



Natural Computation Spring 2012

Motivation

-When we observe a system, we are dependent on a measuring device.

-Measuring devices often neglect many details of the system, and we are left to try to understand the system from reduced data.

-How does course-graining a system affect the behavior of that system?

-Consider the simple model of 1D cellular automata.

Overview of 1-Dimensional CA

Start with a rule:

Rule 18:



(0,1,0,0,1,0,0,0)

Apply rule to current state (string of 1's and 0's).



Course Graining Over Two Cells

For each time step, take every two cells, and apply a transducer to get a string of half the length.

Transducer rule 4:

Translate each string:

$$...0101001011...$$

 $...000010...$

The Rules

There are 16 possible transducer rules.
-Note 0000 and 1111 are uninteresting.
-Note that the entropy rate of systems are 1-0 symmetric.
-Assume that the systems are right-left symmetric.

This reduces the total number of rules to the following five:

```
(0001,0010,0011,0110,0111)
```

Apply to the Interesting Automata



A Metric: Entropy Rate

The entropy rate of the string at a given time is like the entropy of the system, because it tells us the uncertainty in the next bit.

Compare how the entropy rate evolves for a CA with how it evolves for a coursegraining of that CA.

Entropy Rate: First Impressions



-Decreasing with similar features. -More noise for course-grained.











Rule 90





Rule 110







Rule 18 Course-Graining 0011



Rule 18 Course-Graining 0011



Rule 18 Course-Graining 0011 Evens



Rule 18 Course-Graining 0011 Odds







Moving Forward

-Why does rule 18 express different behavior when course-grained? (Is it a fluke?)

-What sort of course-grainings exist which don't impose an arbitrary segmentation of the lattice?