Designing self-adaptive network with thermodynamics

Mingyang Bai¹ and Daqing Li^{1*}

¹ Department of Reliability and Systems Engineering, Beihang University, Beijing 100083, China

* Corresponding author: daqingl@buaa.edu.cn

Abstract

For real-world complex system constantly enduring perturbation, to achieve survival goal in changing yet unknown environments, the central problem is designing a selfadaptation strategy instead of fixed control strategies, which enables system to adjust its internal multi-scale structure according to environmental feedback. Inspired by thermodynamics, we develop a self-adaptive network utilizing only macroscopic information to achieve desired landscape through reconfiguring itself in unknown environments. By continuously estimating environment entropy, our designed selfadaptive network can adaptively realize desired landscape represented by topological measures. The adaptability of this network is achieved under several scenarios, including confinement on phase space and geographic constraint. The adaptation process is described by relative entropy corresponding to the Boltzmann H function, which decreases with time following unique power law distinguishing our self-adaptive network from memoryless systems. Moreover, we demonstrate the transformability of our self-adaptive network, as a critical mechanism of complex system resilience, allowing for transitions from one target landscape to another. Compared to data-driven methods, our self-adaptive network is understandable without careful choice of learning architecture and parameters. Our designed self-adaptive network could help to understand system intelligence through the lens of thermodynamics.

Complex systems experience perturbation from changing environments¹⁻⁴. To achieve survival goal, system needs to constantly adapt its internal structure to external environment according to environmental feedback with limited information. There are many systems with adaptability in nature. By improving vessel conductivity when its flow increases, animals and plants realize highly optimized transportation networks adapted to environment^{5,6}. After suffering external damage⁷ or aging-induced losses⁸, brain reorganizes its neural circuits to meet cognitive task demands. Such adaptability is widely believed to be the nature of general intelligence^{9,10,11}. To design a self-adaptive system, the central problem is finding a self-adaptation strategy, which enables system to adjust itself to achieve survival goals in changing environments. For complex system with hierarchical structure, it needs to build the feedback loop bridging the macroscopic system target with the microscopic system elements¹². Thus, the key requirements are defining a proper macroscopic target and designing a self-adaptation strategy with minimum information, enabling system to adjust its internal multi-scale structure accordingly.

It is revealed that the key to designing an adaptive system is finding efficient adaptation rules guiding the self-organization^{13,14}. These rules instruct systems to reconfigure their organization when systems do not realize targets. For biological systems, the most famous rules may be Thorndike's law of effect¹⁵ and Hebb's rule¹⁶, which greatly influence reinforcement learning¹⁷ and deep learning¹⁸⁻²⁰. Thorndike's law of effect states that behavior leading to desired outcome tends to be repeated more often, which is realized by reconfiguring connection of neurons following Hebb's rule^{21,22}. Thus, animals and humans could adjust their behavior in new environments for the desired outcomes. For engineering systems, stimulated by designing supersonic aircraft under multiple operating conditions, adaptive control methods were developed in 1960s^{23,24}. Based on given adaptation rules, adaptive controller continuously adjusts parameters for desired performance. To steer systems under uncertainty, compared to fixed strategies^{25,26} challenged by identifying system dynamics initially^{27,28}, adaptive strategies seems more appropriate. Meanwhile, many control methods require accessible system variables and parameters for each component, which is usually impossible for complex systems. Although data-driven methods such as reinforcement learning demonstrate great power to adapt to complex environments^{29,30}, they are hard to explain for implementation in safe-critical systems and have expensive computation costs.

To address these challenges, here we develop a self-adaption strategy for complex systems to realize desired landscapes, by selectively accepting the transition of system state based only on macroscopic information, where correct acceptance probability $A(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$ is learned from history. Inspired by thermodynamics, the goal of our strategy is set to landscape of macrostate, namely the negative logarithm of probability distribution for macroscopic variables of interest, which has been used for depicting material³¹, protein³², cancer³³, ecosystem^{34,35} and engineering systems³⁶. To achieve this target, in our strategy, system transition from one state to another due to environmental disturbance, such as adding/removing an edge in network, will be

selectively accepted, where the acceptance probability $A(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_i)$ only depends on

macrostates before and after transition. We show that suitable acceptance probability can be determined by target landscape and environment entropy (Fig. 1a). In unknown environments, self-adaptive systems need to automatically estimate environment entropy for correct acceptance probability. By extending the Wang-Landau method, we derive a simple method to estimate entropy, enabling systems to continuously adjust acceptance probability according to environmental feedback. It is shown that system will converge to target landscape under our adaptation rule (Fig. 1b). The adaptation process is described by a monotonically decreasing relative entropy corresponding to the Boltzmann H function³⁷. The relative entropy decreases with time following unique power law distinguishing our self-adaptive systems from memoryless systems. As a prototypical example, we design a self-adaptive network programmed with target landscapes represented by topological measures, including modularity and others. In a wide variety of unknown environmental conditions, our designed self-adaptive network shows the capacity to realize desired landscape by reconfiguring itself with only macroscopic information. Furthermore, we demonstrate that our self-adaptive network could change from one target landscape to another, a capacity known as transformability, as a crucial mechanism for complex system resilience^{34,38}.

Theory

Model. Consider a complex system of numerous microstates that compose a large phase space $\Gamma = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, ...\}$. For example, an undirected network with *n* nodes and *m* edges can have $\left(\frac{n(n-1)}{2}\right)$ possible microstates. Driven by environment, system continuously transitions from one microstate to another described by a stationary Markov process *T*, where $T(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$ represents the transition probability from microstate σ_i to microstate σ_j at one timestep. We denote the probability of microstate σ_i as $p(\sigma_i)$. When accepting all transitions driven by environment, the distribution of system microstate converges to the stationary distribution $p(\sigma_i) = p^{env}(\sigma_i)$, where the superscript 'env' represents that system is dominated by environment.

Design Target. Due to the difficulty of analyzing countless microstates, thermodynamics coarse-grain different microstates with the same macroscopic property into one macrostate. Analogy to thermodynamics, we only focus on quantity of interest $x(\sigma_i)$ for each microstate σ_i , thus one macrostate x corresponds to a set of microstates $\{x(\sigma_i) = x | \sigma_i \in \Gamma\}$. For complex systems, we focus on the distribution of macrostate

$$p(x) = \sum_{x(\sigma_i)=x} p(\sigma_i), \tag{1}$$

which is the sum of probability of microstate with same macrostate x. The negative logarithm of stationary distribution $-\ln[p(x)]$ corresponds to free energy landscape³¹, which depicts the macroscopic property of complex systems. Not limited to physical and chemical systems, macroscopic landscape also describes the ecosystem resilience^{34,35} and engineering systems³⁶. Moreover, because macroscopic landscape

allows fluctuation and one macrostate contains numerous microstates, macroscopic landscape as design target is more feasible for complex systems under uncertainty compared to microscopic target². Our goal is to realize desired landscape $U^{design}(x)$, thus the stationary distribution p(x) for design target is

$$p^{design}(x) \propto \exp\left(-U^{design}(x)\right).$$
 (2)

Without any intervention, the system landscape will be dominated by environment. Namely, when the system accepts all transition driven by environment (represented by Markov process T), the stationary distribution p(x) of macrostate x becomes

$$p^{env}(x) = \sum_{x(\sigma_i)=x} p^{env}(\sigma_i) = \exp(-U^{env}(x)),$$
(3)

where $p^{env}(x)$ is the stationary distribution of macrostate under Markov process *T*. $U^{env}(x) = -\ln [p^{env}(x)]$ is the environment-dominated landscape, which corresponds to entropy³⁹. Below we seek to steer system from environment-dominated landscape $U^{env}(x)$ to target landscape $U^{design}(x)$ by self-adaptation (Fig. 1b).

Realizing target landscape with adaptation rule. To realize desired macroscopic landscape, we seek to selectively accept the transition of system state to change stationary distribution. While selective acceptance is used in Markov chain Monte Carlo for realizing desired microstate distribution with microscopic information⁴⁰, this information is usually inaccessible for complex systems with numerous microstates. To realize desired macrostate distribution with limited information, under detailed balance condition, we derive the suitable acceptance probability

$$A(\sigma_i \to \sigma_j) = \min\left(1, \frac{\exp\left(U^{design}(x_i) - U^{design}(x_j)\right)}{\exp\left(U^{env}(x_i) - U^{env}(x_j)\right)}\right)$$
(4)

when system is driven from microstate σ_i with macroscopic property $x_i = x(\sigma_i)$ to microstate σ_j with macroscopic property $x_j = x(\sigma_j)$. Exploiting only macroscopic information x_i and x_j , system could reconfigure the stationary distribution to $p(x) = p^{design}(x)$ by selectively accepting environment drive. See derivation in **Methods**.

In unknown changing environments, system use its estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$ to replace $U^{env}(x)$ in Eq. (4), where $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$ should be continuously updated based on environmental feedback. However, finding a proper way to update $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$ is challenged by non-stationary transition probability, which arises from ever-changing acceptance probability when $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$ updates. Considering correspondence between $U^{env}(x) = -\ln [p^{env}(x)]$ and entropy³⁹, we extend the Wang-Landau method^{41,42} and derive a simple method for updating estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$ while pursuing target. Our method degrades into the Wang-Landau method when $U^{design}(x)$ is constant. According to our method, at each timestep, the estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$ on the current macrostate x_i will be updated as

$$\widehat{U}^{env}(x_i) = \widehat{U}^{env}(x_i) - f \times \exp\left(U^{design}(x_i)\right),\tag{5}$$

where adaptation rate f > 0. The larger f, the faster updating while larger fluctuation for $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$. See derivation in **Methods**. Our adaptation rule, as described in Eqs. (4-5), is understandable. For instance, consider the situation when system visits macrostate x_H too frequently compared to target. According to Eq. (5), $\hat{U}^{env}(x_H)$ will decrease faster than other $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$. According to Eq. (4), with low $\hat{U}^{env}(x_H)$, acceptance probability of escaping macrostate x_H will increase while acceptance probability of entering macrostate x_H will decrease. Subsequently, the frequency of visiting macrostate x_H will decrease. Thus, our adaptation rule establishes a negative feedback loop between the deviation from macroscopic target and acceptance decision for realizing target (see Supplementary Section 1).

Taken together, by implementing our strategy shown in Fig. 2, with only macroscopic information, system could adaptively realize desired landscape in unknown environments. In the following, our strategy is applied to designing self-adaptive network which realizes different desired landscapes represented by topological measures automatically.

Results

Self-adaptive network programed with target landscape. Consider a complex network under disturbance, environmental disturbance will remove existing edges or create new edges at each timestep (see environment setting in Methods). To realize desired macroscopic property represented by target landscape, system needs to continuously adjust its behavior (through acceptance probability) according to environmental feedback. As our first example, we choose modularity M, which measures the tendency of network division into densely connected subgroups⁴³, as macrostate of interest. Our goal is to design a self-adaptive network which starts from environment-dominated landscape $U^{env}(M)$ to desired target landscape $U^{design}(M)$ automatically in unknown environments. To test strategy capability, we choose a bistable landscape as the target landscape (see target setting in Methods). Such landscapes with multiple attractors support complex functions in mechanical, biological, and chemical engineering⁴⁴.

Employing our strategy, our self-adaptive network gradually adjusts its behavior to realize target landscape in the initially unknown environment (Fig. 3a). As network continuously updates estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(M)$ (Fig. 3b), the distance to target landscape, quantified by the relative entropy $D_{KL}(q||p^{design})$ between empirical distribution q(M) and target distribution $p^{design}(M)$, decreases monotonically with time following a power law (blue circles, Fig. 3c). Programed with bistable landscape $U^{design}(M)$, self-adaptive network is of bistability. Namely, when $M < M_0$, network modularity will fluctuate around M_1 in a long time (Fig. 3d), where edges are comparatively uniformly distributed among nodes; while when system is perturbed to $M > M_0$, network modularity will fluctuate around M_2 in a long time, where network is divided into several subgroups (Fig. 3e). In practice, the brain networks can switch between low modularity mode and high modularity mode to balance integration and segregation in diverse cognitive process⁴⁵.

The adaptation process can be described by a universal exponent. As shown in Fig. 3c, two regimes are identified, with a crossover at τ_c , corresponding to the correlation time (see Supplementary Section 3). When $t \gg \tau_c$, $D_{KL}(q||p^{design})$ decreases with time following a power law

$$D_{KL}(q||p^{design}) \propto t^{-\alpha}, \tag{6}$$

where exponent $\alpha \approx 2$. Thus self-adaptive network will gradually approach target landscape. While for non-adaptive systems accepting all environmental disturbance, empirical distribution q(M) will converge to environment-dominated distribution $p^{env}(M)$ instead of target distribution $p^{design}(M)$. Thus relative entropy $D_{KL}(q||p^{env})$ decreases with time for non-adaptive systems (red diamonds, Fig. 3c), following a different power law

$$D_{KL}(q||p^{env}) \propto t^{-1}, \tag{7}$$

which describes how non-adaptive systems converge to environment-dominated landscape $U^{env}(M)$. We derive the exponent in Eq. (7) for purely random systems and stationary Markov systems in Supplementary Section 2. Thus exponent $\alpha > 1$ in Eq. (6) suggests that our adaptive system continuously exploits historical observation to adjust itself to realize target distribution, which can distinguish adaptive systems from memoryless systems. And we find that the exponent α depends on the target landscape. For symmetrical bistable landscape $U^{design}(x)$, the exponent $\alpha \approx 2$ is independent of details. For $U^{design}(x)$ with single minimum, the exponent $1 < \alpha < 2$ decreases as probability becomes concentrated (see Supplementary Section 4).

Adaptation under confinement on phase space. Real-world systems suffer many constraints in phase space (red regions in Fig. 4a), which challenges system adaptability. As our second example, we consider such a scenario that some microstates are inaccessible due to environmental restrictions. Specifically, with other setting similar to our first example, we forbid 80% of all possible edges in the second example. These edges could not be added during network evolution. Under confinement, the volume of phase space is reduced to approximately 5^{-200} of the original one (see **Methods**). With enormous forbidden regions, self-adaptive network needs to automatically find possible paths for realizing target landscape. Although numerous microstates are forbidden, the macroscopic property represented by environment estimation $\widehat{U}^{env}(M)$ changes slightly, where the minimum of $\widehat{U}^{env}(M)$ is still around M = 0.45 (red line, Fig. 4b). With slightly adjusted estimation, our network still realizes target landscape in the new environment (Fig. 4c). The relative entropy $D_{KL}(q||p^{design})$ decreases with time following a power law, where exponent $\alpha \approx 2$ still holds under confinement (red triangles, Fig. 4d). The microscopic evolution of network is demonstrated in Fig. 4e. During evolution, forbidden edges (red lines, Fig. 4e) gradually disappear due to environmental constraints. Employing remaining 20% edges, self-adaptive network still realizes desired bistable target landscape (right panel, Fig. 4e). Such adaptability of our self-adaptive network enables systems to flexibly select suitable microscopic evolution trajectories for realizing target under uncertain confinement.

Adaptation under geographic constraint. One important constraint for real-world networks is geographic constraint, where long-range edges require more resources to build and maintain. As our third example, we consider a environment under geographic constraint to test the adaptability of our strategy. Specifically, all nodes of the network are embedded in a two-dimensional square lattice (Fig. 5a). Here, the strength of geographic constraint is represented by a characteristic length ζ . The edge with length

 $d_{ij} \gg \zeta$ is easy to remove while hard to add (see **Methods**). Since average shortest path length L is significantly affected by geographic constraint, we choose L as macrostate of interest in this example. The target landscape is set to a landscape with one minimum, which is different from previous setting. We employ our self-adaptive network in environments with different geographic constraint strengths ζ . As ζ decreases, the environment-dominated landscape $\widehat{U}^{env}(L)$ increases slower with L (Fig. 5b), suggesting that environment with small ζ is more likely to have large L. According to Eq. (4), self-adaptive network will reduce the acceptance probability for increasing Lwith decreasing ζ . Thus network adaptively realizes target under different ζ (Fig. 5c), which is also described by the power-law decay of $D_{KL}(q||p^{target})$, where exponent $\alpha \approx 1.34$ (Fig. 5d). Under different geographic constraints, self-adaptive network realizes macroscopic target by different microscopic modes. Under weak geographic constraint ($\zeta = 100$), there are many long-range edges (Fig. 5e). As ζ decreases, the network realizes target landscape with a highly modularized network structure and a few long-range edges (Fig. 5f-g), which has been observed in real-world spatially embedded networks⁴⁶.

Transformability. Besides adaptively realizing a specific target in various unknown environments, adjusting target landscape to changing requirement is critical for system resilience. Such capacity is defined as transformability³⁴ (Fig. 6a). As our final example, we investigate the transformability of our self-adaptive network. Here, we choose average clustering coefficient *C* as macrostate of interest. We sequentially perform a large transformation (Fig. 6b) and a small transformation (Fig. 6e). It is found that our self-adaptive network can successfully transform to new target landscape (Fig. 6c, 6f).

We further investigate historical experience effect on transformation. When target landscape is changed from an old one (Fig. 6b, 6e, dashed lines) to a new one (Fig. 6b, 6e, solids lines), the estimation \hat{U}^{env} learned in old tasks may help system realize new task faster. To investigate such historical experience effect, we compare the convergence of $D_{KL}(q||p^{target})$ for network with historical experience and network without any historical experience (reset $\hat{U}^{env} \equiv 0$). For large transformation $U_1 \rightarrow U_2$, \hat{U}^{env} learned in old tasks only helps system in the early state (Fig. 6d). While for small transformation $U_2 \rightarrow U_3$, \hat{U}^{env} learned in old task significantly accelerates target realization in the new task, reducing the time to decrease $D_{KL}(q||p^{target})$ (purple dashed arrow, Fig. 6g). Such difference comes from the distance between old target and new target, which is small in transformation $U_2 \rightarrow U_3$ but large in transformation $U_1 \rightarrow$ U_2 . This suggests that environment entropy \hat{U}^{env} plays the role of world model^{11,48} enabling system to generalize previous experience to similar tasks. When the current landscape becomes hard to maintain, such transformability of landscape to evolve a new way of living is critical in social-ecological systems³⁴.

Discussion

Designing systems to achieve goals is of fundamental importance to solving complex tasks and also examines our understanding of complex systems. For complex systems surrounded by unknown yet changing environments, it is hard to obtain their numerous

parameters and microstates, challenging the assumptions of previous works. To steer complex systems toward survival goals with limited information, we develop a self-adaptation strategy to design a self-adaptive network. Our strategy enables complex systems to coordinate their multi-scale structure to realize macroscopic targets with limited information. Existing methods usually focus on the goal of reaching a specific microstate and require microscopic information. For complex systems with emergent phenomena, the macrostate is more directly relevant to performance and more robust to environmental disturbance. With only macroscopic information, our strategy guides systems to make decisions at microscopic level with removal or addition of edges for achieving desired landscape at macroscopic level. Our strategy provides an example of decomposing macroscopic targets into microscopic decisions⁴⁷.

Our designed self-adaptive network has the adaptability to adjust its internal mechanism for its goal. Most prior important work assumes known dynamics, which is challenged by uncertain environments in the real world. Existing methods usually need to model system dynamics and are hard to apply for complex systems with many degrees of freedom and unknown dynamics. Estimating countless microscopic parameters is difficult for nonlinear complex systems. With the adaptation rule that system adjusts its behavior based on the deviation from macroscopic target, our coarse-grain strategy may open a new route to close the loop across different scales, which is believed key to designing complex systems¹².

Our strategy is physics-inspired. Compared to data-driven methods, our explainable strategy does not require complex architecture and elaborated pre-training. Moreover, our work may help to understand the principle behind complex system adaptability and intelligence. We find a universal exponent distinguishing our adaptive system from non-adaptive systems. Our approach suggests that entropy could play the role of world model^{11,48} for multi-scale systems. Our self-adaptive strategy can be applied to designing future intelligent complex systems and help understand system intelligence through the lens of thermodynamics.



Fig. 1| Self-adaptive network. a. Self-adaptive network in unknown environments. Environment will drive network from one microstate to another at each timestep (such as removing or adding edges in network). When accepting all environmental disturbance, network macrostate x is governed by environment-dominated landscape $U^{env}(x)$. To realize target landscape $U^{design}(x)$, our self-adaptive network selectively accept environmental disturbance with suitable acceptance probability $A(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$ based only on macroscopic information (macrostates x_i and x_j before and after transition). The suitable behavior $A(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$ depends on both environment property $U^{env}(x)$ and target $U^{design}(x)$. In unknown environments, self-adaptive network needs to learn environment property $U^{env}(x)$ and adjust its behavior accordingly. **b.** An example of self-adaptive network. In unknown environments, self-adaptive network adaptively adjusts its behavior (represented by $A(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$) based on environmental

feedback. Thus network gradually modifies its landscape from environment-dominated landscape $U^{env}(x)$ to target landscape $U^{design}(x)$. In this example, macrostate of interest x is chosen as modularity. Network gradually forms several communities to increase modularity. Here, nodes in the same community are shown in the same colors. Nodes with more connections are larger.



Fig. 2| Self-adaptation strategy for designing self-adaptive network. a. Self-adaptive network: network structure, unknown environment and target landscape

 $U^{design}(x)$. Environment will drive system from microstate σ_i to microstate σ_j with

unknown probability $T(\sigma_i \to \sigma_j)$ at each timestep. When accepting all environment drive, network macrostate x is governed by environment-dominated landscape $U^{env}(x)$. Self-adaptive network could only observe macrostate x_i for σ_i and macrostate x_j for σ_j to decide whether accepting the transition. Self-adaptive network reconfigures the network structure to target landscape $U^{design}(x)$ by selectively accepting disturbance in unknown environments. **b.** Self-adaptation strategy. At each timestep, our self-adaptive system will first update its environment estimation, then decide whether accepting environmental disturbance. At estimation stage, system updates environment estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$ on current macrostate x_i via Eq. (5). At decision stage, to decide whether to accept or to reject transition $\sigma_i \to \sigma_j$, system calculates the acceptance probability p_{accept} based on environment estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$ and target landscape $U^{design}(x)$. At action stage, system accepts transition $\sigma_i \to \sigma_j$ with acceptance probability p_{accept} . This action determines the network structure at next timestep, which shapes the macroscopic landscape.



Fig. 3| Self-adaptive network programed with target landscape. a. Self-adaptive network realizes target landscape. When accepting all environmental disturbance, the distribution of modularity M is dominated by environment (yellow line, left panel). Employing our self-adaptation strategy, network successfully approaches target distribution (red line, right panel). The empirical distribution $p^{env}(M)$ before and after employing self-adaptation strategy is obtained by simulating 2.42×10^6 timesteps and 5×10^6 timesteps, respectively. **b.** Environment estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(M)$ learned from

environmental feedback after 5×10^6 timesteps. To visualize the trend of $\widehat{U}^{env}(M)$, we smoothed raw data (hollow points) using a moving average method with a window size of 30 to obtain the curve (solid line). The minimum of smoothed $\hat{U}^{env}(M)$ is adjusted to zero by adding a constant term. c. Relative entropy between empirical distribution q(M) and stationary distribution decreases with time following a power law. For our self-adaptive network, stationary distribution is target distribution $p^{design}(M)$. The relative entropy $D_{KL}(q||p^{design})$ decreases with time following a power law (blue circles), where the best-fitting exponent is $\alpha = 1.77 \pm 0.04$, based on the result of one simulation using data points where $D_{KL}(q||p^{design}) < 0.5$. For nonadaptive systems accepting all environmental disturbance, the stationary distribution $p^{env}(M)$ is determined by environment. The relative entropy $D_{KL}(q||p^{env})$ decreases with time following a different power law (red diamonds), where the best-fitting exponent is $\alpha = 0.96 \pm 0.02$, based on the average of 15 independent simulations using data points where $D_{KL}(q||p^{env}) < 0.5$. All the scaling exponents are determined by linear regression in the log-log space. d-e. The network macrostate timeseries and microscopic evolution when network switches between low modularity mode (around $M_1 \approx 0.458$) and high modularity mode (around $M_2 \approx 0.715$). Two modes are separated by the saddle points $M_0 \approx 0.587$. See target setting in **Methods**. Here, nodes in the same community are shown in the same colors. Nodes with more connections are larger.



Fig. 4| Adaptation under confinement on phase space. a. Network could not access some microstates due to environmental restriction (see environment setting in Method). b. Comparison of environment estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(M)$ under confinement (red triangles and red line) and without confinement (blue circles and blue line). Both estimations are obtained by simulating 5×10^6 timesteps. To visualize the trend of $\hat{U}^{env}(M)$, we smoothed raw data (hollow points) using a moving average method with a window size of 30 to obtain the curve (solid lines). The minimum of smoothed $\hat{U}^{env}(M)$ is adjusted to zero by adding a constant term. c. The distribution of network modularity M for selfadaptive network under confinement before and after employing self-adaptation strategy. The empirical distribution before and after employing self-adaptation strategy is obtained by simulating 1×10^6 timesteps and 5×10^6 timesteps, respectively. d. Relative entropy $D_{KL}(q||p^{design})$ between empirical distribution q(M) and target distribution $p^{design}(M)$ without confinement (blue circles) and under confinement (red triangles). $D_{KL}(q||p^{design})$ also decreases with time following a power law under confinement, where the best-fitting exponent is $\alpha = 1.82 \pm 0.04$, based on the result of one simulation using data points where $D_{KL}(q||p^{design}) < 0.5$. The scaling exponent is determined by linear regression in the log-log space. **e.** The microscopic evolution during network adaptation. Initially, there are numerous forbidden edges (red lines, left panel). The ratio of forbidden edges is 81.44% at t = 1, 72.86% at t = 41, 66.83% at t = 81 and 60.40% at t = 121. During evolution, the forbidden edges disappear and network still exhibits desired bistability (right panel). Here, nodes in the same community are shown in the same colors. Nodes with more connections are larger.



Fig. 5| Adaptation under geographic constraint. a. Nodes are embedded in a twodimensional square lattice, where distance between two neighbors are set to 1. The characteristic length ζ represent the strength of geographic constraint (see environment setting in **Method**). b. Environment estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(L)$ obtained in 5×10^5 timesteps under geographic constraint $\zeta = 100$, 2 and 1. To visualize the trend of $\hat{U}^{env}(L)$, we smoothed raw data (hollow points) using a moving average method with a window size of 10 to obtain the curve (solid lines). The value of $\hat{U}^{env}(L)$ at L = 4.805 is adjusted to zero by adding a constant term for comparing $\hat{U}^{env}(L)$ under different geographic

constraints. c. From different environment-dominated distributions (dashed lines), selfadaptive network finally realizes target distribution (solid line). The empirical distributions before and after employing self-adaptation strategy are all obtained by simulating 5×10^5 timesteps. d. Relative entropy $D_{KL}(q||p^{design})$ between empirical distribution and target distribution decreases with time following a power law. The bestfitting exponents are $\alpha = 1.42 \pm 0.01$ for $\zeta = 100$, $\alpha = 1.29 \pm 0.02$ for $\zeta = 2$, and $\alpha = 1.34 \pm 0.005$ for $\zeta = 1$. All the scaling exponents are determined by linear regression in the log-log space, based on the result of one simulation using data points where $D_{KL}(q||p^{design}) < 1$. e-g. The microscopic evolution of self-adaptive network under geographic constraint $\zeta = 100, 2, 1$, where nodes in the same community are shown in the same colors. Nodes with more connections are larger. Edges with longer distance are darker.



Fig. 6| Transformability. a. Illustration of transformability. b. Large transformation from bistable landscape U_1 to monostable landscape U_2 . c. The distribution of average clustering coefficient *C* is successfully changed from $p_1(C) \propto \exp(-U_1(C))$ to $p_2(C) \propto \exp(-U_2(C))$ after transformation $U_1 \rightarrow U_2$ in 10⁶ timesteps. d. The relative entropy $D_{KL}(q||p_2)$ for self-adaptive network with historical experience (blue triangles) and self-adaptive network without experience (red circles) after transformation $U_1 \rightarrow$ U_2 . For self-adaptive network without experience (red circles), the best-fitting exponent $\alpha = 1.43 \pm 0.02$ is determined by linear regression in the log-log space, based on the result of one simulation using data points where $D_{KL}(q||p^{design}) < 0.5$. e. Small transformation from landscape U_2 to landscape U_3 . f. The distribution of average clustering coefficient *C* is successfully changed from $p_2(C) \propto \exp(-U_2(C))$ to $p_3 \propto$ $\exp(-U_3(C))$ after transformation $U_2 \rightarrow U_3$ in 10⁶ timesteps. g. Relative entropy

 $D_{KL}(q||p_3)$ for self-adaptive network with historical experience (blue triangles) and self-adaptive network without historical experience (red circles) after transformation $U_2 \rightarrow U_3$. For self-adaptive network without experience (red circles), the best-fitting exponent $\alpha = 1.75 \pm 0.04$ is determined by linear regression in the log-log space gives, based on the result of one simulation using data points where $D_{KL}(q||p^{design}) < 0.5$. The historical experience reduces the time to decrease $D_{KL}(q||p^{target})$ (purple dashed arrow).

Reference

- 1. Helbing, D. Globally networked risks and how to respond. *Nature* **497**, 51–59 (2013).
- 2. Holling, Crawford S. Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual review* of ecology and systematics **4**, 1-23(1973).
- 3. May, Robert M. Will a large complex system be stable?. *Nature* 238, 413-414 (1972).
- 4. Haldane, Andrew G., and Robert M. May. Systemic risk in banking ecosystems. *Nature* **469**, 351-355(2011).
- 5. Tero, Atsushi, et al. Rules for biologically inspired adaptive network design. *Science* **327**, 5964 (2010).
- 6. Ronellenfitsch H, Katifori E. Global optimization, local adaptation, and the role of growth in distribution networks. *Physical review letters* **117**, 138301 (2016).
- 7. Hope, T. M. H. et al. Right hemisphere structural adaptation and changing language skills years after left hemisphere stroke. *Brain* **140**, 1718–1728 (2017).
- 8. Madden, D. J. et al. Adult age differences in functional connectivity during executive control. *Neuroimage* **52**, 643–657 (2010).
- 9. Wang P. On defining artificial intelligence. *Journal of Artificial General Intelligence* **10**, 1-37 (2019).
- 10. Newel A, Simon H A. Computer science as empirical inquiry: Symbols and search. *Communications of the ACM* **19**, 113-126 (1976).
- 11. Zador A, Escola S, Richards B, et al. Catalyzing next-generation artificial intelligence through neuroai. *Nature communications* **14**, 1597 (2023).
- 12. D'Souza, R.M., di Bernardo, M. & Liu, YY. Controlling complex networks with complex nodes. *Nat Rev Phys* **5**, 250–262 (2023).
- 13. Ashby, W. R. Design for a Brain: The origin of adaptive behaviour. (Chapman and Hall, London, 1952).
- 14. Ashby, W. R. Principles of the self-organizing dynamic system. *The Journal of general psychology* **37**, 125-128 (1947).
- 15. Thorndike, Edward L. The law of effect. *The American journal of psychology* **39**, 212-222 (1927).
- 16. Hebb, D. O. The Organization of Behavior: a Neuropsychological Theory (Wiley, 1949).
- 17. Sutton, R. S. & Barto, A. G. Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction (MIT Press, Cambridge, 1998).
- 18. Hopfield, John J. "Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities." *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* **79**, 2554-2558 (1982).
- 19. Ackley, David H., Geoffrey E. Hinton, and Terrence J. Sejnowski. A learning algorithm for Boltzmann machines. *Cognitive science* **9**, 147-169 (1985).
- 20. G. E. Hinton R. R. Salakhutdinov, Reducing the Dimensionality of Data with Neural Networks. *Science* **313**, 504-507(2006).
- 21. Ahissar, Ehud, et al. Dependence of cortical plasticity on correlated activity of

single neurons and on behavioral context. Science 257, 1412-1415 (1992).

- 22. Athalye, Vivek R., et al. Evidence for a neural law of effect. *Science* **359**, 1024-1029 (2018).
- 23. Astrom, Karl J. Adaptive control around 1960. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine* 16, 44-49 (1996).
- 24. Annaswamy, Anuradha M., and Alexander L. Fradkov. A historical perspective of adaptive control and learning. *Annual Reviews in Control* **52**, 18-41 (2021).
- 25. Liu, Yang-Yu, and Albert-László Barabási. Control principles of complex systems. *Reviews of Modern Physics* **88**, 035006 (2016).
- 26. Ruths, J. and Ruths, D. Control profiles of complex networks. *Science* **343**, 1373-1376 (2014).
- 27. Barzel, B., Liu, YY. & Barabási, AL. Constructing minimal models for complex system dynamics. *Nat Commun* **6**, 7186 (2015).
- 28. Nguyen, H. Chau, Riccardo Zecchina, and Johannes Berg. Inverse statistical problems: from the inverse Ising problem to data science. *Advances in Physics* **66**, 197-261 (2017).
- Kiran, B. Ravi, et al. "Deep reinforcement learning for autonomous driving: A survey." *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 23, 4909-4926 (2021).
- 30. Jaderberg, Max, et al. Human-level performance in 3D multiplayer games with population-based reinforcement learning. *Science* **364**, 859-865 (2019).
- 31. Singh, Sadanand, Manan Chopra, and Juan J. de Pablo. "Density of states-based molecular simulations." *Annual review of chemical and biomolecular engineering* **3**, 369-394 (2012).
- 32. Rathore, Nitin, Thomas A. Knotts IV, and Juan J. de Pablo. Density of states simulations of proteins. *The Journal of chemical physics* **118**, 4285-4290 (2003).
- 33. Li, Chunhe, and Jin Wang. Quantifying the underlying landscape and paths of cancer. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **11**, 20140774 (2014).
- 34. Walker, Brian, et al. Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social– ecological systems. *Ecology and society* **9**, 5 (2004).
- 35. Babak M. S. Arani *et al.* Exit time as a measure of ecological resilience. *Science* **372**, 4895(2021).
- 36. Smith O, Cattell O, Farcot E, et al. The effect of renewable energy incorporation on power grid stability and resilience. *Science advances* **8**, eabj6734 (2022).
- 37. Qian H. Relative entropy: Free energy associated with equilibrium fluctuations and nonequilibrium deviations. *Physical Review E* **63**, 042103 (2001).
- 38. Han B A, Varshney K R, LaDeau S, et al. A synergistic future for AI and ecology. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **120**, e2220283120 (2023).
- 39. Van den Broeck C, Esposito M. Ensemble and trajectory thermodynamics: A brief introduction. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **418**, 6-16 (2015).
- 40. Hastings, W. Keith. Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications. *Biometrika* **57**, 97-109 (1970).

- 41. Wang F, Landau D.P. Efficient, multiple-range random walk algorithm to calculate the density of states. *Physical review letters* **86**, 2050 (2001).
- 42. Wang F, Landau D.P. Determining the density of states for classical statistical models: A random walk algorithm to produce a flat histogram. *Physical Review E* **64**, 056101 (2001).
- 43. Clauset, A., Newman, M. E., & Moore, C. Finding community structure in very large networks. *Physical Review E* **70**, 066111 (2004).
- 44. Cao, Yunteng, et al. Bistable structures for advanced functional systems. *Advanced Functional Materials* **31**, 2106231 (2021).
- 45. Betzel, R. F., Fukushima, M., He, Y., Zuo, X. N., & Sporns, O. Dynamic fluctuations coincide with periods of high and low modularity in resting-state functional brain networks. *NeuroImage* **127**, 287-297 (2016).
- 46. Daqing, L., Kosmidis, K., Bunde, A., & Havlin, S. Dimension of spatially embedded networks. *Nature Physics* 7, 481-484 (2011).
- 47. Ellis G F R. Top-down causation and emergence: some comments on mechanisms. *Interface Focus* **2**, 126-140 (2012).
- 48. Matsuo Y, LeCun Y, Sahani M, et al. Deep learning, reinforcement learning, and world models. *Neural Networks* **152**, 267-275 (2022).

Methods

Deriving the suitable acceptance probability

Without any intervention, the evolution of system follows Markov process T, where the

transition probability from microstate σ_i to microstate σ_j is denoted as $T(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$.

And we assume that Markov process T satisfies the detailed balance condition. The detailed balance holds for environment with time-reversal symmetry⁴⁹. Even for systems violating detailed balance, the violation of detailed balance will be reduced after coarse-graining⁵⁰. The detailed balance condition is given by

$$p^{env}(\sigma_i)T(\sigma_i \to \sigma_j) = p^{env}(\sigma_j)T(\sigma_j \to \sigma_i)$$
(8)

for each pair of microstates σ_i and σ_j , where $p^{env}(\sigma)$ is the stationary probability of microstate σ for the Markov process T. The superscript 'env' denotes that system is evolving by environmental driving $T(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$. The stationary distribution of Markov process T for macrostate x is

$$p^{env}(x) = \sum_{x(\sigma_i)=x} p^{env}(\sigma_i).$$
(9)

Our goal is to change the stationary distribution of macrostate from $p^{env}(x)$ to desired distribution $p^{design}(x)$, where $p^{design}(x) \propto \exp(-U^{design}(x))$. To realize this goal, we accept each transition from microstate σ_i to microstate σ_j with acceptance probability $A(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$. Thus system transition probability from microstate σ_i to microstate σ_j is changed from $T(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$ to $T(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)A(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$, leading to the change of stationary distribution. Below we derive the suitable $A(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$ for changing system stationary distribution of macrostate to $p^{design}(x)$.

We denote the desired stationary distribution of microstate as $p^{design}(\sigma_i)$, which needs to satisfy

$$p^{design}(x) = \sum_{x(\sigma_i)=x} p^{design}(\sigma_i).$$
(10)

To guarantee that distribution $p^{design}(\sigma_i)$ is stationary under transition probability $A(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)T(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$, a sufficient condition is detailed balance condition that

$$A(\sigma_j \to \sigma_i)T(\sigma_j \to \sigma_i)p^{design}(\sigma_j) = A(\sigma_i \to \sigma_j)T(\sigma_i \to \sigma_j)p^{design}(\sigma_i) \quad (11)$$

To satisfy Eq. (11), we choose

$$A(\sigma_i \to \sigma_j) = \min\left(1, \frac{T(\sigma_j \to \sigma_i)p^{design}(\sigma_j)}{T(\sigma_i \to \sigma_j)p^{design}(\sigma_i)}\right)$$
(12)

for each transition $\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j$. Substituting Eq. (8) into Eq. (12), we get

$$A(\sigma_i \to \sigma_j) = \min\left(1, \frac{p^{design}(\sigma_j)}{p^{env}(\sigma_j)} / \frac{p^{design}(\sigma_i)}{p^{env}(\sigma_i)}\right).$$
(13)

Thus we only need to determine the ratio $\frac{p^{design}(\sigma_i)}{p^{env}(\sigma_i)}$ for each microstate σ_i . The acceptance probability for realizing designed microstate distribution in Eq. (12) has been derived in Markov chain Monte Carlo. Below we extend it to designed macrostate distribution. Even the macrostate distribution $p^{design}(x) \propto \exp(-U^{design}(x))$ is determined, there is a lot of freedom to select the desired microstate distribution $p^{design}(\sigma_i)$, which is only constraint by Eq. (10). We will choose the most convenient $p^{design}(\sigma_i)$ for calculating the ratio $\frac{p^{design}(\sigma_i)}{p^{env}(\sigma_i)}$ as following.

Considering ratio $\frac{p^{design}(\sigma_i)}{p^{env}(\sigma_i)}$ also needs to satisfy the constraint shown in Eq. (10). To get a more convenient form of this constraint, we divide Eq. (10) by Eq. (9) and get

$$\frac{p^{design}(x)}{p^{env}(x)} = \frac{\sum_{x(\sigma_i)=x} p^{design}(\sigma_i)}{\sum_{x(\sigma_i)=x} p^{env}(\sigma_i)}.$$
(14)

Thus $p^{design}(\sigma_i)$ only need to satisfy Eq. (14) to satisfy constraint shown in Eq. (10). For convenience of calculating ratio $\frac{p^{design}(\sigma_i)}{p^{env}(\sigma_i)}$ under this constraint, we choose desired microstate distribution $p^{design}(\sigma_i)$ satisfying

$$\frac{p^{design}(\sigma_i)}{p^{env}(\sigma_i)} = \frac{p^{design}(x_i)}{p^{env}(x_i)},$$
(15)

where $x_i = x(\sigma_i)$ is the macrostate of microstate σ_i . According to Eq. (15), when probability of macrostate x_i needs to be scaled by a factor $\kappa \left(\frac{p^{design}(x_i)}{p^{env}(x_i)} = \kappa\right)$, the probability of microstates σ_i with macrostate $x(\sigma_i) = x_i$ will also be scaled by factor κ $\left(\frac{p^{design}(\sigma_i)}{p^{env}(\sigma_i)} = \kappa = \frac{p^{design}(x_i)}{p^{env}(x_i)}\right)$, which guarantees the satisfaction of Eq. (14).

Substituting Eq. (15) into Eq. (13), we get

$$A(\sigma_i \to \sigma_j) = \min\left(1, \frac{p^{design}(x_j)}{p^{env}(x_j)} / \frac{p^{design}(x_i)}{p^{env}(x_i)}\right)$$
(16)

where $x_i = x(\sigma_i)$ and $x_j = x(\sigma_j)$. Notably, the acceptance probability only use the macroscopic information of macrostate x_i and x_j . For convenience, we represent probability distribution with free energy landscape $U^{design}(x)$ and $U^{env}(x)$ shown in Eqs. (2-3), then the acceptance probability becomes

$$A(\sigma_i \to \sigma_j) = \min(1, \frac{\exp(U^{design}(x_i) - U^{design}(x_j))}{\exp(U^{env}(x_i) - U^{env}(x_j))}).$$
(17)

With our target $U^{design}(x)$ and environment property $U^{env}(x)$, we can steer system into desired macroscopic landscape $U^{design}(x)$ with only macroscopic information $x_i = x(\sigma_i)$ and $x_j = x(\sigma_j)$.

Deriving the estimation update method

As shown in Eq. (4), to realize target landscape with only macroscopic information,

system needs to know the $U^{design}(x)$ and $U^{env}(x)$ for proper decision. $U^{design}(x)$ is system target that is initially known. $U^{env}(x)$ encodes the environment property, which is usually unknown. System needs to use historical data to estimate $U^{env}(x)$. In our strategy, system use its estimation $\widehat{U}^{env}(x)$ to replace $U^{env}(x)$ in Eq. (4). When estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$ and $U^{env}(x)$ differ only by a constant term ($\hat{U}^{env}(x) =$ $U^{env}(x) + const$, the estimation $\widehat{U}^{env}(x)$ will give correct acceptance probability

based on Eq. (4) due to the fact that $\widehat{U}^{env}(x_i) - \widehat{U}^{env}(x_i) = U^{env}(x_i) - U^{env}(x_i)$.

Algorithms for estimating entropy, including the Wang-Landau method, have been developed in statistical physics while not for realizing various target landscape $U^{design}(x)$. Due to the correspondence between entropy and $U^{env}(x)$, below we extend the Wang-Landau method to derive a simple estimation update method, which enables system to continuously update estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$ while pursuing target landscape $U^{design}(x)$.

System stores an value of $\widehat{U}^{env}(x_i)$ for each macrostate x_i . And the estimation $\widehat{U}^{env}(x)$ will be updated according to observation during system evolution. Inspired by the Wang-Landau method^{41,42}, when system enters into macrostate x_i , we assume that the corresponding estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(x_i)$ will be updated as

$$\widehat{U}^{env}(x_i) = \widehat{U}^{env}(x_i) - f \times h(x_i),$$
(18)

where f is the adaptation rate and $h(x_i)$ is an undetermined function about macrostate x_i . And estimation $\widehat{U}^{env}(x)$ on other macrostate $x \neq x_i$ will not change. Next we derive the form of $h(x_i)$ based on stationary condition that correct estimation should not be changed with estimation update method Eq. (18). Estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$ is correct if and only if estimation $\widehat{U}^{env}(x)$ and $U^{env}(x)$ differ only by a constant term $(\widehat{U}^{env}(x) = U^{env}(x) + const)$. After a time interval Δt , the estimation $\widehat{U}^{env}(x)$ is updated to $\widehat{U}^{env}(x) + \Delta \widehat{U}^{env}(x)$, where $\Delta \widehat{U}^{env}(x)$ is the increment induced by Eq. (18). The increment $\Delta \hat{U}^{env}(x)$ should be independent of x to keep correct estimation. According to Eq. (18), the increment is

$$\Delta \widehat{U}^{env}(x) = -f \times h(x) \times n_{\Delta t}(x).$$
⁽¹⁹⁾

where $n_{\Lambda t}(x)$ is the number of times that system enters macrostate x during the time interval Δt . When system estimation $\widehat{U}^{env}(x)$ is correct, the probability of entering state x follows the target distribution $p^{design}(x) \propto \exp(-U^{design}(x))$. Thus expected value of increment is

$$<\Delta \widehat{U}^{env}(x) > = -f \times h(x) \times p^{design}(x) \times \Delta t$$
⁽²⁰⁾

where expected value $\langle n_{\Delta t}(x) \rangle = p^{design}(x) \times \Delta t$ is used. Considering $\Delta \widehat{U}^{env}(x)$ should be independent of x, thus

$$h(x) \propto \frac{1}{p^{design}(x)} \propto \exp\left(U^{design}(x)\right).$$
 (21)

Choosing $h(x) = \exp(U^{design}(x))$, we get the estimation update method $\widehat{U}^{env}(x_i) = \widehat{U}^{env}(x_i) - f \times \exp(U^{design}(x_i))).$

$$\tilde{U}^{env}(x_i) = \tilde{U}^{env}(x_i) - f \times \exp\left(U^{design}(x_i)\right).$$
(22)

Our method extends the Wang-Landau method. For the constant target landscape $U^{design}(x) = const$, our method degrades into the Wang-Landau method. We prove the convergence of our adaptation rule, consisting of Eq. (4) and Eq. (5), under slow adaptation limit (see Supplementary Section 1). When applying this estimation update method for continuous macrostate x, we discretize x into small bins and continuously update its estimation for each bins following Eq. (5). And estimation $\hat{U}^{env}(x)$ for each macrostate x is determined by linear interpolation between neighboring bins similar to reference⁵¹.

Environment setting

As shown in Fig. 2a, the environmental disturbance will drive system from one microstate σ_i to another microstate σ_j with transition probability $T(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$, where $T(\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_j)$ is unknown for self-adaptive network. The environment setting is essentially a procedure to generate a perturbed network σ_j from the original network σ_i . Below we introduce the environment setting used in examples.

Each network is initialized as a Erdos-Renyi network with N = 100 nodes and average degree $\langle k \rangle = 4$. Environmental disturbance will remove or add edge to network at each timestep. The environmental disturbance setting is constructed as following. At each timestep, environment will first decide whether to add one edge to network or to remove one edge from network. The probability of removing one edge at one timestep is

$$p_{remove} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp\left(-A_m(m - m_0)\right)},$$
(23)

where *m* is the number of existing edges in current network. The probability of adding one edge $p_{add} = 1 - p_{remove}$. Here, parameters are set to $A_m = 2$ and $m_0 = 200$. When $m < m_0$, environment tends to add edges. When $m > m_0$, environment tends to remove edges. Thus the number of edges in network will fluctuate around m_0 .

After deciding whether to add one edge to network or to remove one edge from network, environment selects a specific edge to add or remove. We try different selection methods to test the adaptability of our self-adaptive network. In the first example and final example, all edges have the same probability of being selected for addition or removal.

In the second example, forbidden edges will not be selected for addition and all existed edges still have the same probability of being selected for removal. After forbidding 80% of all possible edges, the number of possible edges to be added is $20\% \times \frac{N(N-1)}{2}$. For example, we consider a network with *m* edges. Without confinement, the number of possible microstates is $\left(\frac{N(N-1)}{m}\right)$. Under confinement, the number of possible microstates will be reduced from $\left(\frac{N(N-1)}{m}\right)$ to $\binom{20\% \times \frac{N(N-1)}{m}}{m}$. The ratio is

$$\frac{\binom{20\%\times\frac{N(N-1)}{2}}{m}}{\binom{N(N-1)}{2}} \approx \frac{(20\%\times\frac{N(N-1)}{2})^m}{(\frac{N(N-1)}{2})^m} = (\frac{1}{5})^m.$$
 (24)

According to Eq. (23), the number of edges m fluctuates around $m_0 = 200$. Thus the possible microstates of network will be reduced to 5^{-200} of original one.

In the third example, the probability of selecting edge (i,j) depends on the geographic distance d_{ij} between node *i* and node *j*. When environment selects one edge to add, the probability of selecting edge with length d_{ij} is proportional to $\exp(-d_{ij}/\zeta)$. When environment selects one edge to remove, the probability of selecting edge with length d_{ij} is proportional to $\exp(+d_{ij}/\zeta)$ (Fig. 5a). Here, characteristic length ζ represents the strength of geographic constraint. The edge with length $d_{ij} \gg \zeta$ is easy to be removed while hard to be added. As ζ decreases, the geographic constraint will be strengthen. In all four examples, if removing selected edge will break network into disconnected parts, such removal will be directly rejected to ensure network connectivity for calculating average shortest path length. Besides the above environment, where environment may simultaneously add and remove multiple edges (see Supplementary Section 5).

Target setting

In the first and second example, the macrostate of interest is chosen as modularity, which is defined as

$$M = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i \neq j} (A_{ij} - \frac{k_i k_j}{2m}) \delta(c_i, c_j),$$
(25)

where *m* is the number of existing edges in network. The adjacent matrix $A_{ij} = 1$ if there is one edge between node *i* and node *j*, otherwise $A_{ij} = 0$. The degree $k_i = \sum_{l \neq i} A_{il}$ and $k_j = \sum_{l \neq j} A_{jl}$ is the number of edges for node *i* and node *j*, respectively. $\delta(c_i, c_j) = 1$ if node *i* and node *j* belong to the same community, otherwise $\delta(c_i, c_j) = 0$. Here, we use Clauset-Newman-Moore heuristic⁴³ to detect community. The target landscape $U^{design}(M)$ is set to the variation of Landau's free energy function⁵² $U(M) = a_4 M^4 - a_3 M^3 + a_2 M^2 - a_1 M + a_0$, (26) where $a_4 = 5859.375$, $a_3 = 13750$, $a_2 = 11906.25$, $a_1 = 4505.111$ and $a_0 = 627.442$. The target landscape U(M) exhibits two local minima at $M_1 \approx 0.458$ and

In the third example, the macrostate of interest is chosen as average shortest path length L, which is defined as

 $M_2 \approx 0.715$. These minima are separated by a local maximum at $M_0 \approx 0.587$.

$$L = \frac{\sum_{i \neq j} d_{ij}}{N(N-1)},\tag{27}$$

where d_{ij} is the minimum number of edges that must be traversed to travel from node *i* to node *j*. The number of nodes is N = 100. The target landscape $U^{design}(L)$ of average shortest path length is set to

$$U(L) = 2 \times (L - 5.5)^2, \tag{28}$$

which exhibits only one local minimum at L = 5.5.

In the final example, the macrostate of interest is chosen as average clustering coefficient C, which is defined as

$$C = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\sum_{j>k} A_{ij} A_{jk} A_{ki}}{k_i (k_i - 1)/2} \mathbb{I}\{k_i > 1\},$$
(29)

where the indicator function $\mathbb{I}\{k_i > 1\} = 1$ only when the degree $k_i = \sum_{l \neq i} A_{il} > 1$,

otherwise $\mathbb{I}\{k_i > 1\} = 0$. The number of nodes is N = 100. The sum $\sum_{j>k} A_{ij}A_{jk}A_{ki}$

is the number of triangles including node i, and the product $k_i(k_i - 1)/2$ is the numbers of triplet (sets of three nodes with at least two connection) connected by node i. The first target landscape is set to the variation of Landau's free energy function

 $U_1(C) = b_4 C^4 - b_3 C^3 + b_2 C^2 - b_1 C + b_0$ (30a) where $b_4 = 15432.099, b_3 = 10493.827, b_2 = 2388.889, b_1 = 205.68$ and $b_0 = 5.922$. The target landscape $U_1(C)$ exhibits two local minima at $C \approx 0.074$ and $C \approx 0.266$. These minima are separated by a local maximum at $C \approx 0.17$.

The second target landscape is set to a symmetrical landscape

$$U_2(C) = 100(C - 0.17)^2,$$
 (30b)
which exhibits only one local minimum at $C = 0.17$.

The third target landscape is set to an asymmetrical landscape
$$U_2(C) = 30e^{10 \times |C-0.1|}(C-0.2)^2$$

$$U_3(C) = 30e^{10 \times |C-0.1|}(C-0.2)^2,$$
which exhibits only one local minimum at $C = 0.2$.
(30c)

Given target landscape $U^{design}(x)$, our self-adaptive network could realize target distribution

$$p^{design}(x) = \frac{\exp\left(-U^{design}(x)\right)}{\sum_{y \in \Omega_x} \exp\left(-U^{design}(y)\right)},\tag{31}$$

where Ω_x is the operational domain of macrostate *x*.

Reference

- 49. Maes C, Netočný K. Time-reversal and entropy. *Journal of statistical physics* **110**, 269-310 (2003).
- 50. Yu Q, Zhang D, Tu Y. Inverse power law scaling of energy dissipation rate in nonequilibrium reaction networks. *Physical review letters* **126**, 080601 (2021).
- 51. Shell M S, Debenedetti P G, Panagiotopoulos A Z. Generalization of the Wang-Landau method for off-lattice simulations. *Physical review E* **66**, 056703 (2002).
- 52. Qian, H., Ao, P., Tu, Y., & Wang, J. A framework towards understanding mesoscopic phenomena: Emergent unpredictability, symmetry breaking and dynamics across scales. *Chemical Physics Letters* **665**, 153-161(2016).