a cognitive-based intervention. *Child Development*, *63*(6), 1351–1363.
- Blanco, N. J., & Sloutsky, V. M. (2021). Systematic exploration and uncertainty dominate young children's choices. *Developmental Science*, *24*(2), e13026.
- Blanco, N., & Sloutsky, V. (2020). Attentional mechanisms drive systematic exploration in young children. *Cognition*, *202*, 104327.
- Bogenschutz, M. P., Forcehimes, A. A., Pommy, J. A., Wilcox, C. E., Barbosa, P. C. R., & Strassman, R. J. (2015). Psilocybin-assisted treatment for alcohol dependence: A proof-of-concept study. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, *29*(3), 289–299.
- Bogenschutz, M. P., Ross, S., Bhatt, S., Baron, T., Forcehimes, A. A., Laska, E., Mennenga, S. E., O'Donnell, K., Owens, L. T., Podrebarac, S., Rotrosen, J., Tonigan, J. S., & Worth, L. (2022). Percentage of heavy drinking days following psilocybin-assisted psychotherapy vs placebo in the treatment of adult patients with alcohol use disorder: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *79*(10), 953.
- Bonawitz, E., Denison, S., Gopnik, A., & Griffiths, T. L. (2014). Win-Stay, Lose-Sample: A simple sequential algorithm for approximating Bayesian inference. *Cognitive Psychology*, *74*, 35–65.
- Bonawitz, E., Denison, S., Griffiths, T. L., & Gopnik, A. (2014). Probabilistic models, learning algorithms, and response variability: Sampling in cognitive development. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *18*(10), 497–500.
- Browning, M., Behrens, T. E., Jocham, G., O'Reilly, J. X., & Bishop, S. J. (2015). Anxious individuals have difficulty learning the causal statistics of aversive environments. *Nature Neuroscience*, *18*(4), 590–596.
- Buckner, R. L., Andrews-Hanna, J. R., & Schacter, D. L. (2008). The brain's default network: Anatomy, function, and relevance to disease. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1124*(1), 1–38.
- Carbonaro, T. M., Bradstreet, M. P., Barrett, F. S., MacLean, K. A., Jesse, R., Johnson, M. W., & Griffiths, R. R. (2016). Survey study of challenging experiences after ingesting psilocybin mushrooms: Acute and enduring positive and negative consequences. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, *30*(12), 1268–1278.
- Carbonaro, T. M., Johnson, M. W., & Griffiths, R. R. (2020). Subjective features of the psilocybin experience that may account for its self-administration by humans: A double-blind comparison of psilocybin and dextromethorphan. *Psychopharmacology*, *237*(8), 2293–2304.

- Carbonaro, T. M., Johnson, M. W., Hurwitz, E., & Griffiths, R. R. (2018). Double-blind comparison of the two hallucinogens psilocybin and dextromethorphan: Similarities and differences in subjective experiences. *Psychopharmacology*, 235(2), 521–534.
- Carhart-Harris, R. L., & Friston, K. J. (2019). REBUS and the anarchic brain: Toward a unified model of the brain action of psychedelics. *Pharmacological Reviews*, 71(3), 316–344.
- Carhart-Harris, R. L., Bolstridge, M., Rucker, J., Day, C. M. J., Erritzoe, D., Kaelen, M., Bloomfield, M., Rickard, J. A., Forbes, B., Feilding, A., Taylor, D., Pilling, S., Curran, V. H., & Nutt, D. J. (2016). Psilocybin with psychological support for treatment-resistant depression: An open-label feasibility study. *Lancet Psychiatry*, 3(7), 619–627.
- Carhart-Harris, R. L., Erritzoe, D., Williams, T., Stone, J. M., Reed, L. J., Colasanti, A., Tyacke, R. J., Leech, R., Malizia, A. L., Murphy, K., Hobden, P., Evans, J., Feilding, A., Wise, R. G., & Nutt, D. J. (2012). Neural correlates of the psychedelic state as determined by fMRI studies with psilocybin. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(6), 2138–2143.
- Carhart-Harris, R. L., Roseman, L., Bolstridge, M., Demetriou, L., Pannekoek, J. N., Wall, M. B., Tanner, M., Kaelen, M., McGonigle, J., Murphy, K., Leech, R., Curran, H. V., & Nutt, D. J. (2017). Psilocybin for treatment-resistant depression: fMRI-measured brain mechanisms. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 1–11.
- Carhart-Harris, R., Giribaldi, B., Watts, R., Baker-Jones, M., Murphy-Beiner, A., Murphy, R., Martell, J., Blemings, A., Erritzoe, D., & Nutt, D. J. (2021). Trial of psilocybin versus escitalopram for depression. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 384(15), 1402–1411.
- Carlson, S. M. (2005). Developmentally sensitive measures of executive function in preschool children. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 28(2), 595–616.
- Chamberlain, S. R., Fineberg, N. A., Blackwell, A. D., Robbins, T. W., & Sahakian, B. J. (2006). Motor inhibition and cognitive flexibility in obsessive-compulsive disorder and trichotillomania. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 163(7), 1282–1284.
- Cheng, P. W. (1997). From covariation to causation: A causal power theory. *Psychological Review*, 104(2), 367.
- Chrysikou, E. G., Hamilton, R. H., Coslett, H. B., Datta, A., Bikson, M., & Thompson-Schill, S. L. (2013). Noninvasive transcranial direct current stimulation over the left prefrontal cortex facilitates cognitive flexibility in tool use. *Cognitive Neuroscience*, 4(2), 81–89.
- Colantonio, J., Bass, I., Shing, Y. L., Wijekumar, S., McKay, C., Rafetseder, E., Mackey, A. P., & Bonawitz, E. (2025). Computational approaches reveal developmental shifts in exploratory play. *Developmental Science*, 28(6), e70081.
- Davidson, M. C., Amso, D., Anderson, L. C., & Diamond, A. (2006). Development of cognitive control and executive functions from 4 to 13 years: Evidence from manipulations of memory, inhibition, and task switching. *Neuropsychologia*, 44(11), 2037–2078.
- Davis, A. K., Barrett, F. S., & Griffiths, R. R. (2020). Psychological flexibility mediates the relations between acute psychedelic effects and subjective decreases in depression and anxiety. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 15, 39–45.
- Davis, A. K., Barrett, F. S., & Griffiths, R. R. (2020). Psychological flexibility mediates the relations between acute psychedelic effects and subjective decreases in depression and anxiety. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 15, 39–45.
- Davis, A. K., Xin, Y., Sepeda, N. D., Garcia-Romeu, A., & Williams, M. T. (2021). Increases in psychological flexibility mediate relationship between acute psychedelic effects and decreases in racial trauma symptoms among people of color. *Chronic Stress*, 5, 24705470211035607.
- Daws, R. E., Timmermann, C., Giribaldi, B., Sexton, J. D., Wall, M. B., Erritzoe, D., Roseman, L., Nutt, D., & Carhart-Harris, R. (2022). Increased global integration in the brain after psilocybin therapy for depression. *Nature Medicine*, 28(4), Article 4.
- Deng, W., & Sloutsky, V. M. (2016). Selective attention, diffused attention, and the development of categorization. *Cognitive Psychology*, 91, 24–62.
- Denison, S., Bonawitz, E., Gopnik, A., & Griffiths, T. L. (2013). Rational variability in children's causal inferences: The Sampling Hypothesis. *Cognition*, 126(2), 285–300.

- Dennett, D. C. (1989). *The intentional stance*. MIT Press.
- Doss, M. K., Povaz'an, M., Rosenberg, M. D., Sepeda, N. D., Davis, A. K., Finan, P. H., Smith, G. S., Pekar, J. J., Barker, P. B., Griffiths, R. R., & Barrett, F. S. (2021). Psilocybin therapy increases cognitive and neural flexibility in patients with major depressive disorder. *Translational Psychiatry*, *11*(1), 574.
- Dymond, S., Dunsmoor, J. E., Vervliet, B., Roche, B., & Hermans, D. (2015). Fear generalization in humans: Systematic review and implications for anxiety disorder research. *Behavior Therapy*, *46*(5), 561–582.
- Everaert, J., Bronstein, M. V., Cannon, T. D., & Joormann, J. (2018). Looking through tinted glasses: Depression and social anxiety are related to both interpretation biases and inflexible negative interpretations. *Clinical Psychological Science*, *6*(4), 517–528.
- Fair, D. A., Dosenbach, N. U. F., Church, J. A., Cohen, A. L., Brahmbhatt, S., Miezin, F. M., Barch, D. M., Raichle, M. E., Petersen, S. E., & Schlaggar, B. L. (2007). Development of distinct control networks through segregation and integration. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *104*(33), 13507–13512.
- Filipowicz, A., Anderson, B., & Danckert, J. (2016). Adapting to change: The role of the right hemisphere in mental model building and updating. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology/Revue Canadienne de Psychologie Expérimentale*, *70*(3), 201–218.
- Fox, M. D., Snyder, A. Z., Vincent, J. L., Corbetta, M., Van Essen, D. C., & Raichle, M. E. (2005). The human brain is intrinsically organized into dynamic, anticorrelated functional networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *102*(27), 9673–9678.
- Gelpi, R. A. (2021). *Hot, then cold: Predicting hypothesis revision strategies across development with rational process models*. University of Toronto (Canada).
- Gergely, G., Nádasdy, Z., Csibra, G., & Bíró, S. (1995). Taking the intentional stance at 12 months of age. *Cognition*, *56*(2), 165–193.
- Giron, A. P., Ciranka, S., Schulz, E., Van Den Bos, W., Ruggeri, A., Meder, B., & Wu, C. M. (2023). Developmental changes in exploration resemble stochastic optimization. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *7*(11), 1955–1967.
- Gittins, J. C., & Jones, D. M. (1979). A dynamic allocation index for the discounted multiarmed bandit problem. *Biometrika*, *66*(3), 561–565.
- Goodman, N., Tenenbaum, J., Feldman, J., & Griffiths, T. (2008). A rational analysis of rule-based concept learning. *Cognitive Science*, *32*(1), 108–154.
- Goodwin, G. M., Aaronson, S. T., Alvarez, O., Arden, P. C., Baker, A., Bennett, J. C., Bird, C., Blom, R. E., Brennan, C., Bruschi, D., Burke, L., Campbell-Coker, K., Carhart-Harris, R., Cattell, J., Daniel, A., DeBattista, C., Dunlop, B. W., Eisen, K., Feifel, D., ..., & Malievskaia, E. (2022). Single-dose psilocybin for a treatment-resistant episode of major depression. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *387*(18), 1637–1648.
- Goodwin, G. M., Aaronson, S. T., Alvarez, O., Atli, M., Bennett, J. C., Croal, M., DeBattista, C., Dunlop, B. W., Feifel, D., Hellerstein, D. J., Husain, M. I., Kelly, J. R., Lennard-Jones, M. R., Licht, R. W., Marwood, L., Mistry, S., Páleníček, T., Redjep, O., Repantis, D., ...& Malievskaia, E. (2023). Single-dose psilocybin for a treatment-resistant episode of major depression: Impact on patient-reported depression severity, anxiety, function, and quality of life. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *327*, 120–127.
- Gopnik, A. (1996). The scientist as child. *Philosophy of Science*, *63*(4), 485–514.
- Gopnik, A. (2009). *The philosophical baby: What children's minds tell us about truth, love & the meaning of life*. Random House.
- Gopnik, A. (2012). Scientific thinking in young children: Theoretical advances, empirical research, and policy implications. *Science*, *337*(6102), 1623–1627.
- Gopnik, A. (2016). *The gardener and the carpenter: What the new science of child development tells us about the relationship between parents and children*. Macmillan.
- Gopnik, A. (2018). For babies, life may be a trip. *Wall Street Journal*, Retrieved from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/for-babies-life-may-be-a-trip-1531932587>
- Gopnik, A. (2020). Childhood as a solution to explore–exploit tensions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, *375*(1803), 20190502.
- Gopnik, A. (2024). *Explore, exploit, empower: Three ages and three intelligences*. In The 46th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

- Gopnik, A. (in press). Childhood consciousness and numinous experience. In D. B. Yaden & M. van Elk (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Psychedelic, Religious, Spiritual, and Mystical Experiences*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gopnik, A., & Bonawitz, E. (2015). Bayesian models of child development. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 6(2), 75–86.
- Gopnik, A., & Schulz, L. (2004). Mechanisms of theory formation in young children. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8(8), 371–377.
- Gopnik, A., & Wellman, H. M. (2012). Reconstructing constructivism: Causal models, Bayesian learning mechanisms and the theory theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(6), 1085–1108.
- Gopnik, A., Glymour, C., Sobel, D. M., Schulz, L. E., Kushnir, T., & Danks, D. (2004). A theory of causal learning in children: Causal maps and Bayes nets. *Psychological Review*, 111(1), 3.
- Gopnik, A., Griffiths, T. L., & Lucas, C. G. (2015). When younger learners can be better (or at least more open-minded) than older ones. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(2), 87–92.
- Gopnik, A., O'Grady, S., Lucas, C. G., Griffiths, T. L., Wente, A., Bridgers, S., Aboody, R., Fung, H., & Dahl, R. E. (2017). Changes in cognitive flexibility and hypothesis search across human life history from childhood to adolescence to adulthood. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(30), 7892–7899.
- Griffiths, T. L., Lieder, F., & Goodman, N. D. (2015). Rational use of cognitive resources: Levels of analysis between the computational and the algorithmic. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 7(2), 217–229.
- Griffiths, R. R., Johnson, M. W., Carducci, M. A., Umbricht, A., Richards, W. A., Richards, B. D., Cosimano, M. P., & Klindinst, M. A. (2016). Psilocybin produces substantial and sustained decreases in depression and anxiety in patients with life-threatening cancer: A randomized double-blind trial. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, 30(12), 1181–1197.
- Griffiths, R. R., Johnson, M. W., Richards, W. A., Richards, B. D., McCann, U., & Jesse, R. (2011). Psilocybin occasioned mystical-type experiences: Immediate and persisting dose-related effects. *Psychopharmacology*, 218(4), 649–665.
- Griffiths, T. L., & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2005). Structure and strength in causal induction. *Cognitive Psychology*, 51(4), 334–384.
- Griffiths, T. L., Vul, E., & Sanborn, A. N. (2012). Bridging levels of analysis for probabilistic models of cognition. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21(4), 263–268.
- Grob, C. S., Danforth, A. L., Chopra, G. S., Hagerty, M., McKay, C. R., Halberstadt, A. L., & Greer, G. R. (2011). Pilot study of psilocybin treatment for anxiety in patients with advanced-stage cancer. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 68(1), 71.
- Gualtieri, S., & Finn, A. S. (2022). The sweet spot: When children's developing abilities, brains, and knowledge make them better learners than adults. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 17(5), 1322–1338.
- Gukasyan, N., Davis, A. K., Barrett, F. S., Cosimano, M. P., Sepeda, N. D., Johnson, M. W., & Griffiths, R. R. (2022). Efficacy and safety of psilocybin-assisted treatment for major depressive disorder: Prospective 12-month follow-up. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, 36(2), 151–158.
- Hagmann, P., Cammoun, L., Gigandet, X., Meuli, R., Honey, C. J., Wedeen, V. J., & Sporns, O. (2008). Mapping the structural core of human cerebral cortex. *PLoS Biology*, 6(7), e159.
- Harman, W. W., McKim, R. H., Mogar, R. E., Fadiman, J., & Stolaroff, M. J. (1966). Psychedelic agents in creative problem-solving: A pilot study. *Psychological reports*, 19(1), 211–227.
- Hass, R. W. (2017). Tracking the dynamics of divergent thinking via semantic distance: Analytic methods and theoretical implications. *Memory & Cognition*, 45(2), 233–244.
- Heckler, A. F., Kaminski, J. A., & Sloutsky, V. M. (2006). Differential cue salience, blocking and learned inattention. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* (Vol. 28, No. 28).
- Hermle, L., Fünfgeld, M., Oepen, G., Botsch, H., Borchardt, D., Gouzoulis, E., Fehrenbach, R. A., & Spitzer, M. (1992). Mescaline-induced psychopathological, neuropsychological, and neurometabolic effects in normal subjects: Experimental psychosis as a tool for psychiatric research. *Biological Psychiatry*, 32(11), 976–991.

- Hurwitz, E. S. (2024). Cognitive development as a model for the effects of psychedelics: Do changes in cognitive flexibility underly the clinical benefits of psychedelic therapy? (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, San Diego).
- Huttenlocher, P. R. (1990). Morphometric study of human cerebral cortex development. *Neuropsychologia*, 28(6), 517–527.
- Huttenlocher, P. R., & Dabholkar, A. S. (1997). Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human cerebral cortex. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 387(2), 167–178.
- Inhelder, B., & Piaget, J. (1964). *The early growth of logic in the child*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jaquish, G. A., & Ripple, R. E. (1985). A life-span developmental cross-cultural study of divergent thinking abilities. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 20(1), 1–11.
- Jara-Ettinger, J., Gweon, H., Schulz, L. E., & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2016). The naïve utility calculus: Computational principles underlying commonsense psychology. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(8), 589–604.
- Johnson, M. W., Garcia-Romeu, A., & Griffiths, R. R. (2017). Long-term follow-up of psilocybin-facilitated smoking cessation. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 43(1), 55–60.
- Kerns, J. G., Cohen, J. D., MacDonald, A. W., Cho, R. Y., Stenger, V. A., & Carter, C. S. (2004). Anterior cingulate conflict monitoring and adjustments in control. *Science*, 303(5660), 1023–1026.
- Kim, C., Johnson, N. F., & Gold, B. T. (2012). Common and distinct neural mechanisms of attentional switching and response conflict. *Brain Research*, 1469, 92–102.
- Kirkpatrick, S., Gelatt, C. D., & Vecchi, M. P. (1983). Optimization by simulated annealing. *Science*, 220(4598), 671–680.
- Kraus, N., Niedeggen, M., & Hesselmann, G. (2021). Trait anxiety is linked to increased usage of priors in a perceptual decision making task. *Cognition*, 206, 104474.
- Kushnir, T., & Gopnik, A. (2007). Conditional probability versus spatial contiguity in causal learning: Preschoolers use new contingency evidence to overcome prior spatial assumptions. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(1), 186–196.
- Kushnir, T., Xu, F., & Benson, J. B. (2012). *Rational constructivism in cognitive development* (Vol. 43). Academic Press.
- Kuypers, K. P. C. (2018). Out of the box: A psychedelic model to study the creative mind. *Medical Hypotheses*, 115, 13–16.
- Kuypers, K. P. C., Riba, J., de la Fuente Revenga, M., Barker, S., Theunissen, E. L., & Ramaekers, J. G. (2016). Ayahuasca enhances creative divergent thinking while decreasing conventional convergent thinking. *Psychopharmacology*, 233(18), 3395–3403.
- Lapidow, E., & Walker, C. M. (2020). Informative experimentation in intuitive science: Children select and learn from their own causal interventions. *Cognition*, 201, 104315.
- Lee, J. K., & Orsillo, S. M. (2014). Investigating cognitive flexibility as a potential mechanism of mindfulness in generalized anxiety disorder. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 45(1), 208–216.
- Lieder, F., & Griffiths, T. L. (2020). Resource-rational analysis: Understanding human cognition as the optimal use of limited computational resources. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 43, e1.
- Liqin, E., & Gopnik, A. (2022). Children are more exploratory and learn more than adults in an approach-avoid task. *Cognition*, 218, 104940.
- Lucas, C. G., Bridgers, S., Griffiths, T. L., & Gopnik, A. (2014). When children are better (or at least more open-minded) learners than adults: Developmental differences in learning the forms of causal relationships. *Cognition*, 131(2), 284–299.
- Ly, C., Greb, A. C., Cameron, L. P., Wong, J. M., Barragan, E. V., Wilson, P. C., Burbach, K. F., Zarembki, S. S., Sood, A., & Paddy, M. R. (2018). Psychedelics promote structural and functional neural plasticity. *Cell Reports*, 23(11), 3170–3182.
- MacLean, K. A., Johnson, M. W., & Griffiths, R. R. (2011). Mystical experiences occasioned by the hallucinogen psilocybin lead to increases in the personality domain of openness. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, 25(11), 1453–1461.

- Mason, N. L., Kuypers, K. P. C., Reckweg, J. T., Müller, F., Tse, D. H. Y., Da Rios, B., Toennes, S. W., Stiers, P., Feilding, A., & Ramaekers, J. G. (2021). Spontaneous and deliberate creative cognition during and after psilocybin exposure. *Translational Psychiatry*, *11*(1), 209.
- Mason, N. L., Mischler, E., Uthaug, M. V., & Kuypers, K. P. C. (2019). Sub-acute effects of psilocybin on empathy, creative thinking, and subjective well-being. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, *51*(2), 123–134.
- Meder, B., Wu, C. M., Schulz, E., & Ruggeri, A. (2021). Development of directed and random exploration in children. *Developmental Science*, *24*(4), e13095.
- Mennen, A. C., Norman, K. A., & Turk-Browne, N. B. (2019). Attentional bias in depression: Understanding mechanisms to improve training and treatment. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *29*, 266–273.
- Miyake, A., Friedman, N. P., Emerson, M. J., Witzki, A. H., Howerter, A., & Wager, T. D. (2000). The unity and diversity of executive functions and their contributions to complex “frontal lobe” tasks: A latent variable analysis. *Cognitive Psychology*, *41*(1), 49–100.
- Moreno, F. A., Wiegand, C. B., Taitano, E. K., & Delgado, P. L. (2006). Safety, tolerability, and efficacy of psilocybin in 9 patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, *67*(11), 1735–1740.
- Munakata, Y., Casey, B. J., & Diamond, A. (2004). Developmental cognitive neuroscience: Progress and potential. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *8*(3), 122–128.
- Nichols, D. E. (2004). Hallucinogens. *Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, *101*(2), 131–181.
- Noorani, T., Garcia-Romeu, A., Swift, T. C., Griffiths, R. R., & Johnson, M. W. (2018). Psychedelic therapy for smoking cessation: Qualitative analysis of participant accounts. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, *32*(7), 756–769.
- O’Donnell, K. C., Mennenga, S. E., Owens, L. T., Podrebarac, S. K., Baron, T., Rotrosen, J., Ross, S., Forchimes, A. A., & Bogenschutz, M. P. (2022). Psilocybin for alcohol use disorder: Rationale and design considerations for a randomized controlled trial. *Contemporary Clinical Trials*, *123*, 106976.
- Palm, K. M., & Follette, V. M. (2011). The roles of cognitive flexibility and experiential avoidance in explaining psychological distress in survivors of interpersonal victimization. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *33*(1), 79–86.
- Pang, E. W., Dunkley, B. T., Doesburg, S. M., Da Costa, L., & Taylor, M. J. (2016). Reduced brain connectivity and mental flexibility in mild traumatic brain injury. *Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology*, *3*(2), 124–131.
- Peck, S. K., Shao, S., Gruen, T., Yang, K., Babakanian, A., Trim, J., Finn, D. M., & Kaye, W. H. (2023). Psilocybin therapy for females with anorexia nervosa: A phase 1, open-label feasibility study. *Nature Medicine*, *29*(8), 1947–1953.
- Pennington, J., Socher, R., & Manning, C. D. (2014). Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)* (pp. 1532–1543).
- Perfors, A., Tenenbaum, J. B., Griffiths, T. L., & Xu, F. (2011). A tutorial introduction to Bayesian models of cognitive development. *Cognition*, *120*(3), 302–321.
- Plebanek, D. J., & Sloutsky, V. M. (2017). Costs of selective attention: When children notice what adults miss. *Psychological Science*, *28*(6), 723–732.
- Preller, K. H., Duerler, P., Burt, J. B., Ji, J. L., Adkinson, B., Stämpfli, P., Seifritz, E., Repovš, G., Krystal, J. H., Murray, J. D., Anticevic, A., & Vollenweider, F. X. (2020). Psilocybin induces time-dependent changes in global functional connectivity. *Biological Psychiatry*, *88*(2), 197–207.
- Raison, C. L., Sanacora, G., Woolley, J., Heinzerling, K., Dunlop, B. W., Brown, R. T., Kakar, R., Hassman, M., Trivedi, R. P., Robison, R., Gukasyan, N., Nayak, S. M., Hu, X., O’Donnell, K. C., Kelmendi, B., Slosower, J., Penn, A. D., Bradley, E., Kelly, D. F., ... & Griffiths, R. R. (2023). Single-dose psilocybin treatment for major depressive disorder: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*, *330*(9), 843.
- Ramachandran, V., Chunharas, C., Marcus, Z., Furnish, T., & Lin, A. (2018). Relief from intractable phantom pain by combining psilocybin and mirror visual-feedback (MVF). *Neurocase*, *24*(2), 105–110.

- Reverberi, C., Toraldo, A., D'Agostini, S., & Skrap, M. (2005). Better without (lateral) frontal cortex? Insight problems solved by frontal patients. *Brain*, *128*(12), 2882–2890.
- Rich, A. S., & Gureckis, T. M. (2015). The attentional learning trap and how to avoid it. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, 1973–1978*. Pasadena, CA: Cognitive Science Society.
- Roseman, L., Leech, R., Feilding, A., Nutt, D. J., & Carhart-Harris, R. L. (2014). The effects of psilocybin and MDMA on between-network resting state functional connectivity in healthy volunteers. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *8*, 204.
- Roseman, L., Nutt, D. J., & Carhart-Harris, R. L. (2018). Quality of acute psychedelic experience predicts therapeutic efficacy of psilocybin for treatment-resistant depression. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, *8*, 974.
- Ross, S., Bossis, A., Guss, J., Agin-Liebes, G., Malone, T., Cohen, B., Mennenga, S. E., Belser, A., Kalliontzi, K., & Babb, J. (2016). Rapid and sustained symptom reduction following psilocybin treatment for anxiety and depression in patients with life-threatening cancer: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, *30*(12), 1165–1180.
- Sampedro, F., de la Fuente Revenga, M., Valle, M., Roberto, N., Domínguez-Clavé, E., Elices, M., Luna, L. E., Crippa, J. A. S., Hallak, J. E. C., de Araujo, D. B., Friedlander, P., Barker, S. A., Álvarez, E., Soler, J., Pascual, J. C., Feilding, A., & Riba, J. (2017). Assessing the psychedelic “after-glow” in ayahuasca users: Post-acute neurometabolic and functional connectivity changes are associated with enhanced mindfulness capacities. *International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology*, *20*(9), 698–711.
- Sanborn, A. N. (2017). Types of approximation for probabilistic cognition: Sampling and variational. *Brain and Cognition*, *112*, 98–101.
- Sanborn, A. N., & Chater, N. (2016). Bayesian brains without probabilities. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *20*(12), 883–893.
- Sanborn, A. N., Griffiths, T. L., & Navarro, D. J. (2010). Rational approximations to rational models: Alternative algorithms for category learning. *Psychological Review*, *117*(4), 1144–1167.
- Schindler, E. A. D., Sewell, R. A., Gottschalk, C. H., Luddy, C., Flynn, L. T., Lindsey, H., Pittman, B. P., Cozzi, N. V., & D'Souza, D. C. (2021). Exploratory controlled study of the migraine-suppressing effects of psilocybin. *Neurotherapeutics*, *18*(1), 534–543.
- Schindler, E. A. D., Sewell, R. A., Gottschalk, C. H., Luddy, C., Flynn, L. T., Zhu, Y., Lindsey, H., Pittman, B. P., Cozzi, N. V., & D'Souza, D. C. (2022). Exploratory investigation of a patient-informed low-dose psilocybin pulse regimen in the suppression of cluster headache: Results from a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Headache*, *62*(10), 1383–1394.
- Schneier, F. R., Feusner, J., Wheaton, M. G., Gomez, G. J., Cornejo, G., Naraindas, A. M., & Hellerstein, D. J. (2023). Pilot study of single-dose psilocybin for serotonin reuptake inhibitor-resistant body dysmorphic disorder. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *161*, 364–370.
- Schulz, E., Konstantinidis, E., & Speekenbrink, M. (2018). Putting bandits into context: How function learning supports decision making. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *44*(6), 927–943.
- Schulz, E., Wu, C. M., Ruggeri, A., & Meder, B. (2019). Searching for rewards like a child means less generalization and more directed exploration. *Psychological Science*, *30*(11), 1561–1572.
- Scott, W. A. (1962). Cognitive complexity and cognitive flexibility. *Sociometry*, *25*(4), 405–414.
- Seiver, E., Gopnik, A., & Goodman, N. D. (2013). Did she jump because she was the big sister or because the trampoline was safe? Causal inference and the development of social attribution. *Child Development*, *84*(2), 443–454.
- Sessa, B. (2020). *The psychedelic renaissance: Reassessing the role of psychedelic drugs in 21st century psychiatry and society*. Aeon Books.
- Sherman, L. E., Rudie, J. D., Pfeifer, J. H., Masten, C. L., McNealy, K., & Dapretto, M. (2014). Development of the default mode and central executive networks across early adolescence: A longitudinal study. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *10*, 148–159.
- Siegel, J. S., Subramanian, S., Perry, D., Kay, B. P., Gordon, E. M., Laumann, T. O., Reneau, T., Metcalf, N., Chacko, R., Gratton, C., Horan, C., Krimmel, S., Shimony, J., Schweiger, J., Wong, D., Bender, D., Scheidter,

- K., Whiting, F., Padawer-Curry, J., ... & Dosenbach, N. U. (2024). Psilocybin desynchronizes the human brain. *Nature*, 632(8023), 131–138.
- Silvia, P. J., Nusbaum, E. C., Berg, C., Martin, C., & O'Connor, A. (2009). Openness to experience, plasticity, and creativity: Exploring lower-order, high-order, and interactive effects. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43(6), 1087–1090.
- Smigielski, L., Scheidegger, M., Kometer, M., & Vollenweider, F. X. (2019). Psilocybin-assisted mindfulness training modulates self-consciousness and brain default mode network connectivity with lasting effects. *NeuroImage*, 196, 207–215.
- Snell-Rood, E. C. (2013). An overview of the evolutionary causes and consequences of behavioural plasticity. *Animal Behaviour*, 85(5), 1004–1011.
- Sobel, D. M., Tenenbaum, J. M., & Gopnik, A. (2004). Children's causal inferences from indirect evidence: Backwards blocking and Bayesian reasoning in preschoolers. *Cognitive Science*, 28(3), 303–333.
- Spitzer, M., Thimm, M., Hermle, L., Holzmann, P., Kovar, K. A., Heimann, H., Gouzoulis-Mayfrank, E., Kischka, U., & Schneider, F. (1996). Increased activation of indirect semantic associations under psilocybin. *Biological psychiatry*, 39(12), 1055–1057.
- Stamets, P. (1996). *Psilocybin mushrooms of the world: An identification guide*. Ten Speed Press.
- Sumner, E., Steyvers, M., & Sarnecka, B. W. (2019a). It's not the treasure, it's the hunt: Children are more explorative on an explore/exploit task than adults. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 2891–2897). Montreal, CA: Cognitive Science Society.
- Sumner, E., Li, A. X., Perfors, A., Hayes, B., Navarro, D., & Sarnecka, B. W. (2019b). The exploration advantage: Children's instinct to explore allows them to find information that adults miss.
- Supekar, K., Uddin, L. Q., Prater, K., Amin, H., Greicius, M. D., & Menon, V. (2010). Development of functional and structural connectivity within the default mode network in young children. *NeuroImage*, 52(1), 290–301.
- Tagliazucchi, E., Carhart-Harris, R. L., Leech, R., Nutt, D., & Chialvo, D. R. (2014). Enhanced repertoire of brain dynamical states during the psychedelic experience. *Human Brain Mapping*, 35(11), 5442–5456.
- Tandoc, M. C., Nadendla, B., Pham, T., & Finn, A. S. (2024). Directing attention shapes learning in adults but not children. *Psychological Science*, 35(10), 1139–1154.
- Tenenbaum, J. B., Kemp, C., Griffiths, T. L., & Goodman, N. D. (2011). How to grow a mind: Statistics, structure, and abstraction. *Science*, 331(6022), 1279–1285.
- Teodorescu, K., & Erev, I. (2014). Learned helplessness and learned prevalence: Exploring the causal relations among perceived controllability, reward prevalence, and exploration. *Psychological Science*, 25(10), 1861–1869.
- Thomas, R. P., Dougherty, M. R., Sprenger, A. M., & Harbison, J. (2008). Diagnostic hypothesis generation and human judgment. *Psychological Review*, 115(1), 155.
- Thompson-Schill, S. L., Ramscar, M., & Chrysikou, E. G. (2009). Cognition without control: When a little frontal lobe goes a long way. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18(5), 259–263.
- Todd, A. R., Forstmann, M., Burgmer, P., Brooks, A. W., & Galinsky, A. D. (2015). Anxious and egocentric: How specific emotions influence perspective taking. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 144(2), 374.
- Torrado Pacheco, A., Olson, R. J., Garza, G., & Moghaddam, B. (2023). Acute psilocybin enhances cognitive flexibility in rats. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 48(7), 1011–1020.
- Uddin, L. Q., Supekar, K. S., Ryali, S., & Menon, V. (2011). Dynamic reconfiguration of structural and functional connectivity across core neurocognitive brain networks with development. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 31(50), 18578–18589.
- Vaidya, V. A., Marek, G. J., Aghajanian, G. K., & Duman, R. S. (1997). 5-HT_{2A} receptor-mediated regulation of brain-derived neurotrophic factor mRNA in the hippocampus and the neocortex. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 17(8), 2785–2795.
- Vollenweider, F. X., & Preller, K. H. (2020). Psychedelic drugs: Neurobiology and potential for treatment of psychiatric disorders. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 21(11), 611–624.
- Vul, E., & Pashler, H. (2008). Measuring the crowd within: Probabilistic representations within individuals. *Psychological Science*, 19(7), 645–647.

- Vul, E., Goodman, N., Griffiths, T. L., & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2014). One and done? Optimal decisions from very few samples. *Cognitive Science*, 38(4), 599–637.
- Walker, C., Rett, A., & Bonawitz, E. (2020). Design drives discovery in causal learning. *Psychological Science*, 31(2), 129–138.
- Wasson, R. G. (1980). *The wondrous mushroom: Mycolatry in Mesoamerica*. McGraw-Hill.
- Weisbecker, V., & Goswami, A. (2010). Brain size, life history, and metabolism at the marsupial/placental dichotomy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(37), 16216–16221.
- Wu, C. M., Schulz, E., Speekenbrink, M., Nelson, J. D., & Meder, B. (2017). Mapping the unknown: The spatially correlated multi-armed bandit. In *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 1357–1362).
- Yim, H., Best, C., & Sloutsky, V. (2011). Cost of attention as an indicator of category learning. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* (Vol. 33, No. 33).
- Zelazo, P. D. (2006). The Dimensional Change Card Sort (DCCS): A method of assessing executive function in children. *Nature Protocols*, 1(1), 297–301.