

# Maximal Length Cellular Automata : A Survey

Sumit Adak<sup>a,1,\*</sup>, Sukanta Das<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Technical University of Denmark, Kgs. Lyngby, 2800, Denmark

<sup>b</sup>Indian Institute of Engineering Science and Technology, Shibpur, Howrah, 711103, India

---

## Abstract

This article surveys some theoretical aspects of Cellular Automata (CAs) research. In particular, we discuss on *maximal length CA*. An  $n$ -cell CA is a maximal length CA, if all the configurations except one form a single cycle. There is a bonding between maximal length CA and primitive polynomial. So, primitive polynomials occupy a good amount of space in this survey. The main goal of this survey is to provide a tutorial on maximal length CA theory to researchers with classical and new results on *maximality*. We also give a compact collection of known results with references to their proofs, and to suggest some open problems. Additionally, some new theorems and corollaries are added to bridge the gaps among several known results.

**Keywords:** Cellular Automata (CAs), maximal length CA, primitive polynomial, rule, linear CA

---

## 1. Introduction

This article presents a tutorial on a special class of non-uniform cellular automata (CAs); for a general survey on CAs, please see [14]. Non-uniform (hybrid) finite CAs under null boundary condition share a very special property which the classical finite (non-uniform) CAs under periodic boundary condition do not. The property is the *maximality* in cycle length, which means, the presence of a cycle of length  $2^n - 1$  in an  $n$ -cell binary cellular automaton (CA). This property was first observed by Pries et al. [67]. These CAs are traditionally named as *maximal length CAs*. There is a connection between primitive polynomials over *Galois Field* (GF) and maximal length CAs. The main focus of this work on linear maximal length CA and primitive polynomial. In our further reference, by “CA” and “maximal length CA”, we shall mean “linear CA” and “linear maximal length CA”, if not mentioned otherwise.

Although from 1980s, maximal length CA is being observed, they were initially searched by experiments. In early phase, Hortensius et al. [45, 42, 43] used maximal length CAs to generate pseudo-random number. Using computer simulation, they proposed a table which gives the non-uniform constructions necessary to get a CA with maximal length cycle. Serra et al. [73] showed that maximal length CAs with all non-zero configurations lying in a single cycle produce high

---

\*Corresponding author

Email addresses: suad@dtu.dk (Sumit Adak), sukanta@it.iiests.ac.in (Sukanta Das)

<sup>1</sup>The majority of the work was completed when the author was in Indian Institute of Engineering Science and Technology, Shibpur

Table 1: The rules 90 and 150

Present state (RMT)	111 (7)	110 (6)	101 (5)	100 (4)	011 (3)	010 (2)	001 (1)	000 (0)	Rule
(i) Next state	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	90
(ii) Next state	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	150

quality pseudo-random patterns. In [19, 18], Cattell and Muzio developed an adequate algebraic framework for the study of maximal length CAs. It was also shown that deciding primitive polynomials and deciding maximal length CAs are two equivalent problems.

In this tutorial article, we explore the maximal length CAs under three different categories of cellular automata - linear, complemented and non-linear. At first, we define cellular automata and maximal length CAs. Next, we establish the relation between linear maximal length CA and primitive polynomial (Section 2.2.2). Next, we show the different types of approaches which are applied to analyze maximal length CAs (Section 3). We explore various types research on maximal length CA which are done from beginning and the present situation for some basic conditions to get maximality, such as dependence on the boundary conditions. Synthesis of maximal length CA from a given primitive polynomial over GF(2) is discussed in next section (Section 4). This work was most attractive work for many researchers till date. Next, we synthesize the primitive polynomials using cellular automata as a tool (Section 5). Different types of greedy strategies are discussed here. All the prior topics are based on linear maximal length CA, but in next two, we show the complemented and non-linear maximal length CAs. That means, generation of complemented and non-linear maximal length CAs (Section 6 and 7). All the previous discussions are based on GF(2), next we extend it over GF( $q$ ) to finding maximal length CAs (Section 8). Besides, maximal length CA have been used for diverse applications, but most attractive applications are pseudo-random number generator (PRNG) and cryptography (Section 9). Several open problems are discussed at the end of most of the sections. In discussion, we conclude with an important open problem based on maximal length CA.

## 2. One-dimensional Hybrid Cellular Automata

### 2.1. Basics

A cellular automaton (CA) that we are considering here consists of an array of  $n$  cells numbered from 0 to  $n - 1$ . Cells can assume either 0 or 1 as their state. Let  $x_i$  denote the state of cell  $i$ . Then, a configuration of the CA is  $x = (x_0 x_1 \cdots x_{n-1})$  where  $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Let us consider that  $\mathcal{C}$  is the collection of all possible configurations of an  $n$ -cell CA (that is  $|\mathcal{C}|=2^n$ ). Then, a CA can be seen as a function  $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , which satisfies the following conditions:  $y = G(x)$ ,  $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$ , where  $x = (x_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n-1}$ ,  $y = (y_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n-1}$  and  $y_i = \mathcal{R}_i(x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1})$ . The  $\mathcal{R}_i: \{0, 1\}^3 \mapsto \{0, 1\}$  is a next state function for the cell  $i$ , commonly known as *rule*. Here,  $y$  is called the *successor* of  $x$ , and  $x$  the *predecessor* of  $y$ . In this work, we consider null boundary condition where left and right neighbors of cell 0 and cell  $n - 1$  are always in state 0. That is,  $y_0 = \mathcal{R}_0(0, x_0, x_1)$  and  $y_{n-1} = \mathcal{R}_{n-1}(x_{n-2}, x_{n-1}, 0)$ .

The rule  $\mathcal{R}_i$  can be expressed in tabular form (Table 1) and decimal equivalent of the eight-bit binary sequence generally identifies the rule. Obviously, there are  $2^8$  distinct rules. If all the cells of a CA use a single rule, the CA is called *uniform* CA; otherwise it is a *non-uniform* or *hybrid* CA [28, 8]. To define an arbitrary CA, therefore, we need a *rule vector*

$\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{R}_0, \mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_i, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{n-1})$ , where  $\mathcal{R}_i$  is the rule of cell  $i$ . If not specified otherwise, by ‘‘CA’’ we shall mean hereafter one-dimensional hybrid CA under null boundary condition.

For a particular rule  $\mathcal{R}_i$ , let  $\mathcal{R}_i[x_{i-1}x_ix_{i+1}]$  denote the next state of cell  $i$  for the present states combination  $x_{i-1}x_ix_{i+1}$  of cell  $i$  and its neighbors. Each  $x_{i-1}x_ix_{i+1}$  is called as Rule Min Term (RMT). RMTs are identified by their decimal equivalents. For example, 010 of the first row of Table 1 is the RMT 2, next state against which is 0 for rule 90, 1 for rule 150. If  $r$  is an RMT of  $\mathcal{R}_i$ , we write  $\mathcal{R}_i[r]$  to denote its next state. Hence,  $90[2]=0$ ,  $150[2]=1$  (see Table 1).

Sometimes, a configuration can alternatively be represented by its *RMT Sequence (RS)*.

**Definition 1.** Let  $x = (x_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n-1}$  be a configuration of an  $n$ -cell CA. The RMT sequence of  $x$ , denoted as  $\tilde{x}$ , is  $(r_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n-1}$  where  $r_i$  is the RMT  $x_{i-1}x_ix_{i+1}$ .

For example, (0, 1, 3, 7, 7, 6) or simply, 013776 is the RMT sequence of the configuration 001111. An interesting relation is followed in the sequence:  $r_{i+1}$  is either  $2r_i$  or  $2r_i + 1$  under modulo 8 operation. Obviously, an arbitrary sequence of RMTs cannot form an RMT sequence.

**Definition 2.** Two RMTs  $r$  and  $s$  ( $r \neq s$ ) are said to be equivalent to each other if  $2r \equiv 2s \pmod{8}$  and said to be sibling to each other if  $\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor$  ([28]).

Therefore, RMTs 0 and 4 are equivalent to each other, and RMTs 0 and 1 are sibling to each other. That is, the RMTs  $0xy$  and  $1xy$ , and the RMTs  $xy0$  and  $xy1$  form equivalent and sibling RMT sets respectively to any  $x, y \in \{0, 1\}$ .

The 256 rules can be divided into three categories - *linear*, *complemented* and *non-linear* rules [63]. Following is the basic definition of these categories.

**Definition 3.** A rule  $R : \{0, 1\}^3 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is **linear** if  $R(x, y, z) = ax + dy + bz \pmod{2}$  for some constants  $a, d, b \in \{0, 1\}$ . A rule  $\bar{R} : \{0, 1\}^3 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is **complemented** if  $\bar{R}(x, y, z) = 1 - R(x, y, z)$  for some linear rule  $R$ . We call a rule **non-linear** if it is neither linear nor complemented.

There are eight linear rules - 0, 60, 90, 102, 150, 170, 204 and 240, and eight complemented rules -15, 51, 85, 105, 153, 165, 195 and 255 (see Table 2). From Table 2, we get that  $a = 1$ ,  $d = 1$  and  $b = 0$  for rule 60, whereas for rule 90,  $a = 1$ ,  $d = 0$  and  $b = 1$ . Sometime, a linear or complemented rule can be written as -  $(a, d, b)$ . As an example, rule 90 can be written as (1,0,1). Apart from the 16 rules noted in Table 2, the rest 240 rules are non-linear.

Table 2: Linear and complemented CA rules

Linear Rules	Complemented Rules
$0(x, y, z) = 0$	$255(x, y, z) = 1$
$60(x, y, z) = x + y \pmod{2}$	$195(x, y, z) = 1 - 60(x, y, z)$
$90(x, y, z) = x + z \pmod{2}$	$165(x, y, z) = 1 - 90(x, y, z)$
$102(x, y, z) = y + z \pmod{2}$	$153(x, y, z) = 1 - 102(x, y, z)$
$150(x, y, z) = x + y + z \pmod{2}$	$105(x, y, z) = 1 - 150(x, y, z)$
$170(x, y, z) = z$	$85(x, y, z) = 1 - 170(x, y, z)$
$204(x, y, z) = y$	$51(x, y, z) = 1 - 204(x, y, z)$
$240(x, y, z) = x$	$15(x, y, z) = 1 - 240(x, y, z)$




Figure 1: Transition diagram of CA (150, 90, 90, 90)

**Definition 4.** If all the rules of a rule vector  $\mathcal{R}$  are linear, then the CA is **linear**. If at least one rule is complemented and the rest are linear, then the CA is a **complemented CA**. Otherwise, (that is, at least one rule of  $\mathcal{R}$  is non-linear) the CA is **non-linear**.

For example, the CA with rule vector (90, 170, 102, 60) is linear whereas the CA (90, 170, 153, 60) is a complemented CA because rule 153 is a complemented rule. The CA (90, 170, 86, 60) is a non-linear CA because 86 is a non-linear rule.

The sequence of configurations generated during their evolution (with time) directs the CA behaviour. If CAs are finite, the sequence of configurations can be represented by *transition diagram*. Figure 1 shows such a diagram of 4-cell CA (150, 90, 90, 90). The transition diagram of a CA may contain *cyclic* and *acyclic* configurations (see Definition 5). Based on this, a CA can be categorized as either *reversible* and *irreversible*.

**Definition 5.** A configuration  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  is said to be *cyclic* if  $x = G^t(x)$  for some  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$ . Otherwise the configuration is *acyclic*. The CA has a cycle of length  $t$  if  $x = G^t(x)$  but  $x \neq G^{t_1}(x)$  for any  $t_1 < t$ .

**Definition 6.** A CA is *reversible* if all the configurations are cyclic; otherwise the CA is *irreversible*.

In other word, a CA is reversible if its (global transition) function  $G$  is bijective. Deciding an arbitrary CA as reversible is an issue. This issue has been addressed in [28] for an  $n$ -cell non-uniform CA under null boundary condition. In a reversible CA, the initial configuration repeats after certain number of time steps and each configuration has exactly one predecessor (Figure 1). On the other hand, in an irreversible CA, there are some configurations which are having more than one predecessor.

## 2.2. Maximal Length Cellular Automata

Reversible CA can be classified as maximal length and non-maximal length CA:

**Definition 7.** A finite CA is a maximal length CA if all but one configuration of it are in a single cycle.

The researches on maximal length CA are primarily based on binary CAs that use Wolfram's rules. So, major share of this survey is occupied by this class of CAs. For binary maximal length CA, length of maximal cycle is  $2^n - 1$  where  $n$  is number of cells of the CA. In our further discussion, if not stated otherwise, by maximal length CA we shall mean this class of CAs. In a linear maximal length CA of size  $n$ , the marginal configuration is  $0^n$  which forms a single length




Figure 2: Transition diagram of CA (150, 150, 90, 150)

cycle (fixed point), and the rest  $2^n - 1$  (non-zero) configurations form another cycle. For example, the CA (150, 150, 90, 150) is a maximal length CA, which is having a cycle of length  $2^4 - 1 = 15$  (see Figure 2). In case of complemented CAs and some of the non-linear maximal length CAs, the marginal configuration is some non-zero configuration. In literature, however, most of works with maximality are centred around linear CAs. In our further reference, if not stated otherwise, by “maximal length CA”, we shall mean only linear maximal length CA.

### 2.2.1. Matrix Algebra : Characterization Tool

Out of total 256 CA rules, 8 are linear rules (see Table 2). Linear CAs are formed with these linear rules only. The linear CAs can be efficiently characterized by matrix algebra. An  $n$ -cell 1-dimensional linear CA is represented by a characterization matrix  $[T]_{n \times n}$ . The  $i^{th}$  row of  $T$  corresponds to the neighborhood relation of the  $i^{th}$  cell, where

$$T[i, j] = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the next state of cell } i \text{ depends on the present state of cell } j \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since our CA uses 3-neighborhood dependency,  $T[i, j]$  can have non-zero values for  $j = (i - 1)$ ,  $i$ ,  $(i + 1)$ . That is, the  $T$ -matrix is a tridiagonal matrix where the main, upper and lower diagonal can only be non zero. If  $c_t$  is the configuration of the CA at  $t^{th}$  instant of time, then the next configuration - that is, the configuration at  $(t + 1)^{th}$  time instant, is  $c_{t+1} = T.c_t$  where  $c_t$  and  $c_{t+1}$  are presented as column vectors. In our further discussion, when we multiply  $T$  with a configuration, we assume that the configuration is a column vector. However, if  $c_{t+p}$  is reachable from  $c_t$  after  $p$  time steps, that is, if  $c_{t+p} = G^p(c_t)$ , then we get that

$$c_{t+p} = T^p.c_t \quad (1)$$

Reversibility of a CA can easily be decided from its matrix representation. If  $T$  is non-singular, the CA is reversible; otherwise it is irreversible.

$$\det(T) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the CA is reversible} \\ 0, & \text{if the CA is irreversible} \end{cases}$$




Figure 3: Block diagram of null, periodic and intermediate boundary CAs

where  $\det(T)$  is determinant of matrix  $T$ . Under null boundary condition,  $T$  can be represented as the following:

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} d_0 & b_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_1 & d_1 & b_1 & \ddots & & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 & d_2 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & & & \ddots & d_{n-2} & b_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & a_{n-1} & d_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}_{n \times n}$$

Note that, under null boundary condition, the left (resp. right) neighbor of the first (resp. last) cell is considered as in state 0, so the cell is independent of the neighbor. In case of periodic boundary condition, the rightmost and leftmost cells are neighbors of each other. On the other hand, in case for intermediate boundary, the leftmost (rightmost) cell consider the two successive cells on its right (left) as its neighbors (see Figure 3). As an example, a 5-cell CA with rule vector  $(90, 150, 90, 150, 150)$  represented by matrix  $T_{NB}$  under null boundary condition. This CA is represented by the matrices  $T_{PB}$  and  $T_{IB}$  when the used boundary conditions are periodic and intermediate respectively.

$$T_{NB} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad T_{PB} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad T_{IB} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Further, we get the characteristic polynomial of a  $T$ -matrix as  $P(x) = \det(xI + T) \pmod{2}$ . The characteristic polynomial can be obtained using an efficient recurrence relation which is noted down in Lemma 1 [20]. Before going to prove that, let us define some terms. We adopt the notation  $\mathcal{R}_{i,j}$  ( $i \leq j$ ) to refer to a sub-rule vector of  $\mathcal{R}$ :  $\mathcal{R}_{i,j} = (\mathcal{R}_i, \mathcal{R}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathcal{R}_j)$ . Such a sub-rule vector consisting of rules from cell  $i$  to cell  $j$ . We use  $\Delta_{i,j}$  to denote the characteristic polynomial

of  $\mathcal{R}_{i,j}$ , and abbreviate  $\Delta_{0,j}$  as  $\Delta_j$ . We call  $\Delta_{i,j}$  a subpolynomial. The complete rule vector  $\mathcal{R}$  is written as  $\mathcal{R}_{0,n-1}$  with corresponding characteristic polynomial  $\Delta$ . In our further discussion, null boundary condition is assumed as default boundary.

$$T_k = \begin{bmatrix} d_0 & b_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_1 & d_1 & b_1 & \ddots & & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 & d_2 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & & & \ddots & d_{k-2} & b_{k-2} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & a_{k-1} & d_{k-1} \end{bmatrix}_{k \times k}$$

**Lemma 1.** Let  $T_k$  denote the  $k \times k$  submatrix of  $T$  and  $\Delta_{k-1} = \det(xI + T_k)$ . Then,  $\Delta_{k-1}$  satisfies the following recurrence:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{-1} &= 1, \\ \Delta_0 &= (x + d_0) \\ \Delta_{k-1} &= (x + d_{k-1})\Delta_{k-2} + b_{k-2}a_{k-1}\Delta_{k-3} \end{aligned}$$

**Proof :** By expanding  $(xI + T_k)$  along the last row, we have

$$\Delta_{k-1} = (x + d_{k-1})\Delta_{k-2} + a_{k-1} \det(B),$$

where

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} x + d_0 & b_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_1 & x + d_1 & b_1 & \ddots & & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 & x + d_2 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & a_{k-3} & x + d_{k-3} & b_{k-3} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & a_{k-2} & b_{k-2} \end{bmatrix}$$

Now,  $\det(B) = b_{k-2}(xI + T_{k-2}) + a_{k-2} \cdot 0$

Therefore,

$$\Delta_{k-1} = (x + d_{k-1})\Delta_{k-2} + b_{k-2}a_{k-1}\Delta_{k-3} \quad \square$$

The characteristic polynomial can be calculated using the above recurrence relation. Lets take an example to get the characteristic polynomial of a CA.

**Example 1.** Let us take a 4-cell CA with rule vector (90, 150, 90, 150) represented by matrix  $T$ :

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}_{4 \times 4}$$

We can find out the characteristic polynomial of any submatrix of  $T$  (mod 2) according to recurrence relation given above:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{-1} &= 1, \\ \Delta_0 &= (x + 0) = x, \\ \Delta_1 &= (x + 1)x + 1 = x^2 + x + 1, \\ \Delta_2 &= (x + 0)(x^2 + x + 1) + x = x^3 + x^2, \\ \Delta_3 &= (x + 1)(x^3 + x^2) + (x^2 + x + 1) = x^4 + x + 1 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the characteristic polynomial of the given CA is  $x^4 + x + 1$ .

### 2.2.2. Characteristic Polynomial

The characteristic polynomials of  $T$ -matrices can be reducible, irreducible and primitive. Types of such polynomials depend on two factors - the rules used in rule vectors and sequence of rules.

**Definition 8.** A nonzero polynomial  $P(x)$  over  $GF(q)$  is said to be irreducible if it cannot be factored into two non-constant polynomials  $G(x)$  and  $H(x)$  over the same field, that is,  $P(x) \neq G(x) \times H(x)$  for any non-constant  $G(x)$  and  $H(x)$ ; otherwise, it is reducible.

**Definition 9.** The polynomial  $P(x)$  over  $GF(q)$  is primitive, if it is irreducible and  $\min_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{n | P(x) \text{ divides } x^n - 1\} = q^k - 1$ . In this case,  $P(x)$  has a root  $\alpha$  in  $GF(q^k)$  such that, it generates all the elements of the extension field  $GF(q^k)$  from the base field  $GF(q)$  as successive power of  $\alpha$ . That is,  $\{0, 1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \dots, \alpha^{q^k-2}\}$  is the entire field  $GF(q^k)$ .

**Theorem 1.** In an  $n$ -cell CA, if  $a_i = 0$  for any  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$  or  $b_j = 0$  for any  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-2\}$ , then  $\Delta$  is always reducible [73, 20].

**Proof:** Suppose,  $a_k = 0$  ( $0 < k \leq n-1$ ). Then, according to Lemma 1, we get  $\Delta_k = (x+d_k)\Delta_{k-1}$ . Hence,  $\Delta_{k-1}$  is a factor of  $\Delta_k$ . Therefore,  $\Delta_{k+1} = (x+d_{k+1})\Delta_k + \Delta_{k-1}$  is divisible by  $\Delta_{k-1}$ . Continuing by induction,  $\Delta$  is also divisible by  $\Delta_{k-1}$ . Since  $\Delta_{k-1}$  is a polynomial of degree  $k \geq 1$ , it is the case that  $\Delta$  is reducible. If we now similarly consider  $b_k = 0$ , for any  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-2\}$ , we get the similar result. Hence the proof.  $\square$

From Table 2, we find that all the linear rules except rules 90 and 150 either  $a = 0$  or  $b = 0$ . Then, according to Theorem 1, these rules cannot participate in maximal length CAs. Hence, we have only two rules, rule 90 and rule 150, which are capable to generate characteristic polynomials as irreducible and primitive.

**Theorem 2.** Only a specific sequence of rules 90 and 150 can form a maximal length CA.

**Proof:** By contradiction, consider that any sequence of 90 and 150 of length  $n \geq 2$  form a maximal length CA. The automaton of Figure 1 contradicts the proposition. Hence, a specific sequence of 90 and 150 forms rule vector of a maximal length CA.  $\square$

An efficient algorithm has been developed by Cattell and Muzio. to synthesize maximal length CA from a primitive polynomial [19] which will be discussed in Section 4. This implies that deciding primitive polynomials and deciding maximal length CAs are two equivalent problems. According to the discussions of Section 3 and Section 4, we get the following theorem which relates maximal length CA and primitive polynomials. The proof of this theorem can be derived from these discussion.

**Theorem 3.** A linear CA is a maximal length CA under null boundary condition iff its characteristic polynomial is primitive over  $GF(2)$ .

**Example 2.** For the CA of (150, 150, 90, 150) under null boundary condition, we get the characteristic polynomial as  $x^4 + x^3 + 1$  which is primitive over  $GF(2)$ . The CA is also maximal length CA (see Figure 2). Now, for the CA (150, 90, 90, 90), we get the characteristic polynomial  $x^4 + x^3 + x^2 + 1$ , which is not primitive but irreducible. The CA is also not maximal length (see Figure 1).



Furthermore, the CAs that involve only rules 90 and 150 are generally called **90-150 CAs**. A cell with rule 90 depends on left and right neighbors, whereas a cell with rule 150 depends on left, self and right neighbors. So, the upper and lower diagonals of a matrix representing a CA with rules 90 and 150 are all 1. Further, the main diagonal is 0 if the rule of cell is 90, and 1 if the rule of cell is 150.

$$d_i = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if cell } i \text{ uses rule 90} \\ 1, & \text{if cell } i \text{ uses rule 150} \end{cases}$$

The characteristic polynomial of 90-150 CAs can be calculated using the following recurrence relation which is simplified from previous recurrence relation (see Lemma 1).

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{-1} &= 1, \\ \Delta_0 &= (x + d_0) \\ \Delta_1 &= (x + d_1)\Delta_0 + \Delta_{-1}, \\ &\vdots \\ \Delta_k &= (x + d_k)\Delta_{k-1} + \Delta_{k-2}, \\ &\vdots \\ \Delta &= \Delta_{n-1} = (x + d_{n-1})\Delta_{n-2} + \Delta_{n-3} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

However, there is no maximal length CA under periodic boundary condition (this will be discussed in next section).

### 3. Analysis of Maximality

Although the first maximal length cellular automaton was identified through an experimental approach [67], a polynomial theory based approach has been taken later to analyse maximality of a cellular automaton. In fact, these are the only two approaches available to decide maximality of a CA.

1. [Exhaustive Search] Test reversibility of a given 90-150 CA. If the CA is reversible, then test if the cycle length is maximal or not.
2. [Primitivity Based] Find characteristic polynomial of a given 90-150 CA. If the polynomial is primitive, the CA is of maximal length.

Testing maximality and testing primitivity - both the approaches take exponential time by the best-known algorithms. However, if primitive polynomials are known a priori, the second approach becomes efficient. Some researchers have used known primitive polynomials to analyze as well as to synthesize maximal length CAs. We shall present those results. Before that, we present a generic procedure to test maximality of a 90-150 CA.

For example, the CA of Figure 2 with  $\mathcal{R} = (150, 150, 90, 150)$  is a maximal length CA. If we start counting from  $x = 0001$ , we get  $count = 15$  after covering all configurations.

Hortensius et al. [45, 43] added some extra points in maximal length CAs that are used to generate pseudo-random number. Using computer simulation, they proposed a table which gives the non-uniform constructions necessary to achieve maximality for size 4 to 50. The table can be found in Ref. [45]. These maximal length CAs eventually lead to sequences which closely

---

**Algorithm 3.1:** Decide Maximality

---

**Input**  $n$ -cell 90-150 CA  
**Output** Maximal length CA or not (**True/False**)

- 1: **if** the CA is not reversible **then**
- 2:     **return** False (Not Maximal)
- 3: **end if**
- 4:  $x \leftarrow 0^{n-1}1, y \leftarrow G(x)$  and  $count \leftarrow 1$
- 5: **while**  $x \neq y$  **do**
- 6:      $y \leftarrow G(y)$
- 7:      $count \leftarrow count + 1$
- 8: **end while**
- 9: **if**  $count \neq 2^n - 1$  **then**
- 10:     **return** False (Not Maximal)
- 11: **else**
- 12:     **return** True (that is, the CA is a maximal length CA)
- 13: **end if**

---

resemble a random sequence from a regular starting pattern. Furthermore, we can generate maximal length CAs from primitive polynomials. Few research works have been done by using primitive polynomials [13, 11, 41].

The maximal length CAs that we have seen till now, use null boundary condition. Researchers took effort to find maximal length CAs with other boundary conditions.

### 3.1. Boundary Condition Dependence

Based on the results of extensive simulations, Bardell [10, 12] proposed a conjecture that there is no non-uniform CA with periodic boundary condition that has characteristic polynomial as primitive. The conjecture has later been proved by Nandi et al. [61]. They have shown that, for an  $n$ -cell periodic boundary CA with rules 90 and 150, either  $x$  or  $(x + 1)$  is a factor of the characteristic polynomial, or the characteristic polynomial is a square. Hence, its characteristic polynomial is always reducible. Outline of the proof can be found in Theorem 11.

**Theorem 4.** *There is no 90-150 CA under periodic boundary condition that has the characteristic polynomials as primitive.*

Nandi et al. [61] have also shown that there exist maximal length CAs against each primitive polynomial under intermediate boundary condition. Following theorem establishes the fact that there exists at least one CA in intermediate boundary condition, corresponding to a CA under null boundary condition. Both of the CAs are having same characteristic polynomial.

**Theorem 5.** *For every 90-150 CA in null boundary, there exists at least one CA in intermediate boundary having the same characteristic polynomial.*

**Proof :** The characteristic matrix of a 90-150 CA under null boundary condition is represented as

$$T_{NB} = \begin{bmatrix} d_0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & d_1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & d_2 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & d_3 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & d_{n-3} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & d_{n-2} & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & d_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}_{n \times n}$$

where  $d_i = 0$  (resp. 1), if the rule of  $i^{\text{th}}$  cell is 90 (resp. 150). The characteristic polynomial of this is  $\det(xI + T_{NB})$

$$T_{NB} + Ix = \begin{bmatrix} d_0 + x & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & d_1 + x & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & d_2 + x & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & d_3 + x & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & d_{n-3} + x & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & d_{n-2} + x & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & d_{n-1} + x \end{bmatrix}_{n \times n}$$

Let us number the rows and columns of the above matrix as  $Row(1), Row(2), \dots, Row(n)$ , and  $Col(1), Col(2), \dots, Col(n)$  respectively. We now perform row and column operations on the above matrix, and get the following matrices.

$$\Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 + d_0 + x & 1 + d_1 + x & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & d_1 + x & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & d_2 + x & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & d_3 + x & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & d_{n-3} + x & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & d_{n-2} + x & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 1 + d_{n-2} + x & 1 + d_{n-1} + x \end{bmatrix}_{n \times n}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Row(1) &\leftarrow Row(1) + Row(2) \\ Row(n) &\leftarrow Row(n) + Row(n-1) \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 + d_0 + x & d_0 + d_1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 + d_1 + x & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & d_2 + x & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & d_3 + x & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & d_{n-3} + x & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 1 + d_{n-2} + x & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & d_{n-2} + d_{n-1} & 1 + d_{n-1} + x \end{bmatrix}_{n \times n}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Col(2) &\leftarrow Col(1) + Col(2) \\ Col(n-1) &\leftarrow Col(n) + Col(n-1) \end{aligned}$$




Figure 4: Sub-rule vector related by the concatenation relation

$$\Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1+d_0 & d_0+d_1 & \boxed{1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1+d_1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & d_2 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & d_3 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & d_{n-3} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 1+d_{n-2} & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \boxed{1} & d_{n-2}+d_{n-1} & 1+d_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}_{n \times n}$$

$$\Rightarrow T_{IB} + Ix$$

where  $T_{IB}$  is the matrix representation of CA under intermediate boundary condition. Hence the proof.  $\square$

We shall see in detail that for each primitive polynomial, there exists at least one CA under null boundary condition. Hence, for every primitive polynomial, there exist at least one CA in intermediate boundary condition. From the exhaustive simulation study, they have proposed following conjecture for intermediate boundary condition.

**Conjecture 1.** *There exist exactly 18  $n$ -cell CAs ( $n \geq 4$ ) with intermediate boundary conditions for every primitive polynomial of degree  $n$  [61].*

### 3.2. Palindromic and Uniform CA

This section explores some special patterns of rule vectors, for which the CA is always non-maximal. The first of these is palindromic, where the rule vector is identical to its own reversal. That means, it has a symmetric rule vector:  $(\mathcal{R}_0, \mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{n-1}) = (\mathcal{R}_{n-1}, \mathcal{R}_{n-2}, \dots, \mathcal{R}_0)$ . As an example, the CA with rule vector (150, 90, 150, 90, 150) is a palindromic CA. In [16], it has been shown that the characteristic polynomials of an even length palindromic CA is a perfect square, and of an odd length palindromic CA is the product of a monomial and a perfect square. Hence, the characteristic polynomial of a palindromic CA is always reducible. To prove this statement, at first we have to prove the concatenation relation which gives characteristic polynomial of a CA formed by concatenating two CAs. The result is stated in terms of breaking an  $n$ -cell CA into components  $0, 1, \dots, k-1$  and  $k, k+1, \dots, n-1$  (see Figure 4). like before, we use  $\Delta_{i,j}$  to denote characteristic polynomial of  $\mathcal{R}_{i,j}$ , and abbreviate  $\Delta_{0,j}$  as  $\Delta_j$ . Note that a characteristic polynomial can be denoted as  $\Delta_{0,n-1}$ ,  $\Delta_{n-1}$  or  $\Delta$ . Later material requires that the characteristic polynomial of an  $n$ -cell CA for  $n = 0$  and  $n = -1$  be defined:  $\Delta_{0,-1} = \Delta_{-1} = 1$  and  $\Delta_{0,-2} = \Delta_{-2} = 0$ .

**Theorem 6.** *For any  $k$  with  $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ ,*

$$\Delta_{0,n-1} = \Delta_{0,k-1} \Delta_{k,n-1} + \Delta_{0,k-2} \Delta_{k+1,n-1}$$

**Proof :** We prove this theorem by induction. The base case of the inductive proof is for  $k = 0$ . By definitions of  $\Delta_{i,j}$  and from Lemma 1 we get that  $\Delta_{0,-1} = \Delta_{-1} = 1$ , and  $\Delta_{0,-2} = \Delta_{-2} = 0$ . Then the theorem claims that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{0,n-1} &= \Delta_{0,-1}\Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{0,-2}\Delta_{1,n-1} \\ &= 1 \cdot \Delta_{0,n-1} + 0 \cdot \Delta_{1,n-1} \\ &= \Delta_{0,n-1}\end{aligned}$$

and hence is satisfied trivially.

Assuming that the theorem holds for  $k$ , it is to show that it holds for  $k + 1$ . By the inductive hypothesis,

$$\Delta_{0,n-1} = \Delta_{0,k-1}\Delta_{k,n-1} + \Delta_{0,k-2}\Delta_{k+1,n-1}$$

A CA has left-right symmetry with respect to its characteristics polynomial. It implies that the characteristic polynomial remains unchanged if the cell labelings are reversed. This result is formally proved in Section 4.1 (see Corollary 3). Hence, the recurrence relation 2 can be rewritten considering right-most rule as the first rule. Then we get

$$\Delta_{k,n-1} = (x + d_k)\Delta_{k+1,n-1} + \Delta_{k+2,n-1}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{0,n-1} &= \Delta_{0,k-1}\Delta_{k,n-1} + \Delta_{0,k-2}\Delta_{k+1,n-1} \\ &= \Delta_{0,k-1}((x + d_k)\Delta_{k+1,n-1} + \Delta_{k+2,n-1}) + \Delta_{0,k-2}\Delta_{k+1,n-1} \\ &= \Delta_{0,k-1}\Delta_{k+2,n-1} + (x + d_k)\Delta_{0,k-1}\Delta_{k+1,n-1} + \Delta_{0,k-2}\Delta_{k+1,n-1} \\ &= \Delta_{0,k-1}\Delta_{k+2,n-1} + ((x + d_k)\Delta_{0,k-1} + \Delta_{0,k-2})\Delta_{k+1,n-1}\end{aligned}$$

Applying (2) where  $\Delta_{0,k} = \Delta_k = (x + d_k)\Delta_{0,k-1} + \Delta_{0,k-2}$

$$\Delta_{0,n-1} = \Delta_{0,k}\Delta_{k+1,n-1} + \Delta_{0,k-1}\Delta_{k+2,n-1}$$

Hence the formula holds for  $k + 1$ , given that it holds for  $k$ . Hence the proof.  $\square$

**Example 3.** Consider the 4-cell CA in Example 1 with the rule vector (90, 150, 90, 150). With  $k = 2$

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{0,3} &= \Delta_{0,1}\Delta_{2,3} + \Delta_{0,0}\Delta_{3,3} \\ &= (x^2 + x + 1)(x^2 + x + 1) + x(x + 1) \\ &= x^4 + x + 1\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the characteristic polynomial of the given CA is  $x^4 + x + 1$  which is same as Example 1.

**Theorem 7.** The characteristic polynomial  $\Delta(\Delta_{0,n-1})$  of a palindromic CA is given by

$$\Delta_{0,n-1} = \begin{cases} (\Delta_{0,\frac{n}{2}-1} + \Delta_{0,\frac{n}{2}-2})^2, & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ (x + d_{\frac{n-1}{2}})(\Delta_{0,\frac{n-1}{2}-1})^2, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

**Proof :** Suppose that  $n$  is even, and let  $k = (n/2) - 1$ . The symmetry of the rule vector  $\mathcal{R}$  implies that  $(\mathcal{R}_0, \mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{n-1}) = (\mathcal{R}_0, \dots, \mathcal{R}_k, \mathcal{R}_k, \dots, \mathcal{R}_0)$ .

Due to left-right symmetry of CA with respect to its characteristic polynomial, the polynomial remains unchanged if the cell labelings are reversed. Applying it into the palindromic CA, we can get  $\Delta_{0,k} = \Delta_{k+1,n-1}$  and  $\Delta_{0,k-1} = \Delta_{k+2,n-1}$ . By substituting these into Theorem 6

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{0,n-1} &= \Delta_{0,k}\Delta_{k+1,n-1} + \Delta_{0,k-1}\Delta_{k+2,n-1} \\ &= \Delta_{0,k}\Delta_{0,k} + \Delta_{0,k-1}\Delta_{0,k-1} \\ &= (\Delta_{0,k})^2 + (\Delta_{0,k-1})^2 \\ &= (\Delta_{0,k} + \Delta_{0,k-1})^2 \\ &= (\Delta_{0,\frac{n}{2}-1} + \Delta_{0,\frac{n}{2}-2})^2\end{aligned}$$

Now, Suppose  $n$  is odd, and let  $k = ((n - 1)/2) - 1$ . Then the rule vector  $\mathcal{R}$  has the form  $(\mathcal{R}_0, \mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{n-1}) = (\mathcal{R}_0, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{k-1}, \mathcal{R}_k, \mathcal{R}_{k+1}, \mathcal{R}_k, \mathcal{R}_{k-1}, \dots, \mathcal{R}_0)$ . Hence,  $\Delta_{0,k} = \Delta_{k+2,n-1}$  and  $\Delta_{0,k-1} = \Delta_{k+3,n-1}$ . Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{0,n-1} &= \Delta_{0,k}\Delta_{k+1,n-1} + \Delta_{0,k-1}\Delta_{k+2,n-1} \\
&= \Delta_{0,k}((x + d_{k+1})\Delta_{k+2,n-1} + \Delta_{k+3,n-1}) + \Delta_{0,k-1}\Delta_{0,k} \\
&= \Delta_{0,k}((x + d_{k+1})\Delta_{0,k} + \Delta_{0,k-1}) + \Delta_{0,k-1}\Delta_{0,k} \\
&= (x + d_{k+1})\Delta_{0,k}\Delta_{0,k} + \Delta_{0,k}\Delta_{0,k-1} + \Delta_{0,k-1}\Delta_{0,k} \\
&= (x + d_{k+1})(\Delta_{0,k})^2 \\
&= (x + d_{\frac{n-1}{2}})(\Delta_{0,\frac{n-1}{2}-1})^2 \square
\end{aligned}$$

From the above theorem, we get that the characteristic polynomial of any palindromic CA is always reducible. Therefore, it can not produce a maximal length cycle. A *uniform* CA is trivially palindromic, and so has a reducible characteristic polynomial. So, uniform CAs cannot have maximal length cycles. Hence, we need non-uniform CAs.

**Corollary 1. :** *The characteristic polynomial of an  $n$ -cell uniform CA is always reducible.*

**Example 4.** *Let us consider a 5-cell CA with rule vector (150, 90, 150, 90, 150). This is a palindromic CA. The characteristic polynomial of this CA is  $x^5 + x^4 + x^3 + x^2 + x + 1 = (x + 1)(x^2 + x + 1)^2$ . Hence, it is a reducible polynomial. Let us now take an 8-cell uniform CA of rule 90. Its characteristic polynomial is  $x^8 + x^6 + x^4 + 1$ , which is reducible as  $(x + 1)^2(x^3 + x + 1)^2$ .*

### 3.3. Minimal Cost Maximal Length CA

It is difficult to measure the cost of a CA, as it involves assigning relative costs to addition, multiplication by constants, and storage of elements from the field. However, using the formula -  $(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d_i + \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} b_i)$ , we can calculate the cost of a CA. When it is minimal, then we call the CA as minimal cost CA. As an example, costs of two CAs (150, 90, 150, 150, 90) and (150, 90, 90, 90, 90) are 11 and 9 respectively. Which means the cost of the second CA is minimum here.

In case of binary CAs, the above formula implies that minimal cost maximal length CA is a maximal length CA with minimum number of rule 150. In [85], Zhang et al. has presented an algorithm for determining minimal cost maximal length CA. This algorithm is used to identify a such CAs for each length upto 150 cells. Further, the results have been extended by Cattell et al. [21] upto degree 500. They have reported an algorithm of deciding whether a given  $n$ -cell CA has a maximal length cycle by checking if the corresponding characteristic polynomial is primitive; If so, the CA has the maximal length cycle.

In this procedure, an  $n$ -cell maximal length CA with a single 150 is searched. If this is not successful, then a maximal length CA with two 150 is searched. The search was stopped at the first CA with maximal length cycle. This search has never failed, meaning that for each degree upto 500, there is a CA with the maximal length cycle that has either one or two rule 150 [85, 21]. The results can be find in Ref. [21]. From the experimental results, following result has been conjectured.

**Conjecture 2.** *For every  $n$ , there exist a maximal length CA using at most two 150 rules [21].*

### 3.4. Phase Shift Operation

Let us now turn our attention to an interesting property of a maximal length CA. Consider Table 3 which notes down consecutive configurations of a maximal length CA (150, 150, 90,

Table 3: Phase shift with respect to cell 0 of the CA (150, 150, 90, 150)

Step	Cell			
	0	1	2	3
1	<b>1</b>	0	0	0
2	1	1	0	0
3	0	0	1	0
4	0	<b>1</b>	0	1
5	1	1	0	1
6	0	0	0	1
7	0	0	1	1
8	0	1	1	0
9	1	0	1	1
10	1	0	1	0
11	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
12	1	1	1	1
13	0	1	0	0
14	1	1	<b>1</b>	0
15	0	1	1	1

150) (see Figure 2) against time. Column II shows the bit sequence generated by cell 0. Observe that the same sequence is repeated in column III from 4<sup>th</sup> time step. Start of the sequence in both columns are marked by bold face. The same sequence is also repeated in column IV and column V (start of the sequence is marked by bold face). Let us consider that  $(S_i^0)_{1 \leq i \leq 15}$  is the bit sequence generated by cell 0, and  $\sigma$  is a left shift operator. Then we get,

$$(S_i^0)_{1 \leq i \leq 15} = \sigma^3((S_i^1)_{1 \leq i \leq 15}) = \sigma^{13}((S_i^2)_{1 \leq i \leq 15}) = \sigma^{10}((S_i^3)_{1 \leq i \leq 15})$$

These shifts in sequences with respect to cell 0 are named as *phase shifts*. Hence, the phase shift of 1st, 2nd and 3rd cell with respect to cell 0 are 3, 13 and 10 respectively. Following is the formal definition of phase shift.

**Definition 10.** For an  $n$ -cell maximal length CA,  $(S_i^a)_{1 \leq i \leq 2^n - 1} = \sigma^k((S_i^b)_{1 \leq i \leq 2^n - 1})$  where  $a$  and  $b$  are two cells of the CA ( $0 \leq a, b \leq n - 1$ ) and  $k$  is the number of shift ( $1 \leq k \leq 2^n - 1$ ). Such a shift in the bit sequence is called phase shift.

Finding of phase shifts of a maximal length CA was investigated by Bardell [10]. He calculated the phase shifts between the output sequences generated by different stages of a maximal length CA by using discrete logarithms of a binary polynomial. Nandi and Chaudhuri [60] proposed a method for the study of phase shift analysis based on matrix algebra. In [71], Sarkar has given an algorithm to find phase shifts. This was achieved by developing a proper algebraic framework for the study of CA sequences. The algorithm is implemented following the algorithm by Tezuka and Fushimi [76] which is also based on a result of Mesirov and Sweet [56].

In an earlier work, Bardell had provided an example of computing shift in CA sequences of a 6-cell CA - (150, 90, 90, 90, 90, 90). The characteristic polynomial is  $P(x) = x^6 + x^5 + x^4 + x + 1$  which is primitive. The shifts were computed to be 0, 39, 35, 47, 33, 32. On the other hand, for the same CA, the computed shifts are 0, 24, 28, 16, 30, 31 by using the Sarkar's algorithm. Basically, Bardell's shift calculation and Sarkar's shifts calculation are obtained in

opposite directions. So, the phase shift operation of a CA with respect to a given cell position is not uniquely determined by the characteristic polynomial of the CA. The reason is, there exist at least two CAs with respect to a characteristic polynomial and for those two CAs we can observe different phase shift properties.

In the above background, Nandi and Chaudhuri [60] proposed a simple method based on matrix algebra to analyze the phase shift operation. Following theorem gives a compact formulation of the method to calculate the phase shift values where  $T$  is the correspondence matrix of a given CA.

**Theorem 8.** *If  $T^k$  has a 1 at the  $j^{\text{th}}$  column of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row (where  $i \neq j$ ), with all other elements of the row are 0, then there exist a phase shift of  $k$  bit for the bit sequence generated by the  $i^{\text{th}}$  cell position with respect to that of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  cell position of the CA having  $T$  as its characteristic matrix.*

**Proof :** Let the state vector at a particular instant of time be  $S$  and after  $k$  time its  $S^k$ . Then, assume that the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row has a single 1 at  $j^{\text{th}}$  column position. Hence, we can write from matrix algebra tools [26],

$$S^k = T^k \times S \quad \text{i.e.}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_0^k \\ s_1^k \\ \vdots \\ s_i^k \\ \vdots \\ s_{n-1}^k \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} s_0 \\ s_1 \\ \vdots \\ s_j \\ \vdots \\ s_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

Hence we have,  $s_i^k = s_j$ .

This proves that the sequence appearing at the  $j^{\text{th}}$  cell position appears at the  $i^{\text{th}}$  cell position after  $k$  time. Hence the proof.  $\square$

Let's take an example of the above theorem where the CA is same as of Table 3. As per the above theorem, the position of matrix  $T^k$  have been marked to identify shifting characteristic.

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad T^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \boxed{1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad T^3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \boxed{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad T^5 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxed{1} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Thus, we can calculate the shifting amount of sequences for different cell positions which means value of  $k$ . Amount of shift:  $k = 2$  for shift of cell position 0 with respect to 2,  $k = 3$  for shift of cell position 1 with respect to 0 and  $k = 5$  for shift of cell position 0 with respect to 3. As this CA is a 4-cell maximal length CA having a cycle length of 15; so phase shift with respect to  $0^{\text{th}}$  cell are 3, 13 and 10 for  $1^{\text{st}}$ ,  $2^{\text{nd}}$  and  $3^{\text{rd}}$  cell respectively. Based on the above characterization, we outline a method of finding the phase shift in a given  $n$ -cell maximal length CA (see Algorithm 3.2) with respect to a **predefined cell position (pivot cell)**. For details of this algorithm and example, see [60].



---

**Algorithm 3.2:** Finding Phase Shifts

---

**Input** The  $n \times n$  matrix  $T$  for an  $n$ -cell maximal length CA  
pivot cell  $p$   
**Output** phaseshift[n] /\* stores shift of cell positions with respect to pivot cell \*/

- 1:  $M \leftarrow T$ ,  $\text{mark}_{1 \times n} \leftarrow 0$ ;  $\text{mark}[p] \leftarrow 1$ ;  $\text{power} \leftarrow 1$ ;  $\text{phaseshift}[p] \leftarrow 2^n - 1$ ;
- 2: while (all  $\text{mark} \neq 1$ ) do step 3 to step 6.
- 3: count the number of 1's in the  $p^{\text{th}}$  row of  $M$ .  
if  $p^{\text{th}}$  row contains single 1, then  $j \leftarrow$  column position with 1; otherwise  $j \leftarrow (-1)$ .
- 4: if ( $j \neq 1$ ), then  
mark[j]  $\leftarrow 1$   
phaseshift[j]  $\leftarrow ((2^n - 1) - \text{power})$ ;  
goto step 6.
- 5: for  $i = 0$  to  $n - 1$ , do  
if ( $\text{mark}[i] \neq 1$  and  $M[i, p] = 1$  and  $i \neq p$ ), then  
count number of 1's in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row of  $M$   
if  $i^{\text{th}}$  row contains single 1, then  $j \leftarrow$  column position with 1; otherwise  $j \leftarrow (-1)$ .  
if ( $j \neq 1$ ), then  
mark[i]  $\leftarrow 1$   
phaseshift[i]  $\leftarrow \text{power}$ ;
- 6:  $M \leftarrow T \times M$   
power  $\leftarrow \text{power} + 1$

---

### 3.5. Searching for Pattern

According to the previous discussion, only rules 90 and 150 can take part in the rule vectors of maximal length CAs. As there is no efficient algorithm to decide a maximal length CA, they search for a pattern, if exists, in the rule vectors of maximal length CAs. For a given  $n$ , there are  $2^n$  rule vectors, some of which correspond to maximal length CAs. At first, they efficiently exclude the rule vectors (that is, the CAs) which correspond to some reducible polynomials. In the set of remaining CAs, which obviously correspond to the irreducible polynomials, they search for a pattern in the rule vectors which may indicate the maximal length CAs.

In [4], they proposed three experimental approaches to observe any pattern in the CAs. The approaches are primarily experimental. In the first approach, the authors have undertaken the machine learning approach. A standard open-source software tool *Weka* is used for that purpose [81]. In this approach, they search for a pattern to differentiate maximal length CAs from the other CAs whose characteristic polynomials are irreducible (but not primitive). There are many classifiers, implemented in *Weka*, from which three well-known algorithms are chosen. They are *ZeroR*, *LibSVM* and *J48* (see [81] for details of these algorithms). One can find the experimental results in [4], which have indicated that there is no pattern by observing which one can decide a CA as a maximal length CA.

In the second approach, the concept of ratio of rules were used. They experiment to see if the ratio of 90 and 150 matters in differentiating the maximal length CAs from the CAs with irreducible polynomials. To start with, they first see the distribution of CAs having characteristic polynomial as irreducible (including primitive) against the number of 150s. In this experiment, they observe that for any size  $n$ , the number of CAs having  $k$  150s is equal to the number of CAs having  $(n - k)$  150s, where  $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$ . For example, for the size 15, there are 388 CAs using five 150s. And, the number of CAs with ten 150s is also 388. To explore this interesting

property, the term **conjugate** is introduced.

**Definition 11.** Two CAs with rule vectors  $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{R}_0, \mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{n-1})$  and  $\mathcal{R}' = (\mathcal{R}'_0, \mathcal{R}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}'_{n-1})$  are said to be **conjugate** to each other if the following condition is satisfied:  $\mathcal{R}_i$  is 90 (resp. 150) iff  $\mathcal{R}'_i$  is 150 (resp. 90), for each  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ .

As an example, consider a CA  $\mathcal{R} = (90, 90, 90, 150, 150)$ , then its conjugate CA is  $\mathcal{R}' = (150, 150, 150, 90, 90)$ . We next experiment with the conjugate CAs. And, as a result of this experiment, we get the following property.

**Theorem 9.** The characteristic polynomial of a CA is irreducible iff the characteristic polynomial of its conjugate CA is irreducible.

**Proof :** If  $p(x) = \det(T + xI)$  is the characteristic polynomial of CA  $\mathcal{R}$  then the characteristic polynomial of its conjugate  $\mathcal{R}'$  is  $\det(T + I + xI) = \det(T + (x+1)I) = p(x+1)$ . If  $p(x)$  is not irreducible, so that  $p(x) = a(x)b(x)$  then also  $p(x+1)$  is not irreducible as  $p(x+1) = a(x+1)b(x+1)$ . Symmetrically, if  $p(x+1)$  is not irreducible then its conjugate  $p(x)$  is not irreducible either.  $\square$

Let us take the following pair of conjugate CAs: (90, 90, 90, 150, 150) and (150, 150, 150, 90, 90). The characteristic polynomial of the first CA is  $x^5 + x^3 + x^2 + x + 1$ , which is irreducible. The polynomial for the second CA is  $x^5 + x^4 + x^3 + x + 1$ , which is also irreducible.

Although it appears to us that conjugate CAs may follow some pattern. The authors have adopted many techniques on conjugate CAs and as well as ratio of rules 90 and 150. But, it has failed to produce any convincing result. However, the idea of conjugate CAs and their corresponding polynomials would be an area of work in future.

In the third approach, they concatenate the small sized CAs and check the final CA is maximal length or not. Let  $\mathcal{R}'$  and  $\mathcal{R}''$  be rule vectors of two CAs, and  $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{R}'\mathcal{R}'')$  be another rule vector obtained by concatenating  $\mathcal{R}'$  and  $\mathcal{R}''$ . Let us name the rule vectors  $\mathcal{R}'$  and  $\mathcal{R}''$  as *component CAs* of  $\mathcal{R}$ .

In the first experiment, they concatenate two or more CAs which are maximal length and get the final CA. Finally, check the chance of final CA to be maximal length and also comparing with actual percentage of maximal length CAs. In another experiment, they concatenate two or more CAs which are not maximal length but their characteristic polynomials are irreducible and do the same. Observe that, when some maximal length CAs are concatenated, then the chance of the final CA to be maximal length becomes high. The experimental results can be found in Ref. [4]. From the results, we can conclude that the chances improve when the component CAs are maximal length CAs. But, it is little disappointing that finally there are no clear pattern in the rule vectors of maximal length CAs.

We finish this section by posing an open problem about the complexity issue of maximal length cellular automata:

**Open Problem 1.** Decide a given CA as maximal length in polynomial time.

#### 4. Synthesis of Maximal Length CA from Primitive Polynomial

Let us now synthesize a maximal length CA from a given primitive polynomial. By “synthesis” we mean to find out a rule vector of a maximal length CA from a given primitive polynomial. The method that we are going to present next synthesizes CAs from an irreducible polynomial in

GF(2). When the polynomial is primitive, then synthesized CA is of maximal length. It is also shown here that there are exactly two CAs against each irreducible polynomial. One can find the details of the algorithm in [19].

The pair of polynomials  $\Delta_{n-1}$  and  $\Delta_{n-2}$  (defined in Section 2.2.1) uniquely determine the CA using Euclid's GCD algorithm. Conversely, a CA uniquely determines  $\Delta_{n-1}$  and  $\Delta_{n-2}$ . If we divided  $\Delta_{n-1}$  by  $\Delta_{n-2}$ , we get  $(x + d_{n-1})$  as quotient and  $\Delta_{n-3}$  as remainder as per recurrence relation 2. So, if we proceed to find GCD of  $\Delta_{n-1}$  and  $\Delta_{n-2}$  by Euclid's algorithm, we observe a series of quotients  $x + d_{n-1}, x + d_{n-2}, \dots, x + d_0$  that come out as part of the GCD computation. This gives us the CA as  $(d_0, d_1, \dots, d_{n-1})$ . This result is stated in Lemma 2.

**Definition 12.** For an  $n$ -cell CA,  $\Delta_{0,n-2}$  is called a CA subpolynomial, and the pair of polynomials  $\Delta_{0,n-1}, \Delta_{0,n-2}$  are called a CA polynomial-subpolynomial pair. Note that a CA subpolynomial is itself a CA polynomial.

**Lemma 2.** Let  $p$  and  $q$  be two polynomials, with degree  $n$  and  $n - 1$  respectively. Then, there exists a CA with characteristic polynomial  $p$  and characteristic subpolynomial  $q$  ( $\Delta_{n-1} = p$  and  $\Delta_{n-2} = q$ ) if and only if applying Euclid's GCD algorithm to  $p$  and  $q$ ,  $n$  quotients with degree 1 are received in sequence.

**Proof :** Suppose there exists a CA with  $\Delta_{n-1} = p$  and  $\Delta_{n-2} = q$ . Lemma 1 (relation 2) ensures that the sequence of remainder polynomials obtained from Euclid's GCD algorithm is  $\Delta_{n-3}, \Delta_{n-4}, \dots, \Delta_1, \Delta_0$ . As these polynomials have degrees differing by one, Euclid's algorithm produces  $n$  quotients, each of which is of degree 1. For the converse, suppose that Euclid's algorithm is applied to a degree  $n$  polynomial  $p$  and degree  $n - 1$  polynomial  $q$ , and that  $n$  quotients  $x + d_{n-1}, x + d_{n-2}, \dots, x + d_0$  are obtained in sequence. The last remainder is always zero, and the fact that there are  $n$  quotients means that the last divisor (second last remainder) is one. Now if we apply recurrence relation 2 and use  $d_0, d_1, \dots, d_{n-1}$ , we get the polynomials  $\Delta_{n-1} = p$  and  $\Delta_{n-2} = q$ . Hence, there exists a CA with the desired properties.

□

**Example 5.** Let us consider the CA (90, 150, 150, 90, 90) where  $\Delta_{n-1} = x^5 + x^3 + 1$  and  $\Delta_{n-2} = x^4 + 1$ . When Euclid's GCD algorithm is applied on  $\Delta_{n-1}$  and  $\Delta_{n-2}$ , following results come out in successive divisions.

dividend	divisor	quotient	remainder	$d_i$ (Rule)
$x^5 + x^3 + 1$	$x^4 + 1$	$x$	$x^3 + x + 1$	0 (90)
$x^4 + 1$	$x^3 + x + 1$	$x$	$x^2 + x + 1$	0 (90)
$x^3 + x + 1$	$x^2 + x + 1$	$x + 1$	$x$	1 (150)
$x^2 + x + 1$	$x$	$x + 1$	1	1 (150)
$x$	1	$x$	0	0 (90)

Note that we have extracted the rules from the series of 5 quotients.

#### 4.1. Solutions to the Quadratic Congruence

It is clear now that finding a  $q$  satisfying Lemma 2 would solve the CA synthesis problem, if it could be done efficiently. The degree  $n - 1$  polynomial  $\Delta_{n-2}$  satisfies an expression called the CA quadratic congruence [17] which is a key result and central to the synthesis approach. The usefulness of the result is discussed below and its application to the synthesis algorithm is described later. We now ready to present the key result.

**Theorem 10.** Suppose we have a CA with characteristic polynomial  $\Delta_{0,n-1}$  and characteristic subpolynomials  $\Delta_{0,n-2}$  and  $\Delta_{1,n-1}$ . The both  $y = \Delta_{0,n-2}$  and  $y = \Delta_{1,n-1}$  satisfy the congruence

$$y^2 + (x^2 + x)\Delta'_{0,n-1}y + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{\Delta_{0,n-1}}$$

where  $\Delta'_{0,n-1}$  is formal derivative of  $\Delta_{0,n-1}$ .

**Proof :** The proof consists of several steps, with some of the steps requiring extensive case analysis. One case of each type is shown for illustrative purpose, to simplify the presentation.

The characteristic polynomial of a CA under periodic boundary condition is related to the characteristic polynomial of its underlying null boundary CA. This relation leads to Theorem 11. This is in turn combined with Lemma 3 to obtain Theorem 12. The CA quadratic congruence follows from this and the *product of subpolynomials* relation (the latter being a standard property of Euclid's GCD algorithm).

A periodic boundary CA is formed from its underlying null-boundary CA by the addition of interconnections between cells 0 and  $n - 1$ . Hence the characteristic matrix of a periodic boundary CA contains a 1 in each of the corner entries  $(0, n - 1)$  and  $(n - 1, 0)$ . The characteristic polynomial of a periodic boundary CA, say  $\Phi_{0,n-1}$  can be obtained from that of null boundary CA.

**Lemma 3.** The characteristic polynomial of a periodic boundary CA ( $\Phi_{0,n-1}$ ) is related to the characteristic polynomial of its underlying null boundary CA as follows

$$\Phi_{0,n-1} = \Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{1,n-2}$$

**Proof :** Let A be the characteristic matrix of a periodic boundary CA.

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & a_1 & 1 & \ddots & & & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & a_2 & \ddots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & a_{n-3} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & & & \ddots & 1 & a_{n-2} & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 1 & a_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}_{n \times n}$$

where  $a_i$  denotes  $x + d_i$ . By expanding the determinant along the first row, we get

$$\Phi_{0,n-1} = a_0\Delta_{1,n-1} + |B| + |D|,$$

where

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 & 1 & \ddots & & & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & a_3 & \ddots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & a_{n-3} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & & & \ddots & 1 & a_{n-2} & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 1 & a_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad D = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & a_1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & a_2 & 1 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & 1 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & & & \ddots & \ddots & a_{n-3} & 1 \\ 0 & & & & \ddots & 1 & a_{n-2} \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Now, by expanding  $B$  along the first column and  $D$  along the last row,

$$\begin{aligned} |B| &= \Delta_{2,n-1} + |E|, \text{ and} \\ |D| &= \Delta_{1,n-2} + |F| \end{aligned}$$

where

$$E = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ a_2 & 1 & \ddots & & & & 0 \\ 1 & a_3 & \ddots & \ddots & & & \vdots \\ 0 & 1 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & a_{n-4} & 1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 1 & a_{n-3} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 1 & a_{n-2} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad F = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & a_2 & 1 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & 1 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & & & \ddots & \ddots & a_{n-4} & 1 \\ \vdots & & & & \ddots & 1 & a_{n-3} \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Since  $E$  and  $F$  are lower and upper triangular, respectively, with all 1s on the diagonal,  $|E| = |F| = 1$ . Substituting these into the expressions for  $B$  and  $D$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |B| &= \Delta_{2,n-1} + 1 \\ |D| &= \Delta_{1,n-2} + 1 \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{0,n-1} &= a_0 \Delta_{1,n-1} + |B| + |D| \\ &= (x + d_0) \Delta_{1,n-1} + \Delta_{2,n-1} + 1 + \Delta_{1,n-2} + 1 \\ &= \Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{1,n-2} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Delta_{0,n-1} = (x + d_0) \Delta_{1,n-1} + \Delta_{2,n-1}$

□

A periodic boundary CA has *rotational symmetry*, which implies that the characteristic polynomial remains unchanged if the cell labels are rotated. A crucial consequence of this is that the  $n$  (typically different) null boundary CAs associated with the  $n$  label rotations of a periodic boundary CAs, all have the same value for  $\Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{1,n-2}$ . Let  $w$  denote the weight of the rule vector depending on even and odd numbers of rules 90 and 150. If the rule vector contains an even number of rule 150, then  $w = 0$  and 1 otherwise.

**Theorem 11.** Consider a periodic boundary CA with characteristic polynomial  $\Phi_{0,n-1}$ , and let  $w$  denote the weight of its rule vector. Then,

$$\Phi_{0,n-1} = \begin{cases} q^2 & \text{if } n \text{ is even and } w = 0 \\ (x+1)q^2 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd and } w = 1 \\ (x)q^2 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd and } w = 0 \\ (x)(x+1)q^2 & \text{if } n \text{ is even and } w = 1 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

for some polynomial  $q$ .

**Proof :** The proof is by induction on  $n$ . The base cases can be checked by calculating the characteristic polynomials of all periodic boundary CAs for  $n \leq 4$ . The inductive step consists of ten cases.

The first eight cases apply when the periodic boundary CA has a label rotation so that  $d_0 = d_{n-1}$  (i.e., the CA contains adjacent cells that use the same rule). The eight cases come about

from the possible values of (1)  $n$  is even or odd, (2)  $w$  is zero or one, and (3)  $d_0 (= d_{n-1})$  is zero or one. It is straightforward to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{0,n-1} &= \Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{1,n-2} \\
&= (x + d_0)\Delta_{1,n-1} + \Delta_{2,n-1} + \Delta_{1,n-2} \\
&= (x + d_0)\Delta_{1,n-1} + (x + d_{n-1})\Delta_{2,n-2} + \Delta_{2,n-3} + \Delta_{1,n-2} \\
&= (x + d_0)(\Delta_{1,n-1} + \Delta_{2,n-2}) + (\Delta_{2,n-3} + \Delta_{1,n-2}) \quad \text{here, } (d_0 = d_{n-1}) \\
&= (x + d_0)\Phi_{1,n-1} + \Phi_{1,n-2}
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Suppose that  $n$  is even,  $w = 0$ , and  $d_0 = 0$ . Then  $[d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{n-1}]$  has odd length and weight zero, and so by induction  $\Phi_{1,n-1} = xq_y^2$  for some  $q_y \in GF(2)[x]$ . Similarly,  $[d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{n-2}]$  has even length and weight zero (recall that  $d_0 = d_{n-1}$ ), and so  $\Phi_{1,n-2} = q_z^2$  for some  $q_z$ . Applying Equation 4

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{0,n-1} &= (x + d_0)\Phi_{1,n-1} + \Phi_{1,n-2} \\
&= x(xq_y^2) + q_z^2 \\
&= (xq_y + q_z)^2 \\
&= q^2
\end{aligned}$$

where  $q = xq_y + q_z$ . Thus the inductive hypothesis is satisfied. The other seven cases are proven along the same lines.

The last two cases come about when no two adjacent cells use the same rule. For these cases,  $n$  is necessarily even, but  $w$  could be zero or one. However, such a periodic boundary CA has in the form of  $(90, 150, 90, 150, \dots, 90, 150)$ . This special structure gives the equation

$$\Phi_{0,n-1} = x(x + 1)\Phi_{2,n-1} + \Phi_{4,n-1}$$

By an argument similar to that for the eight cases above, the inductive hypothesis can be shown to hold. This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

We now return our attention to null boundary CA. We need to consider the CA along with three closely related CAs, obtained by changing the rules used in one or both of the end cells. The rule vectors of the CAs and their characteristic polynomials (stated in terms of subpolynomials of the original CA) are

<u>case</u>	<u>characteristic polynomial</u>
original $[d_0, d_1, \dots, d_{n-2}, d_{n-1}]$	$\Delta_{0,n-1}$
complement $d_{n-1} [d_0, d_1, \dots, d_{n-2}, d_{n-1} + 1]$	$\Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{0,n-2}$
complement $d_0 [d_0 + 1, d_1, \dots, d_{n-2}, d_{n-1}]$	$\Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{1,n-1}$
complement both $[d_0 + 1, d_1, \dots, d_{n-2}, d_{n-1} + 1]$	$\Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{0,n-2} + \Delta_{1,n-1} + \Delta_{1,n-2}$

where  $d_i = 0$  when cell  $i$  rule is 90 and  $d_i = 1$  when rule is 150. And, complement of rules means replace the rule 90 (150) by rule 150 (90).

**Theorem 12.** *The sum of subpolynomials states that*

$$\Delta_{0,n-2} + \Delta_{1,n-1} = \begin{cases} (x^2 + x)\Delta'_{0,n-1} & \text{if } n \text{ is even, } w = 0 \\ \Delta_{0,n-1} + (x^2 + x)\Delta'_{0,n-1} & \text{if } n \text{ is even, } w = 1 \\ (x + 1)\Delta_{0,n-1} + (x^2 + x)\Delta'_{0,n-1} & \text{if } n \text{ is odd, } w = 0 \\ x\Delta_{0,n-1} + (x^2 + x)\Delta'_{0,n-1} & \text{if } n \text{ is odd, } w = 1 \end{cases}$$

**Proof :** The proof requires four cases, the first of which is as follows. Suppose that  $n$  is even and  $w$  is zero. Equation 3 states that there exists a polynomial  $q_1$  such that

$$\Phi_{0,n-1} = \Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{1,n-2} = q_1^2$$

If  $d_{n-1}$  is complemented,  $[d_1, \dots, d_{n-2}]$  remains unchanged and the length is still even, but the weight has become one. Hence, again by Equation 3, there exists  $q_2$  such that

$$(\Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{0,n-2}) + \Delta_{1,n-2} = (x^2 + x)q_2^2 \quad (5)$$

Similarly, if  $d_0$  is complemented, there is a  $q_3$  with

$$(\Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{1,n-1}) + \Delta_{1,n-2} = (x^2 + x)q_3^2 \quad (6)$$

If both  $d_0$  and  $d_{n-1}$  are complemented, the resulting CA has even length and weight zero, and so there exists  $q_4$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{0,n-2} + \Delta_{1,n-1} + \Delta_{1,n-2}) + \Delta_{1,n-2} &= q_4^2 \\ \Rightarrow \Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{0,n-2} + \Delta_{1,n-1} &= q_4^2 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

By adding Equations 5 and 6, and differentiating both sides, we respectively get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{0,n-2} + \Delta_{1,n-1} &= (x^2 + x)(q_2 + q_3)^2 \\ \Rightarrow (\Delta_{0,n-2} + \Delta_{1,n-1})' &= (q_2 + q_3)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have the differential equation

$$(\Delta_{0,n-2} + \Delta_{1,n-1}) = (x^2 + x)(\Delta_{0,n-2} + \Delta_{1,n-1})' \quad (8)$$

Equation 7 says that  $\Delta_{0,n-1} + \Delta_{0,n-2} + \Delta_{1,n-1}$  is a perfect square, and so

$$\Delta'_{0,n-1} = (\Delta_{0,n-2} + \Delta_{1,n-1})' \quad (9)$$

Combining Equations 8 and 9

$$\Delta_{0,n-2} + \Delta_{1,n-1} = (x^2 + x)\Delta'_{0,n-1}$$

which completes the proof for this case. The other cases are different, but the same argument structure holds (see, Ref. [16] for details).  $\square$

*CA Quadratic Congruence:* Theorem 12 immediately provides the congruence

$$\Delta_{0,n-2} + \Delta_{1,n-1} \equiv (x^2 + x)\Delta'_{0,n-1} \pmod{\Delta_{0,n-1}} \quad (10)$$

The product of subpolynomials relation comes from Euclid's GCD algorithm (one can find the details in [16]). It states that

$$\Delta_{0,n-2}\Delta_{1,n-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{\Delta_{0,n-1}} \quad (11)$$

Solving Equation 10 for  $\Delta_{1,n-1}$  and substituting into Equation 11

$$(\Delta_{0,n-2})^2 + (x^2 + x)\Delta'_{0,n-1}\Delta_{0,n-2} + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{\Delta_{0,n-1}}$$

Equivalently,

$$(\Delta_{1,n-1})^2 + (x^2 + x)\Delta'_{0,n-1}\Delta_{1,n-1} + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{\Delta_{0,n-1}}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 10.  $\square$

We demonstrate the theorem on the CA (90, 90, 150, 150, 90), which has characteristic polynomial  $x^5 + x^3 + 1$ . For this CA,  $\Delta_{0,3} = x^4 + x$  and  $\Delta_{1,4} = x^4 + 1$ . Substituting  $y = x^4 + 1$  into the left-hand side of Theorem 10,

$$\begin{aligned} &y^2 + (x^2 + x)\Delta'_{0,n-1}y + 1 \\ &= (x^4 + 1)^2 + (x^2 + x)(x^4 + x^2)(x^4 + 1) + 1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (x^8 + 1) + (x^{10} + x^9 + x^8 + x^7 + x^6 + x^5 + x^4 + x^3) + 1 \\
&= 0 \pmod{x^5 + x^3 + 1}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, substituting  $y = x^4 + x$  into the left-hand side results in zero. By combining Lemma 2 and Theorem 10, we have a characterization of CA polynomials.

**Corollary 2. :** *Let  $p$  be a degree  $n$  polynomial. Then  $p$  is a CA polynomial if and only if there exists some solution  $q$  for  $y$  of the congruence*

$$y^2 + (x^2 + x)p'y + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

where  $p'$  is the formal derivative of  $p$ .

Theorem 10 is very useful for irreducible polynomials. As discussed above, when  $\Delta_{0,n-1}$  is irreducible, solutions to quadratic congruence (Theorem 10) can be found elegantly which extracts the following corollary.

**Corollary 3. :** *If  $p$  is a degree  $n$  irreducible polynomial, then  $p$  has exactly two CA realizations.*

**Proof :** As per Theorem 10, we get two solutions for a characteristic polynomial. This implies, two CAs have the same characteristic polynomial. Hence, for each irreducible polynomial, there are exactly two CAs.  $\square$

As an example, suppose we have an irreducible polynomial which is  $x^5 + x^2 + 1$ . Then, we get two CAs where both of which characteristic polynomials are  $x^5 + x^2 + 1$ . For this polynomial the CAs are - (150, 150, 150, 150, 90) and (90, 150, 150, 150, 150) where the CAs are reversal of each other.

#### 4.2. The Formula for the Solutions

Let  $p$  be a degree  $n$  polynomial. Then according to previous theorem, we can write the congruence according to  $p$ . To simplify the statement of the formula, we use the following denotations.

$$y^2 + (x^2 + x)p'y + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

Let us take,  $f(x) = (x^2 + x)p'$  and  $g(x) = \left(\frac{1}{f(x)}\right)^2$ . Some definitions are necessary to describe the algorithm. At first, we define the *trace* [55] of a polynomial  $a(x)$  with respect to the irreducible polynomial  $p$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
Tr(a) &= (a + a^2 + a^4 + \dots + a^{2^{n-1}}) \pmod{p} \\
&= \left( \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a^{2^i} \right) \pmod{p}
\end{aligned}$$

At this point, we require a polynomial  $\theta(x)$  with trace one. If  $n$  is odd then we may use  $\theta(x) = 1$ , but if  $n$  is even we have to find such a polynomial. Interestingly, any such  $\theta(x)$  suffices. Now, we define the polynomial  $\beta(x)$  by

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(x) &= g\theta^2 + (g + g^2)\theta^2 + \dots + (g + g^2 + \dots + g^{2^{n-2}})\theta^{2^{n-1}} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} g^{2^j} \right) \theta^{2^i}
\end{aligned}$$

If  $n$  is odd, the use of  $\theta(x) = 1$  simplifies the expression for  $\beta(x)$  to



$$\begin{aligned}\beta(x) &= g^2 + g^8 + \cdots + g^{2^{n-2}} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{(n-1)/2} g^{2^{2i-1}}\end{aligned}$$

We now show how the solutions of the quadratic equations are used to obtain the CA. Because  $p$  is irreducible, we know that the quadratic has two distinct solution (according to Theorem 10), and we denote them  $q_1(x)$  and  $q_2(x)$ . In fact, the CA obtained by using  $q_2$  is the reversal of the CA obtained by using  $q_1$ . In practice, we need only one solution. We apply Euclid's GCD algorithm [48] to get the solutions. The pseudocode listed below summarizes the process of computing a CA for a given irreducible polynomial  $p$ .

---

```

1: procedure CalcCAFromPolys
2: let  $f = (x^2 + x)p'(x)$ 
3: let  $g = (1/f)^2$ 
4: let  $q = \beta f$ 
5: if  $n$  is even then
6:   find  $\theta$  with trace one
7:   calculate  $\beta$ 
8: else
9:   calculate  $\beta$ 
10: end if
11: calculate  $q$ 
12: calculate gcd(p,q)
13: return the quotients form the CA from the constant terms of the quotients.

```

---

We present a complete example of computing the CA for a degree 5 irreducible polynomial. It shows the determination of the solution of the CA quadratic congruence, and the subsequent application of Euclid's GCD algorithm. The following steps mirror the algorithm description above.

Let  $p$  be an irreducible (in this case,  $p$  is primitive) polynomial ( $n = 5$ )

$$p = x^5 + x^2 + 1$$

Now, we calculate the formal derivative of  $p$ , reducing the coefficients modulo 2

$$p' = 5x^4 + 2x = x^4$$

Compute  $f$ , recalling that all polynomials are reduced in modulo  $p$

$$f = (x^2 + x)p' = x^6 + x^5 = x^3 + x^2 + x + 1$$

Applying the extended Euclidean GCD algorithm [19] to compute the inverse of  $f$ , we get

$$1/f = x^3 + x^2 + 1$$

To get  $g$ , we calculate

$$g = (1/f)^2 = x^6 + x^4 + 1 = x^4 + x^3 + x + 1$$

The trace of  $g$  can be verified to be zero, as expected. Since  $n$  is odd, we use the formula to getting  $\beta$  where  $\theta = 1$

$$\begin{aligned}\beta &= \sum_{i=1}^2 g^{2^{2i-1}} \\ &= g^2 + g^8\end{aligned}$$

Further, we have to compute the powers of  $g$ .

$$\begin{aligned}g &= x^4 + x^3 + x + 1 \\ g^2 &= (x^4 + x^3 + x + 1)^2 = x^8 + x^6 + x^2 + 1 = x \\ g^4 &= (g^2)^2 = x^2 \\ g^8 &= (g^4)^2 = x^4\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\beta &= g^2 + g^8 \\ &= x + x^4\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we compute a solution  $q$  to the quadratic

$$\begin{aligned}q &= (x^2 + x)p'\beta \\ &= (x^2 + x)(x^4)(x + x^4) \\ &= x^4 + x^2 + 1\end{aligned}$$

Euclid's algorithm is now applied to determine the CA. At this point, we know that  $q$  is  $\Delta_{n-2}$

$$\begin{aligned}x^5 + x^2 + 1 &= (x)(x^4 + x^2 + 1) + x^3 + x^2 + x + 1 \\ x^4 + x^2 + 1 &= (x + 1)(x^3 + x^2 + x + 1) + x^2 \\ x^3 + x^2 + x + 1 &= (x + 1)(x^2) + x + 1 \\ x^2 &= (x + 1)(x + 1) + 1 \\ x + 1 &= (x + 1)(1) + 0\end{aligned}$$

The algorithm results in the five degree one quotients  $[x, x + 1, x + 1, x + 1, x + 1]$ , and so the CA is (150, 150, 150, 150, 90).

## 5. Synthesis of Primitive Polynomial using CA

In this section, we use CA as tool of generating primitive polynomials over GF(2). Till date, there is no efficient algorithm known to decide primitivity of a polynomial in polynomial time. Also, there is no proof claiming that it is an NP-complete or NP-hard problem. Till date the complexity for deciding a primitive polynomial is exponential [72]. In [54, 5], the authors consider some special type of CAs to generate maximal length CAs. These CAs can be used as generators of primitive polynomials of a set of degrees. However, they do not always get maximal length CAs by those special CAs. Hence, these generators are imperfect.

Matsumoto [54] has first worked with such a special type of CAs. He has chosen a simple and explicit construction of CAs which consist of only one rule 150 (for the first cell) and rest of the rules are rule 90. This CA may be used for generating maximal length CAs. Further, this work has been extended in [5].

### 5.1. Imperfect Strategies

In [5], the authors develop three strategies for finding maximal length CAs, hence primitive polynomials over GF(2) of large degree. The proposed strategies greedily synthesize (linear) CAs of different sizes, which are almost always of maximal length. Since the characteristic polynomial of a maximal length cellular automaton is primitive, characteristic polynomials of the synthesized CAs are claimed as primitive. The main drawback is the proposed strategies do not generate CAs of every size, though it can generate CAs of arbitrary large size. Following are the definition of two simple special type of CAs which they are used to generate maximal length CAs.

**Definition 13.** An  $n$ -cell CA with rule vector  $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{R}_0, \mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{n-1})$

- is called CA(90') with  $n$ -cell if  $\mathcal{R}_0 = 150$  and  $\mathcal{R}_i = 90$  where  $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ .
- is called CA(150') with  $n$ -cell if  $\mathcal{R}_0 = 90$  and  $\mathcal{R}_i = 150$  where  $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ .

Note that CA(90') and CA(150') are *conjugate* (discussed in Section 3.5) to each other. Next to identify some sizes for which the CAs do not show maximality. These greedy procedures are backed by the dynamics of the CAs and run in polynomial time. The strategies for CA(90') and CA(150') greedily work on the configurations that consist of all but one non-zero element. Decimal equivalents of these configurations are always power-of-2 numbers, namely  $p$ -configuration.

**Definition 14.** A configuration is a  $p$ -configuration if only one cell is in state 1 and others are in state 0.

The configuration 0001, for example, is a  $p$ -configuration. In an  $n$ -cell CA, there are  $n$   $p$ -configurations, which are named as  $p^0, p^1, p^2, \dots, p^{n-1}$ . Here,  $p^i$  indicates that cell  $n - i$  is at state 1 and the rest are in state 0. For example, the configuration 0010 is  $p^1$  and the configuration 1000 is  $p^3$ . It is, however, obvious that if a CA with  $n$  cells is a maximal length CA, then all the  $p$ -configurations lie in a single cycle.

#### 5.1.1. Properties of CA(90') and CA(150')

Here we note down some properties of CA(90') and CA(150') with respect to maximality. Following is an important property of CA(90') which notes down the behaviour of  $p$ -configurations in a cycle and we take  $p^0$  as initial configuration. To state the property, a function *length* is defined as following:  $length(x, y) = k$  for two configurations  $x, y$  if  $y = G^k(x)$ , where  $G$  is the global transition function of the CA.

**Theorem 13.** In CA(90') with  $n \geq 2$  cells, following relation holds:

$$\begin{aligned} length(p^{m_0}, p^{m_1}) &= 2^0, \\ length(p^{m_1}, p^{m_2}) &= 2^1, \\ &\vdots \\ length(p^{m_i}, p^{m_{i+1}}) &= 2^i, \\ &\vdots \\ length(p^{m_k}, p^{m_0}) &= 2^k \end{aligned}$$

where  $m_0 = 0$  and the sequence  $(m_i)_{0 \leq i \leq k}$  with some  $k \leq n - 1$  maintains the following relation:




Figure 5: Space-time diagram of  $CA(90')$  and  $CA(150')$ . Figures (a) and (b) for  $CA(90')$  where the evolutions have started from configuration  $p^0(0^{n-1}1)$  and figures (c) and (d) for  $CA(150')$  where evolutions have started from  $p^{n-1}(10^{n-1})$ . Here, white is for state 0 and black is for state 1.

$$m_{i+1} = \begin{cases} 2m_i + 1 & \text{if } 2m_i + 1 < n \\ 2(n - 1 - m_i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad [5]$$

Lets take an example of the above theorem. The authors used the space-time diagram instead of transition diagram in here. Space-time diagram is a well-known tool which has been used since long to understand the transitions and dynamical behaviour of a CA [82]. Figure 5 shows the space-time diagram of  $CA(90')$  and  $CA(150')$ .

Let us first consider that  $n = 5$  (see, Figure 5(b)). Here, sequence of  $p$ -configurations is  $(p^0, p^1, p^3, p^2, p^4)$ , and  $length(p^0, p^1) = 2^0$ ,  $length(p^1, p^3) = 2^1$ ,  $length(p^3, p^2) = 2^2$ ,  $length(p^2, p^4) = 2^3$  and  $length(p^4, p^0) = 2^4$ . All  $p$ -configurations are covered in one cycle, and this CA is a maximal length CA. Let us now take another example of  $n = 4$  (see, Figure 5(a)). The  $p$ -configurations covered in this diagram are  $p^0, p^1$  and  $p^3$ , and  $length(p^0, p^1) = 2^0$ ,  $length(p^1, p^3) = 2^1$  and  $length(p^3, p^0) = 2^2$ . However, this CA is not a maximal length CA.

**Corollary 4. :** For an  $n$ -cell  $CA(90')$ , if all the  $p$ -configurations lie in a single cycle and two consecutive  $p$ -configurations  $p^x$  and  $p^y$  maintain the relation:  $y = 2x + 1$  if  $(2x + 1) < n$ ; otherwise,  $y = 2(n - 1 - x)$ , then the CA is a maximal length CA.

**Proof :** Let us assume that the  $n$   $p$ -configurations of an  $n$ -cell  $CA(90')$  are in a single cycle and two consecutive  $p$ -configurations  $p^x$  and  $p^y$  of the cycle maintain the following relation:  $y = 2x + 1$  if  $(2x + 1) < n$ ; otherwise,  $y = 2(n - 1 - x)$ . Hence, we get from Theorem 13 that lengths between two consecutive  $p$ -configurations in the cycle, starting from  $p^0$ , are  $2^0, 2^1, \dots, 2^{n-1}$ . Therefore, length of the cycle is  $length(p^0, p^0) = 2^0 + 2^1 + \dots + 2^{n-1} = 2^n - 1$ . Hence, the CA is a maximal length CA.  $\square$

One may observe that in many occasions the sequence of  $p$ -configurations  $(p^0, p^{m_0}, p^{m_1}, \dots, p^{m_{k-2}}, p^{n-1}, p^0)$  maintaining the stated condition of two consecutive  $p$ -configurations in Theorem 13 does not include all the  $p$ -configurations. These CAs are not maximal length CAs. On the other hand, in most of the cases when all the  $p$ -configurations are covered maintaining the above stated relation between two consecutive  $p$ -configurations, then it is a maximal length CA.

In the case of  $CA(150')$ , similar behaviour is observed. Unlike previous,  $p^{n-1}$  is considered as initial configuration. The relation between the  $p$ -configurations are noted below.

**Theorem 14.** In  $CA(150')$  with  $n \geq 2$  cells, following relation holds:

$$\begin{aligned} length(p^{m_0}, p^{o_0}) &= 2^0, \\ length(p^{m_1}, p^{o_1}) &= 2^1, \\ &\vdots \\ length(p^{m_i}, p^{o_i}) &= 2^i, \\ &\vdots \\ length(p^{m_k}, p^{o_k}) &= 2^k \end{aligned}$$

where  $m_0 = n - 1$ ,  $o_0 = n - 2$  and the sequences  $(m_i)_{0 \leq i \leq k}$  and  $(o_i)_{0 \leq i \leq k}$  with some  $k \leq n - 1$  obey the following relation:

$$m_{i+1} = \begin{cases} 2m_i + 1 & \text{if } 2m_i + 1 < n \\ 2(n - 1 - m_i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad o_{i+1} = \begin{cases} 2o_i + 1 & \text{if } 2o_i + 1 < n \\ 2(n - 1 - o_i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad [5]$$

Let us take examples to illustrate the theorem. At first, consider  $n = 5$ . For two sequences of  $p$ -configurations  $(p^4, p^0, p^1, p^3, p^2, p^4)$  and  $(p^3, p^2, p^4, p^0, p^1, p^3)$ , we observe that  $length(p^4, p^3) = 2^0$ ,  $length(p^0, p^2) = 2^1$ ,  $length(p^1, p^4) = 2^2$ ,  $length(p^3, p^0) = 2^3$  and  $length(p^2, p^1) = 2^4$ . From these two sequences, we can extract a sequence of  $p$ -configurations  $p^4, p^3, p^0, p^2, p^1, p^4$ . This sequence is observed in a single cycle with length between two consecutive  $p$ -configurations are  $2^0, 2^3, 2^1, 2^4$  and  $2^2$  respectively. Hence, it is a maximal length CA (see, Figure 5(c)). In the next example, consider  $n = 6$ . Two sequences of  $p$ -configurations are  $(p^5, p^0, p^1, p^3, p^4, p^2)$  and  $(p^4, p^2, p^5, p^0, p^1, p^3)$ . From where, we can get a sequence  $p$ -configurations as  $p^5, p^4, p^1, p^5$  where  $length(p^5, p^4) = 2^0$ ,  $length(p^4, p^1) = 2^4$ ,  $length(p^1, p^5) = 2^2$ . Since all the  $p$ -configurations are not in a single cycle and the CA is not maximal length (see, Figure 5(d)).

Formal proofs of Theorem 13 and Theorem 14 are quite lengthy. One can find the details of the proofs in Ref.[5].

Let us now state the greedy strategy for  $CA(90')$  and  $CA(150')$ . Based on some logic, the procedure returns false to report that the CA is non-maximal, and true to indicate that the CA may be of maximal length. The logic is developed based on Theorem 13 for  $CA(90')$  and Theorem 14

for  $CA(150')$ . The details of the procedures - **procedure  $CA(90')$**  and **procedure  $CA(150')$**  can be find in Ref. [5].

### 5.1.2. Generators

Whenever **procedure  $CA(90')$**  and **procedure  $CA(150')$**  returns “True”, we understand from its dynamical behaviour that there is a good chance for the CA to be a maximal length CA. Table 4 and Table 5 shows the effectiveness of the procedurs. The numbers in the table denote the size of  $CA(90')$  and  $CA(150')$  for which **procedure  $CA(90')$**  and **procedure  $CA(150')$**  returns “True”. In Table 4 and Table 5 some numbers are marked by “\*”. These numbers are the sizes for which  $CA(90')$  and  $CA(150')$  are not maximal length CAs. That is, for these sizes, **procedure  $CA(90')$**  and **procedure  $CA(150')$**  returns “True”, but the CA is not maximal length CA. Hence, these numbers are *false positive* if we use the procedure as maximal length CAs generator.

Table 4: List of sizes when procedure of  $CA(90')$  returns “True”. \*-marked sizes are false positive

2	3	5	6	9	11	14	18*	23	26	29
30	33	35	39	41	50*	51	53	65	69	74
81	83	86	89	90	95	98*	99*	105	113	119
131	134*	135	146	155	158	173	174*	179	183	186*
189	191	194*	209	210	221	230	231	233	239	243
245	251	254	261	270*	273	278*	281	293	299	303
306	309	323	326	329	330	338*	350*	354*	359	371
375	378*	386	393*	398	410*	411	413	414*	419	426
429	431	438*	441	443	453	470	473	483	491	495
509	515	519	530	531	543	545	554	558	561	575
585	593	606*	611	614*	615	618	629	638	639	641
645*	650*	651	653	659	683	686*	690*	713	719	723
725	726	741*	743	746	749	755	761	765	771	774
779	783*	785	791	803*	809	810	818	831	833	834
846	866	870	873	879	891	893	911	923	930*	933
935	938	939	950*	953	965	974*	975	986*	989	993
998	1013	1014*	1019	1026*	1031	1034*	1041	1043	1049	1055
1065	1070	1103	1106*	1110*	1118	1119	1121	1133	1134*	1146
1154	1155	1166	1169	1178*	1185	1194				

The procedures are heavily dependent on the theorems (Theroem 13 and 14). However, there are some cases when the procedures cannot detect their non-maximality, but are actually non-maximal. The strategies target to eliminate these cases by adding some filtering methods. Based on filtering, three strategies have been proposed. First two strategies directly use  $CA(90')$  and  $CA(150')$  respectively, whereas the last strategy uses both of them jointly. Empirical studies show that most of the time, generated CAs are maximal length CAs. Since, for few cases, generated CAs are not of maximal length, the strategies are called as imperfect.

Further, to generate primitive polynomial using the **procedure  $CA(90')$** , then the success rate of this scheme is above 80%. Further to improve this success rate, the authors exclude the even  $n$ . Observe that in Table 4, occurrence of error is higher for the cases of even  $n$  than odd  $n$ . In fact, percentage of primitive polynomials for odd  $n$  is higher than that of even  $n$ . This fact can also be understood from the theory of polynomials. Note that number of primitive polynomials against a degree ( $n$ ) is dependent on *Totient function*  $\phi(2^n - 1)$  [1], which is related to prime factors of  $2^n - 1$ . The number of prime factors of  $2^n - 1$  is less when  $n$  is odd, and this fact actually implies

that the number of primitive polynomial against odd  $n$  is higher than that of even  $n$ . In the case of  $CA(90')$ , we can improve the success rate upto 95.41%. From the above understanding, the authors reported the first strategy. In similar fashion, the authors developed the second strategy followed by  $CA(150')$ .

**STRATEGY 1:** Declare  $CA(90')$  of size  $n$  as maximal length CA if **procedure**  $CA(90')$  returns “True” for  $n$  and odd  $n$ .

**STRATEGY 2:** Declare  $CA(150')$  of size  $n$  as maximal length CA if **procedure**  $CA(150')$  returns “True” for  $n$  and odd  $n$ .

The authors explored the relationship between  $CA(90')$  and  $CA(150')$  to develop the next strategy. These two CAs of size  $n$  are *conjugate* to each other and in Ref. [4] the authors published an interesting results about conjugate CAs. That is, the characteristic polynomial of  $CA(90')$  with size  $n$  is irreducible iff that of  $CA(150')$  of same size is irreducible. These facts indicate that there are some cases where both procedures may help to detect non-maximality (one can compare the Table 4 and Table 5 to get an overview). For example, **procedure**  $CA(90')$  and **procedure**  $CA(150')$  both return “True” when  $n = 11$ , and the characteristic polynomials of both CAs are primitive. On the other hand, for  $n = 15$ , **procedure**  $CA(150')$  returns “True” but **procedure**  $CA(90')$  returns “False”, and the characteristic polynomials of these CAs are reducible. Which means, there are some cases where false positive of  $CA(90')$  in guessing maximality can be filtered by **procedure**  $CA(150')$ .

**STRATEGY 3:** Declare  $CA(90')$  of size  $n$  as maximal length CAs if **procedure**  $CA(90')$  and **procedure**  $CA(150')$  both return “True” for  $n$ .<sup>2</sup>

Table 5: List of sizes when procedure of  $CA(150')$  returns “True”. \*-marked sizes are false positive

2	3	5	9	11	14	23	26	29	35	39
41	50*	53	65	69	74	81	83	86	89	95
98*	99*	105	113	119	131	134*	146	155	158	173
179	189	191	194*	209	221	230	231	233	239	243
251	254	278*	281	293	299	303	323	326	329	338*
350*	359	371	375	386	398	410*	411	413	419	429
431	443	453	470	473	491	509	515	519	530	531
543	554	561	575	593	614*	615	629	638	639	641
645*	650*	653	659	683	686*	713	719	723	725	741*
743	746	749	761	779	783*	785	803*	809	818	831
833	866	873	893	911	923	950*	953	965	974*	975
986*	989	993	998	1013	1019	1031	1034*	1041	1043	1049
1070	1103	1106*	1118	1119	1121	1133	1154	1155	1166	1169
1178*	1185									

The results of above strategies can be find in Ref. [5]. It has been conjectured that for Sophie

<sup>2</sup>It is interesting to note that if one interchanges the role of  $CA(90')$  and  $CA(150')$  in this strategy, then she can get similar result.

Germain Primes, the strategies always generate maximal length CAs.

**Conjecture 3.** *Characteristic polynomials of CA(90') and CA(150') of size  $n$  are primitive over GF(2) if  $n$  and  $2n + 1$  both are primes (i.e.  $n$  is a **Sophie Germain prime**) [5].*

## 6. Complemented Maximal Length CA

Linear maximal length CAs have been studied so far. Advantage of linear CAs is, they can be characterized by matrix algebra. Matrix algebra, however, can be extended to characterize complemented CAs by introducing an inversion vector ( $F$ ) [33, 65, 64]. The inversion vector  $F$  of a complemented CA is defined as -

$$F_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the next state of the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ cell is resulted from inversion (complement)} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise (linear).} \end{cases}$$

If  $c_t$  represents the configuration of the CA at  $t^{\text{th}}$  instant of time, then the next configuration - that is, the configuration at  $(t + 1)^{\text{th}}$  time instant, is given by

$$c_{(t+1)} = T.c_t + F \Rightarrow c_{(t+p)} = T^p.c_t + (I + T + T^2 + \dots + T^{p-1})F, \quad (12)$$

where  $c_{(t+p)}$  is the configuration of CA at  $(t + p)^{\text{th}}$  instant of time. For an  $n$ -cell CA,  $F$  is the  $n$  bit inversion vector with its  $i^{\text{th}}$  ( $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$ ) bit as 1, if complemented rule is applied on the  $i^{\text{th}}$  cell; 0 if linear rule is applied. Linear CA is the special case where the inversion vector  $F$  is an all 0s vector, the next state function for the linear CA gets simplified to

$$c_{(t+1)} = T.c_t \Rightarrow c_{(t+p)} = T^p.c_t \quad (13)$$

### 6.1. Vector Space Theoretic Analysis of Complemented CA

A complemented CA is represented by the characteristic matrix  $T$  and the non-zero inversion vector  $F$ . The complemented CA exhibits more varieties in cyclic behaviour than that of linear CA. A complemented CA is reversible if and only if its linear counterpart is a reversible CA [63]. It signifies that the *cycle structure* [9, 62, 46] of a complemented CA can be figured out from the analysis of configuration transition behaviour of the corresponding linear CA. Cycle structure of a CA represents number of cycles present in the CA along with their lengths. To illustrate the cycle structure of a CA, let us take an example. Suppose, a CA has 4 cycles of length 1, 2 cycles of length 2, 4 cycles of length 3 and 2 cycles of length 6. Then, the cycle structure of the CA is denoted as  $CS = [4(1), 2(2), 4(3), 2(6)]$ . Moreover, the concept of null space and its relationship with cycle length of a linear CA can be employed for further analysis of cycle structure of a complemented CA. These concepts are reproduced below from [33, 65].

**Definition 15.** *The null space of a matrix ( $T$ ) consists of all such vectors that can be transformed to the all-zero vector when pre-multiplied by the  $T$ .*

**Theorem 15.** *If a linear CA, represented by  $T$ , has a cycle of length  $k$ , then the cardinality of null space of  $(T^k + I)$  denotes the number of configurations forming cycles of length  $k$  or sub-multiple of  $k$  [64].*

**Theorem 16.** *If a linear CA is represented by  $T$  and for any configuration  $\chi \neq 0$ ,  $g(T) \cdot \chi = 0$ , then  $g(x)$  and the characteristic polynomial  $f(x)$  of  $T$  have a common factor  $h(x)$  [33].*



The analysis of a complemented CA's configuration transition behaviour, reported in [39], targets solutions to the following issues:

- I. To check whether a particular cycle of length  $k$  is present in the cycle structure of a complemented CA.
- II. To find the special class of complemented CA ( $C'$ ) with the cycle structure as that of its linear counterpart  $C$ , irrespective of its inversion vector  $F$ .
- III. To identify the class of  $C'$  whose cycle structure differs from that of  $C$  as well as the properties of  $F$  vectors which impart this difference.
- IV. To compute the cycle structure of  $C'$ .

The following theorem enables us to determine whether a cycle of length  $k$  exists in the cycle structure of a complemented CA [39].

**Theorem 17.** *In a complemented CA with characteristic matrix  $T$  and inversion vector  $F$ , a cycle of length  $k$  exists if  $\text{rank}([T^k + I]) = \text{rank}([T^k + I, \mathcal{F}])$ , where  $\mathcal{F} = [I + T + T^2 + \dots + T^{k-1}]F$*

**Proof :** Let  $\chi$  be a configuration that falls on a cycle of length  $k$  in a complemented CA ( $C'$ ). Hence, as per Equation 12,

$$\chi = [I + T + T^2 + \dots + T^{k-1}]F + T^k \cdot \chi$$

It can be written as

$$[T^k + I] \cdot \chi = \mathcal{F}, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{F} = [I + T + T^2 + \dots + T^{k-1}]F \quad (14)$$

If a cycle of length  $k$  is to exist in  $C'$ , Equation 14 should be consistent. The condition for consistency is

$$\text{rank}([T^k + I]) = \text{rank}([T^k + I, \mathcal{F}]) \quad (15)$$

Hence the proof.  $\square$

## 6.2. Complemented CA with cycle structure identical to its linear counterpart

The complemented maximal length CAs can be derived from linear maximal length CAs. Against an  $n$ -cell linear maximal length CA, there are  $2^n - 1$  complemented maximal length CAs. Using linear maximal length CAs, so, we can get complemented maximal length CAs. To establish the fact theoretically, we have to identify the complemented CA that has *cycle structure* identical to that of a linear CA irrespective of its inversion vector  $F$ .

Theorem 17 guides identification of the complemented CA ( $C'$ ) that has cycle structure identical to that of a linear CA ( $C$ ) irrespective of its inversion vector  $F$ . The following theorem defines the class of  $C'$ .

**Theorem 18.** *The cycle structures of complemented CA ( $C'$ ) and linear CA ( $C$ ) are identical if the characteristic polynomial  $f(x)$  of  $T$  matrix of the complemented CA does not have a factor  $(x + 1)$  [39].*

**Proof :** Let  $k$  be the length of a cycle of the linear CA ( $C$ ) with characteristic matrix  $T$ , characteristic polynomial  $f(x)$  of which does not have a factor  $(x + 1)$ . To have a cycle of length  $k$  in the corresponding complemented CA ( $C'$ ), Equation 15 has to be satisfied.

The number of vectors, forming a cycle of length  $k$  or sub-multiple of  $k$ , in the complemented CA or linear CA are derived from the computation of null space of  $\alpha_1 = (T^k + I)$  [65].

Let  $(x^k + 1) = g(x) \cdot \phi_c(x)$ ; where  $\phi_c(x)$  is the largest factor of the characteristic polynomial  $f(x)$ . Therefore,  $g(x)$  and  $f(x)$  don't have any common factor. Hence, for each configuration  $\chi$  with  $(T^k + I) \cdot \chi = 0$ , there is a corresponding unique configuration  $\bar{\chi}$ , where  $\phi_c(T) \cdot \bar{\chi} = 0$  (from Theorem 16). Hence, the cardinality of null space of  $\alpha_2 = \phi_c(T)$  is same as  $\alpha_1$ .

Since  $f(x)$  does not have a factor  $(x + 1)$  and  $x^k + 1 = (x + 1) \cdot (1 + x + x^2 + \dots + x^{k-1})$ , therefore, the cardinality of the null space of  $\alpha_3 = [I + T + T^2 \dots T^{k-1}]$  is same as that of  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$ . Hence,

$$\text{rank}(T^k + I) = \text{rank}(T^k + I, I + T + T^2 \dots T^{k-1})$$

that is,

$$\text{rank}(T^k + I) = \text{rank}(T^k + I, \mathcal{F})$$

directly follows for any  $F$ .

Therefore, all the cycle lengths of  $C$  also exist in  $C'$ . Since the number of vectors forming each cycle length is same for both of  $C$  and  $C'$  (directly derived from the cardinality of null space), the cycle structures for both the CAs are identical. Hence the proof.  $\square$

**Example 6.** This example illustrates the result of Theorem 18. Let us consider a 5-cell complemented CA ( $C'$ ) with characteristic matrix  $T$  and the inversion vector  $F \neq 0$ , where

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

The characteristic polynomial of  $T$  is  $(x^3 + x + 1)(x^2 + x + 1)$ . The cycle structure of the corresponding linear CA ( $C$ ) is  $[1(1), 1(3), 1(7), 1(21)]$ . The complemented CA as per Theorem 18, has the identical cycle structure as that of the linear CA, irrespective of  $F$ .

Let us consider a particular cycle of length 7. As per the theorem, we compute  $\alpha_1 = T^7 + I$ ,  $\alpha_2 = T^3 + T + 1$  and  $\alpha_3 = T^6 + T^5 + T^4 + T^3 + T^2 + T + I$ :

$$T^7 + I = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$T^3 + T + 1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$




Figure 6: Transition diagram of CA (165, 105, 90, 150)

$$T^6 + T^5 + T^4 + T^3 + T^2 + T + I = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

The cardinality of null space for all the three matrices (with 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> rows as all zeros) is 8. Therefore,  $\text{rank}(\alpha_1) = \text{rank}(\alpha_2, \alpha_3)$  and  $\text{rank}(\alpha_1) = \text{rank}(\alpha_2, \mathcal{F})$ ;  $\mathcal{F} = (I + T + T^2 + T^3 + T^4 + T^5 + T^6) \cdot F$ . That is, both the  $C'$  and  $C$  have cycles of length 7. The number of configurations in the cycles of length 7 or sub-multiple of 7 (here it is 1) is 8. Therefore, the number of cycles of length 7 is 1 (as one configuration forms a single cycle). The complete cycle structure  $CS' = [1(1), 1(3), 1(7), 1(21)]$  is same as that of  $C$ .

The characteristic polynomials of maximal length CAs are primitive; that means polynomials are irreducible. Irreducible polynomials does not have any factor. Therefore, we can apply Theorem 18 on maximal length CA. Hence complemented maximal length CAs can be obtained by exploiting the linear maximal length CAs. Further, we can extract the following corollary from Theorem 18.

**Corollary 5. :** For every linear maximal length CA, we can get complemented maximal length CAs.

To get complemented maximal length CAs, we have to use the complemented rules of rule 90 and rule 150. The respective complemented rules are 165 and 105. Only using these two rules, we can design complemented maximal length CAs from a linear maximal length CA [37, 39]. According to the above discussion, if any 90 or 150 in the rule vector of a linear maximal length CA is replaced by its complement (that is, 165 or 105), the new CA remains as a maximal length CA. For example, the CA (90, 150, 90, 150) is a linear maximal length CA, and so (165, 105, 90, 150) (Figure 6), (90, 150, 165, 150), etc. are also maximal length CAs. Any number of rules in a rule vector of a linear maximal length CA can be replaced by their complements to get a new complemented maximal length CA. Therefore, against an  $n$ -cell linear maximal length CAs, there are  $2^n - 1$  number of complemented CAs which are maximal length.

## 7. Non-linearity in Maximal Length CAs

The maximal length CAs, studied so far, are linear and complemented, where all the rules in rule vectors are either linear or complemented rules. Out of 256 rules, there are eight linear rules and eight complemented rules. There are 240 rules which are non-linear. If any one rule of a CA is non-linear, then the CA is non-linear.

There have been some efforts to introduce non-linearity in maximal length CAs [31, 32, 40, 7]. The technique referred in [31] manipulates the number of clock cycles, based on inputs, in a maximal length CA. This method becomes unsynchronized for different inputs. An efficient technique is devised for generating non-linear maximal length CA from linear maximal length CA by injecting non-linearity in different cell positions [40]. The effect of the non-linearity can be propagated among multiple cells by shifting the non-linear function. However, such a non-linear CA increases neighborhood dependencies of some cells; for example the 3-neighborhood dependency, which is traditionally used by the maximal length CAs, may increase to 5-neighborhood dependency.

In [40], the authors have provided an algorithm to construct non-linear maximal length CA from a given linear maximal length CA. But, there is no proof behind the correctness of the algorithm. The algorithm uses a *neighbor set*  $\mathbf{N}(i)$ , for each cell  $i$ , which is the set of cells on which the  $i^{\text{th}}$  cell is dependent on each iteration. For a three neighborhood CA,  $\mathbf{N}(i) = \{i - 1, i, i + 1\}$  for any  $i$ . Let  $f_i$  be the feedback function of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  cell, then define an operation called shifting as followed.

**Definition 16.** *The one cell shifting operation, denoted by  $f_i \xrightarrow{P} f_{i\pm 1}$  moves a set of algebraic normal form monomials  $P$  from  $i^{\text{th}}$  cell of a non-linear CA to all the cells from  $(i - 1)$  to  $(i + 1)^{\text{th}}$  cell, according to the dependency of the affected cells upon the  $i^{\text{th}}$  cell. Each variable in  $P$  is changed by their previous state. Similarly, a  $k$  cell shifting is obtained by applying the one cell shifting operation for  $k$  times upon the initial non-linear CA and symbolized as  $f_i \xrightarrow{P} f_{i\pm k}$ .*

The details of the scheme have been presented in [40]. Before injecting non-linearity to the required position of a given linear maximal length CA, a shifting operation is applied to the corresponding non-linear function at the required position to retain the maximal length. The procedure to synthesize a non-linear maximal length CA from a linear maximal length CA is depicted in following algorithm. In Ref. [40], one can find the details of the algorithm and example.

---

### Algorithm 7.1: Synthesize Non-linear Maximal Length CA

---

**Input** A  $n$ -cell linear maximal length CA ( $\mathcal{R}$ ), position  $j$  to inject non-linearity

**Output** A non-linear maximal length CA ( $\mathcal{R}'$ )

- 1:  $\mathcal{R}' \leftarrow \mathcal{R}$
  - 2: Let  $\mathcal{R}' = \{f_{n-1}, \dots, f_0\}$
  - 3:  $\mathcal{X} \subset F : \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, x \notin \mathbf{N}(j)$  ▷ select a subset from  $F$
  - 4:  $P \leftarrow \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}(\mathcal{X})$  ▷  $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}$  is a non-linear function
  - 5:  $f_j \leftarrow f_j \oplus P$
  - 6:  $(f_j \xrightarrow{P} f_{j+1})$  ▷ applying shifting operation
  - 7:  $f_j \leftarrow f_j \oplus P$
  - 8: **return**  $\mathcal{R}'$
-

However, the question remains - without exceeding the neighborhood dependency can we get non-linear maximal length CAs. In [7], the authors generate non-linear maximal length CAs from linear maximal length CAs in the 3-neighborhood dependency. However, no formal procedure was presented in Ref.[7] to study the generation of non-linear maximal length CA. This is mainly due to the challenge in applying mathematical tools like linear algebra, primitive polynomial etc. to analyze the properties of non-linear CAs. In recent one [6], the authors address this issue by introduced few concepts that help us to identify non-linear CAs that can potentially generate maximal length CAs.

At first, they have investigated some essential properties of non-linear maximal length CAs. For example, if a (non-uniform) CA has a *blocking word*, it cannot be a maximal length CA. Further, a maximal length CA should have only one single length cycle. Further, the number of non-linear rules cannot be more than  $n/2$  for an  $n$ -cell non-linear maximal length CAs. These properties help in straightway identifying some of the non-linear CAs that won't generate maximal length cycles, without even computing their cycle lengths.

The main approach is to systematically explore if mathematical tools of matrix and linear algebra can be applied with minor modifications for the case of non-linear maximal length CAs. To this effect, they have studied if a non-linear maximum length CA can be generated by starting from a linear CA and then changing a very few rules of it to non-linear. Introduced the notion of *isomorphism*, which acts as a similarity measure between the cycle structures of two CAs. In particular, if a non-linear CA is isomorphic (see Definition 17) to a linear maximal length CA, then the former is also a maximal length CA. They developed theories to determine the conditions under which a non-linear CA can be isomorphic to linear maximal length CA. Finally, an algorithm has been developed for the same (details of the algorithm in Ref.[6]).

**Definition 17.** Let  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  be two CAs of length  $n$ . We say that  $G_2$  is isomorphic to  $G_1$  iff -

1. transition diagram of  $G_2$  is isomorphic<sup>3</sup> to that of  $G_1$ .
2. there exist a non-empty set of configuration  $C$  such that  $\forall x \in C, G_1(x) = G_2(x)$ .

Table 6 notes few non-linear maximal length CAs which we get using the above method. The second column of Table 6 shows the linear maximal length CAs, whereas the third and fourth columns show at which position(s) of the linear CAs the non-linear rule(s) is (are) put, and the the non-linear rule(s) respectively. The linear rule which is replaced are marked in bold face. For example, positions of bold faced rules for size = 24 are 5 and 21. In the corresponding non-linear maximal length CA ( $G_2$ ), rules 30 and 86 are placed in there positions respectively.

It is also an interesting open question to determine a function which can generate non-linear maximal length CAs from a linear maximal length CA in polynomial time.

**Open Problem 2.** Generation of non-linear maximal length CAs from a linear maximal length CA in polynomial time.

## 8. Maximality over $\text{GF}(q)$

The topics discussed till now are related to the binary CAs. In this section, we extend the ideas to the CAs defined over the finite filed  $\text{GF}(q)$ ,  $q$  is a prime. The relevant background of

---

<sup>3</sup>Two graphs which contain the same number of vertices connected in the same way are said to be isomorphic.

Table 6: Linear maximal length CAs to non-linear maximal length CAs. Rule with bold face is replaced by non-linear one

Size	$G_1$	$G_2$	
		Positions	Non-linear rules
4	(6,90, <b>150</b> ,80)	2	89
5	(6,150, <b>150</b> ,150,80)	2	75
6	(6,90, <b>90</b> ,150,90,20)	2	86
7	(10,90,150, <b>90</b> ,150,90,20)	3	169
8	(6,150,150,90,150, <b>150</b> ,150,20)	5	154
9	(10, <b>150</b> ,150,150,90, <b>90</b> ,90,90,20)	1,5	30,58
10	(10,150,150, <b>90</b> ,90,90,90,150,150,20)	3	101
11	(6,90,150,150, <b>150</b> ,90,150,90,90,150,20)	4	86
12	(10,90, <b>150</b> ,150,150,150,90, <b>90</b> ,90,150,150,20)	2,7	86,149
13	(6,90,150, <b>90</b> ,90,90,150,90,150,90,150,20)	3,4	210,101
14	(10,150,90, <b>150</b> ,90,150,90,90,90,90,90,90,20)	3,4	45,169
15	(10,150, <b>90</b> ,90,90,150,150,90,150,90,150,90,150,150,20)	2	53
16	(6,150,90,90,90,90,90,90,90, <b>150</b> ,90,90,150,90,90,20)	9	154
17	(6,90,90,90, <b>90</b> ,150,90,150,90,150,90,150,90,150,90,90,20)	4	101
18	(6,150,150,90, <b>150</b> ,90,150,90,150,90,90,150,90,90,150,90,150,80)	4	225
19	(10,90,150,150, <b>90</b> ,90,150,90,90,90,150,150,150,150,90,150,90,90,20)	4,5	30,154
20	(10,90,150,150,150,150,150,90,90,90,90,150,150, <b>150</b> ,90,90,90,150,150,20)	13	86

linear machines over finite fields can be found in [55, 51]. The cells can be in any of the states of  $\mathcal{S} = \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$ . A configuration of the CA is a mapping  $c: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the set of all possible configurations of an  $n$ -cell CA. Then,  $|\mathcal{C}|=q^n$ . Now, we can define the linear rules in  $q$ -state CA which is similar to Definition 3.

**Definition 18.** A rule  $R: \mathcal{S}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  is called **linear** if  $R$  can be expressed as  $R(x, y, z) = ax+dy+bz \pmod{q}$ , for some  $a, b, d \in \mathcal{S}$ .

To state a rule, we can use the triplet:  $(a, d, b)$ . Let us represent a rule for cell  $i$  as  $(a_i, d_i, b_i)$ . For a CA in  $\text{GF}(q)$ , there are in total  $q^3$  linear rules. For example, number of linear rules in  $\text{GF}(2)$ ,  $\text{GF}(3)$  and  $\text{GF}(5)$  are 8, 27 and 125 respectively. In this section, by ‘‘CA’’ we shall mean 1-dimensional  $q$ -state 3-neighborhood non-uniform CAs having null boundary condition. The rule vector of an  $n$ -cell CA is  $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{R}_0, \mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_i, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{n-1})$  where cell  $i$  follows  $\mathcal{R}_i \equiv (a_i, d_i, b_i)$ .

As per previous discussion (see Section 2.2.1), an  $n$ -cell 3-neighborhood linear CA can also be expressed by a square matrix ( $T$ ) of dimension  $n$ . The matrix shows the dependency of a cell on other cells. Under null boundary condition, it can be represented as the following:

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} d_0 & b_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_1 & d_1 & b_1 & \ddots & & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 & d_2 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & & & \ddots & d_{n-2} & b_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & a_{n-1} & d_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}_{n \times n}$$




Figure 7: Transition diagram of 3-state CA  $((1,2,1), (2,0,1), (2,0,2))$

The characteristic polynomial of this matrix is  $P(x) = \det(xI + T) \pmod{q}$ . The characteristic polynomial in  $\text{GF}(q)$  can be calculated using the previous recurrence relation (see Lemma 1), where  $\Delta = \det(xI + T) \pmod{q}$ .

$$\Delta = \Delta_n = (x + d_{n-1})\Delta_{n-1} + b_{n-2}a_{n-1}\Delta_{n-2} \quad (16)$$

**Example 7.** Let us consider a 3-state 3-cell CA with rule vector  $((1,2,1), (2,0,1), (2,0,2))$ . The characteristic polynomial of this matrix is  $\det(xI + T) \pmod{3} = x^3 + x^2 + 2x + 1$ .

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}_{3 \times 3}$$

Figure 7 shows a transition diagram for the 3-state 3-cell CA  $((1,2,1), (2,0,1), (2,0,2))$ . Here, the next configuration  $c'$  of any configuration  $c$  can be calculated by multiplying  $c$  with  $T$ , where the configuration  $c$  is represented by an  $n \times 1$  column vector. The CA of Figure 7 is reversible; in fact it is a maximal length CA.

For a linear maximal length CA over  $\text{GF}(q)$ , the length of the cycle is  $q^n - 1$ . Theorem 19 relates the maximal length CA and primitive polynomial over  $\text{GF}(q)$ . The characteristic polynomial of the CA of Figure 7 is  $x^3 + x^2 + 2x + 1 \pmod{3}$ , which is primitive over  $\text{GF}(3)$ .

**Theorem 19.** A  $q$ -state linear CA is maximal length if and only if the characteristic polynomial of this CA is primitive over  $\text{GF}(q)$  [18].

For some conditions, the characteristic polynomials of CAs over  $\text{GF}(q)$  are always reducible. Following theorem is generalization of Theorem 1 and Theorem 7.

**Theorem 20.** The characteristic polynomial of an  $n$ -cell CA is always reducible over  $\text{GF}(q)$ , if one of the following conditions is satisfied -

1.  $a_i = 0$  for any  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$  or  $b_j = 0$  for any  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-2\}$  of any rule.
2. the CA is palindromic.

In [18], Cattell and Muzio have provided one minimal cost maximal length CA for each degree upto size 40, for the fields of order 2, 3, 5, 7 and 11. Only rules (1,0,1) and (1,1,1) are used to generate maximal length CAs where minimal of rule (1,1,1) are used.

Given a polynomial  $p(x)$ , does there exist a CA with characteristic polynomial  $p(x)$ ? If this question does not hold for all  $p(x)$ , then does it hold for a subclass of polynomials? Cattell and

Muzio have addressed this question for CA over  $GF(2)$  [19] by applying the results of Mesirov and Sweet [56]. Unfortunately, the approach can not be extended to the CA over  $GF(q)$ . But, a large body of empirical evidence suggests the following conjecture for CA over  $GF(q)$ . The evidence is obtained by exhaustive enumeration of all CA for various fields and various  $n$ , finding the characteristic polynomials, and checking if all irreducible polynomials appear.

Further, we can decide it to the new cases where we find the details of our work related to the EDA and MMAS with degree 2 terminology.

**Conjecture 4.** *If  $p(x)$  is an irreducible polynomial over  $GF(q)$ , then there exists a CA with characteristic polynomial  $p(x)$  [18].*

We have synthesized CA from a given irreducible polynomial over  $GF(2)$  (see Section 4.2). However, there is no efficient method of synthesizing CAs over  $GF(q)$ . So, to find maximal length CAs in  $GF(q)$ , the known way is following [3].

1. For a given size, randomly generate a candidate CA.
2. Find characteristic polynomial of the CA using recurrence relation.
3. Test whether the polynomial is primitive using prime factorization method [68].

In Ref. [3], the authors experimentally generated maximal length CAs in  $GF(q)$  using the above approach. Table 7 records a demo of this process to find one maximal length CA of size 10, 15 and 20 over  $GF(2)$  to  $GF(19)$  where the last column shows the total number of attempts after which we can get a maximal length CA. We conclude this section with some open problems related to maximal length CAs over  $GF(q)$ . Some of them are quite old and difficult. These problems are solved in  $GF(2)$ , but remain unsolved over  $GF(q)$ . Through experiments, Problem 5 has been answered affirmatively. But, the proof is still not known.

**Open Problem 3.** *Synthesize a CA from a given polynomial over  $GF(q)$ .*

**Open Problem 4.** *How many CAs are there for an irreducible polynomial over  $GF(q)$ ?*

**Open Problem 5.** *Does there exist a CA for every irreducible polynomial in  $GF(q)$ ?*

## 9. Applications: PRNGs and Others

One advantage of the binary CAs is that they can easily be implemented in hardware. Figure 8 shows a schematic diagram of hardware implementation of an  $n$ -cell non-uniform CA under null boundary condition. Here, each cell consists of a flip-flop (FF) to store the state of a cell and a combinational logic circuit to find the next state of the cell. Due to similarity of this structure with finite state machine, many researchers, who have been working with finite non-uniform CAs, consider these CAs as finite state machine (FSM) and call the configurations of CAs as states.

The CAs are useful in many application areas due to their simplicity, modularity and regularity [24, 35, 50, 77, 74, 80, 38, 29, 30]. In the last several years, a group of researchers started characterizing maximal length CA based models in diverse fields including pseudo-random number generation [45, 42, 83, 43, 10, 25, 76], cryptography [59, 23, 31, 32], signature analysis [44, 27], error correcting codes [78, 69], test-pattern generator [26] and etc. Next, we discuss some of the applications briefly.



Table 7: Finding one maximal length CA of a particular degree in  $GF(q)$  in a sample run

Field	CA Size	Time (sec)	Actual number of execution
GF(2)	10	3.697707	5
	15	6.421378	11
	20	21.839431	20
GF(3)	10	2.441540	3
	15	7.400775	6
	20	6.092859	5
GF(5)	10	2.461736	2
	15	3.680341	3
	20	18.409685	16
GF(7)	10	32.476975	31
	15	18.126331	15
	20	56.014876	55
GF(11)	10	52.554778	47
	15	12.102284	9
	20	12.099299	9
GF(13)	10	3.577851	3
	15	11.738276	10
	20	16.560623	14
GF(17)	10	9.406888	7
	15	6.121513	5
	20	102.453698	92
GF(19)	10	3.397518	2
	15	84.848327	71
	20	34.926098	26

### 9.1. Pseudo-random Number Generators (PRNGs)

In 1980s, cellular automata (CAs) were introduced as an alternative source of randomness [84]. CAs are simple, regular, locally interconnected, and modular. Further, using of maximal length CAs as the source of randomness offers some inherent advantages. Due to these properties, many researchers have used these CAs as their pseudo-random number generators [45, 43, 10, 25, 76].

We must first consider a suitable definition of randomness in order to properly evaluate any PRNG. The randomness tests of Knuth [48] were used as the metric against which a PRNG can be measured for randomness. This metric describes the result of the average performance of sequences produced by a PRNG on all tests. The weighting allows some tests to have an increased importance. For example, if it were crucial that a pseudo-random sequence have equidistribution, then the weighting for the equidistribution test could be made large. Here we assign equal weight to all tests.

Hortensius et al. [45, 43] added some extra points in maximal length CAs to generate pseudo-random number. They used the technique of “site spacing” between output sites, as in Figure 9 with the maximal length CA. They have defined a site spacing parameter,  $\gamma$ , where the value




Figure 8: Implementation of an  $n$ -cell non-uniform CA under null boundary condition




Figure 9: Definition of site spacing : here  $\gamma = 3$

of  $\gamma$  is the number of sites between outputs in the CA. For example, in Figure 9,  $\gamma = 3$ . If  $\gamma$  is increased, the authors have expected that the cross correction between adjacent bits in the pseudo-random numbers is to be reduced. Also, one can find the experimental results of the pseudo-random number tests for various values of site spacing in Ref. [43]. Maximal length CAs with  $\gamma = 0$  possess “poor” pseudo-random properties because of the distribution problems, but when single spacing site is introduced the maximal length CA sequences pass as many tests as the sequences produced by the algorithmic PRNG. Therefore, a site spacing of  $\gamma = 1$  will be considered adequate for pseudo-random sequence generation. These are very encouraging results as the application of site spacing may prove to be of academic interest only. At this point, the maximal length CA based PRNG is performing like a standard software based PRNG.

Usually, latest PRNG technique claims to be better from previous one. This claim is based on the PRNG’s performance in some statistical tests, like Diehard [53], TestU01 [49], NIST [75] etc. battery of tests, which empirically detect non-randomness in the generated numbers. In a PRNG, based on CA, the pseudo-random numbers are generated out of the configurations of a finite CA, so, to be unpredictable, the CA has to *destroy* the information of the initial configuration, step by step, during its evolution [47, 34, 57, 15, 22, 2, 58]. In the space-time diagram of a CA, one can find this type of unpredictability. This unpredictability, if satisfied in a finite CA, has a correspondence to the independence property, which is essential for a good PRNG. Maximal length CAs have those properties including information flow on both sides (right and left).

It has been established that the pattern generated by maximal length CAs meet all the criteria and the quality of randomness of the patterns generated by CAs is good. In [3], the authors explore the randomness quality of maximal length CAs in  $GF(q)$  and verified the randomness quality of these maximal length CAs as PRNGs by using Diehard battery of tests. They claim that, if we increase  $q$  from 2 to 11, the randomness quality of the CAs for some specific size improve (see Figure 10).

## 9.2. Security Purpose

**Signature Analysis** : Signature analysis is the most widely used data compression technique for test response evaluation. Built-in self test (BIST) design methodologies attempt to deal with the inherent complexity of testing digital VLSI circuits by incorporating both the test pattern generator and data compactor on-chip. Advantages of this approach over other VLSI test techniques




Figure 10: Comparison chart of the maximal length CAs by using Diehard battery of tests

include high speed, low pin overhead, and relatively low cost. In the traditional signature analysis method, they are well understood and are thoroughly explained in the algebraic coding theory literature as *syndrome detection* [66, 52] and in the digital testing literature as *signature analysis* [36, 79]. But in [44], Hortensius et al. discussed different signature analysis technique based on CAs. In this paper, they have examined in detail some of the signature analysis properties of CA. By experimentally, they proved that, the nearest neighbor communication properties is required for implementing elementary one-dimensional CA to allow the consideration of several different techniques of signature analysis. They have examined four signature analysis techniques for CAs. It was shown that, signature analysis methods using maximal length CA provide equivalent aliasing performance compared to others.

**Cryptography** : With this ever increasing growth of data communication, the need for security and privacy have become a basic necessity. Cryptography is an essential requirement for communication privacy or concealment of data. Encryption may be achieved by constructing two different types of ciphers - block ciphers and stream ciphers [70]. A block cipher is the one in which a message is broken into successive blocks and they are encrypted using single key or multiple keys. On the other hand, in a stream cipher the message is broken into successive bits or characters and then the string of characters is encrypted using a key stream. The stream ciphers play an important role in cryptographic practices that protect communications in very high frequency domain. The central problem in stream cipher cryptography, however, is the difficulty of generating a long unpredictable sequence of binary signals from a short and random key. In [59], they produce three basic requirements for cryptographically secure key stream generators which are as follows.

1. The period of the key stream must be large enough to accommodate the length of the transmitted message.
2. The output bits must be easy to generate.
3. The output bits must be hard to predict. That is, given a portion of the output sequence,

the cryptanalyst should not be able to generate other bits forward or backward.

Nandi et al. [59] have presented a CA based scheme for a class of block ciphers and stream ciphers. The scheme which has several attractive features use of maximal length CA. Chang et al. [23] have used, maximal length CAs for stream ciphers. Linear maximal length CAs are not secure, therefore, we need non-linear maximal length CAs. Das et al. [31, 32] put non-linearity in maximal length CAs which are cryptographically suitable. It shows that the bit streams generated in this manner are highly non-linear and pass all the statistical tests for randomness. These maximal length CAs can be used as a non-linear primitive in cryptographic applications.

## 10. Discussion

Maximal length CA has gone through a long journey from the early days to the modern trends of research. In this survey, we have presented known results over a variety of research using different characterization tools. Various milestone of development regarding maximal length CAs are briefly depicted. Although we have omitted some results regarding maximal length CAs, we have targeted to provide an overview of results that we consider important in the field of maximal length CA theory. We have provided several open problems which are important for maximal length CAs and primitive polynomials. Till date the complexity for deciding a maximal length CA is exponential. Further, there is no proof claiming that it is an NP-complete or NP-hard problem. So, it is also an important open problem related to maximal length CAs.

**Open Problem 6.** *Is the problem of deciding maximal length CA NP-complete or NP-hard?*

## References

- [1] Abramowitz, M., Stegun, I.A., 1965. Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs and Mathematical Tables. Dover Publications, Inc., New York.
- [2] Acerbi, L., Dennunzio, A., Formenti, E., 2009. Conservation of some dynamical properties for operations on cellular automata. Theoretical Computer Science 410, 3685–3693.
- [3] Adak, S., Bhattacharjee, K., Das, S., 2020. Maximal length cellular automata in  $gf(q)$  and pseudo-random number generation. International Journal of Modern Physics C 31, 2050037.
- [4] Adak, S., Das, S., 2019. A study on maximal length cellular automata and primitive polynomials in  $GF(2)$ . Journal of Cellular Automata 14, 289–310.
- [5] Adak, S., Das, S., 2021. (imperfect) strategies to generate primitive polynomials over  $gf(2)$ . Theoretical Computer Science 872, 79 – 96.
- [6] Adak, S., Mukherjee, S., 2023. On non-linear maximal length cellular automata, in: Proceedings of Second Asian Symposium on Cellular Automata Technology, Springer Nature Singapore, Singapore. pp. 115–126.
- [7] Adak, S., Mukherjee, S., Das, S., 2018. Do there exist non-linear maximal length cellular automata? A study, in: Proceedings of 13<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Cellular Automata for Research and Industry, ACRI 2018, Como, Italy, September 17-21, 2018, pp. 289–297.
- [8] Adak, S., Mukherjee, S., Das, S., 2021. Reachability problem in non-uniform cellular automata. Information Sciences 543, 72 – 84.
- [9] Adak, S., Naskar, N., Maji, P., Das, S., 2016. On Synthesis of Non-uniform Cellular Automata Having Only Point Attractors. Journal of Cellular Automata 12, 81–100.
- [10] Bardell, P.H., 1990. Analysis of Cellular Automata Used as Pseudo-random Pattern Generators, in: Proceedings of International Test Conference, pp. 762–768.
- [11] Bardell, P.H., 1992. Primitive polynomials of degree 301 through 500. Journal of Electronic Testing 3, 175–176.
- [12] Bardell, P.H., McAnney, W., 1986. Pseudorandom arrays for built-in tests. IEEE Transactions on Computers C-35, 653–658.
- [13] Bardell, P.H., McAnney, W.H., Savir, J., 1987. Built-in Test for VLSI : Pseudo-Random Techniques. John Wiley & Sons.

- [14] Bhattacharjee, K., Naskar, N., Roy, S., Das, S., 2018. A survey of cellular automata: Types, dynamics, non-uniformity and applications. *Natural Computing*, 1–29.
- [15] Cattaneo, G., Formenti, E., Margara, L., Mauri, G., 1999. On the dynamical behavior of chaotic cellular automata. *Theoretical Computer Science* 217, 31–51.
- [16] Cattell, K., 1995. Characteristic Polynomials of One-Dimensional Linear Hybrid Cellular Automata. Ph.D. thesis. Department of Computer Science, University of Victoria, Canada.
- [17] Cattell, K., Muzio, J.C., 1991. A linear cellular automata algorithm: theory. Dept. of Computer Science, University of Victoria, Canada Technical Report DCS-161-IR.
- [18] Cattell, K., Muzio, J.C., 1996a. Analysis of one-dimensional linear hybrid cellular automata over  $GF(q)$ . *IEEE Transactions on Computers* 45, 782–792. doi:10.1109/12.508317.
- [19] Cattell, K., Muzio, J.C., 1996b. Synthesis of one-dimensional linear hybrid cellular automata. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems* 15, 325–335.
- [20] Cattell, K., Serra, M., 1990. The analysis of one dimensional multiple-valued linear cellular automata, in: *Proceedings of the 20<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic*, pp. 402–409. doi:10.1109/ISMVL.1990.122655.
- [21] Cattell, K., Zhang, S., 1995. Minimal cost one-dimensional linear hybrid cellular automata of degree through 500. *Journal of Electronic Testing* 6, 255–258.
- [22] Cervelle, J., Dennonzio, A., Formenti, E., 2009. Chaotic behavior of cellular automata, in: Meyers, B. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Complexity and Systems Science*. Springer-Verlag, pp. 978–989.
- [23] Chang, T., Song, I., Bae, J., Kim, K.S., 1997. Maximum length cellular automaton sequences and its application. *Signal Processing* 56, 199 – 203.
- [24] Comer, J.M., Cerda, J.C., Martinez, C.D., Hoe, D.H., 2012. Random number generators using cellular automata implemented on FPGAs, in: *Proceedings of the 44<sup>th</sup> Southeastern Symposium on System Theory*, IEEE, pp. 67–72.
- [25] Compagner, A., Hoogland, A., 1987. Maximum-length sequences, cellular automata, and random numbers. *Journal of Computational Physics* 71, 391 – 428.
- [26] Das, A.K., Pal Chaudhuri, P., 1993. Vector space theoretic analysis of additive cellular automata and its application for pseudoexhaustive test pattern generation. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* 42, 340–352.
- [27] Das, A.K., Saha, D., Roy Chowdhury, A., Misra, S., Pal Chaudhuri, P., 1990. Signature analysers based on additive cellular automata, in: *Proceedings of the 20<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Fault-Tolerant Computing*, IEEE, pp. 265–272.
- [28] Das, S., 2007. Theory and Applications of Nonlinear Cellular Automata In VLSI Design. Ph.D. thesis. Bengal Engineering and Science University, Shibpur, India.
- [29] Das, S., Kundu, A., Sen, S., Sikdar, B.K., Pal Chaudhuri, P., 2003. Non-linear cellular automata based PRPG design (without prohibited pattern set) in linear time complexity, in: *Proceedings of the 12<sup>th</sup> Asian Test Symposium, ATS'03*, IEEE, pp. 78–83.
- [30] Das, S., Kundu, A., Sikdar, B.K., 2004. Nonlinear CA based design of test set generator targeting pseudo-random pattern resistant faults, in: *Proceedings of the 13<sup>th</sup> Asian Test Symposium, ATS'04*, IEEE, pp. 196–201.
- [31] Das, S., Roy Chowdhury, D., 2010. Generating Cryptographically Suitable Non-linear Maximum Length Cellular Automata, in: *Proceedings of 9<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Cellular Automata for Research and Industry (ACRI)*, pp. 241–250.
- [32] Das, S., Roy Chowdhury, D., 2011. Cryptographically suitable maximum length cellular automata. *Journal of Cellular Automata* 6, 439–459.
- [33] Datta, K.B., 1993. Matrix and Linear Algebra. BPB Publications.
- [34] Eisele, M., 1991. Long-range correlations in chaotic cellular automata. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* 48, 295–310.
- [35] Formenti, E., Imai, K., Martin, B., Yunès, J.B., 2014. Advances on random sequence generation by uniform cellular automata, in: *Proceedings of Computing with New Resources*. Springer, pp. 56–70.
- [36] Fujiwara, H., 1985. Logic Design and Design for Testability. The MIT Press, London.
- [37] Ganguly, N., 2004. Cellular Automata Evolution : Theory and Applications in Pattern Recognition and Classification. Ph.D. thesis. Bengal Engineering College (a Deemed University), India.
- [38] Ganguly, N., Nandi, A., Das, S., Sikdar, B.K., Pal Chaudhuri, P., 2002. An evolutionary strategy to design an on-chip test pattern generator without prohibited pattern set (PPS), in: *Proceedings of the 11<sup>th</sup> Asian Test Symposium, ATS'02*, IEEE, pp. 260–265.
- [39] Ganguly, N., Sikdar, B.K., Pal Chaudhuri, P., 2008. Exploring cycle structures of additive cellular automata. *Fundamenta Informaticae* 2, 137–154.
- [40] Ghosh, S., Sengupta, A., Saha, D., Chowdhury, D.R., 2014. A Scalable Method for Constructing Non-linear Cellular Automata with Period  $2^n - 1$ , in: *Proceedings of 11<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Cellular Automata for Research and Industry (ACRI)*, pp. 65–74.
- [41] Hansen, T., Mullen, G.L., 1992. Primitive polynomials over finite fields. *Mathematics of Computation* 59, 639–643.

- [42] Hortensius, P.D., Card, H.C., McLeod, R.D., Pries, W., 1989a. Importance sampling for Ising computers using one-dimensional cellular automata. *IEEE Transactions on Computers C-38*, 769–774.
- [43] Hortensius, P.D., McLeod, R.D., Card, H.C., 1989b. Parallel random number generation for VLSI systems using cellular automata. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* 38, 1466–1473.
- [44] Hortensius, P.D., McLeod, R.D., Card, H.C., 1990. Cellular automata based signature analysis for built-in self-test. *IEEE Transactions on Computers C-39*, 1273–1283.
- [45] Hortensius, P.D., McLeod, R.D., Pries, W., Miller, D.M., Card, H.C., 1989c. Cellular automata-based pseudorandom number generators for built-in self-test. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems* 8, 842–859.
- [46] Kamilya, S., Adak, S., Sikdar, B.K., Das, S., 2019. Sacas: (non-uniform) cellular automata that converge to a single fixed point. *Journal of Cellular Automata* 14, 27–49.
- [47] Kamilya, S., Das, S., 2018. A study of chaos in cellular automata. *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos* 28, 1830008.
- [48] Knuth, D.E., 1981. *The Art of Computer Programming : Seminumerical Algorithms, Volume 2*. Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., Boston, MA, USA.
- [49] L’Ecuyer, P., Simard, R., 2007. Testu01: A c library for empirical testing of random number generators. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software* 33, 22:1–22:40.
- [50] Leporati, A., Mariot, L., 2014. Cryptographic properties of bipermutive cellular automata rules. *Journal of Cellular Automata* 9, 437–475.
- [51] Lidl, R., Niederreiter, H., 1986. *Introduction to Finite Fields and Their Applications*. Cambridge University Press, New York, USA.
- [52] Lin, S., Costello, D., 1983. *Error Control Coding : Fundamentals and Applications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [53] Marsaglia, G., 1996. DIEHARD: A battery of tests of randomness, in: [http://stat.fsu.edu/~ geo/diehard.html](http://stat.fsu.edu/~geo/diehard.html).
- [54] Matsumoto, M., 1998. Simple cellular automata as pseudorandom m-sequence generators for built-in self-test. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation* 8, 31–42.
- [55] McEliece, R.J., 1987. *Finite Field for Scientists and Engineers*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Norwell, MA, USA.
- [56] Mesirov, J.P., Sweet, M.M., 1987. Continued fraction expansions of rational expressions with irreducible denominators in characteristic 2. *Journal of Number Theory* 27, 144 – 148.
- [57] Mitchell, M., Hraber, P.T., Crutchfield, J.P., 1993. Revisiting the edge of chaos: Evolving cellular automata to perform computations. *Complex Systems* 7, 89–130.
- [58] Mukherjee, S., Adak, S., Bhattacharjee, K., Das, S., 2021. Non-uniform non-linear cellular automata with large cycles and their application in pseudo-random number generation. *International Journal of Modern Physics C* 32, 2150091.
- [59] Nandi, S., Kar, B.K., Pal Chaudhuri, P., 1994. Theory and applications of cellular automata in cryptography. *IEEE Transactions on computers* 43, 1346–1357.
- [60] Nandi, S., Pal Chaudhuri, P., 1993. Additive cellular automata as an on-chip test pattern generator, in: *Proceedings of 2<sup>nd</sup> Asian Test Symposium*, IEEE. pp. 166–171.
- [61] Nandi, S., Pal Chaudhuri, P., 1996. Analysis of periodic and intermediate boundary 90/150 cellular automata. *IEEE Transactions on computers* 45, 1–12.
- [62] Naskar, N., Adak, S., Maji, P., Das, S., 2014. Synthesis of Non-uniform Cellular Automata Having only Point Attractors, in: *Proceedings of 11<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Cellular Automata for Research and Industry (ACRI)*, pp. 105–114.
- [63] Pal Chaudhuri, P., Roy Chowdhury, D., Nandi, S., Chatterjee, S., 1997. *Additive Cellular Automata – Theory and Applications*. IEEE Computer Society Press, USA, ISBN 0-8186-7717-1. volume 1.
- [64] Paul, K., 2002. *Theory and Application of GF(2<sup>p</sup>) Cellular Automata*. Ph.D. thesis. Bengal Engineering College (a Deemed University), India.
- [65] Paul, K., Roy Chowdhury, D., Pal Chaudhuri, P., 2002. Theory of Extended Linear Machines. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* 51, 1106–1110.
- [66] Peterson, W.W., Weldon, E.J., 1972. *Error-correcting codes*. 2nd ed., MIT Press Cambridge.
- [67] Pries, W., Thanailakis, A., Card, H.C., 1986. Group properties of cellular automata and VLSI applications. *IEEE Transactions on Computers C-35*, 1013–1024.
- [68] Rabin, M., 1980. Probabilistic algorithms in finite fields. *SIAM Journal on Computing* 9, 273–280.
- [69] Roy Chowdhury, D., Basu, S., Sen Gupta, I., Pal Chaudhuri, P., 1994. Design of CAECC – Cellular automata based error correcting code. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* 43, 759–764.
- [70] Rueppel, R.A., 1986. *Analysis and Design of Stream Ciphers*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [71] Sarkar, P., 2003. Computing shifts in 90/150 cellular automata sequences. *Finite Fields and Their Applications* 9, 175 – 186.
- [72] Saxena, N.R., McCluskey, E.J., 2004. Primitive polynomial generation algorithms implementation and perfor-

- mance analysis. Technical Report CRC TR 04-03, Center for Reliable Computing, Stanford University, California
- [73] Serra, M., Slater, T., Muzio, J.C., Miller, D.M., 1990. The analysis of one-dimensional linear cellular automata and their aliasing probabilities. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design* 9, 767–778.
  - [74] Sipper, M., Tomassini, M., 1996. Generating parallel random number generators by cellular programming. *International Journal of Modern Physics C* 7, 181–190.
  - [75] Soto, J., 1999. Statistical testing of random number generators, in: *Proceedings of the 22<sup>nd</sup> National Information Systems Security Conference*, Arlington, Virginia, United States.
  - [76] Tezuka, S., Fushimi, M., 1994. A Method of Designing Cellular Automata as Pseudorandom Number Generators for Built-in Self-Test for VLSI. *Finite Fields: Theory, Applications and Algorithms*, Contemporary Mathematics AMS 168, 363–367.
  - [77] Tomassini, M., Sipper, M., Perrenoud, M., 2000. On the generation of high-quality random numbers by two-dimensional cellular automata. *IEEE Transactions on computers* 49, 1146–1151.
  - [78] Tsalides, P., 1990. Cellular automata-based built-in self-test structures for VLSI systems. *Electronics Letters* 26, 1350–1352.
  - [79] Tsui, F., 1987. *LSI/VLSI Testability Design*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
  - [80] Wang, Q., Yu, S., Ding, W., Leng, M., 2008. Generating high-quality random numbers by cellular automata with PSO, in: *Proceedings of 4<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Natural Computation*, IEEE. pp. 430–433.
  - [81] Witten, I.H., Frank, E., Hall, M.A., Pal, C.J., 2016. *Data Mining, Fourth Edition: Practical Machine Learning Tools and Techniques*. 4th ed., Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA.
  - [82] Wolfram, S., 1983. Statistical mechanics of cellular automata. *Reviews of modern physics* 55, 601–644.
  - [83] Wolfram, S., 1984. Universality and complexity in cellular automata. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* 10, 1 – 35.
  - [84] Wolfram, S., 1985. Origins of randomness in physical systems. *Physical Review Letters* 55, 449–452.
  - [85] Zhang, S., Miller, D.M., Muzio, J.C., 1991. Determination of minimal cost one-dimensional linear hybrid cellular automata. *Electronics Letters* 27, 1625–1627.