

2D MOORE CA WITH NEW BOUNDARY CONDITIONS AND ITS REVERSIBILITY

B.A. OMIROV¹, SH.B. REDJEPOV², AND J.B. USMONOV³

ABSTRACT. In this paper, under certain conditions we consider two-dimensional cellular automata with the Moore neighborhood. Namely, the characterization of 2D linear cellular automata defined by the Moore neighborhood with some mixed boundary conditions over the field \mathbb{Z}_p is studied. Furthermore, we investigate the rule matrices of 2D Moore CA under some mixed boundary conditions by applying rotation. Finally, we give the conditions under which the obtained rule matrices for 2D finite CAs are reversible.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is known that a cellular automaton (CA) is a set of cells arranged in a grid of a specific shape. Each cell changes its state over time based on a predetermined set of rules determined by the states of neighboring cells. Cellular automata (CAs) have been proposed for potential applications in public-key cryptography, as well as in the fields of geography, anthropology, political science, sociology, physics, and others (refer to [1], [2], [3]). Cellular automata were studied in the early 1950s as a possible model for biological systems by J. Von Neumann and Stan Ulam ([20], [19], [21]). Two most common types of CA used by different authors are: one-dimensional CA (1D CA) and two-dimensional CA (2D CA). As a famous example of 2D CA, John Conway's Game of Life (also known simply as Life) is a two-dimensional, totalistic CA that introduces more complexity than an elementary CA, since each cell in the grid has a bigger neighborhood. It is a computation-universal CA since it can effectively emulate any CA, Turing machine, or other systems that can be translated into a system known to be universal ([7], [13]). If the grid is a linear array of cells, is called *1D CA* and if it is a rectangular or hexagonal grid of cells then it is called *2D CA*. One-dimensional cellular automata have now been investigated in several ways [22]. A CA with one central cell and four near neighborhood cells is called a *von Neumann neighborhood CA* whereas a CA having one central cell and eight near neighborhood cells is called *the Moore neighborhood CA*.

A configuration of the system is an assignment of states to all the cells. Every configuration determines the next configuration via a transition rule that is local in the sense that the state of a cell at time $(t + 1)$ depends only on the states of some of its neighbors at time t . When the transition rule is linear and under some boundary conditions there are several results (see [17]). Usually, 2D CA is considered with triangular, square, hexagonal, and pentagonal lattices (see [4], [14], [15], [16], [8]). In the paper [18] investigated the evolution of image patterns corresponding to the uniform linear rules of 2D CA with the reflexive and adiabatic boundary conditions over \mathbb{Z}_2 . Moreover, the linear rules of CA can be found to be some image copies of a given first image depending on the special boundary types. The mathematical representation of 2D finite cellular automata (CA) allows us to determine the description of the studied CA. The more critical aspect is determining the reversibility or irreversibility of these CAs. The reversibility is the important character of the CAs which characterizes the non existence of Gardens of Eden. A reversible cellular automaton is a cellular automaton in which every configuration has a unique predecessor. It has been demonstrated that determining the reversibility of cellular automata (CA) for dimensions greater than or equal to two is undecidable (see [10], [11], [14], [15], [17]). This implies that, in general, obtaining the inverse of a given cellular automaton (CA) for higher dimensions through an algorithm is unattainable due to its complex structure. Consequently, it can be observed that determining inverses or cases of reversibility for 2D finite CAs is a complex challenge in the general scenario ([6]).

In this paper, we study 2D linear CA for Moore neighbors on the square lattice. Since the local rule is a linear function, we obtain transition rules as matrices. Then we investigated CA under new

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37B15, 68Q80.

Key words and phrases. Cellular Automata; Boundary conditions; Rule matrix; Reversibility.

types of boundary conditions with the p-state spin value case, i.e., over the field \mathbb{Z}_p . We obtain the transition rule matrices of the Moore finite CA over some mixed boundary conditions. Then we give the algorithm for computing the rank of obtained rule matrices for the Moore neighborhood. Finally, we give the conditions under which the obtained rule matrices of 2D finite CAs are reversible.

2. PRELIMINARY

The 2D finite CA consists of $m \times n$ cells arranged in m rows and n columns, where each cell takes one of the values of the field \mathbb{Z}_p . From now on, we will denote 2D finite CA order to $m \times n$ by 2D $CA_{m \times n}$. A configuration of the system is an assignment of the states to all cells. Every configuration determines a next configuration via a linear transition rule that is local in the sense that the state of a cell at time $(t + 1)$ depends only on the states of some of its neighbors at the time t using modulo p algebra.




FIGURE 1. von Neumann and Moore neighborhoods

2.1. The von Neumann and Moore neighborhood on CA lattice. In 2D CA's theory, there are some classic types of neighborhoods, but in this paper we only restrict ourselves to the Moore neighborhood. This neighborhood was used in the well known Conway's Game of Life. It is similar to the notion of 8-connected pixels in computer graphics. In Figure 1, we illustrate the von Neumann and Moore neighborhoods. The von Neumann neighborhood the center cell is surrounded by four square cells (see Figure 1 (left)). The Moore neighborhood comprises eight square cells which surround the center cell $x_{(i;j)}$ (see Figure 1 (right)). From now on, we deal only with Moore neighborhood. Then the state $x_{i;j}^{(t+1)}$ of the cell $(i;j)$ th at time $(t + 1)$ is defined by the local rule function $\Psi : \mathbb{Z}_p^8 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$ as follows:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} x_{i;j}^{(t+1)} &= \Psi(x_{i-1,j-1}, x_{i-1,j}, x_{i-1,j+1}, x_{i,j+1}, x_{i+1,j+1}, x_{i+1,j}, x_{i+1,j-1}, x_{i,j-1}) \\ &= ax_{i-1,j-1}^{(t)} + bx_{i-1,j}^{(t)} + cx_{i-1,j+1}^{(t)} + dx_{i,j+1}^{(t)} + ex_{i+1,j+1}^{(t)} + fx_{i+1,j}^{(t)} \\ &\quad + gx_{i+1,j-1}^{(t)} + hx_{i,j-1}^{(t)} \pmod{p} \end{aligned}$$

where $a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h \in \mathbb{Z}_p^* = \mathbb{Z}_p \setminus \{0\}$

The value of each cell for the next state may not depend upon all eight neighbors.

Remark 2.1. If we assume $a = c = e = g = 0$, then all obtained above results hold for von Neumann neighborhood.

Note that it is impossible to simulate a truly infinite lattice on a computer (unless the active region always remains finite). Therefore, we have to prescribe some boundary conditions (BC). Regarding the neighborhood of the boundary cells, four approaches exist:

- If the boundary cells are connected to 0-state, then CA is called *null boundary (NB) CA* (see Table 1).
- If the boundary cells are adjacent to each other, then CA is called *periodic boundary (PB) CA* (see Table 2).
- An *Adiabatic Boundary (AB) CA* is duplicating the value of the cell in an extra virtual neighbor (see Table 3).
- A *Reflexive Boundary (RB) CA* is designed for the value of the left and right neighbors to be equal concerning the boundary cell (see Table 4).

TABLE 1. Null boundary condition on a 2D finite $CA_{3 \times 3}$.

0	0	0	0	0
0	$x^{(i-1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j)}$	$x^{(i-1,j+1)}$	0
0	$x^{(i,j-1)}$	$x^{(i,j)}$	$x^{(i,j+1)}$	0
0	$x^{(i+1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j)}$	$x^{(i+1,j+1)}$	0
0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 2. Periodic boundary condition on a 2D finite $CA_{3 \times 3}$.

$x^{(i+1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j)}$	$x^{(i+1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j-1)}$
$x^{(i-1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j)}$	$x^{(i-1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j-1)}$
$x^{(i,j+1)}$	$x^{(i,j-1)}$	$x^{(i,j)}$	$x^{(i,j+1)}$	$x^{(i,j-1)}$
$x^{(i+1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j)}$	$x^{(i+1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j-1)}$
$x^{(i-1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j)}$	$x^{(i-1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j-1)}$

TABLE 3. Adiabatic boundary condition on a 2D finite $CA_{3 \times 3}$.

$x^{(i-1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j)}$	$x^{(i-1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j+1)}$
$x^{(i-1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j)}$	$x^{(i-1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j+1)}$
$x^{(i,j-1)}$	$x^{(i,j-1)}$	$x^{(i,j)}$	$x^{(i,j+1)}$	$x^{(i,j+1)}$
$x^{(i+1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j)}$	$x^{(i+1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j+1)}$
$x^{(i+1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j)}$	$x^{(i+1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j+1)}$

TABLE 4. Reflexive boundary condition on a 2D finite $CA_{3 \times 3}$.

$x^{(i,j)}$	$x^{(i,j-1)}$	$x^{(i,j)}$	$x^{(i,j+1)}$	$x^{(i,j)}$
$x^{(i-1,j)}$	$x^{(i-1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j)}$	$x^{(i-1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i-1,j)}$
$x^{(i,j)}$	$x^{(i,j-1)}$	$x^{(i,j)}$	$x^{(i,j+1)}$	$x^{(i,j)}$
$x^{(i+1,j)}$	$x^{(i+1,j-1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j)}$	$x^{(i+1,j+1)}$	$x^{(i+1,j)}$
$x^{(i,j)}$	$x^{(i,j-1)}$	$x^{(i,j)}$	$x^{(i,j+1)}$	$x^{(i,j)}$

3. THE RULE MATRIX OF MOORE CA AND MIXED BOUNDARY CONDITION ASSOCIATED WITH NON-BIJECTIVE MAP

Now, we can study the rule matrix under null boundary conditions. In order to characterize the corresponding rule, first we represent each matrix of size $m \times n$ as a column vector of size $mn \times 1$. If the same rule is applied to all the cells in each evaluation, then those CA is called *uniform or regular*. Throughout the paper we deal with uniform CA.

Thus, the problem of finding a rule matrix of the corresponding rule is taken from the space of $m \times n$ matrices to the space of \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn} . In order to describe this problem more detailly we define the following map:

$$\Phi: \mathbf{M}_{m \times n}(\mathbb{Z}_p) \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}_{mn \times 1}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$$

which takes the t -th state $X^{(t)}$ given by

$$(3.1) \quad C(t) := \begin{pmatrix} x_{11}^{(t)} & x_{12}^{(t)} & \cdots & x_{1n}^{(t)} \\ x_{21}^{(t)} & x_{22}^{(t)} & \cdots & x_{2n}^{(t)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_{m1}^{(t)} & x_{m2}^{(t)} & \cdots & x_{mn}^{(t)} \end{pmatrix} \longrightarrow X^{(t)} := (x_{11}^{(t)}, \dots, x_{1n}^{(t)}, \dots, x_{m1}^{(t)}, \dots, x_{mn}^{(t)})^T.$$

where the superscript T denotes the transpose and $\mathbf{M}_{m \times n}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ is the set of matrices with entries $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$.

Thus, local rules will be assumed to act on \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn} rather than $\mathbf{M}_{m \times n}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. The matrix $C(t)$ is called *the configuration matrix (or information matrix)* of the 2-D finite CA at the time t and $C(0)$ is the initial information matrix of the 2-D finite CA. Therefore, one can conclude that $\Phi(C(t)) = X^{(t)}$.

Using the identification (3.1), we can define

$$T_R \cdot X^{(t)} = X^{(t+1)} \pmod{p}.$$

This matrix T_R is called *the rule matrix of 2D CA* such that T_R operating on the current CA state $X^{(t)}$ generates the next state $X^{(t+1)}$.

Let $e_{i,j} \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times n}(\mathbb{Z}_p^*)$ be the matrix units. Consider the following two sets:

$$X = \{e_{i,j}, 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m\},$$

$$Y = \{e_{0,i}, e_{m+1,i}, e_{j,0}, e_{j,n+1}, 0 \leq i \leq n, 0 \leq j \leq m\}.$$

We define $\alpha, \eta, \pi, \rho: Y \rightarrow X$ mappings by the boundary conditions in the tables 1, 2, 3 and 4. Namely, α is adiabatic BC, η is null BC, π is periodic BC and ρ is reflexive BC.

Now consider a mapping $\varphi: \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ where $\Gamma = \{\alpha, \eta, \pi, \rho\}$. Then we study the CA under boundary conditions that depends on the mapping φ . In other words, the boundary cells are evaluated depending upon $\varphi(x)$, $x \in \Gamma$ (see Figure 2). In the paper [9] for the bijective function φ the characterization problem of 2D finite von Neumann CA is completely solved. Let us define $\phi, \psi, \tau, \sigma, \lambda$, and ξ are non-bijective maps on Γ as

$$(3.2) \quad \phi(\alpha) = \phi(\rho) = \eta, \quad \phi(\eta) = \phi(\pi) = \rho,$$

$$(3.3) \quad \psi(\alpha) = \psi(\rho) = \eta, \quad \psi(\eta) = \psi(\pi) = \pi,$$

$$(3.4) \quad \tau(\alpha) = \tau(\rho) = \eta, \quad \tau(\eta) = \tau(\pi) = \alpha,$$

$$(3.5) \quad \sigma(\alpha) = \sigma(\rho) = \rho, \quad \sigma(\eta) = \sigma(\pi) = \alpha,$$

$$(3.6) \quad \lambda(\alpha) = \lambda(\rho) = \rho, \quad \lambda(\eta) = \lambda(\pi) = \pi,$$

$$(3.7) \quad \xi(\alpha) = \xi(\rho) = \pi, \quad \xi(\eta) = \xi(\pi) = \alpha,$$

where each map describes some mixed boundary condition for the finite 2D CA.

Note that if we consider Moore neighborhood under the condition (3.2) there is ambiguity with setting boundary condition in the cells $x_{0,n+1}$, $x_{m+1,0}$. In order to distinguish this unclearness on the condition (3.2) we define *strong left null* and *strong right reflexive* boundary conditions for those cells, i.e. there is null boundary condition in the cells $x_{0,n+1}$ and $x_{0,n}$, also the cells $x_{m+1,0}$ and $x_{m+1,1}$ have reflexive boundary condition. Later this progress carries out for the boundary conditions (3.3), (3.4), (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7).




FIGURE 2. Mixing boundary condition

To establish the transition rule matrix T_R structure, it is needed to specify the action of T_R on the basis matrices $e_{i,j}$, respectively. Firstly, let us take the linear transition T_R from $m \times n$ matrix space structure to itself. The images $T_R(e_{i,j})$ of $e_{i,j}$ are connected to the four nearest neighbor elements considering the Moore neighborhood. Note that the boundary condition ϕ does not play role for non-border cells. Hence, $T_R(e_{i,j})$ elements are equal to a linear sum of its eight neighbor elements. Thus, for non-border elements we have

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} T_R(e_{i,j}) &= ae_{i-1,j-1} + be_{i-1,j} + ce_{i-1,j+1} + de_{i,j+1} + ee_{i+1,j+1} \\ &\quad + fe_{i+1,j} + ge_{i+1,j-1} + he_{i,j-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we define the action of T_R on the border elements. All border cells have three neighbors out of the configuration, but we should define what is the boundary condition in the neighbor cells $e_{0,0}, e_{0,n+1}, e_{m+1,0}, e_{m+1,n+1}$ of $e_{1,1}, e_{1,n}, e_{m,1}, e_{m,n}$ out of the configuration. Without loss of generality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T_R^\phi(e_{1,1}) &= de_{1,2} + ee_{2,2} + fe_{2,1}, \\ T_R^\phi(e_{1,n}) &= (h+d)e_{1,n-1} + (e+g)e_{2,n-1} + fe_{2,n}, \\ T_R^\phi(e_{m,1}) &= (b+f)e_{m-1,1} + (c+e+g)e_{m-1,2} + de_{m,2}, \\ T_R^\phi(e_{m,n}) &= (a+c+e+g)e_{m-1,n-1} + (b+f)e_{m-1,n} + (d+h)e_{m,n-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

Moreover, the border elements excepting $e_{1,1}, e_{1,n}, e_{m,1}, e_{m,n}$ have three neighbors out of the configuration. Thus, we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned} T_R^\phi(e_{1,i}) &= de_{1,i+1} + ee_{2,i+1} + fe_{2,i} + ge_{2,i-1} + he_{1,i-1}, \\ T_R^\phi(e_{m,i}) &= (a+g)e_{m-1,i-1} + (b+f)e_{m-1,i} + (c+e)e_{m-1,i+1} \\ &\quad + de_{m,i+1} + he_{m,i-1}, \\ T_R^\phi(e_{j,1}) &= be_{j-1,1} + ce_{j-1,2} + de_{j,2} + ee_{j+1,2} + fe_{j+1,1}, \\ T_R^\phi(e_{j,n}) &= (a+c)e_{j-1,n-1} + be_{j-1,n} + (d+h)e_{j,n-1} \\ &\quad + (e+g)e_{j+1,n-1} + fe_{j+1,n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $2 \leq i \leq n-1$, $2 \leq j \leq m-1$ and $a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

Set

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$A = dP + hQ, \quad B = fI + eP + gQ, \quad C = bI + cP + aQ,$$

where $P, Q, I \in \mathbf{M}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, I is the identity matrix and $a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$.

Let ϕ be the function in (3.2), then the following result is true.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $T_R^\phi: \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn}$ be the rule matrix which takes the finite Moore CA over the configuration $C(t)$ of order $m \times n$ to the configuration $C(t+1)$ under the boundary condition of ϕ . Then T_R^ϕ has the following matrix form:*

$$(3.9) \quad T_R^\phi = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & B_1 & O & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ C_1 & A_1 & B_1 & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ O & C_1 & A_1 & B_1 & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & C_1 & A_1 & B_1 \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & O & D_1 & A_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $A_1 = A + d\epsilon_{n,n-1}$, $B_1 = B + e\epsilon_{n,n-1}$, $C_1 = C + c\epsilon_{n,n-1}$, $D_1 = B + C + (c+e)\epsilon_{n,n-1} + g\epsilon_{1,2}$, $O, \epsilon_{1,2}, \epsilon_{n,n-1} \in \mathbf{M}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, O is the zero matrix and $\epsilon_{1,2}, \epsilon_{n,n-1}$ are unit matrices.

$$\begin{aligned}
T_R^\psi(e_{m,n}) &= ae_{m-1,n-1} + be_{m-1,n} + ce_{m-1,1} + de_{m,1} + ee_{1,1} + fe_{1,n} + ge_{1,n-1} + he_{m,n-1}, \\
T_R^\psi(e_{1,i}) &= de_{1,i+1} + ee_{2,i+1} + fe_{2,i} + ge_{2,i-1} + he_{1,i-1}, \\
T_R^\psi(e_{m,i}) &= ae_{m-1,i-1} + be_{m-1,i} + ce_{m-1,i+1} + de_{m,i+1} + ee_{1,i+1} + fe_{1,i} + ge_{1,i-1} + he_{m,i-1}, \\
T_R^\psi(e_{j,1}) &= be_{j-1,1} + ce_{j-1,2} + de_{j,2} + ee_{j+1,2} + fe_{j+1,1}, \\
T_R^\psi(e_{j,n}) &= ae_{j-1,n-1} + be_{j-1,n} + ce_{j-1,1} + de_{j,1} + ee_{j+1,1} + fe_{j+1,n} + ge_{j+1,n-1} + he_{j,n-1};
\end{aligned}$$

- the case of τ :

$$\begin{aligned}
T_R^\tau(e_{1,1}) &= de_{1,2} + ee_{2,2} + fe_{2,1}, \\
T_R^\tau(e_{1,n}) &= de_{1,n} + (e+f)e_{2,n} + ge_{2,n-1} + he_{1,n-1}, \\
T_R^\tau(e_{m,1}) &= be_{m-1,1} + ce_{m-1,2} + (d+e)e_{m,2} + (f+g)e_{m,1}, \\
T_R^\tau(e_{m,n}) &= ae_{m-1,n-1} + (b+c)e_{m-1,n} + (d+e+f)e_{m,n} + (g+h)e_{m,n-1}, \\
T_R^\tau(e_{1,i}) &= de_{1,i+1} + ee_{2,i+1} + fe_{2,i} + ge_{2,i-1} + he_{1,i-1}, \\
T_R^\tau(e_{m,i}) &= ae_{m-1,i-1} + be_{m-1,i} + ce_{m-1,i+1} + (d+e)e_{m,i+1} + fe_{m,i} + (g+h)e_{m,i-1}, \\
T_R^\tau(e_{j,1}) &= be_{j-1,1} + ce_{j-1,2} + de_{j,2} + ee_{j+1,2} + fe_{j+1,1}, \\
T_R^\tau(e_{j,n}) &= ae_{j-1,n-1} + (b+c)e_{j-1,n} + de_{j,n} + (e+f)e_{j+1,n} + ge_{j+1,n-1} + he_{j,n-1};
\end{aligned}$$

- the case of σ :

$$\begin{aligned}
T_R^\sigma(e_{1,1}) &= (a+c+e+g)e_{2,2} + (b+f)e_{2,1} + (h+d)e_{1,2}, \\
T_R^\sigma(e_{1,n}) &= (a+c+g)e_{2,n-1} + (b+e+f)e_{2,n} + de_{1,n} + he_{1,n-1}, \\
T_R^\sigma(e_{m,1}) &= (a+c)e_{m-1,2} + be_{m-1,1} + (d+e+h)e_{m,2} + (f+g)e_{m,1}, \\
T_R^\sigma(e_{m,n}) &= ae_{m-1,n-1} + (b+c)e_{m-1,n} + (d+e+f)e_{m,n} + (g+h)e_{m,n-1}, \\
T_R^\sigma(e_{1,i}) &= (a+g)e_{2,i-1} + (b+f)e_{2,i} + (c+e)e_{2,i+1} + de_{1,i+1} + he_{1,i-1}, \\
T_R^\sigma(e_{m,i}) &= ae_{m-1,i-1} + be_{m-1,i} + ce_{m-1,i+1} + (d+e)e_{m,i+1} + fe_{m,i} + (g+h)e_{m,i-1}, \\
T_R^\sigma(e_{j,1}) &= (a+c)e_{j-1,2} + be_{j-1,1} + (d+h)e_{j,2} + (e+g)e_{j+1,2} + fe_{j+1,1}, \\
T_R^\sigma(e_{j,n}) &= ae_{j-1,n-1} + (b+c)e_{j-1,n} + de_{j,n} + (e+f)e_{j+1,n} + ge_{j+1,n-1} + he_{j,n-1};
\end{aligned}$$

- the case of λ :

$$\begin{aligned}
T_R^\lambda(e_{1,1}) &= (a+c+e+g)e_{2,2} + (b+f)e_{2,1} + (h+d)e_{1,2}, \\
T_R^\lambda(e_{1,n}) &= (a+c+g)e_{2,n-1} + (b+f)e_{2,n} + de_{1,1} + ee_{1,2} + he_{1,n-1}, \\
T_R^\lambda(e_{m,1}) &= (a+c)e_{m-1,2} + be_{m-1,1} + (d+h)e_{m,2} + ee_{1,2} + fe_{1,1} + ge_{1,n}, \\
T_R^\lambda(e_{m,n}) &= ae_{m-1,n-1} + be_{m-1,n} + ce_{m-1,1} + de_{m,1} + ee_{1,1} + fe_{1,n} + ge_{1,n-1} + he_{m,n-1}, \\
T_R^\lambda(e_{1,i}) &= (a+g)e_{2,i-1} + (b+f)e_{2,i} + (c+e)e_{2,i+1} + de_{1,i+1} + he_{1,i-1}, \\
T_R^\lambda(e_{m,i}) &= ae_{m-1,i-1} + be_{m-1,i} + ce_{m-1,i+1} + de_{m,i+1} + ee_{1,i+1} + fe_{1,i} + ge_{1,i-1} + he_{m,i-1}, \\
T_R^\lambda(e_{j,1}) &= (a+c)e_{j-1,2} + be_{j-1,1} + (d+h)e_{j,2} + (e+g)e_{j+1,2} + fe_{j+1,1}, \\
T_R^\lambda(e_{j,n}) &= ae_{j-1,n-1} + be_{j-1,n} + ce_{j-1,1} + de_{j,1} + ee_{j+1,1} + fe_{j+1,n} + ge_{j+1,n-1} + he_{j,n-1};
\end{aligned}$$

- the case of ξ :

$$\begin{aligned}
T_R^\xi(e_{1,1}) &= ae_{m,n} + be_{m,1} + ce_{m,2} + de_{1,2} + ee_{2,2} + fe_{2,1} + ge_{2,n} + he_{1,n}, \\
T_R^\xi(e_{1,n}) &= ae_{m,n-1} + be_{m,n} + ce_{m,1} + de_{1,n} + (e+f)e_{2,n} + ge_{2,n-1} + he_{1,n-1}, \\
T_R^\xi(e_{m,1}) &= ae_{m-1,n} + be_{m-1,1} + ce_{m-1,2} + (d+e)e_{m,2} + (f+g)e_{m,1} + he_{m,n}, \\
T_R^\xi(e_{m,n}) &= ae_{m-1,n-1} + (b+c)e_{m-1,n} + (d+e+f)e_{m,n} + (g+h)e_{m,n-1}, \\
T_R^\xi(e_{1,i}) &= ae_{m,i-1} + be_{m,i} + ce_{m,i+1} + de_{1,i+1} + ee_{2,i+1} + fe_{2,i} + ge_{2,i-1} + he_{1,i-1}, \\
T_R^\xi(e_{m,i}) &= ae_{m-1,i-1} + be_{m-1,i} + ce_{m-1,i+1} + (d+e)e_{m,i+1} + fe_{m,i} + (g+h)e_{m,i-1}, \\
T_R^\xi(e_{j,1}) &= ae_{j-1,n} + be_{j-1,1} + ce_{j-1,2} + de_{j,2} + ee_{j+1,2} + fe_{j+1,1} + ge_{j+1,n} + he_{j,n}, \\
T_R^\xi(e_{j,n}) &= ae_{j-1,n-1} + (b+c)e_{j-1,n} + de_{j,n} + (e+f)e_{j+1,n} + ge_{j+1,n-1} + he_{j,n-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where $2 \leq i \leq n-1$, $2 \leq j \leq m-1$ and $a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

Applying the above forms of matrix rule we give the following theorem without proof.

Theorem 3.2. *Let the boundary conditions generated by ψ , τ , σ , λ and ξ . Then T_R^ψ , T_R^τ , T_R^σ , T_R^λ and T_R^ξ have the following matrix forms:*

$$T_R^\psi = \begin{pmatrix} A_{np} & B_{np} & O & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ C_{np} & A_{np} & B_{np} & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ O & C_{np} & A_{np} & B_{np} & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & C_{np} & A_{np} & B_{np} \\ D_{np} & O & O & O & \dots & O & C_{np} & A_{np} \end{pmatrix}, \quad T_R^\tau = \begin{pmatrix} A_{na} & B_{na} & O & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ C_{na} & A_{na} & B_{na} & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ O & C_{na} & A_{na} & B_{na} & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & C_{na} & A_{na} & B_{na} \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & O & C_{na} & D_{na} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$T_R^\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} A_{ra} & E_{ra} & O & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ C_{ra} & A_{ra} & B_{ra} & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ O & C_{ra} & A_{ra} & B_{ra} & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & C_{ra} & A_{ra} & B_{ra} \\ D_{ra} & O & O & O & \dots & O & C_{ra} & A_{ra} \end{pmatrix}, \quad T_R^\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} F_{rp} & E_{rp} & O & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ C_{rp} & A_{rp} & B_{rp} & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ O & C_{rp} & A_{rp} & B_{rp} & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & C_{rp} & A_{rp} & B_{rp} \\ D_{rp} & O & O & O & \dots & O & C_{rp} & A_{rp} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$T_R^\xi = \begin{pmatrix} A_{pa} & B_{pa} & O & O & \dots & O & O & E_{pa} \\ C_{pa} & A_{pa} & B_{pa} & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ O & C_{pa} & A_{pa} & B_{pa} & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & C_{pa} & A_{pa} & B_{pa} \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & O & C_{pa} & D_{pa} \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{np} &= A + d\epsilon_{n,1}, & B_{np} &= B + e\epsilon_{n,1}, \\ C_{np} &= C + c\epsilon_{n,1}, & D_{np} &= B + e\epsilon_{n,1} + g\epsilon_{1,n}, \\ A_{na} &= A + d\epsilon_{n,n}, & B_{na} &= B + e\epsilon_{n,n}, \\ C_{na} &= C + c\epsilon_{n,n}, & D_{na} &= A + B + g\epsilon_{1,1} + (d + e)\epsilon_{n,n}, \\ A_{ra} &= A + h\epsilon_{1,2} + d\epsilon_{n,n}, & B_{ra} &= B + g\epsilon_{1,2} + e\epsilon_{n,n}, \\ C_{ra} &= C + a\epsilon_{1,2} + c\epsilon_{n,n}, & D_{ra} &= A + B + g\epsilon_{1,1} + h\epsilon_{1,2} + (d + e)\epsilon_{n,n}, \\ A_{rp} &= A + h\epsilon_{1,2} + d\epsilon_{n,1}, & B_{rp} &= B + g\epsilon_{1,2} + e\epsilon_{n,1}, \\ C_{rp} &= C + a\epsilon_{1,2} + c\epsilon_{n,1}, & D_{rp} &= B + e\epsilon_{n,1} + g\epsilon_{1,n}, \\ F_{rp} &= A + h\epsilon_{1,2} + d\epsilon_{n,1} + e\epsilon_{n,2}, & E_{rp} &= B + C + (a + g)\epsilon_{1,2} + c\epsilon_{n,n-1} + e\epsilon_{n,n}, \\ A_{pa} &= A + h\epsilon_{1,n} + d\epsilon_{n,n}, & B_{pa} &= B + g\epsilon_{1,n} + e\epsilon_{n,n}, \\ C_{pa} &= C + a\epsilon_{1,n} + c\epsilon_{n,n}, & D_{pa} &= A + B + g\epsilon_{1,1} + h\epsilon_{1,n} + (d + e)\epsilon_{n,n}, \\ E_{pa} &= C + a\epsilon_{1,n} + c\epsilon_{n,1}, & E_{ra} &= B + C + (a + g)\epsilon_{1,2} + c\epsilon_{n,n-1} + e\epsilon_{n,n}. \end{aligned}$$


where O , $\epsilon_{1,1}$, $\epsilon_{1,2}$, $\epsilon_{1,n}$, $\epsilon_{n,1}$, $\epsilon_{n,n-1}$, $\epsilon_{n,n} \in \mathbf{M}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, O is the zero matrix and $\epsilon_{1,1}$, $\epsilon_{1,2}$, $\epsilon_{1,n}$, $\epsilon_{n,1}$, $\epsilon_{n,n-1}$, $\epsilon_{n,n}$ are unit matrices.

3.1. The rule matrices for boundary conditions by rotating ϕ on the lattice. In this subsection, we consider the rule matrices the boundary conditions generated by rotating φ (more precisely, for the case ϕ) on the lattice. We distinguish the following 4 cases: $\phi \equiv \phi_{0^\circ}$, ϕ_{90° , ϕ_{180° , ϕ_{270° .

After rotate to 90° degrees of the function ϕ on the lattice(see Figure 3) then we define

$$\phi_{90^\circ}(\alpha) = \phi_{90^\circ}(\eta) = \eta, \quad \phi_{90^\circ}(\rho) = \phi_{90^\circ}(\pi) = \rho.$$

Above we have defined *strong left null* and *strong right reflexive* for the cells $x_{0,n+1}$, $x_{m+1,0}$. If we consider ϕ_{90° then ambiguity with defining boundary conditions in the cells $x_{0,n+1}$, $x_{m+1,0}$ moves to $x_{0,0}$, $x_{m+1,n+1}$. That is why, we define the conditions *strong up null* and *strong down reflexive* in the cells $x_{m+1,n+1}$ and $x_{0,0}$, respectively. Therefore, reflexive condition acts in the cell $x_{0,0}$ and there is null condition in $x_{m+1,n+1}$. Then we conclude

FIGURE 3. The mixed boundary conditions by rotating 90° the functions ϕ .

$$\begin{aligned}
T_R^{\phi_{90^\circ}}(e_{1,1}) &= (a + g + e)e_{2,2} + (d + h)e_{1,2} + fe_{2,1}, \\
T_R^{\phi_{90^\circ}}(e_{1,n}) &= fe_{2,n} + ge_{2,n-1} + he_{1,n-1}, \\
T_R^{\phi_{90^\circ}}(e_{m,1}) &= (a + c + e + g)e_{m-1,2} + (b + f)e_{m-1,1} + (d + h)e_{m,2}, \\
T_R^{\phi_{90^\circ}}(e_{m,n}) &= (a + g)e_{m-1,n-1} + (b + f)e_{m-1,n} + he_{m,n-1}, \\
T_R^{\phi_{90^\circ}}(e_{1,i}) &= de_{1,i+1} + ee_{2,i+1} + fe_{2,i} + ge_{2,i-1} + he_{1,i-1}, \\
T_R^{\phi_{90^\circ}}(e_{m,i}) &= (a + g)e_{m-1,i-1} + (b + f)e_{m-1,i} + (c + e)e_{m-1,i+1} + de_{m,i+1} \\
&\quad + he_{m,i-1}, \\
T_R^{\phi_{90^\circ}}(e_{j,1}) &= (a + c)e_{j-1,2} + be_{j-1,1} + (d + h)e_{j,2} + (e + g)e_{j+1,2} + fe_{j+1,1}, \\
T_R^{\phi_{90^\circ}}(e_{j,n}) &= ae_{j-1,n-1} + be_{j-1,n} + fe_{j+1,n} + ge_{j+1,n-1} + he_{j,n-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where $2 \leq i \leq n - 1$, $2 \leq j \leq m - 1$ and $a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

For non-border elements $T_R(e_{i,j})$ is computed as in (3.8). The following theorem forms the transition rule matrix $T_R^{\phi_{90^\circ}}$.

Theorem 3.3. Let $T_R^{\phi_{90^\circ}} : \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn}$ be the rule matrix which takes the finite Moore CA over the configuration $C(t)$ of order $m \times n$ to the configuration $C(t + 1)$ under the boundary condition of ϕ_{90° . Then $T_R^{\phi_{90^\circ}}$ has the following matrix form:

$$(3.10) \quad T_R^{\phi_{90^\circ}} = \begin{pmatrix} A_2 & F_2 & O & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ C_2 & A_2 & B_2 & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ O & C_2 & A_2 & B_2 & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & C_2 & A_2 & B_2 \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & O & D_2 & A_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $A_2 = A + h\epsilon_{1,2}$, $B_2 = B + g\epsilon_{1,2}$, $C_2 = C + a\epsilon_{1,2}$, $D_2 = B + C + (a + g)\epsilon_{1,2}$, $F_2 = B + (a + g)\epsilon_{1,2}$, $O, \epsilon_{1,2} \in \mathbf{M}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, with O is the zero matrix and $\epsilon_{1,2}$ is a unit matrix.

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1. \square

Now we shall consider rotation to 180° degrees of the function ϕ on the lattice as

$$\phi_{180^\circ}(\eta) = \phi_{180^\circ}(\pi) = \eta, \quad \phi_{180^\circ}(\alpha) = \phi_{180^\circ}(\rho) = \rho.$$

If we consider rotating to 180° degrees for the matrices $P, Q, I, \epsilon_{1,2}, \epsilon_{n,n-1}$ and the parameters $a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(P) &= Q, & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(Q) &= P, & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(I) &= I, \\ \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(\epsilon_{1,2}) &= \epsilon_{n,n-1}, & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(\epsilon_{n,n-1}) &= \epsilon_{1,2}, & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(d) &= h, \\ \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(h) &= d, & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(e) &= a, & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(g) &= c, \\ \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(f) &= b, & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(a) &= e, & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(c) &= g, \\ \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(b) &= f. \end{aligned}$$

TABLE 5. Situation of parameters of the function ϕ on the boundary cells.

a	b	c	→	e	f	g
h		d		d		h
g	f	e		c	b	a

By above denotations we can give the following theorem.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $T_R^{\phi_{180^\circ}} : \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn}$ be the rule matrix which takes the finite Moore CA over the configuration $C(t)$ of order $m \times n$ to the configuration $C(t+1)$ under the boundary condition of ϕ_{180° . Then $T_R^{\phi_{180^\circ}}$ has the following matrix form:*

$$(3.11) \quad T_R^{\phi_{180^\circ}} = \begin{pmatrix} A_3 & D_3 & O & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ C_3 & A_3 & B_3 & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ O & C_3 & A_3 & B_3 & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & C_3 & A_3 & B_3 \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & O & C_3 & A_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $A_3 = A + h\epsilon_{1,2}$, $B_3 = B + g\epsilon_{1,2}$, $C_3 = C + a\epsilon_{1,2}$, $D_3 = B + C + (a + g)\epsilon_{1,2} + ce_{n,n-1}$, $O, \epsilon_{1,2}, \epsilon_{n,n-1} \in \mathbf{M}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, O is the zero matrix and $\epsilon_{1,2}, \epsilon_{n,n-1}$ are unit matrices.

Proof. First let us rotate the matrix with blocks then we rotate each block matrices A_1, B_1, C_1, D_1 .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(T_R^\phi) &= \text{rot}^{180^\circ} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & B_1 & O & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ C_1 & A_1 & B_1 & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ O & C_1 & A_1 & B_1 & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & C_1 & A_1 & B_1 \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & O & D_1 & A_1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(A_1) & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(D_1) & \dots & O & & O & & O \\ \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(B_1) & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(A_1) & \dots & O & & O & & O \\ O & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(B_1) & \dots & O & & O & & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ O & O & \dots & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(B_1) & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(A_1) & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(C_1) & & \\ O & O & \dots & O & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(B_1) & \text{rot}^{180^\circ}(A_1) & & \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we compute $\text{rot}^{180^\circ}(A_1)$, $\text{rot}^{180^\circ}(B_1)$, $\text{rot}^{180^\circ}(C_1)$ and $\text{rot}^{180^\circ}(D_1)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
rot^{180^\circ}(A_1) &= rot^{180^\circ}(A + d\epsilon_{n,n-1}) = rot^{180^\circ}(dP + hQ + d\epsilon_{n,n-1}) \\
&= rot^{180^\circ}(dP) + rot^{180^\circ}(hQ) + rot^{180^\circ}(d\epsilon_{n,n-1}) \\
&= rot^{180^\circ}(d)rot^{180^\circ}(P) + rot^{180^\circ}(h)rot^{180^\circ}(Q) \\
&\quad + rot^{180^\circ}(d)rot^{180^\circ}(\epsilon_{n,n-1}) = hQ + dP + h\epsilon_{1,2} = A + h\epsilon_{1,2} = A_3,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
rot^{180^\circ}(B_1) &= rot^{180^\circ}(B + e\epsilon_{n,n-1}) = rot^{180^\circ}(fI + eP + gQ + e\epsilon_{n,n-1}) \\
&= rot^{180^\circ}(fI) + rot^{180^\circ}(eP) + rot^{180^\circ}(gQ) + rot^{180^\circ}(e\epsilon_{n,n-1}) \\
&= rot^{180^\circ}(f)rot^{180^\circ}(I) + rot^{180^\circ}(e)rot^{180^\circ}(P) + rot^{180^\circ}(g)rot^{180^\circ}(Q) \\
&\quad + rot^{180^\circ}(e)rot^{180^\circ}(\epsilon_{n,n-1}) = bI + aQ + cP + a\epsilon_{1,2} = C + a\epsilon_{1,2} \\
&= C_3,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
rot^{180^\circ}(C_1) &= rot^{180^\circ}(C + c\epsilon_{n,n-1}) = rot^{180^\circ}(bI + aQ + cP + c\epsilon_{n,n-1}) \\
&= rot^{180^\circ}(bI) + rot^{180^\circ}(aQ) + rot^{180^\circ}(cP) + rot^{180^\circ}(c\epsilon_{n,n-1}) \\
&= rot^{180^\circ}(b)rot^{180^\circ}(I) + rot^{180^\circ}(a)rot^{180^\circ}(Q) + rot^{180^\circ}(c)rot^{180^\circ}(P) \\
&\quad + rot^{180^\circ}(c)rot^{180^\circ}(\epsilon_{n,n-1}) \\
&= fI + eP + gQ + g\epsilon_{1,2} = B + a\epsilon_{1,2} = B_3,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
rot^{180^\circ}(D_1) &= rot^{180^\circ}(B + C + (c + e)\epsilon_{n,n-1} + g\epsilon_{1,2}) = rot^{180^\circ}(B) + rot^{180^\circ}(C) \\
&\quad + rot^{180^\circ}((c + e)\epsilon_{n,n-1}) + rot^{180^\circ}(g\epsilon_{1,2}) = C + B \\
&\quad + rot^{180^\circ}(c + e)rot^{180^\circ}(\epsilon_{n,n-1}) + rot^{180^\circ}(g)rot^{180^\circ}(\epsilon_{1,2}) \\
&= C + B + (a + g)\epsilon_{1,2} + c\epsilon_{n,n-1} = D_3.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the matrix has the form

$$\begin{pmatrix}
A_3 & D_3 & O & O & \dots & O & O & O \\
B_3 & A_3 & C_3 & O & \dots & O & O & O \\
O & B_3 & A_3 & C_3 & \dots & O & O & O \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
O & O & O & O & \dots & B_3 & A_3 & C_3 \\
O & O & O & O & \dots & O & B_3 & A_3
\end{pmatrix}.$$

□

By rotating 270° the function ϕ we obtain the following results similar those given above.

Theorem 3.5. Let $T_R^{\phi_{270^\circ}} : \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn}$ be the rule matrix which takes the finite Moore CA over the configuration $C(t)$ of order $m \times n$ to the configuration $C(t + 1)$ under the boundary condition of $rot^{270^\circ}(\phi(\alpha)) = rot^{270^\circ}(\phi(\rho)) = \eta$, $rot^{270^\circ}(\phi(\theta)) = rot^{270^\circ}(\phi(\pi)) = \rho$. Then $T_R^{\phi_{270^\circ}}$ has the following matrix form:

$$(3.12) \quad T_R^{\phi_{270^\circ}} = \begin{pmatrix}
A_4 & D_4 & O & O & \dots & O & O & O \\
C_4 & A_4 & B_4 & O & \dots & O & O & O \\
O & C_4 & A_4 & B_4 & \dots & O & O & O \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
O & O & O & O & \dots & C_4 & A_4 & B_4 \\
O & O & O & O & \dots & O & F_4 & A_4
\end{pmatrix},$$

where $A_4 = A + d\epsilon_{n,n-1}$, $B_4 = B + e\epsilon_{n,n-1}$, $C_4 = C + c\epsilon_{n,n-1}$, $D_4 = B + C + (c + e)\epsilon_{n,n-1}$, $F_4 = C + (c + e)\epsilon_{n,n-1}$, $O, \epsilon_{n,n-1} \in \mathbf{M}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, O is the zero matrix and $\epsilon_{n,n-1}$ is a unit matrix.

The proof of the theorem is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.3.

4. DYNAMICS OF CAs

The global transition function is a defining characteristic of a cellular automaton. This function shows how each configuration is changed in one time step. In our case, the global transition function is $T_R : \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn}$, i.e. the rule matrix of CA, where \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn} are all configurations in 2D CA $_{m \times n}$. Consequently, a cellular automaton (CA) can be conceptualized as a discrete-time dynamical system denoted by $\langle T_R, Z_p \rangle$. The attractors explain how a dynamical system behaves asymptotically. Attractors are states of the system towards which the system is attracted. The system may converge to a specific fixed-point attractor or to a periodic limit cycle attractor. Sometimes, the system represents chaotic behavior. Limit sets have been proposed as potential formalizations of attractors within the cellular automata theory. In the context of a cellular automaton, a limit set encompasses all configurations that can arise after arbitrarily long computations. The concept of "nilpotency" plays a crucial role in the dynamical behavior of CAs. A cellular automaton is called nilpotent if its limit set contains just one configuration. [5] have shown that for two or more dimension, the nilpotency of CAs is undecidable. In this section, we study some aspects of dynamical systems of 2D CA with mixed boundary conditions. In particular, for reasons of convenience, we consider the von Neumann neighborhood, and, in accordance with Remark 2.1, we assume $a = c = e = g = 0$.

If a square matrix T is nilpotent, it means that there exists a positive integer k such that $T^k = O$, where O is the zero matrix. In fact, for a given rule matrix T of 2D CA $_{m \times n}$ we have the following: if T is nilpotent, then for any initial configuration, the trajectory will ultimately converge to the zero state.

Proposition 4.1. *Let If T_R^ϕ be a rule of 2D CA with the boundary condition (3.2) and $d = f = 0$. Then T_R^ϕ is nilpotent.*

The proof of this result leads from the fact that T_R^ϕ is a strictly lower triangular matrix under the condition $d = f = 0$.

On the other hand, the dynamical system $\langle T_R, Z_p \rangle$ is over the finite field \mathbb{Z}_p and the field with the usual topology induced by the metric is not compact. That is why, the dynamics of 2D CA over \mathbb{Z}_p is different from real or complex cases. Now, let us find fixed points. Since T_R^ϕ is a linear operator, $0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^{mn}$ is a fixed point. Therefore, we check for other fixed points and we shall analyse the homogeneous linear system

$$(4.1) \quad (T_R^\phi - I')x = 0,$$

where $I' \in M_{mn \times mn}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ is an identity matrix.

The block matrix form of $T_R^\phi - I'$ is

$$(4.2) \quad T_R^\phi - I' = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 - I & fI & O & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ bI & A_1 - I & fI & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ O & bI & A_1 - I & fI & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & bI & A_1 - I & fI \\ O & O & O & O & \dots & O & (b+f)I & A_1 - I \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let us assume $f = 0$. Then $\det(T_R^\phi - I') = (\det(A_1 - I))^m$.

$$A_1 - I = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & d & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ h & -1 & d & O & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & h & -1 & d & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & h & -1 & d \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & h+d & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By using methods of evaluating higher-order determinants, for the determinant of $A_1 - I$ we obtain the following result.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $A_1 - I$ be a matrix $n \times n$. Then*

$$\det(A_1 - I) = -\Delta_{n-1} - d(h+d)\Delta_{n-2}$$

where $\Delta_n = \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} C_{n+1}^{2k+1} (-1)^{n-2k} (1-4hd)^k}{2^n}$ and $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ is the integer part of $\frac{n}{2}$. Moreover, we can simplify this determinant under some conditions:

- if $d = 0$, then $\det(A_1 - I) = (-1)^n$;
- if $d \neq 0$ and $h = 0$, then $\det(A_1 - I) = (-1)^{n-1} (d^2 - 1)$;
- if $dh \neq 0$, $d + h = -1$, and $d \neq h$ then $\det(A_1 - I) = \frac{d^n - h^n}{d - h} h$;
- if $dh \neq 0$, $d + h = -1$ and $d = h$, then $\det(A_1 - I) = nd^n$.

By using proposition 4.2 we get solutions of the system (4.1), i.e. $\text{Fix}(T_R^\phi)$ is the set of fixed points T_R^ϕ .

Proposition 4.3. Let T_R^ϕ be a rule of 2D $CA_{m \times n}$ with the boundary condition (3.2) and $f = 0$. Then

- if $d = 0$, then $\text{Fix}(T_R^\phi) = \{0\}$;
- if $d \neq 0, 1$ and $h = 0$, then $\text{Fix}(T_R^\phi) = \{0\}$;
- if $dh \neq 0$, $d + h = -1$ and $d \neq h$, then $\text{Fix}(T_R^\phi) = \{0\}$;
- if $dh \neq 0$, $d + h = -1$ and $d = h$, then $\text{Fix}(T_R^\phi) = \{0\}$.

Example 4.4. Let $m = n = 3$ and $d = 1, b = f = h = 0$. Then

$$A_1 - I = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

According to the Proposition 4.2, $\det(A_1 - I) = 0$. By the theorem on homogeneous linear systems, there are some solutions of $(T_R^\phi - I)x = 0$ except for 0 and these solutions are $(x_1, x_1, x_1, x_4, x_4, x_4, x_7, x_7, x_7,)$, $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

5. REVERSIBILITY OF THE RULE MATRIX T_R^ϕ .

In the present section, we shall establish an algorithm to decide whether the 2D (linear) CA determined by the Moore rule under the boundary conditions of non-bijective function ϕ is reversible or not. We already have found the rule matrix T_R^ϕ corresponding to the 2D finite CA with the function ϕ . Thus, we can state the following relation between the column vectors $X(t)$ and the rule matrix T_R^ϕ :

$$X^{(t+1)} = T_R^\phi \cdot X^{(t)} \pmod{p}.$$

If the rule matrix T_R is non-singular, then we have

$$X^{(t)} = (T_R^\phi)^{-1} \cdot X^{(t+1)} \pmod{p}.$$

Thus, our main aim is to study whether the rule matrix T_R^ϕ in (3.9) is invertible or not. It is well known that the 2D finite CA is reversible if and only if its rule matrix T_R^ϕ is non-singular. If the rule matrix T_R^ϕ has full rank, then it is invertible, so the 2D finite CA is reversible, otherwise it is irreversible.

Further, we use the following auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 5.1. Let $T \in \mathbf{M}_{mn \times mn}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ be a matrix of the following form:

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{pmatrix} A_m & X & O & \dots & O & O \\ B_{m-1} & A_{m-1} & X & \dots & O & O \\ O & B_{m-2} & A_{m-2} & \dots & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & \dots & A_2 & X \\ O & O & O & \dots & B_1 & A_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where all submatrices are $n \times n$, O is the zero matrix. If the submatrix X has full rank, then

$$\text{rank}(T) = (m-1)n + \text{rank}(P_m),$$

with $P_1 = A_1$, $P_2 = -B_1 - A_1X^{-1}A_2$, $P_k = -P_{k-2}X^{-1}B_{k-1} - P_{k-1}X^{-1}A_k$, $k \in \{3, \dots, m\}$.

Proof. Assume that we are given the matrix T . Firstly, we multiply the $(m-1)$ th row block by $-A_1X^{-1}$ from the left and add it to the last row block. Thus, we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_m & X & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ B_{m-1} & A_{m-1} & X & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & \dots & B_2 & A_2 & X \\ O & O & O & \dots & O & B_1 & A_1 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} A_m & X & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ B_{m-1} & A_{m-1} & B_2 & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & \dots & B_2 & A_2 & X \\ O & O & O & \dots & -A_1X^{-1}B_2 & B_1 - A_1X^{-1}A_2 & O \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now, let us use the denotations $P_2 = B_1 - A_1X^{-1}A_2$, $Q_2 = -A_1X^{-1}B_2$. Then, we multiply the $(m-2)$ th row block by $-P_2X^{-1}$ from the left and add it to the last row block. Thus, we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_m & X & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ B_{m-1} & A_{m-1} & X & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & \dots & B_2 & A_2 & X \\ O & O & O & \dots & Q_2 & P_2 & O \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} A_m & X & O & \dots & O & O & O \\ B_{m-1} & A_{m-1} & X & \dots & O & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & \dots & B_2 & A_2 & X \\ O & O & O & \dots & P_3 & O & O \end{pmatrix}.$$

Similarly, in the k -th step we multiply the $(m-k)$ th row block by $-P_kX^{-1}$ from the left and add it to the last row block. Thus, we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_m & X & \dots & O & O & \dots & O & O \\ B_{m-1} & A_{m-1} & \dots & O & O & \dots & O & O \\ O & B_{m-2} & \cdot & O & O & \dots & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & \dots & A_{k+1} & X & \dots & \dots & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & \dots & O & O & \cdot & A_2 & X \\ O & O & \dots & P_{k+1} & O & \dots & O & O \end{pmatrix}.$$

Finally, in the last step we multiply the first row block by $-P_{m-1}X^{-1}$ from the left and add it to the last row block. Hence, we obtain

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|cccccc} A_m & X & O & \dots & O & O \\ B_{m-1} & A_{m-1} & X & \dots & O & O \\ O & B_{m-2} & A_{m-2} & \dots & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & \dots & A_2 & X \\ \hline P_m & O & O & \dots & O & O \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|cccc} A_m & & & \\ B_{m-1} & & & \\ \vdots & & \Delta & \\ O & & & \\ O & & & \\ \hline P_m & O & O & \dots & O \end{array} \right).$$

Further, the X has full rank which implies that the matrix Δ has full rank. Therefore, we obtain the required result $\text{rank}(T) = (m-1)n + \text{rank}(P_m)$. \square

Remark 5.2. Since the rank of the transpose of the matrix is equal to rank of itself, then we can prove similar result to Lemma 5.1 for matrices $T \in \mathbf{M}_{mn \times mn}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ of the following form:

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & B_1 & O & \dots & O & O \\ X & A_2 & B_2 & \dots & O & O \\ O & X & A_3 & \dots & O & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & O & O & \dots & A_{m-1} & B_{m-1} \\ O & O & O & \dots & X & A_m \end{pmatrix},$$

where all submatrices are $n \times n$, O is the zero matrix, I is the identity matrix. If the submatrix X has full rank, then

$$\text{rank}(T) = (m-1)n + \text{rank}(P_m),$$

where $P_1 = A_1$, $P_2 = -A_1X^{-1}B_2$, $P_k = -P_{k-2}X^{-1}B_{k-1} - P_{k-1}X^{-1}A_k$, $k \in \{3, \dots, m\}$.

Now, we give the algorithm of computing the rank of the rule matrix T_{Rule} . Here, we can use the direct application of Lemma 5.1 to the rule matrices.

Theorem 5.3. *Let T_{R}^ϕ be the rule matrix in (3.9). If the matrix B_1 has the full rank, then*

$$\text{rank}(T_{\text{R}}^\phi) = (m-1)n + \text{rank}(P_m),$$

where the submatrix P_m is computed as in Lemma 5.1.

Proof. It is clear that any rule matrix T_{Rule}^ϕ is of the form (5.1). Therefore, we may have $X = B_1$. In the case B_1 has the full rank, the matrix X has full rank. Hence, doing the same row block operations as in Lemma 5.1 we find the submatrix P_m . Thus, we obtain

$$\text{rank}(T_{\text{R}}^\phi) = (m-1)n + \text{rank}(P_m).$$

□

Now we identify the conditions when the matrix $B_1 \in \mathbf{M}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ has the full rank. The matrix B_1 has the following form:

$$B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} f & e & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ g & f & e & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g & f & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & f & e \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & g+e & f \end{pmatrix}.$$

By computing the determinant via recurrence relation in Proposition 4.2 we can try to simplify the form of the determinant of B_1 for some cases:

- if $e = 0$ then $\det(B_1) = f^n$.
- if $e \neq 0$ and $g = 0$ then $\det(B_1) = f^{n-2}(f^2 - e^2)$.
- if $eg \neq 0$, $f = e + g$ and $e \neq g$ then $\det(B_1) = \frac{e^n - g^n}{e - g}g$.
- if $eg \neq 0$, $f = e + g$ and $e = g$ then $\det(B_1) = ne^n$.

Remark 5.4. We can formulate the theorem 5.3 for the rule matrix $T_{\text{R}}^{\phi_{180^\circ}}$ in (3.11) by help of Remark 5.2.

For computing the rank of the rule matrix $T_{\text{R}}^{\phi_{90^\circ}}$ in (3.10) we give the following theorem without proof. It proves like Theorem 5.3.

Theorem 5.5. *Let $T_{\text{R}}^{\phi_{90^\circ}}$ be the rule matrix in (3.10). If the matrix C_2 and D_2 have the full rank, then*

$$\text{rank}(T_{\text{R}}^\phi) = (m-1)n + \text{rank}(P_m),$$

where the submatrix P_m is computed as in Remark 5.2.

Example 5.6. In order to illustrate the previous theorem, we take $m = 4$ and $n = 3$ and consider the rule matrix T_{R}^ϕ with over the ternary field \mathbb{Z}_3 . Thanks to Theorem 3.1 we have

$$T_{\text{R}}^\phi = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & B_1 & O & O \\ C_1 & A_1 & B_1 & O \\ O & C_1 & A_1 & B_1 \\ O & O & D_1 & A_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where O is the zero matrix and

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d & 0 \\ h & 0 & d \\ 0 & h+d & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} f & e & 0 \\ g & f & e \\ 0 & g+e & f \end{pmatrix},$$

$$C_1 = \begin{pmatrix} b & c & 0 \\ a & b & c \\ 0 & a+c & b \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} b+f & e+c+g & 0 \\ g+a & b+f & c+e \\ 0 & g+a+e+c & b+f \end{pmatrix},$$

with $a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h \in \mathbb{Z}_3$.

Now, let $a = b = c = d = e = f = g = h = 1$. Then,

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_1 = C_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since B_1 has the full rank (i.e. $\det B_1 = 1$) we find the matrix P_4 as in the proof of Theorem 5.3. According to the recurrence relation in Lemma 5.1, we get the following matrices:

$$P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$P_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, by applying the algorithm for computing the rank of the rule matrix T_R^ϕ (see Theorem 5.3) we have

$$\text{rank}(T_R^\phi) = (4 - 1) \cdot 3 + \text{rank}(P_4) = 9 + 2 = 11.$$

Hence, the rule matrix T_R^ϕ does not have full rank. This implies that it is not reversible. In other words the mapping T_R^ϕ is not surjective, i.e. there exists a configuration of CA which is not an image of any configuration. Moreover, for this CA there exists Garden of Eden.

In a cellular automaton, a Garden of Eden is a configuration that has no predecessor. It can be the initial configuration of the automaton but cannot arise in any other way. The successor of a configuration is another configuration, formed by applying the update rule simultaneously to every cell. The transition function of the automaton is the function that maps each configuration to its successor. If the successor of configuration \mathbf{X} is configuration \mathbf{Y} , then \mathbf{X} is a predecessor of \mathbf{Y} . A configuration may have zero, one, or more predecessors, but it always has exactly one successor. A Garden of Eden is defined to be a configuration with zero predecessors.

As it was mentioned in the introduction, computing the GOE configurations of a cellular automaton is an important notion in cellular automata theory. Moore introduced this notion in [12]. Recently, Ying et al. [23] have computed the number of GOE configurations of a 2D cellular automaton over the binary field \mathbb{Z}_2 .

6. CONCLUSIONS

We investigate 2D finite linear Moore CA with some mixing boundary conditions over the p -ary field \mathbb{Z}_p (i.e. p -state spin values). We construct the transition rule matrix corresponding to the boundary condition for Moore CA. Characterization problems for 2D finite linear Moore CA are analyzed for p -ary spin cases. As we noted above, it is impossible to simulate a truly infinite lattice on a computer. Usually, for 2D CA, only one of the boundary conditions was considered: null, periodic, adiabatic, and reflexive. In [8] new type boundary condition was introduced as the mixed boundary condition. There, mixed boundary condition contains all four boundary conditions. In this paper, we generalize the mixed boundary condition. Suppose the boundary condition contains just two boundary conditions. For instance, one of the adjacent sides of the lattice has a null boundary condition, another adjacent sides has reflexive. There may be other cases. It may consider boundary conditions of opposite sides of the lattice are the same. Or three different types boundary conditions use on the sides of the lattice. But, in the paper we discussed mixed boundary conditions as an example above. Studying the rest types of boundary conditions have been planned by us in the next papers.

A known fact is that determining the reversibility of 2D CA is a very difficult problem considering the general reversibility case. Reversibility is one of the main characterization of CA. If CAs are irreversible, then there is such a configuration that their pre-image does not exist. This configuration is called a Garden of Eden. We mentioned such kind of CA in Example 5.6. Given special m , n values, and some number of rows and columns of the transition matrix, we develop an algorithm for computing the rank of the rule matrix with new types of boundary conditions for Moore neighborhood. Therefore, some special 2D CA is reversible and some of them are irreversible as given in Example 5.6. We present how to obtain the reversibility of 2D CA over the field \mathbb{Z}_p elements. Then the reversibility problem of 2D Moore CA with a given mixed boundary condition is completely solved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been supported by Ministry of Innovative Development of Uzbekistan, grant FZ-20200930492.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adamatzky, A.I. [1995] *Identification Of Cellular Automata (1st ed.)* (CRC Press).
- [2] Adamatzky, A. [1999] “Nonconstructible blocks in 1D cellular automata: minimal generators and natural systems,” *Appl. Math. Comput.* **99**, 77–91.
- [3] Adamatzky, A. [2010] *Game of life cellular automata*; (Springer, London).
- [4] Bays, C. [2009] “Cellular Automata in Triangular, Pentagonal and Hexagonal Tessellations,” *Encyclopedia of Complexity and Systems Science*, ed. Meyers, R. (Springer, New York).
- [5] Culik, K., Hard, L.P., Yu, S. [1990] “Computation theoretic aspects of cellular automata,” *Physica D* **45**(1-3), 357–378.
- [6] Durand, B. “Inversion of 2D cellular automata: some complexity results,” *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **134** 387–401.
- [7] Gardner, M. [1970] “Mathematical Games - The fantastic combinations of John Conway’s new solitaire game ”life””, *Scientific American* **223**, 120–123.
- [8] Jumaniyozov, D., Omirov, B., Redjepov, Sh., Uguz, S. [2023a] “Irreversibility of 2D Linear CA and Garden of Eden”” *Intern. J. Bifur. and Chaos*, **33**(06), 2350065.
- [9] Jumaniyozov, D., Casas, J.M., Ladra, M., Omirov, B., Redjepov, Sh. [2023b] “2D Linear CA with Mixing Boundary Conditions and Reversibility”” *Intern. J. Bifur. and Chaos*, **33**(08), 2350094.
- [10] Kari, J. [1990] “Reversibility of 2D cellular automata is undecidable,” *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, **45**, 379–385.
- [11] Kari, J. [1994] “Reversibility and surjectivity problems of cellular automata,” *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, **48**, 149–182.
- [12] Moore, E.F. [1962] “Machine models of self-reproduction,” *Proc. Symp. Appl. Math.*, **14**, 17–33.
- [13] Rendell, P. A [2005] “Turing Machine in Conway’s ”Game of Life”” Available online: <http://rendell-attic.org/gol/tm.htm> (January 12, 2005)
- [14] Siap, I., Akin, H., Uguz, S. [2011] “Structure and reversibility of 2D hexagonal cellular automata,” *Comput. Math. Applications*, **62**, 4161–4169.
- [15] Uguz, S., Akin, H., Siap, I. [2013] “Reversibility algorithms for 3-state hexagonal cellular automata with periodic boundaries,” *Intern. J. Bifur. and Chaos*, **23**, 1350101-1-15.
- [16] Uguz, S., Acar, E., Redjepov, Sh. [2019] “2D Triangular von Neumann Cellular Automata with Periodic Boundary,” *Intern. J. Bifur. and Chaos*, **29**(03), 1950029.
- [17] Uguz, S., Redjepov, S., Acar, E., Akin, H. [2017] “Structure and Reversibility of 2D von Neumann Cellular Automata Over Triangular Lattice,” *Intern. J. Bifur. and Chaos*, **27** 1750083.
- [18] Uguz, S. and Redjepov, S. [2021] “Reflexive and adiabatic boundary 2D linear cellular automata and evolution of image patterns,” *2021 International Conference on Information Science and Communications Technologies (ICISCT)*, pp. 1–7.
- [19] Ulam, S.M. [1962] “On some mathematical problems connected with patterns of growth of figures,” *Proc. Symp. Appl. Math.* **14**, pp. 215–224.
- [20] Von Neumann, J. [1966] *The Theory of Self-reproducing Automata*, A.W. Burks (Ed.), (Univ. of Illinois Press, Urbana).
- [21] Wolfram, S. *A New Kind of Science*; (Champaign, IL: Wolfram Media).
- [22] Wolfram, S. [1984] “Cellular automata as models for complexity,” *Nature*, **311**, p.419.
- [23] Ying, Z., Zhong, Y., Pei-min, D. [2009] “On behavior of two-dimensional cellular automata with an exceptional rule,” *Inform. Sci.* **179** (5), 613–622.

(1) INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN MATHEMATICS, HARBIN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGIES, HARBIN, 150001, CHINA

Email address: omirovb@mail.ru

(2) TASHKENT UNIVERSITY OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES, AMIR TEMUR STREET, 100200, TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN

Email address: sh.redjepov@gmail.com

(3) NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF UZBEKISTAN, UNIVERSITY STREET, 100174, TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN

Email address: javohir0107@mail.ru