

STABILITY IN RANDOM BOOLEAN CELLULAR AUTOMATA ON THE INTEGER LATTICE

F. MICHEL DEKKING AND LEONARD VAN DRIEL

ABSTRACT. We consider random boolean cellular automata on the integer lattice, i.e., the cells are identified with the integers from 1 to N . The behaviour of the automaton is mainly determined by the support of the random variable that selects one of the sixteen possible Boolean rules, independently for each cell. A cell is said to stabilize if it will not change its state anymore after some time. We classify the random boolean automata according to the positivity of their probability of stabilization. Here is an example of a consequence of our results: if the support contains at least 5 rules, then asymptotically as N tends to infinity the probability of stabilization is positive, whereas there exist random boolean cellular automata with 4 rules in their support for which this probability tends to 0.

1. INTRODUCTION

Random Boolean cellular automata were introduced by Stuart Kauffman in 1969 ([2]). One could say that these are simply dynamical systems on a finite set of 2^N points, where N is the number of cells of the cellular automaton. The automaton with its evolution rules are chosen randomly. First the N cells obtain a random graph structure. In this paper we only consider 2-connected automata, i.e., for each cell i independently a mother $M(i)$ and a father $F(i)$ are chosen uniformly from the remaining pairs of cells. This gives a graph with vertices i and directed edges $(M(i), i)$, $(F(i), i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Next, each cell i is assigned independently a Boolean rule Φ_i uniformly from the set of 16 Boolean rules (i.e., maps from $\{0, 1\}^2$ to $\{0, 1\}$, see also Table 1). To start, all cells obtain independently an initial value $X_i(0)$ from the set $\{0, 1\}$ with equal probability. The state of the automaton at time t will be denoted by $X(t)$. Then the automaton runs according to the map Ψ_Φ :

$$X(t+1) = \Psi_\Phi(X(t))$$

given by

$$X_i(t+1) = \Phi_i(X_{M(i)}(t), X_{F(i)}(t))$$

for all cells i .

Date: April 18, 2007.

In this paper we will study random Boolean cellular automata, where the graph is no longer random, but a subgraph of the integer lattice. This means in dimension 1 that the cells may be identified with the integers i , and that $M(i) \equiv i - 1$, $F(i) \equiv i + 1$. For some previous work with rather partial results on 2-dimensional versions of this kind of automata see e.g. [10], [1]. They also have come up recently in the modelling of the subsurface in the geosciences (see [11]). Finally they are of interest in the context of Stephen Wolfram’s book “A new kind of science” ([12]) since our work gives some insight in the interaction of different boolean rules—also in the deterministic case.

In Figure 1 we display the evolution of a CA in the usual way: zero’s and ones are coded by white and black squares, space is in the horizontal direction, time in the vertical direction.




FIGURE 1. Evolution of an inhomogeneous boolean CA on the integer lattice. After two time steps, most cells already become periodic. After five steps, the whole CA is periodic.

We say a cell stabilizes if its value is not changed anymore after some time. In Figure 1 the stable cells yield the black or white stripes; in this example about 56% of the cells stabilize. Kaufmann ([3]) found in his simulations that about 60-80% of the cells stabilize. It was later shown rigorously by Luczak and Cohen ([4]) that in the limit as the number of cells N tends to infinity 100% of the cells will stabilize—size $N = 10\,000$ in Kaufmanns simulations is much too small to unearth this behaviour.

For the Kaufmann automata there is no natural model for the infinite size ($N \rightarrow \infty$) automaton. For an automaton on the integers there is: the graph is simply the set of all integers with edges between nearest neighbors. It therefore makes sense to speak of the probability σ_* of stabilization of the

infinite automaton. The result of Luczak and Cohen leads to the question whether this $\sigma_* = 1$. In this paper we will show that this is rarely the case, and moreover that there are many cases where actually $\sigma_* = 0$. By different cases we mean different distributions on the set of Boolean rules. We remark that the results in [3] and [4] are restricted to the uniform distribution on the set of rules—see [5], [6] for some results for Kauffman automata with other rule distributions.

The second problem we will discuss is whether the probability σ_N that a cell stabilizes in an automaton of size N will converge when $N \rightarrow \infty$. We will show that this will often be the case, but may also fail to hold.

2. RANDOM BOOLEAN CELLULAR AUTOMATA

Before we define Random Boolean Cellular Automata (RBCA), we describe their realizations which are inhomogeneous cellular automata. The dynamics in such a CA is defined by attaching a Boolean rule to each cell. The rule is given by specifying what its value is on the four different values $(1, 1)$, $(1, 0)$, $(0, 1)$ and $(0, 0)$ of the neighbors of a cell. In Table 1, all 16 different rules are defined.

TABLE 1. Definition of the 16 Boolean rules. The last column gives a formula for $\varphi_j(x, y)$ when φ_j is affine.

j	$\varphi_j(0, 0)$	$\varphi_j(0, 1)$	$\varphi_j(1, 0)$	$\varphi_j(1, 1)$	affine
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	no
2	0	1	0	0	no
3	1	1	0	0	$x + 1$
4	0	0	1	0	no
5	1	0	1	0	$y + 1$
6	0	1	1	0	$x + y$
7	1	1	1	0	no
8	0	0	0	1	no
9	1	0	0	1	$x + y + 1$
10	0	1	0	1	y
11	1	1	0	1	no
12	0	0	1	1	x
13	1	0	1	1	no
14	0	1	1	1	no
15	1	1	1	1	1

For ease of notation these are indexed as φ_j where j is the number in binary notation obtained from the four bits in the row describing φ_j . Anytime we

refer to one of these 16 rules we use index j (note the different font); when we use index i we refer abusively to the rule assigned to cell i .

An inhomogeneous CA's mapping $\Psi_\varphi : \{0, 1\}^N \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^N$ is determined by a vector of rules, $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N)$. Here for all time steps, φ_i is the rule of cell i . Hence given a state $x = (x_1 \dots x_N)$ we get $(\Psi_\varphi(x))_i = \varphi_i(x_{i-1}, x_{i+1})$ for $i = 2, \dots, N-1$. To deal with the problem that occurs in the end points we consider the automata as defined on a circle; a convenient way to express this is to define $x_{i+kN} = x_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, and all integers k .

To address Ψ_φ we will sometimes write the vector of lower indices of the φ_i ($1 \leq i \leq N$) mentioned. E.g., mapping (0,3,3,15) describes $\Psi_\varphi : \{0, 1\}^4 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^4$ with rule vector $(\varphi_0, \varphi_3, \varphi_3, \varphi_{15})$.

In a RBCA the rules φ_i are chosen according to a distribution Φ on the set of rules, independently for each i . The initial state is an i.i.d. sequence $(X_i(0))$ from a Bernoulli(1/2) distribution, independent from the (Φ_i) . Then the value of the i^{th} cell at time $t + 1$ is given by

$$(1) \quad X_i(t+1) = \Phi_i(X_{i-1}(t), X_{i+1}(t)).$$

We denote by \mathbb{P}_N the probability generated by the $(X_i(0))$ and the (Φ_i) on the space of infinite periodic sequences with period N . It is natural to consider also the probability measure \mathbb{P}_* on $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ generated by two infinite independent i.i.d. sequences $(X_i(0))$ and (Φ_i) .

3. STABILITY

We say¹ cell i stabilizes at time T if

$$X_i(t) = X_i(T) \quad \text{for all } t \geq T,$$

and T is the smallest integer with this property. Let σ_N be the probability that a cell in a random cellular automaton of size N with rule distribution Φ stabilizes. Because of stationarity,

$$\sigma_N = \mathbb{P}_N(\text{cell } 0 \text{ stabilizes}).$$

We first give an example where σ_N does not converge as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Consider the RBCA's for $N = 1, 2 \dots$ with rule distribution given by

$$\mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_6) = 1.$$

Note that randomness is only involved because of the randomness in the initial state $X(0) = (X_i(0))$, and that φ_6 is the well known linear rule which can be written as $\varphi_6(x, y) = x + y$. This addition, as all additions with 0's and 1's, is modulo 2.

¹This definition is slightly different from the one used by Luczak and Cohen, who require this for any initial state $X(0)$.

Proposition 1. *For the φ_6 -RBCA one has*

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_N = 0, \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_N = 1.$$

Proof: It is well known (see e.g. [9]) and easy to prove that the φ_6 -automaton satisfies

$$X_i(t) = X_{i-t}(0) + X_{i+t}(0) \quad \text{if } t = 2^p \text{ for some } p.$$

It follows that $\sigma_N = 1$ for each $N = 2^p$ which is a power of 2:

$$X_i(N) = X_{-N+i}(0) + X_{N+i}(0) = 2X_i(0) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i,$$

which implies that $X_i(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq N$. This proves that $\limsup \sigma_N = 1$. To obtain the statement on \liminf , consider the subsequence of N of the form $N = 2^p + 1$. Then we find for all i

$$X_i(N - 1) = X_i(2^p) = X_{-2^p+i}(0) + X_{2^p+i}(0) = X_{i+1}(0) + X_{i-1}(0).$$

From this we directly obtain that

$$X_0(N) = X_{-1}(N - 1) + X_1(N - 1) = X_{-2}(0) + X_0(0) + X_0(0) + X_2(0),$$

and so

$$(2) \quad X_0(N) = X_{-2}(0) + X_2(0).$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{P}_N(X_0(N - 1) \neq X_0(N)) = \mathbb{P}_N(X_{-1}(0) + X_1(0) \neq X_{-2}(0) + X_2(0)) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Note that this computation does not only hold for $t = N - 1$, but for any t which satisfies $t = -1 \pmod{N}$. An infinite sequence of such t 's is given by $t = 2^{(2k+1)p}$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. For N of the form $2^p + 1$ we therefore obtain that

$$1 - \sigma_N = \mathbb{P}_N(X_0(t) \neq X_0(t + 1) \text{ for infinitely many } t) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

This inequality is a warm up for a more general result: we can generalize Equation (2) to for all m

$$X_0(N + 2^m - 2) = X_{-2^m}(0) + X_{2^m}(0).$$

Since for $m = 0, 1, \dots, \ell$ the $X_{-2^m}(0) + X_{2^m}(0)$ are independent Bernoulli variables with success probability $1/2$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_N(\exists m, 0 \leq m < \ell : X_0(N + 2^m - 2) \neq X_0(N - 1)) = 1 - \frac{1}{2^\ell},$$

and employing the same infinite sequence of t 's as for the $\ell = 1$ case, we can deduce that $\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_N = 0$. \square

It is convenient to define random variables Z_i by $Z_i = 1$ if cell i stabilizes, and 0 otherwise. We then have (independently of i):

$$\sigma_N = \mathbb{P}_N(Z_i = 1), \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_* = \mathbb{P}_*(Z_i = 1).$$

The *uniform* RBCA is given by the rule distribution $\mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_j) = 1/16$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, 15$.

Theorem 1. *Let σ_N be the probability of stabilization of a size N uniform RBCA, σ_* that of an infinite size uniform RBCA. Then*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_N = \sigma_* \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_* > 0.$$

Proof: The two rules φ_0 and φ_{15} are called *walls*. We denote $W = \{\varphi_0, \varphi_{15}\}$. Cells that have obtained a rule from W are already stable at time 0 or 1. We define for positive integers k and l the *chambers* $C_{k,l}$ by

$$C_{k,l} = \{\Phi_{-k} \in W, \Phi_{-k+1} \notin W, \Phi_{-k+2} \notin W, \dots, \Phi_{l-1} \notin W, \Phi_l \in W\}.$$

In addition we put $C_{0,0} = \{\Phi_0 \in W\}$. Since the chambers are disjoint events whose union has probability 1 we can write

$$\sigma_* = \mathbb{P}_*(Z_0 = 1) = \mathbb{P}_*(Z_0 = 1 | C_{0,0}) \mathbb{P}_*(C_{0,0}) + \sum_{k,l=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_*(Z_0 = 1 | C_{k,l}) \mathbb{P}_*(C_{k,l}).$$

We will make a similar splitting for RBCA of size N . In case $N = 2M + 1$ we consider these on $\{-M, \dots, 0, \dots, M\}$, in case $N = 2M$ on $\{-M + 1, \dots, 0, \dots, M\}$. In the sequel we will assume N is odd, as our arguments can be transferred trivially to the case N even. Let D be the event

$$D = \left(C_{0,0} \cup \bigcup_{k,l=1}^M C_{k,l} \right)^c.$$

Then D occurs iff there is no wall among Φ_{-M}, \dots, Φ_0 or among Φ_0, \dots, Φ_M . Since $\mathbb{P}_N(\Phi_i \notin W) = \mathbb{P}_*(\Phi_i \notin W) = 7/8$, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}_*(D) = \mathbb{P}_N(D) = 2 \left(\frac{7}{8} \right)^{M+1} - \left(\frac{7}{8} \right)^{2M+1} \leq 2 \left(\frac{7}{8} \right)^{N/2}.$$

The crux of the proof is that for all $1 \leq k, l \leq M$ and for $k = l = 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}_N(Z_0 = 1 | C_{k,l}) = \mathbb{P}_*(Z_0 = 1 | C_{k,l}),$$

simply because both the finite automaton and the infinite automaton evolve between the walls independently of the evolution outside the walls. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma_N - \sigma_*| &\leq \mathbb{P}_*(Z_0 = 1 | D) \mathbb{P}_*(D) + \mathbb{P}_N(Z_0 = 1 | D) \mathbb{P}_N(D) \\ &\leq 4 \left(\frac{7}{8} \right)^{N/2}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\sigma_N \rightarrow \sigma_*$ exponentially fast. Note that

$$\sigma_N \geq \mathbb{P}_N(\Phi \in W) = \frac{1}{8},$$

and so $\sigma_* \geq 1/8 > 0$. \square

Actually we can obtain a good estimate of σ_* using the exponential convergence of σ_N , by sampling uniform RBCA's for some large N and computing a 95% confidence interval. We found that $\sigma_{100} = 0.678058 \pm 0.000029$. Interestingly, an exhaustive enumeration for $N = 6$ yields already a value σ_6 close to 0.68.

We end this section with the remark that the 'wall'-property directly implies that the sequence (Z_i) is strongly mixing (i.e., $\mathbb{P}_*(Z_0 = \varepsilon_0, Z_i = \varepsilon_1) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_*(Z_0 = \varepsilon_0)\mathbb{P}_*(Z_0 = \varepsilon_1)$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$). Therefore the ergodic theorem applies, yielding that we also have pathwise about 68% of stable cells.

4. STABILITY BY MEANS OF IMPERMEABLE BLOCKS

Note that the proof of Theorem 1 will still be valid if Φ is not uniformly distributed, but has an arbitrary distribution with $\mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_j) > 0$ for all j (of course $7/8$ has to be replaced by $\mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_0) + \mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_{15})$). The only thing that matters is the *support* of Φ defined by

$$\text{Supp}(\Phi) = \{j : \mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_j) > 0\} = \{j : \mathbb{P}_*(\Phi = \varphi_j) > 0\}.$$

In this section we will generalize the concept of a wall. An easy adaptation of its proof will permit to draw the conclusions of Theorem 1 for a large majority of the 2^{16} different supports.

Consider an inhomogeneous BCA. We call adjacent cells $\{i+1, \dots, i+p\}$ an *impermeable block* of size p , if there exist a $b = (b_1, \dots, b_p) \in \{0, 1\}^p$, and a $(j_1, \dots, j_p) \in \{0, \dots, 15\}^p$ such that if

$$(x_{i+1}(0), \dots, x_{i+p}(0)) = (b_1, \dots, b_p) \quad \text{and} \quad (\varphi_{i+1}, \dots, \varphi_{i+p}) = (\varphi_{j_1}, \dots, \varphi_{j_p}),$$

then for all t

$$(x_{i+1}(t), \dots, x_{i+p}(t)),$$

is unchanged, whatever values are chosen for $x_i(s)$ and $x_{i+p+1}(s)$, for $s = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$. Here we assume that N is larger than $p+2$.

As an example take $p = 2$, $b = (0, 0)$ and $(j_1, j_2) = (2, 4)$.

If a particular Φ has φ_j 's in its support that yield an impermeable block, then any Φ containing this set in its support will also have an impermeable

block. We therefore look for minimal sets of j 's such that the φ_j 's give rise to impermeable blocks. Here is a listing of these sets:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G} = \{ & \{0\}, \{1\}, \{7\}, \{8\}, \{14\}, \{15\}, \{2, 4\}, \{2, 5\}, \{2, 9\}, \{2, 12\}, \{2, 13\}, \\ & \{3, 4\}, \{3, 5\}, \{3, 10\}, \{3, 13\}, \{4, 9\}, \{4, 10\}, \{4, 11\}, \{5, 11\}, \\ & \{5, 12\}, \{6, 11\}, \{6, 13\}, \{10, 12\}, \{10, 13\}, \{11, 12\}, \{11, 13\}, \\ & \{2, 6, 10\}, \{4, 6, 12\}, \{9, 10, 11\}, \{9, 12, 13\} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Because of the symmetries of the collection of sets of CA rules (cf. A), of these 30 subsets there is a subcollection $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ of only 12 where the dynamics of the associated Ψ_{Φ} is essentially different. Table 2 gives these supports with their φ -blocks $(\varphi_{j_1}, \dots, \varphi_{j_p})$, and their b -blocks (b_1, \dots, b_p) .

TABLE 2. Impermeable blocks.

Support	φ -block	b -block		Support	φ -block	b -block
$\{0\}$	(0)	(0)		$\{2, 12\}$	(2,12)	(0,0)
$\{1\}$	(1,1,1)	(0,1,0)		$\{2, 13\}$	(13, 2)	(1,0)
$\{8\}$	(8,8)	(0,0)		$\{3, 5\}$	(5,3)	(0,0)
$\{2, 4\}$	(2,4)	(0,0)		$\{3, 10\}$	(10,3)	(0,0)
$\{2, 5\}$	(5,2)	(1,0)		$\{10, 12\}$	(10,12)	(0,0)
$\{2, 9\}$	(2,9,9,2)	(0,0,1,0)		$\{2, 6, 10\}$	(10,6,2)	(1,1,0)

Often there is more than b -block that will work, in the table we have chosen b -blocks with minimal length. It can be quickly verified that the entries in Table 2 yield impermeable blocks. See B for two examples of the type of verification one has to perform.

We can describe the supports which do *not* give rise to impermeable blocks by the list

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} = \{ & \{2, 3, 6\}, \{2, 3, 11\}, \{2, 10, 11\}, \{3, 9, 11\}, \{4, 5, 6\}, \{4, 5, 13\}, \\ & \{4, 12, 13\}, \{5, 9, 13\}, \{3, 6, 9, 12\}, \{5, 6, 9, 10\} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Any support which does not admit an impermeable block is a subset of a set in \mathcal{B} . For an example of a proof that with these supports no impermeable blocks occur, see C.

One can check that any subset of $\{0, 1, \dots, 15\}$ is either a subset of a set from \mathcal{B} , or contains a set from \mathcal{G} , and so we have completely described the supports with regard to the existence of impermeable blocks.



FIGURE 2. The automata with support $\{\varphi_2\}$ and $\{\varphi_2, \varphi_{10}\}$.

5. CLASSIFYING RBCA'S

In the previous section we have established that all the RBCA's whose support contains a set in \mathcal{G} are well behaved in the sense that they are stability continuous ($\sigma_N \rightarrow \sigma_*$), and do have a positive probability to stabilize ($\sigma_* > 0$). As there are only 53 supports described by \mathcal{B} this means that this regular behaviour manifests itself for at least 99,9% of the RBCA's. In the sequel our goal will be to classify the remaining 53. Because of symmetries it is enough to consider the 18 supports which occur as subsets of the sets in the collection $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \{\{2, 3, 6\}, \{2, 3, 11\}, \{2, 10, 11\}, \{3, 6, 9, 12\}\}.$$

As we will show in Section 6, subsets of rules in $\{3, 6, 9, 12\}$ all give supports which yield behaviour that is completely different of that of the 99,9% majority; in particular we will show that $\sigma_* = 0$ for the 10 RBCA's given by these rules.

It occurs that the remaining supports can be split into two parts. The first part consists of the supports which occur as subsets of $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = \{\{2, 3\}, \{2, 11\}, \{2, 3, 6\}, \{2, 3, 11\}, \{2, 10, 11\}\}.$$

The $\tilde{}$ here indicates that we removed those supports that are symmetry equivalent to supports that are already listed, as, for example, $\{3, 11\}$. The supports in $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ will be shown in Section 7 to be of the same regular type as found in Section 4. The second part consists of the three supports

$$\{2\}, \{2, 10\}, \text{ and } \{2, 6\}.$$

Here the automata with supports $\{2\}$ and $\{2, 10\}$ behave very similarly. The $\{2, 10\}$ -automaton exhibits a form of self-organization which eventually transforms it into a $\{2\}$ -automaton (see also Figure 2).

In both cases the process $(X_i(t))$ of cell i will after a transient phase be a hidden Markov chain on 8 equiprobable states in which no more than two 1's occur consecutively. Hence $\sigma_* = 0$, and it is also not hard to show that there is stability continuity.

We are left with the RBCA with support $\{2, 6\}$. This is the only case where we do not know how to prove convergence, nor how to determine whether σ_* is positive or not. We conjecture that the automaton is stability continuous, with $\sigma_* > 0$.

6. AFFINE CHAOS

Here we will analyze the RBCA's whose support is a subset of $\{3, 6, 9, 12\}$.




FIGURE 3. Evolution of an RBCA with support $\{3, 6, 9, 12\}$.

The crucial observation is that not only these rules are affine, but they can all be written as

$$\varphi_j(x, y) = x + f(y),$$

where $f(y) = 1, y, y + 1, 0$ for $j = 3, 6, 9, 12$ respectively. It follows from this that we can write for some function f_t

$$(3) \quad x_i(t) = x_{i-t}(0) + f_t(x_{i-t+1}(0), \dots, x_{i+t}(0), \varphi_{i-t+1}, \dots, \varphi_{i+t}).$$

Indeed, for $t = 1$ we have

$$x_i(1) = x_{i-1}(0) + f_1(x_{i+1}(0), \varphi_i),$$

where $f_1(y, \varphi_i) = f(y)$ as above. For $t = 2$ we obtain from this

$$\begin{aligned} x_i(2) &= x_{i-1}(1) + f_1(x_{i+1}(1), \varphi_i) \\ &= x_{i-2}(0) + f_1(x_i(0), \varphi_{i-1}) + f_1(x_i(0) + f_1(x_{i+2}(0), \varphi_{i+1}), \varphi_i). \end{aligned}$$

Defining

$$\begin{aligned} f_2(x_{i-1}(0), \dots, x_{i+2}(0), \varphi_{i-1}, \dots, \varphi_{i+2}) \\ = f_1(x_i(0), \varphi_{i-1}) + f_1(x_i(0) + f_1(x_{i+2}(0), \varphi_{i+1}), \varphi_i), \end{aligned}$$

we obtain Equation (3) for $t = 2$. Continuing in this fashion we obtain Equation (3) for all t .

The following proposition will immediately imply that $\sigma_* = 0$ for the RBCA's from this section.

Proposition 2. *Consider an RBCA with $\text{Supp}(\Phi) \subset \{\varphi_3, \varphi_6, \varphi_9, \varphi_{12}\}$, and let i be a fixed cell. Then the random variables $(X_i(t))_{t=0}^{t=\infty}$ are independent $\text{Ber}(\frac{1}{2})$ random variables under \mathbb{P}_* .*

Proof: We prove this by induction w.r.t. the length t of the cylinders. We will show that for each cell i and for all $t = 1, 2, \dots$

$$(4) \quad \mathbb{P}_*(X_i(0) = \varepsilon_0, X_i(1) = \varepsilon_1, \dots, X_i(t-1) = \varepsilon_{t-1}) = 2^{-t}$$

for all $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{t-1}$ from $\{0, 1\}^t$.

1




FIGURE 4. Additive propagation.

Although in general the $(X_i(t))$ will not be stationary (any cell which stabilizes but not at $t = 0$ has a transient evolution!), a simple computation shows that Equation (4) implies that shifted cylinders of length t also have probability 2^{-t} to occur.

We will use the following abbreviations:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{i,t} &= f_t(X_{i-t+1}(0), \dots, X_{i+t}(0), \Phi_{i-t+1}, \dots, \Phi_{i+t}) \\ E_{i,t,\varepsilon} &= \{X_i(0) = \varepsilon_0, X_i(1) = \varepsilon_1, \dots, X_i(t-1) = \varepsilon_{t-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

First note that Equation (4) is true for $t = 1$ by definition of the RBCA. Figure 4 is useful in the remainder of the proof.

Suppose that Equation (4), i.e., $\mathbb{P}_*(E_{i,t,\varepsilon}) = 2^{-t}$ has been proved for cylinders of length t . Then for all $\varepsilon_0, \dots, \varepsilon_{t-1}$ from $\{0, 1\}^t$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_*(E_{i,t,\varepsilon}, X_i(t) = 1) = \\ &\mathbb{P}_*(E_{i,t,\varepsilon}, X_{i-t}(0) = 0, Y_{i,t} = 1) + \mathbb{P}_*(E_{i,t,\varepsilon}, X_{i-t}(0) = 1, Y_{i,t} = 0) = \\ \mathbb{P}_*(X_{i-t}(0) = 0) \mathbb{P}_*(E_{i,t,\varepsilon}, Y_{i,t} = 1) + \mathbb{P}_*(X_{i-t}(0) = 1) \mathbb{P}_*(E_{i,t,\varepsilon}, Y_{i,t} = 0) = \\ &\frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{P}_*(E_{i,t,\varepsilon}, Y_{i,t} = 1) + \mathbb{P}_*(E_{i,t,\varepsilon}, Y_{i,t} = 0)) = \\ &\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_*(E_{i,t,\varepsilon}) = 2^{-(t+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $X_{i-t}(0)$ is independent of $E_{i,t,\varepsilon}$ and of $Y_{i,t}$. This equality proves Equation (4) for length $t + 1$ cylinders. \square

What remains for the automata in this section is the question whether $\sigma_N \rightarrow \sigma_*$. For some automata this is easy to answer. We have already seen that for support $\{6\}$ there is *no* stability continuity (see Proposition 1). By symmetry, the same is true for support $\{9\}$ and with a little more work this can also be shown for support $\{6, 9\}$. On the other hand it is easy to show that $\sigma_N = 0$ for $\text{Supp}(\Phi) = \{3\}$ and $\sigma_N = 2^{-N+1}$ for $\text{Supp}(\Phi) = \{12\}$, hence we do have stability continuity in these cases. Also for the combined support $\{3, 12\}$ it is easily shown that $\sigma_N \leq 2^{-N+1}$, hence here too there is stability continuity. However, for the automata with supports $\{3, 6\}$, $\{6, 12\}$, $\{3, 6, 9\}$, $\{3, 6, 12\}$, $\{6, 9, 12\}$, and $\{3, 6, 9, 12\}$, the computation of σ_N becomes quite involved, and we will not pursue this matter here.

7. STABILITY BY MEANS OF ABSORBING BLOCKS

Here we show that we may define a weaker notion than that of an impermeable block which still permits us to conclude to continuity of stabilization and a positive probability to stabilize.

Consider an inhomogeneous BCA. We call adjacent cells $\{i + 1, \dots, i + p\}$ an *absorbing block* of size p , if there exist a b in $\{0, 1\}^p$, and a (j_1, \dots, j_p)

in $\{0, \dots, 15\}^p$ such that if

$$(x_{i+1}(0), \dots, x_{i+p}(0)) = (b_1, \dots, b_p) \quad \text{and} \quad (\varphi_{i+1}, \dots, \varphi_{i+p}) = (\varphi_{j_1}, \dots, \varphi_{j_p}),$$

then for some c with $1 < c < p$ the value $x_{i+c}(t)$ is unchanged for all t , whatever values are chosen for $x_i(s)$ and $x_{i+p+1}(s)$, $s = 0, 1, \dots, t - 1$.

(Here we assume that N is larger than $p + 2$).

The idea is that the evolution of one or both adjacent cells i and $i + p + 1$ may ‘penetrate’ the block, but will never influence the ‘central’ cell $i + c$.

We give an example for an inhomogeneous automaton with rules φ_2 and φ_{11} . Let $p = 4$, $b = (0, 1, 1, 0)$, and $(j_1, \dots, j_4) = (2, 2, 11, 2)$. Then this block is absorbing with $c = 2$:

cell i	cell $i + 1$	cell $i + 2$	cell $i + 3$	cell $i + 4$	cell $i + 5$
	φ_2	φ_2	φ_{11}	φ_2	
x	0	1	1	0	y
x'	$1 - x$	1	0	0	y'
x''	$1 - x'$	0	0	y'	y''
x'''	0	0	1	y''	y'''
	0	1	1	0	

Note that at time $t = 4$ the block $b = (0, 1, 1, 0)$ reappears, so cell $i + 2$ has a periodic evolution with period 4, independently of the evolution of cell i and cell $i + 5$. This establishes that $(2, 2, 11, 2)$ is an absorbing block. Similarly it can be verified that $(2, 2, 3)$ is an absorbing block for the automata with rules φ_2 and φ_3 .

It follows from these observations that the following subsets of $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ are stability continuous:

$$\{2, 3\}, \{2, 11\}, \{2, 3, 6\}, \{2, 3, 11\} \text{ and } \{2, 10, 11\}.$$

We can not yet conclude that $\sigma_* > 0$, since in both cases the central cell has a period 4 dynamics. However, we can find larger absorbing blocks with a stable central cell c : for $\{2, 3\}$ take $p = 9$, $c = 6$, φ -block: $(2, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 3)$ and b -block: $(0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$. For $\{2, 11\}$ take $p = 10$, $c = 5$, φ -block: $(2, 2, 11, 2, 11, 2, 2, 2, 11, 2)$ and b -block: $(0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)$. The existence of such absorbing blocks with a stable cell implies that $\sigma_* > 0$.

8. CONCLUSION

We have studied the behaviour of random Boolean automata with two inputs on the integer lattice. The two constant rules φ_0 and φ_{15} prominently force stability, but we showed (in contrast with the Kaufmann automata), that still 32% of the cells of the integer lattice do not stabilize when the rules are chosen uniformly. When the rules φ_0 and φ_{15} are absent, (sometimes subtle) interactions between the rules play a role. To handle these, we introduced

the notions of impermeable, and more general, absorbing blocks. These tools permit to conclude that the large majority of the automata behaves quite regular. It is interesting to note that we have shown that the behaviour of the automata does not depend on the probabilities with which the Boolean rules $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{15}$ are attached to the integers, but only on the support of the random rule Φ , i.e., on the probabilities $\mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_j)$ being 0 or positive. This contrasts with the behaviour of Kauffman automata as determined by Lynch ([7, 8]). His result is that there is ordered behaviour as long as

$$\mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_0) + \mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_{15}) \geq \mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_6) + \mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_9),$$

and chaotic behaviour when the opposite inequality holds. Nevertheless, there is an interesting parallel: for the integer lattice automata $\mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_0) + \mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_{15}) > 0$ implies regular behaviour in the sense that $\sigma_* > 0$ and exponential convergence of σ_N to σ_* , while $\mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_6) + \mathbb{P}_N(\Phi = \varphi_9) = 1$ implies that $\sigma_* = 0$, and *no* convergence of σ_N to σ_* .

APPENDIX A. CA SYMMETRIES

There are two symmetry operations on the collection of sets of CA rules. The first one is an extension of the mirror map \mathcal{M} defined by

$$\mathcal{M}(0) = 1, \quad \mathcal{M}(1) = 0.$$

It is given by

$$(\mathcal{M}\varphi)(x, y) = \mathcal{M}(\varphi(\mathcal{M}(x), \mathcal{M}(y))).$$

The second one is space reversal \mathcal{R} , defined by

$$(\mathcal{R}\varphi)(x, y) = \varphi(y, x).$$

Both operations are involutions. The effect of \mathcal{M} , written as a permutation is:

$$(0 \ 15)(1 \ 7)(2 \ 11)(4 \ 13)(6 \ 9)(8 \ 14).$$

The effect of \mathcal{R} is:

$$(2 \ 4)(3 \ 5)(10 \ 12)(11 \ 13).$$

APPENDIX B. IMPERMEABLE BLOCKS

Here we give two examples of the proofs that the blocks obtained from Table 2 yield impermeable blocks.

To prove that the pair $((b_1, \dots, b_4) = (0, 0, 1, 0), (j_1, \dots, j_4) = (2, 9, 9, 2))$ yields an impermeable block, we have to consider a configuration as

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c} \varphi_2 & \varphi_9 & \varphi_9 & \varphi_2 & \\ \hline x & 0 & 0 & 1 & y \end{array}$$

Filling in $\varphi_2(x, 0) = 0$, $\varphi_9(0, 1) = 0$, $\varphi_9(0, 0) = 1$ and $\varphi_2(1, y) = 0$, which is true for arbitrary x and y , we obtain the next line (time $t = 1$):

	φ_2	φ_9	φ_9	φ_2	
x	0	0	1	0	y
x'	0	0	1	0	y'

Since this is the same as the state at time 0, it follows that we do indeed have an impermeable block, consisting of four cells that always stabilize at time 0.

There is only one exception of an impermeable block which does *not* consist of stable cells:

	φ_5	φ_3	
x	0	0	y
x'	1	1	y'
x''	0	0	y''
x'''	1	1	y'''

This time we obtain a period 2 impermeable block, but actually a period 1 impermeable block is also possible by taking $(b_1, b_2) = (0, 1)$.

APPENDIX C. NO IMPERMEABLE BLOCKS

We will show that the RBCA's with their support in $\{\varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_{11}\}$ do not admit any impermeable blocks. We will do this by showing that diagrams as in the previous appendix can not exist. In the following we will use frequently that a block is impermeable if and only if its mirror image, respectively space reversal is impermeable.

Consider the first element φ_{j_1} of the φ -block. This can not be φ_3 , since $\varphi_3(x, y) = x$, which is not compatible with impermeability from the left. So it has to be φ_2 or φ_{11} . Since $\mathcal{M}(\varphi_2) = \varphi_{11}$, and $\mathcal{M}(\varphi_3) = \varphi_3$, we can assume without loss of generality that it is φ_{11} . Since $\varphi_{11}(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $(x, y) = (1, 0)$ the first element of the iterates of the b -block must be equal to 1:

	φ_{11}	$\varphi.$	$\varphi.$	$\varphi.$	\dots
x	\dots
x'	1	.	.	.	\dots
x''	1	.	.	.	\dots

We next consider all three possibilities for φ_{j_2} , filling in, if possible, the values of the second cell given by the rules. For $j_2 = 2$ we obtain:

	φ_{11}	φ_2	$\varphi.$	$\varphi.$	\dots
x	\dots
x'	1	.	.	.	\dots
x''	1	0	.	.	\dots

However this gives a contradiction at $t = 3$, since $\varphi_{11}(x'', 0) = 1 - x''$ depends on x'' . Exactly the same contradiction occurs when $j_2 = 3$. Consequently

we must have $j_2 = 11$. The whole second column of the b -block must consist of 1's, again because of $\varphi_{11}(x, 0) = 1 - x$. But then, since $\varphi_{11}(1, 0) = 0$ also the 3^{rd} column must be filled with 1's starting from $t = 1$. It is then quickly checked in the following diagram that $j_3 = 2$ and $j_3 = 3$ are impossible:

	φ_{11}	φ_{11}	φ_{j_3}	φ	\dots
x	\cdot	1	\cdot	\cdot	\dots
x'	1	1	1	\cdot	\dots
x''	1	1	1	\cdot	\dots

Conclusion: also $j_3 = 11$. Continuing in this fashion we find that the (string of indices of the) φ -block has the form $(j_1, \dots, j_p) = (11, \dots, 11)$. But then we have a problem in the p^{th} column since $\varphi_{11}(1, y) = y$ depends on y . Hence for any p this possibility is ruled out.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Fogelman-Soulié, E. Goles-Chacc, and G. Weisbuch. Specific roles of the different Boolean mappings in random networks. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 44(5):715–730, 1982.
- [2] Stuart Kauffman. Metabolic stability and epigenesis in randomly constructed genetic nets. *J. Theoret. Biol.*, 22(1):437–467, 1969.
- [3] Stuart A. Kauffman. Emergent properties in random complex automata. *Phys. D*, 10(1-2):145–156, 1984. Cellular automata (Los Alamos, N.M., 1983).
- [4] T. Luczak and J.E. Cohen. Stability of vertices in random boolean cellular automata. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 2:327–334, 1991.
- [5] James F. Lynch. Antichaos in a class of random Boolean cellular automata. *Physica D*, 69(1):201–208, 1993.
- [6] James F. Lynch. A criterion for stability in random Boolean cellular automata. *Ulam Quart.*, 2(1):32ff., approx. 13 pp. (electronic only), 1993.
- [7] James F. Lynch. Critical points for random Boolean networks. *Phys. D*, 172(1-4):49–64, 2002.
- [8] James F. Lynch. Dynamics of random Boolean networks. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Mathematical Biology and dynamical systems (Series on Knots & Everything, Vol 38)*, pages 15–38, 2007.
- [9] Olivier Martin, Andrew M. Odlyzko, and Stephen Wolfram. Algebraic properties of cellular automata. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 93(2):219–258, 1984.
- [10] Didier Pellegrin. Dynamics of Boolean networks. In *Disordered systems and biological organization (Les Houches, 1985)*, volume 20 of *NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. F Comput. Systems Sci.*, pages 67–70. Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [11] Henk M. Schuttelaars, F.Michel Dekking, and Cas Berentsen. Subsurface characterization using a cellular automaton approach. *In preparation*.
- [12] Stephen Wolfram. *A new kind of science*. Wolfram Media, Inc., Champaign, IL, 2002.