Biological systems are notorious for their complex behavior within short timescales (e.g., metabolic activity) and longer time scales (e.g., evolutionary selection), along with their complex spatial organization. Because of their complexity and their ability to innovate with respect to their environment, living systems are considered to be open-ended. Historically, it has been difficult to model open-ended evolution and innovation. As a result, our understanding of the exact mechanisms that distinguish open-ended living systems from non-living ones is limited. One of the biggest barriers is understanding how multiple, complex parts within a single system interact and contribute to the complex, emergent behavior of the system as a whole. In biology, this is essential for understanding systems such as the human gut, which contain multiple microbial communities that contribute to the overall health of a person. How do interactions between parts of a system lead to more complex behavior of the system as a whole? What types of interactions contribute to open-ended behavior?

In this talk, two interacting cellular automata (CA) are used as an abstract model to address the effects of complex interactions between two individual entities embedded within a larger system. Unlike elementary CA, these CA are state-dependent because they change their update rules as a function of the systems state as a whole. The resulting behavior of the two-CA system suggests that complex interaction rules between the two CA have little to no effect on the complexity of each component CA. However, having an interaction rule that is random results in open-ended evolution regardless of the specific type of state-dependency. This suggests that randomness does indeed contribute to open-ended evolution, but not by random perturbations of the states as previously speculated.

From a bottom-up approach, it is assumed that a system’s behavior is entirely determined by the underlying laws of the parts that compose it. A top-down approach suggests just the opposite: That the behavior of individual parts in a system is determined by the behavior of the system as a whole. Empirical results suggest that biology uses both, and entities within a system change their laws over time. For example, human social systems are composed of individuals and groups of individuals who change their behavior as a function of other individuals or groups, who in turn do the same. Biological systems with multiple entities, like communities, change their behavior as a function of other entities within the same system.

In online video games, strategies evolve open-endedly in ways that are reminiscent of biological open-ended evolution. In a popular online video game called League of Legends, several strategies are explored by players. The winning strategies are often the most popular strategies. The popular strategies change over time, but the evolution of which strategies are most popular through time never settles into an attractor cycle. In fact, the game developers organize the system of game code, players, and themselves such that this is guaranteed. The game developers change the game’s code every two weeks, which changes important aspects of the game. This, in turn, changes the set of possible strategies that players are able to choose strategies from. This guarantees that
the evolution of the most popular strategies never settles into an attractor cycle, since the state space of strategies changes regularly. In addition, the methods that the game developers use to update the game’s code are determined largely by empirical analysis of player behavior. The game developers attempt to strengthen the weaker strategies and weaken the stronger strategies. In this sense, League of Legends is a system composed of multiple entities and levels of organization. Within the larger system, the set of popular strategies evolves open-endedly, even under an unchanging interaction rule between game developers and the game’s code. This suggests there is indeed a causal relationship between having multiple subsystems within a system and that system’s ability to exhibit open-ended evolution.

The vocal behavior of domestic cats interacting with humans is an example of two interacting individuals within a system of communication. Since cats do not vocalize very often in the absence of humans, it is assumed that domestic cats adapted to living with humans by vocalizing more often than they do in the wild. It was found that cat vocalizations are unique to each cat-human pair, which may indicate the cat’s choice of vocalization tones is unique to the individual relationship with a specific human. This is likely due to an interaction rule between both individuals; humans provide feedback mechanisms to the cat, which provides an evolutionary pressure on the cat to vocalize sounds that result in desired outcomes.

In this paper, two interacting cellular automata (CA) are used as an abstract model to address the effect of complex interactions between two individual entities within a larger system. Unlike elementary cellular automata (ECA), these CA change their update rules as a function of some part of the system as a whole at each time step. Because biological evolution is widely accepted as being open-ended, CA that are capable of open-ended evolution according to a definition tailored for discrete, bounded, synchronous models are identified. The relationship between the complexities of various interaction functions between these CA, and the qualitative characteristics of each CA’s resulting behavior is explored. Due to the algorithmic nature of this model, approximations to algorithmic complexity are used in place of entropy-based measures of complexity throughout this analysis.

I. APPARENT OPEN-ENDED EVOLUTION

Even though biological evolution is widely accepted as being open-ended, there is no scientific consensus on an exact, quantifiable definition of open-endedness. But for bounded, discrete dynamical models with synchronous update rules, open-ended evolution (OEE) can be formally identified if that model’s evolutionary trajectory (discrete states over time) is both unbounded and innovative. This definition heavily relies on the Poincaré Recurrence Theorem for discrete, deterministic systems.

The Poincaré recurrence time \( t_P \) of a finite, deterministic, bounded, and dynamical model provides a time constraint on when it will repeat exactly. For 1-dimensional ECA, \( t_P = 2^w \), where \( w \) is the number of cells in a single CA state. This is because an ECA can, at most, express every possible state in its evolutionary state trajectory, and because the update rule \( r \) is fixed, visiting the same state more than once would cause the state trajectory to repeat itself exactly.

**Definition 1 Unbounded evolution**

A finite, deterministic, and bounded dynamical system \( u \), which can be decomposed into subsystems \( c_1 \in C \) and \( c_2 \in C \) that interact according to a function \( f \), exhibits unbounded evolution if there exists a recurrence time \( t_r \) in \( c_1 \) or \( c_2 \) such that \( s_f(t) = (s(t_1), s(t_2), s(t_3) \ldots s(t_r) \) is non-repeating for \( t_r > t_P \), where \( t_P \) is the Poincaré recurrence time for an equivalent isolated (non-interacting) system \( c \in C \).

Here, \( f \) is the interaction rule function between \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \), defined in section II. Because the state evolution (trajectory) of \( c \) is compared to counterfactual state trajectories of ECAs of the same size, this implies that ECAs are inherently incapable of unbounded evolution. Innovation is defined as:

**Definition 2 Innovation**

A finite, deterministic, and bounded dynamical system \( u \), which can be decomposed into subsystems \( c_1 \in C \) and \( c_2 \in C \) that interact according to a function \( f \), exhibits innovation if there exists a state trajectory \( s_f(t) = (s(t_1), s(t_2), s(t_3) \ldots s(t_r) \) that is not contained in the set of all possible state trajectories \( \{s_i\} \) for an equivalent isolated (non-interacting) system \( c \in C \).

That is, a subsystem CA \( c \) exhibits innovation by Definition 2 if its state trajectory cannot be produced by an ECA of the same size. Both Definitions 1 and 2 reflect the intuitive notions of “on-going production of novelty” and “unbounded evolution” but do not necessarily mean the complexity of individual states increases with time. Furthermore, OEE is apparent on the scale of a single CA embedded within a larger system. This is in agreement with our intuition of OEE within biology—the evolution of life as a whole appears to evolve open-endedly, but it is embedded within a larger system that is not necessarily open-ended.
II. MODEL
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FIG. 1: Each of these CA evolve over time (downwards) and change their update rule \( r \in R = [0, 255] \) according to some function \( f_{\text{type}} \) as described in the text. Because results are exhaustive, only CA with \( w = 3 \) are considered.

The model system explored here is composed of two finite, deterministic, and spatially bounded interacting CA with fixed widths \( w \) and periodic boundary conditions. Each CA starts exactly like an ECA with a fixed update rule \( r \in R = [0, 255] \), but after each time step, each CA changes its rule that is used to determine that CA’s next state \( s \). Both CA use one of the following types of functions \( f_{\text{type}}(\cdot) \) at time \( t \) to change their rule \( r \), which will then determine the next state \( s_{t+1} \):

1. \( r_{x,t} = f_{\text{this state},t}(s_{x,t}): r_{x,t} \) is determined only by the current state \( s_{x,t} \) of that CA.

2. \( r_{x,t} = f_{\text{other state},t}(s_{y,t}): r_{x,t} \) is determined only by the current state \( s_{y,t} \) of the opposing CA.

3. \( r_{1,t} = r_{2,t} = f_{\text{both states},t}(s_{1,t}, s_{2,t}): \) Both \( r_{1,t} \) and \( r_{2,t} \) are determined by the current states \( s_i \) of both CA.

4. \( r_{x,t} = f_{\text{mixed},t}(\text{random choice}(s_{1,t}, s_{2,t})): r_{x,t} \) depends on a random choice of both CA states, the state of that CA, or the state of the opposing CA.

Because all possible initial states for a given \( w \) and initial rules \( r_0 \in R = [0, 255] \) are explored for both CA, only CA with \( w = 3 \) were explored. For each of all possible combinations of \( s_{0,w}, r_0 \), state trajectories were recorded for \( 2 \times 2^w \) time steps. An illustration of this model is shown in Figure 1.

For each interaction function type \( f_{\text{type}} \), the exact mappings \( f_{\text{type},i} \) between states \( s \) and rules \( r \) was generated randomly. 5000 random mappings were created for each \( f_{\text{type}} \), and only six of these 5000 mappings were used. The six mappings were chosen based on their relative approximate complexity values (described in III)—three mappings with relatively high complexity and three mappings with relatively low complexity. Because the interaction function for \( f_{\text{mixed}} \) depends on a random choice made at each time step \( t \), the complexity could not be measured for \( f_{\text{mixed},i} \) mappings, since a static mapping does not exist. However, the exact random choice in mappings were based on the other three interaction types. For each of the interaction function types, the six individual mappings are denoted as \( i \in [0, 5] \).

III. METHODS

Both CA state trajectories were checked for apparent OEE according to Definitions 1 and 2. Algorithmic complexity (Kolmogorov-Chaitin-Solomonoff complexity) cannot be computed exactly due to the Halting Problem, but can be approximated using the Block Decomposition Method (BDM)\(^7\). This is an upper-bound approximation of the algorithmic complexity, which, in short, measures the size of the smallest computer program that can produce the string of symbols being measured\(^7\).

The BDM can be used to approximate the algorithmic complexity of 1-dimensional or 2-dimensional objects. By representing each interaction function mapping \( f_{\text{type},i} \) as an adjacency matrix, it is possible to approximate the complexity for any non-changing \( f_{\text{type},i} \). But since each interaction function mapping \( f_{\text{type},i} \) was generated randomly, this would affect the expected range of BDM values for any \( f_{\text{type},i} \). BDM is largely known for quantifying the randomness of mechanisms capable of producing an object. This was mitigated by selecting mappings with high and low BDM values relative to a batch of 5000 randomly-generated mappings.

The CA state trajectory of both CAs can be represented in two ways for the purposes of measuring the BDM. The first is to measure the BDM of each state in the state trajectory. Then the mean of the BDM values for each individual state \( s \) are calculated per CA state trajectory. The second is by enumerating all possible states for a CA of size \( w \) and measuring the BDM of the sequence of enumerated states. For \( w = 3 \), there are \( 2^w = 8 \) possible states, making it computationally tractable to measure the BDM for the entire state trajectory. For computational tractability reasons, the Python 3 package pybdm (https://pybdm.readthedocs.io/en/latest/) does not support sequences with an alphabet size over 9, thus making it possible to use pybdm to calculate the BDM for each of these measurements.

IV. RESULTS

Figure 2 shows the number of open-ended CA state trajectories (% OEE) for both CAs as a function of the different interaction function types \( f_{\text{type}} \), as defined by Definitions 1 and 2. There were no OEE state trajectories for
so that the \( t_r \) of each CA depends on the states and rules from both CA simultaneously. Then, by definition, there are no OEE state trajectories for \( f_{\text{both states}} \) since the \( t_r \) is completely determined by the dynamics of the whole system. Surprisingly, there were also no OEE state trajectories \( f_{\text{other state}} \). This is consistent with prior results\(^4\), which suggest that the open-ended evolution of a subsystem is largely dependent on self-reference—it must use its own state in \( f_{\text{type}} \) to produce open-ended behavior.

The distributions of recurrence times \( t_r \) are shown in Figure 3. If the \( t_r > 2 \times 2^w \), then \( t_r \) was denoted as \( t_r = 2 \times 2^w + 1 \), for computational simplicity. Within each \( f_{\text{type}} \), the individual mappings showed little difference in the distribution of \( t_r \). The interaction function \( f_{\text{mixed}} \) shows an exponential-like distribution.

The distributions of the mean BDM of a state within a CA state trajectory is shown in Figure 4 for each \( f_{\text{type}} \). Similarly, the distribution of the BDM for each enumerated state trajectory is show in Figure 5. These results are for CA 1, and results for CA 2 are very similar (not shown).

For \( f_{\text{this state}} \), the relationship between \% OEE and mean BDM are shown in Figures 6 and 7 for the mean BDM of states within a trajectory and the enumerated state trajectory, respectively. The average mean BDM value is separated by the six mappings \( f_{\text{this state}, i} \). The other interaction function types are not shown because either they were not able to produce OEE state trajectories, or because the BDM for the mapping could not be measured (for \( f_{\text{mixed}, i} \) mappings). Results for CA 2 are similar and are not shown.

Finally, Figures 8 and 9 show the \( f_{\text{type}, i} \) mapping BDMs vs. the mean BDM of states within a trajectory and the enumerated state trajectory, respectively, for the three \( f_{\text{type}} \) with measurable BDMs. Each panel is plotted with the same x and y range for comparison.
V. DISCUSSION

These results suggest that the complexity of an interaction rule likely has little to no effect on the complexity of the behavior of an individual CA embedded in a larger system. However, Figure 2, Figure 3, and Figure 5 strongly suggest that an interaction rule between two CAs that randomly changes its state-dependencies results in open-ended evolution, complex states, and complex state dynamics, regardless of the static mapping between states and rules it chooses from. This suggests the results for \( f_{\text{mixed}} \) are robust against the exact mapping between states and rules, and the resulting complex behavior within a CA results from the random dependencies of different parts of the entire system.

For real biological systems, such as a human gut microbiome, these results suggest that the complex evolutionary behavior of individual communities may not be a consequence of a fixed, static relationship between entities, but rather of random events from multiple parts of an entire system. While these results remain true for abstract Turing Machine-based cellular automata, they could guide data-driven empirical analyses on how communities, individuals, or other entities interact to form
FIG. 7: % OEE state trajectories vs. average BDM values of enumerated CA state trajectories for all six $f_{\text{this state},i}$ mappings.

complex behavior in real biological systems.

FIG. 8: BDM complexity values for each $f_{\text{type},i}$ mapping vs. average mean BDM values of individual states in a CA state trajectory.
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FIG. 9: BDM complexity values for each $f_{type,i}$ mapping vs. average BDM values of enumerated CA state trajectories.