

Temporally Non-Uniform Cellular Automata (t-NUCA): Reversibility and Cyclic behavior

Subrata Paul^{a,*}, Sukanta Das^a

^a*Department of Information Technology, Indian Institute of Engineering Science and Technology, Shibpur, India*

Abstract

In this work, we propose a variant of non-uniform cellular automata, named as *Temporally Non-Uniform Cellular Automata (t-NUCAs)*, which temporally use two rules, f and g in a sequence \mathcal{R} . To observe *reversibility* in *t-NUCAs*, we study their *injectivity* and *surjectivity* properties. Unlike classical CAs, some *irreversible t-NUCAs* show the behavior similar to *reversible t-NUCAs*. To study this behavior, we define *restricted surjectivity* of *t-NUCA* and introduce *restricted reversibility* which shows *reversibility* of *t-NUCA* for a set of initial configurations. By further investigating the remaining irreversible *t-NUCAs*, some *t-NUCAs* are found which have many-to-one mapping in their configuration space, but do not have *non-reachable* (Garden-of-Eden) configurations. We name these *t-NUCAs* as *weakly reversible t-NUCAs*. Under finite lattice size, a *t-NUCA*, like any classical CA, shows cyclic behavior. We explore this cyclic behavior and discuss its relation with rule sequence. Finally, we note down the possible longest cycle length of a *t-NUCA*, based on the lattice size and rule sequence.

Keywords: Cellular Automata (CA), Temporally Non-Uniform Cellular Automata (t-NUCA), Reversibility, Restricted Reversible, Weakly Reversible, Recurrent Length, Cyclic behavior

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: subratapaul.sp.sp@gmail.com (Subrata Paul),
sukanta@it.iiests.ac.in (Sukanta Das)

I. Introduction

Cellular Automaton (CA) is a discrete dynamical system that consists of a regular network of cells and the cells update their states depending on the current states of the cell itself and the neighboring cells. Classically, cellular automata (CAs) use a single local rule to update the states of all cells synchronously during evolution [1]. In this work, we study a class of non-classical cellular automata, where different rules at different time steps can be used to update their cells. We name these automata as *temporally Non-Uniform Cellular Automata (t-NUCAs)*.

Non-uniformity in cellular automata was first introduced in 1986 [2], which allows the cells to use different rule. These non-uniform CAs were characterized by a number of researchers with a target to use them in VLSI design & test and other related application domains [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. Later, this class of non-uniform CAs have been generalized and defined in [9, 10]. Dynamical behavior of these CAs, such as *injectivity*, *surjectivity*, *permutivity*, *equicontinuity*, *decidability*, *structural stability* etc. have also been investigated in [9, 10, 11]. Another class of non-uniform CAs, called asynchronous cellular automata, has been studied, which do not force all the cells to be updated simultaneously [12]. A number of variations of ACAs have been proposed over the time [13, 14, 15, 16], and their dynamical behavior have also been studied [14, 17, 18, 19].

However, in all the above cases the local rule are not changed during evolution of the CA. The present works deals with a different class of non-uniformity where local rules are changed during evolution. In this work, we assume only two rules, say f and g , which are used to update the states of the cells in a temporal sequence during evolution. The behavior of a *t-NUCA* depends on both the rules (f and g) and the sequence in which the rules are applied. In literature, we find that such a non-uniform CA (*t-NUCA*) was first used to solve density classification problem [20]. Recently, some dynamical behavior of a special class of *t-NUCA* have been studied in [21]. We have also studied a sub-class of *t-NUCAs*, named *Temporally Stochastic Cellular Automata*, where the system uses a default rule (f) for evolution, but is stochastically affected sometime by a noise (g) [22]. The present work generalizes this model.

We start our investigation by exploring the set theoretic properties of *t-NUCAs*, keeping an eye on the reversibility of them. We first investigate *injectivity*, *surjectivity* and *bijectivity* of *t-NUCAs* in classical sense. As usual,

bijjective t -NUCAs are reversible and we find that when individual CAs with local rules f and g are reversible then, a t -NUCA consists of f and g with a rule sequence is *reversible*.

We investigate the behavior of irreversible t -NUCAs, and observe that some of them exhibit reversible CA-like behavior. We find that, some *irreversible* t -NUCAs shows *injectivity* (reps. *surjectivity*) for a set of initial configurations. We name such t -NUCAs as *restricted injective* (resp. *restricted surjective*) t -NUCAs (see Section IV).

A t -NUCA behaves in a way that is similar to being *reversible* for a set of initial configurations if it is both *restricted injective* and *restricted surjective*. This sort of t -NUCAs was given the name *restricted reversible* t -NUCAs. In addition to this, we find more by looking at the remaining irreversible t -NUCAs. We observe that certain t -NUCAs do not have *non-reachable* configurations despite having many-to-one mapping in their configuration space. These t -NUCAs have weak resemblance with the reversibility and name them as *weakly reversible* t -NUCA.

A t -NUCAs, like any classical CA, exhibits cyclic behavior when the lattice size is finite. In Section V, we investigate the cyclic behavior of t -NUCAs with finite lattice size. We analyze the relationship between cycles and rule sequences. Finally we discuss the Hamiltonian cycle related to the transition diagram of t -NUCA and we report the Euler cycle length of t -NUCA.

II. The Proposed Model

Like classical cellular automata, the proposed *temporally Non-Uniform Cellular Automata* (t -NUCAs) are also defined as a quadruple $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ where,

- $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^D$ is the D -dimensional lattice. Elements of \mathcal{L} are called cells.
- $\mathcal{N} = (\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2, \dots, \vec{v}_m)$ is the neighborhood vector of each cell \vec{v} of the lattice and $(\vec{v} + \vec{v}_i) \in \mathcal{L}$, where m is the number of neighbors.
- \mathcal{S} is the finite set of states.
- $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{R}_t)_{t \geq 1}$ is the temporal rule sequence of local rules, where the rule $\mathcal{R}_t : \mathcal{S}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is applied to all cells at the time step t . If $s_{\vec{v}}$ is the present state of cell $\vec{v} \in \mathcal{L}$, then the next state of the cell at t is $\mathcal{R}_t(s_{\vec{v}+\vec{v}_1}, s_{\vec{v}+\vec{v}_2}, \dots, s_{\vec{v}+\vec{v}_m})$.

The primary difference of t -NUCA and classical CA is, a classical CA uses a single rule during evolution, whereas a t -NUCA uses a set of rules temporally in some sequence. In this sense, classical CAs are a special case of t -NUCAs. Although a t -NUCA can use any set of local rules, we use only two local rules in this work, f and g , which act in some sequence.

A configuration, denoted by $c : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$, is a snapshot of the states of all cells at a specific time instance, which can be represented as $c = (s_{\vec{v}})_{\vec{v} \in \mathcal{L}}$, where $s_{\vec{v}}$ is the state of cell $\vec{v} \in \mathcal{L}$. We denote $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{L}}$ as the set of all configurations of the CA.

The local rule (say, f) of a classical CA induces a global transition function $G_f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ of the CA, where,

$$G_f(\vec{v}) |_{\vec{v} \in \mathcal{L}} = f(s_{\vec{v}+\vec{v}_1}, s_{\vec{v}+\vec{v}_2}, \dots, s_{\vec{v}+\vec{v}_m}) \quad (1)$$

Although the results presented here are applicable to any D , \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{N} , the examples given in this article mostly adhere to ECA (Elementary Cellular Automata) settings and employs f and g as two ECA rules. ECAs are one-dimensional, two-state, three-neighborhood cellular automata, in which a cell changes its state based on its left neighbor, self, and right neighbor. Updates are made synchronously at each time step in accordance with a local rule, such as $f : \mathcal{S}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$. A global function $G_f : \mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{L}}$ is defined such that, for a given local rule f and a set of cells \mathcal{L} , the image $y = (y_i)_{i \in \mathcal{L}} = G_f(c)$, where c is a configuration, $c = (c_i)_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \in \mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{L}}$. Rule f can be defined as,

$$\forall i \in \mathcal{L}, y_i = f(c_{i-1}, c_i, c_{i+1}) \quad (2)$$

Each rule f is associated with a ‘decimal code’ w , where $w = f(0, 0, 0) \cdot 2^0 + f(0, 0, 1) \cdot 2^1 + \dots + f(1, 1, 1) \cdot 2^7$, for the naming purpose. Following examples use ECA rules to show working of t -NUCAs.

Example 1. *Let us consider a finite t -NUCA with ECA rules 14 and 243. The number of cells (lattice size) is assumed as 4 and the boundary condition is periodic. Suppose the rules are used in the following sequence: 14, 14, 243, 14, 14, 243, \dots . That is, rule 14 is applied twice, and then the rule 243 is used once, and this repeats. In Figure 1, we can find the transition diagram of 4-cell ECA rule 14 and rule 243 in Figure 1(a) and Figure 1(b) respectively. The transition diagram of t -NUCA is shown in Figure 1(c). In this diagram, if a transition is due to rule 14, it is marked by black edge,*

if by rule 243 then marked by blue edge. Figure 1(d) is a derived transition diagram, named as partial transition diagram of the t -NUCA where only the configurations, marked by white circle are considered as initial configurations, from where the execution starts and the intermediate configurations¹ (marked by gray circle) are reached during evolution.




Figure 1: Transition diagram of two ECAs and a t -NUCA with lattice size 4. Configurations are noted by their decimal equivalents with first bit as LSB; (a) Transition diagram of a 4-cell ECA 14; (b) Transition diagram of a 4-cell ECA 243; (c) Transition diagram of a 4-cell t -NUCA (14, 243)[A001651]; (d) Partial transition diagram of the t -NUCA (14, 243)[A001651], where the configurations, marked by gray circle is the intermediate configurations that are reached during evolution from initial configurations (marked by white circle). The black and blue arrow indicate the transitions by rule 14 and rule 243 respectively.

¹In a partial transition diagram, an intermediate configurations is not considered as initial configuration. However, the configuration is reached during evolution of a t -NUCA from an initial configuration.

The sequence of rules (\mathcal{R}) affects the dynamics of a t -NUCA. Any sequence of f and g can be used in a t -NUCA. Sometime some well-defined condition on time step may be used to get a sequence. Let us consider that $\Theta(t)$ is such a condition, which if holds the rule f is applied, otherwise rule g is applied. That is,

$$\mathcal{R}_t = \begin{cases} f & \Theta(t) \text{ holds} \\ g & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

We generally identify a t -NUCA by the notation $(f, g)[\mathcal{R}]$. If we note down the time t when $\Theta(t)$ holds, then we can get a sequence of integers. These integers mean the time steps when f is applied. For example, let us assume that $\Theta(t)$ holds if t is odd. That is, the series for t is: $1, 3, 5, 7, 9, \dots$. The series of t when $\Theta(t)$ holds can represent the rule sequence. So, in our further reference, we shall call this series as rule sequence. Some time, it is difficult to represent a rule sequence in the notation of t-NUCA when the sequence is long enough. Hence, we need to consider a rule sequence identifier to represent a rule sequence.

A rule sequence can be identified in various way, e.g., using binary bits: $101010\dots$ ($\Theta(t)$ holds if t is odd), where 1 (resp. 0) represents the application of f (reps. g). Since, in the sequence $101010\dots$, the term 10 repeats over and over, one can consider the sequence as $(10)^+$ or $\mathbf{10}$, hence, the notation of the t-NUCA is $(f, g)[(10)^+]$. Alternatively, in the database of OEIS [23], the integer sequences are designated by some lexicographical ordering number. The rule sequence of a t -NUCA can be identified by such an ordering number, say χ , then a t -NUCA with two ECAs f and g can be identified as t-NUCA $(f, g)[\chi]$.

For example, a t -NUCA with two ECAs f and g and the series of t , when f is applied: $1, 3, 5, 7, 9, \dots$, i.e., A005408 [23] can be identified as $(f, g)[A005408]$. This paper considers such notations to represents a t-NUCA, where the lexicographical ordering numbers are considered as the identifiers of the rule sequences.

The rule sequences can be classified as, *periodic* and *aperiodic*,

Periodic : A periodic sequence (cyclic sequence) is a sequence for which the same terms are repeated over and over: For example, $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \dots, \mathcal{R}_l, \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \dots, \mathcal{R}_l, \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \dots, \mathcal{R}_l, \dots$ is a *periodic* rule sequence where $(\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \dots, \mathcal{R}_l)$ is repeated in the sequence. The l number of repeated terms is called the *period*. That is, $\mathcal{R} = (R_t)_{t \geq 1} = (\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \dots, \mathcal{R}_l)^+$.




Figure 2: Space-time diagram of a t -NUCA s $(90, 73)[A001651]$, where the rule sequence is OEIS A001651, that is, f is applied twice, and then the rule g is used once, and this repeats. Here the rule sequence is *periodic*.

For example, let us assume a t -NUCA, where $\mathcal{R}_t \in \{f, g\}$.

$$\Theta(t) = \begin{cases} True & t \text{ is not divisible by } 3, \\ False & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Hence the time steps of applying f is as follow : $1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, \dots$ (OEIS A001651). That is, rule f is applied twice and the rule g is used once, and this repeats (see Figure 1). This represents a periodic rule sequence with period length 3. Alternatively, to examine the detailed transitions of a t -NUCA with periodic rule sequence, we present the space-time diagram of a t -NUCA $(90, 73)[A001651]$ in Figure 2. Here, the cells with states 1, updated by f or g , are marked by *blue* or *red*, respectively. The cells with state 0 are represented by *white* cells.

Aperiodic : A sequence, which is not periodic, is called aperiodic sequence. For example, let us assume, a t -NUCA consists of two rules f and g , where g is applied when t is prime, rule f is applied otherwise; that is,

$$\Theta(t) = \begin{cases} True & t \text{ is not prime.} \\ False & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Hence the series of t when $\Theta(t)$ holds is as follow : $1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 14, \dots$, i.e., OEIS A018252. Figure 3 shows the space-time diagram of the t -NUCA s $(90, 73)[A018252]$ and $(164, 131)[A018252]$.




Figure 3: Space-time diagram of two t -NUCAs $(90, 73)[A018252]$ and $(164, 131)[A018252]$. The rule sequence is OEIS A018252, where g is applied when t is prime, rule f is applied otherwise. Here the rule sequence is *aperiodic*.

III. Injectivity and Surjectivity

A classical CA with rule f is injective (resp. surjective) if its global transition function G_f is injective (resp. surjective). In classical finite CAs, injectivity implies surjectivity, hence bijectivity. A surjective CA has no *non-reachable* (Garden-of-Eden) configurations. In this section, we investigate the existence of *non-reachable* configurations in a t -NUCA through the injectivity and surjectivity of CA f and CA g .

Definition 1. *A configuration of a CA is non-reachable if the CA can not reach to the configuration during its evolution from any initial configuration.*

Figure 1(a) shows the transition diagram of a non surjective CA, where the configurations 7, 11, 13, 14, and 15 are *non-reachable* configurations. This is not a surjective CA. For a non-surjective CA, we always get a set of *non-reachable* configurations. In case of t -NUCA, non-surjectivity follows the same.

Theorem 1. *Let X_f and X_g be the sets of non-reachable configurations of G_f and G_g respectively. Then, there exist non-reachable configurations in a t -NUCA for any rule sequence if $X_f \cap X_g \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let X_f and X_g be the sets of non-reachable configurations of G_f and G_g respectively, and $X_f \cap X_g \neq \emptyset$. Now if $x \in X_f \cap X_g$ and \mathcal{C} is the set of all configurations of a t -NUCA, then both of the following statements are true:

1. $\forall y \in \mathcal{C}, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, x \neq G_f^k(y)$

$$2. \forall z \in \mathcal{C}, \forall l \in \mathbb{N}, x \neq G_g^l(z)$$

From the above statements, we get the following -

Let us consider $(G_t)_{t \geq 1}$ be the sequence of rules that are used in a t-NUCA. Here, G_t is either G_f or G_g . Hence,

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{N}, x \notin G_t|_{\mathcal{C}_t}(\mathcal{C}_t)$$

This implies, the configuration x can not be reached from any configuration. Hence, for a t-NUCA consists of f and g , x is a non-reachable configuration. \square

Theorem 1, however, does not state the sufficient condition for existence of *non-reachable* configuration in a *t-NUCA*. There exists *non-reachable configuration* even if CAs f and g do not have any *non-reachable* configurations in common (that is, $X_f \cap X_g = \emptyset$). Following example illustrates the case.

Example 2. Let us consider a finite *t-NUCA* $(3, 15)[A001651]$, where 3 and 15 are two ECA rules. The number of cells (lattice size) is assumed as 4 and the boundary condition is periodic. The ECAs 3 and 15 do not have non-reachable configurations in common; that is $X_3 \cap X_{15} = \emptyset$ (see Figure 4). However, the *t-NUCA* has non-reachable configurations, where the series of sequence is 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, \dots (Figure 4(c)).

Theorem 2. A t-NUCA with any rule sequence has no non-reachable configuration sequence iff G_f and G_g both are bijective.

Proof. Let us consider $(G_t)_{t \geq 1}$ be the sequence of CAs used in a t-NUCA. Here, G_t is either G_f or G_g . If G_f and G_g both are bijective, then each $(G_t)_{t \geq 1}$ remains bijective. For a rule sequence of a t-NUCA, the compositions of G_t and G_{t+1} for all $t \geq 1$ are bijective. Hence, all the configurations are reachable.

Let us now consider that the *t-NUCA* has no non-reachable configuration. By contradiction, let us assume that G_f is not surjective and it has non-reachable configurations. That is, $G_f(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$.

Now consider another t-NUCA with the same couple of CAs f and g , consists of a trivial rule sequence where only rule f is used in each step. Then, obviously, the *t-NUCA* has *non-reachable* configuration, i.e., not surjective. This contradicts our consideration that the *t-NUCA* has no *non-reachable*




Figure 4: Transition diagram of two ECAs and transition diagram a t -NUCA where the lattice size is 4; (a) Transition diagram of a 4-cell ECA 3; (b) Transition diagram of a 4-cell ECA 15; (c) Transition diagram of a 4-cell t -NUCA (3, 15)[A001651].

configuration. Hence G_f is to be bijective. With the similar argument, G_g is also to be bijective. Hence the proof. \square

Example 3. Let us consider an infinite t -NUCA with ECA rules 51 and 204. Suppose the rule 51 is used in the following sequence $1, 3, 5, 7, \dots$, (OEIS A005408). The t -NUCA (51, 204)[A005408] shows bijectivity. Here, the ECAs 51 and 204 both are bijective. Figure 5 illustrates some transitions of the t -NUCA. All other transitions behave similarly.

Although the proof of Theorem 2 considers trivial rule sequence (only one rule is used in each time step), there are a number of rule sequences for which a t -NUCA can have *non-reachable* configurations when G_f and G_g are not bijective.

Corollary 1. Let, a t -NUCA with a rule sequence consists of two rules f and g , then each configuration of the t -NUCA is reached by both f and g during evolution iff both the rules are bijective.

Let us now extend the definition of injectivity of classical CAs to the t -NUCA. From the above discussion, we get that a t -NUCA behaves like an injective (resp. surjective) CA if G_f and G_g both are injective (resp. surjective). This observation leads us to the following definition.




Figure 5: Transitions of infinite t -NUCA (51, 204)[A005408].

Definition 2. A t -NUCA is injective (resp. surjective) iff G_f and G_g both are injective (resp. surjective).

Similar to injectivity, if G_f and G_g both are surjective then a t -NUCA consists of f and g remains surjective. Surjectivity of a t -NUCA implies that, each configuration has k predecessor for k number of different rules using in it. In this work, two rules are utilized, that is, each configuration $c \in \mathcal{C}$ of a t -NUCA is reached by both the rules during evolution.

Example 4. Let us consider a 4-cell t -NUCA consists of ECA rules 170 and 85 with periodic boundary condition. Suppose the rule sequence is OEIS A005408. Here, both the ECAs 170 and 85 are injective. Hence, the t -NUCA (170, 85)[A005408] is injective and all the configurations are reached by both the rules, hence surjective (Figure 6).

Example 5. Let us consider a 3-state t -NUCA where each rule (say f) is associated with a ‘decimal code’ w_3 , where $w_3 = f(0, 0, 0) \cdot 3^0 + f(0, 0, 1) \cdot 3^1 + f(0, 0, 2) \cdot 3^2 + \dots + f(2, 2, 2) \cdot 3^{26}$, for the naming purpose. Suppose the t -NUCA consists of two CA rules 1470343891115 and 5594248657947, and the rule sequence is OEIS A001651. Hence, the t -NUCA is denoted as (1470343891115, 5594248657947)[A001651]. The number of cells (lattice size) is assumed as 3 and the boundary condition is periodic. Figure 7(c) shows the partial transitions of the t -NUCA. Since, the CAs, 1470343891115 and 5594248657947 both are injective and surjective, the t -NUCA is injective and surjective.




Figure 6: Transition diagram of a 4-cell reversible t-NUCA $(170, 85)[A005408]$; (a) Transition diagram of a 4-cell t-NUCA $(170, 85)[A005408]$; (b) Partial transition diagram of the t-NUCA $(170, 85)[A005408]$, where the configurations, colored by gray (resp. white) is the intermediate configuration (resp. initial configuration).

A t-NUCA is bijective iff the t-NUCA is injective and surjective. In Example 4 and Example 5, both the *t-NUCA*s are injective and surjective. Hence, the *t-NUCA*s are bijective.

Reversibility is a property of some mathematical and physical systems for which time-reversed dynamics are well-defined. That is, no information loss is there during the evolution. Hence, a *t-NUCA* can be considered as reversible if the evolution of the t-NUCA can be inverted with respect to time. In other word, a t-NUCA is said to be reversible if it is invertible. This is only possible if the *t-NUCA* is bijective.

Proposition 1. *A t-NUCA is said to be reversible iff the CA is bijective (injective and surjective).*

Proof. In case of two bijective rules f and g , there may exist $z \in \mathcal{C}$, for which, $G_f(x) = G_g(y) = z$, for some $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$, $x \neq y$. That is, the configuration z has two predecessors for two different rules. However, since a specific rule sequence can be found in a *t-NUCA*, any predecessor can be reached from one configuration by a given rule (as per rule sequence) during inversion. That implies, for a *t-NUCA*, a configuration has only one predecessor for a specific rule. Hence, no information loss is there. So, the *t-NUCA*s, consist of two bijective rules, are reversible *t-NUCA*s. \square




Figure 7: Transition diagram for two 3-neighborhood 3-state CAs and a t -NUCA with lattice size 3. Every vertex of the diagram represents decimal equivalence of a configuration. (a) Transition diagram of a 3-cell CA 1470343891115; (b) Transition diagram of a 3-cell CA 5594248657947; (c) Partial transition diagram of a 3-cell t -NUCA (1470343891115, 5594248657947)[A001651], where the configurations, colored by gray (resp. white) is the intermediate configuration (resp. initial configuration).

Example 6. Let us consider an example of a 4-cell t -NUCA consists of two ECA rules 15 and 170. The rule sequence of the t -NUCA is OEIS A018252, i.e., the rule 15 is used in the following sequence: when t is not prime apply 15, otherwise apply 170. The t -NUCA (15, 170)[A018252] shows reversibility (see Figure 8).

Hence the t -NUCAs, mentioned in Figure 6, Figure 7 and Figure 8, are the examples of reversible t -NUCAs. There exists t -NUCAs where, all the configurations are reached during evolution, however G_f and G_g both are not surjective. We discuss such interesting behavior of t -NUCA in the next section.




Figure 8: Transition diagram of a 4-cell t-NUCA consists of ECA rules 15 and 170, where every vertex of the diagram represents decimal equivalence of a configuration; (a) Transition diagram of a 4-cell ECA 15; (b) Transition diagram of a 4-cell ECA 170; (c) Transition diagram of a 4-cell t-NUCA (15, 170)[A018252].

IV. Restricted and weak Reversibility

Theorem 1 has proved that there exist *non-reachable* configurations for a t-NUCA consists of f and g if $X_f \cap X_g \neq \emptyset$. Example 2 has next shown that there exist non-reachable configurations of a t-NUCA with a rule sequence even if $X_f \cap X_g = \emptyset$. However, if one rule is bijective (then, $X_f \cap X_g = \emptyset$), we can find a rule sequence for which the t-NUCA has no *non-reachable* configuration. This provides the evidence that, $X_f \cap X_g = \emptyset$ is a necessary condition for a t-NUCA which has no non-reachable configuration.

Lemma 1. *There exists a t-NUCA consists of f and g with a rule sequence, for which the t-NUCA has no non-reachable configuration if G_f or G_g is bijective.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let us consider that G_f is bijective. Construct a rule sequence of a t-NUCA where first rule f is used and then rule g is used. If G_g is non-bijective, then there exist some *non-reachable* configurations in the CA g . Suppose X_g is the set of *non-reachable* configuration of G_g . However, all members of X_g are reachable by G_f . Since G_f is used first in the sequence, all the configurations, including X_g , are reachable during the t-NUCA evolution. Hence the proof. \square

From the proof of Lemma 1, a number of rule sequences, where one rule is bijective, are identified for which a t -NUCA has no non-reachable configuration.

A CA with no non-reachable configurations implies that the CA is *surjective*. For a t -NUCA, if both the rules are not *surjective* then the t -NUCA is not *surjective*. However, if there exists a rule sequence for which, all configurations can be reached, then one can say that the t -NUCA has no non-reachable configuration for that sequence. Hence, the t -NUCA can behave like a *surjective* CA, though the rules are not *surjective*. In this direction, the t -NUCAs, consist of non-surjective ECAs, behaves like surjective CA for some rule sequences. We named this type of t -NUCA as *restricted surjective t-NUCA*.

Definition 3. *A t-NUCA is restricted surjective if there exists a set of configuration to which all the other configuration can be reached during evolution and the t-NUCA has no non-reachable configuration.*

In other word, for a t -NUCA, if all the configurations are covered during evolution, then the t-NUCA is called *restricted surjective t-NUCA*. Obviously, all *surjective* t-NUCAs are *restricted surjective* but the reverse is not true.

Let us consider that $(G_t)_{t \geq 1}$ is the sequence of CAs used in a t -NUCA. Here, G_t is either G_f or G_g . We can now define a restriction on G_t for some set $\mathcal{C}_t \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, i.e., $G_t|_{\mathcal{C}_t}(x) = G_t(x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{C}_t$. This implies, the restriction of G_t to \mathcal{C}_t is the same function as G_f or G_g . Then we get a sequence of restrictions $(G_t|_{\mathcal{C}_t})_{t \geq 1}$. The following propositions are noted based on this considerations,

Proposition 2. *A t-NUCA is restricted surjective for $t \geq 1$, if it satisfies the following conditions,*

1. $\mathcal{C}_{t+1} = G_t|_{\mathcal{C}_t}(\mathcal{C}_t)$
2. *Each $G_t|_{\mathcal{C}_t} : \mathcal{C}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{t+1}$ is surjective*
3. *There exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$, for which, $\bigcup_{t=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{C}_{t+1} = \mathcal{C}$*

Proof. Let us assume \mathcal{C} be a set of all configuration of t-NUCA. By condition 1, $\mathcal{C}_{t+1} = G_t|_{\mathcal{C}_t}(\mathcal{C}_t)$ where each $\mathcal{C}_t \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and $G_t \in \{G_f, G_g\}$. Now, we suppose that without loss of generality, each restriction $G_t|_{\mathcal{C}_t} : \mathcal{C}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{t+1}$, $\forall t \geq 1$ have onto map, that is surjective (Condition 2).

In a non-surjective G_t , there exists non-reachable configuration. However, by condition 2, in each restrictions, each reachable configuration in \mathcal{C}_{t+1} has a predecessor. Now, let all configurations are reachable in a t-NUCA if each non reachable configuration of $G_{t_1}|_{\mathcal{C}_{t_1}}$ is reachable by $G_{t_2}|_{\mathcal{C}_{t_2}}$ where $t_1 \neq t_2$. That is, $\bigcup_{t=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{C}_{t+1} = \mathcal{C}$ which is exactly equivalent to the condition 3.

Hence the proof. \square

Example 7. Let us consider a t-NUCA with ECAs 15 and 25. Suppose the sequence is OEIS A001651, i.e., 15, 15, 25, 15, 15, 25, \dots (see Figure 9). In this t-NUCA, no non-reachable configuration is there. Hence the CA is restricted surjective. However, ECA 25 is not surjective, hence the t-NUCA is not a surjective t-NUCA.

Definition 4. A t-NUCA is restricted injective if each reachable configuration of the t-NUCA has unique predecessor for an unique rule.

Note that, in a restricted injective t-NUCA both the rules may not be injective. Restricted injectivity of a t-NUCA depends on the set of initial configuration, where each restriction, $G_t|_{\mathcal{C}_t} : \mathcal{C}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{t+1}$ is injective.

Proposition 3. A t-NUCA is restricted injective if the t-NUCA satisfies the following conditions,

1. $\mathcal{C}_{t+1} = G_t|_{\mathcal{C}_t}(\mathcal{C}_t)$
2. Each $G_t|_{\mathcal{C}_t} : \mathcal{C}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{t+1}$ is injective
3. For two functions $G_f|_{\mathcal{C}_i}$ and $G_f|_{\mathcal{C}_j}$, $x_1 = x_2$ iff $G_f|_{\mathcal{C}_i}(x_1) = G_f|_{\mathcal{C}_j}(x_2)$, where $x_1 \in \mathcal{C}_i$ and $x_2 \in \mathcal{C}_j$ (the same clause applies to G_g).

Proof. Let us first assume that each \mathcal{C}_{t+1} contains all reachable configurations (Condition 1). Now we suppose that each $G_t|_{\mathcal{C}_t} : \mathcal{C}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{t+1}$ has one-to-one map, that is injective (Condition 2). This ensures that each configuration say $x \in \mathcal{C}_{t+1}$ has unique predecessor for each restriction $G_t|_{\mathcal{C}_t}$

Let us assume the configuration x are in both \mathcal{C}_{i+1} and \mathcal{C}_{j+1} , and the restrictions are $G_f|_{\mathcal{C}_i}$ and $G_f|_{\mathcal{C}_j}$. According to condition 2, x has one unique predecessor say $x_1 \in \mathcal{C}_i$ for restriction $G_f|_{\mathcal{C}_i}$ and another unique predecessor $x_2 \in \mathcal{C}_j$ for restriction $G_f|_{\mathcal{C}_j}$. Now, according to the definition of restricted injectivity, since same G_f is considered in the restrictions, x_1 and x_2 should be same, i.e., $x_1 = x_2$ which is exactly equivalent to the condition 3.

Hence the proof. \square




Figure 9: Transition diagram of two ECAs 15 and 25 and partial transition diagram of a t -NUCA (15, 25)[A001651] with lattice size 5, where black arrow (blue arrow) represents the transition by rule 15 (by rule 25 respectively); (a) Transition diagram of a 5-cell ECA 15; (b) Transition diagram of a 5-cell ECA 25; (c) Partial transition diagram of a 5-cell t -NUCA (15, 25)[A001651], where the configurations, colored by gray (resp. white) is the intermediate configuration (resp. initial configuration).

Example 8. Let us consider a 4-cell t -NUCA with ECA rules 7 and 40. Suppose the rule sequence is OEIS A001651, i.e., 7, 7, 40, 7, 7, 40, \dots (see Figure 10). This t -NUCA, is restricted injective for $\mathcal{C}_{in} = \{0, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12\}$. However the ECAs 7 and 40 are not injective, hence the t -NUCA is not injective.

Remark 1. Let us consider a t -NUCA, consist of f and g , and \mathcal{C}_x and \mathcal{C}_y are the set of configurations, for which the CAs G_f and G_g have many-to-one map respectively. Then the t -NUCA is restricted injective if $\mathcal{C}_x \cap \mathcal{C}_y = \emptyset$.




Figure 10: Transition diagram of a 4-cell *restricted reversible t-NUCA* (7, 40)[A001651]. (a) Transition diagram of a 4-cell ECA 7; (b) Transition diagram of a 4-cell ECA 40; (c) Partial transition diagram of a 4-cell t-NUCA (7, 40)[A001651], where the configurations, marked by white circle can be considered as the initial configurations, i.e., $\mathcal{C}_{in} = \{0, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12\}$.

It is obvious that, if G_f and G_g shows many-to-on map for the same set of configurations, then there exists no restrictions for which the t-NUCA shows restricted injectivity.

Whenever a *t-NUCA* shows restricted bijectivity, i.e., restricted surjective and restricted injective for a set of initial configurations, say \mathcal{C}_{in} , the time-reversed dynamics can be observed in the *t-NUCA* if it starts journey from any configuration of \mathcal{C}_{in} . Although the *t-NUCA* is not bijective, there is no information loss throughout evolution. Therefore, the *t-NUCA* can be inverted with respect to time, similar to the behavior of reversible *t-NUCA*.

Definition 5. A *t-NUCA* is said to be *restricted reversible* iff the *t-NUCA* is *restricted surjective* and *restricted injective*, that is *restricted bijective*.

For example, let us consider a 4-cell *t-NUCA* (7, 40)[A001651]. The *t-NUCA* has no non-reachable configuration (see Figure 10). So, it is a *restricted surjective t-NUCA*. The *t-NUCA* is also *restricted injective* (see Example 8), hence the t-NUCA is *restricted reversible*.

It is described that there exists a sequence for which a *t-NUCA* is *restricted reversible*, if any one rule is bijective. However there exists some *t-NUCA* where both the rules are not bijective. But, if all the configurations of a set of no-reachable configurations, say X_f (resp. X_g) can be reachable by G_g (resp. G_f) then, one can find that, $X_f \cap X_g = \emptyset$.

The above argument is generalized in the following proposition.

Proposition 4. *Let us assume a t-NUCA consists of two irreversible ECAs f and g where the first rule of the rule sequence is f and \mathcal{C} is the set of all configurations. Let,*

$$\begin{aligned} S_f &= \{y \mid y = G_f(\mathcal{C})\} \\ S_g &= \{z \mid z = G_g(S_f)\} \end{aligned}$$

The t-NUCA is not a restricted / week reversible t-NUCA if it satisfy any of the following condition –

1. $S_g \subseteq S_f$
2. $\exists y, y \in \{\mathcal{C} - S_g\}$, such that, $y \notin S_f$

Proof. This proposition first assumes that S_f and S_g are the sets of reachable configurations of a t-NUCA by f and g respectively where f is the first rule in the rule sequence. Let \mathcal{C} be the set of all configurations of the t-NUCA.

Case 1: Since, f is the first rule in the rule sequence, if f is not bijective then, $S_f \subset \mathcal{C}$. The best case scenario of getting maximum number of reachable configurations by g is that, g is applied after the first f (applied second) in the rule sequence, because $G_f^k(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq G_f(\mathcal{C}), k > 1$. Now, $S_g = \{y \mid y = G_g(S_f)\}$, if $S_g \subseteq S_f$ then the non-reachable configurations of f , i.e., $\{\mathcal{C} - S_f\}$ are also non-reachable by g . There exists non-reachable configuration in the t-NUCA, i.e., the t-NUCA is not restricted surjective. Hence, the t-NUCA is not a restricted / week reversible t-NUCA.

Case 2: Let us assume, $\exists y \in \mathcal{C}, y \notin S_f$, where, y is the non reachable configuration of f . Now, if $y \notin G_g(S_f)$ then y become the non-reachable configuration of the t-NUCA. There exists non-reachable configuration in the t-NUCA, i.e., $\mathcal{C} - \{S_f \cup S_g\} \neq \emptyset$ and the t-NUCA is not a restricted surjective. Hence, the t-NUCA is not restricted/week reversible.

Hence the proof. □

In this direction, one can observe that the ‘*reversibility*’ of the t-NUCA depends on the rules but does not depend on the rule sequence. However, the *restricted reversibility* of t-NUCA depends on both the rules as well as the rule sequence. Hence, the *restricted reversibility* is rule sequence sensitive. Further, the *restricted reversibility* of a t-NUCA is initial configurations sensitive.

Let us further explore the remaining irreversible t -NUCAs (the irreversible t -NUCAs excluding *restricted reversible t-NUCAs*). We find that some of them are *restricted surjective* but not *restricted injective*. Whenever a t -NUCA shows *restricted surjectivity* then there exist no *non-reachable* configuration. If many-to-one map may exist in the t -NUCA, the t -NUCA does not show *restricted bijectivity*. Although all configurations are reachable, there exist information-loss during evolution. Hence, the t -NUCAs can not be reversed with respect to time. If we consider the lattice is finite, then the configurations of such t -NUCAs form cycles (since, no non-reachable configuration exists). For classical CAs under finite lattice, if all configurations are reachable, then the CA is reversible, and the configurations form cycles. From that resemblance with the reversibility behavior of finite CA, let us call such t -NUCAs as *weakly reversible t-NUCAs*.

Definition 6. *A t-NUCA is called as weakly reversible if the CA is restricted surjective.*

Proposition 1 has proved that there exists a rule sequence in a t -NUCA for which the t -NUCA has no non-reachable configurations if G_f or G_g is bijective. Hence, one can find that there exists at least one rule sequence for which a t -NUCA is weakly reversible if any rule is bijective.

Example 9. *Let us consider a 5-cell t-NUCA consists of ECA rules 229 and 85 with a rule sequence OEIS A001651, i.e., 229, 229, 85, 229, 229, 85, \dots (Figure 11). The CA is restricted surjective, but the t-NUCA has many-to-one map for the configurations 0 and 31, that implies the CA is not restricted injective. Hence the t-NUCA is weakly reversible.*

However, it is not mandatory that one of the rules has to be bijective in a *weakly reversible t-NUCA*. There exist weakly reversible t -NUCA consist of two rules, where G_f and G_g both are not bijective. Example 1 is such an example of a weakly reversible t -NUCA, where G_f and G_g both are not bijective.

There exists no *non-reachable* configuration in a t -NUCA if $X_g \subseteq \mathcal{C}_f$ and $X_f \subseteq \mathcal{C}_g$, where \mathcal{C}_f and \mathcal{C}_g are the sets of reachable configurations by f and g in the t -NUCA respectively. Such a t -NUCA is *restricted surjective*, that is, all the configurations are reached during evolution. Although there exist no non-reachable configuration, the t -NUCA is not *restricted injective* (many-to-one map exists). As a result, the t -NUCAs are able to develop cycles when the lattice is considered as finite.




Figure 11: Transition diagram of a *weakly reversible* 5-cell *t-NUCA* (229, 85)[A001651]. (a) Transition diagram of a 5-cell ECA 229; (b) Transition diagram of a 5-cell ECA 85; (c) Partial transition diagram of a 5-cell *t-NUCA* (229, 85)[A001651], where the configurations, colored by gray (resp. white) is the intermediate configuration (resp. initial configuration).

V. Cyclic behavior

Let us now turn our attention to the finite lattice size only. Under this setting, we explore here cyclic behavior of a *t-NUCA*. To facilitate our study, we introduce following terminologies by taking vocabulary from *Markov Chain* theory.

Definition 7. For an initial configuration $c \in \mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{L}}$, a configuration $x \in \mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{L}}$ is transient if the configuration can not be reachable after leaving it. In contrast, a configuration is recurrent for c if it is not transitory and the configuration can be reachable after leaving it.

In the transition diagram of a *t-NUCA* in Figure 4(c), configuration 5 is transient for the initial configuration 5, whereas configurations 0 and 15 are recurrent for the same initial configuration. If the CA evolves further,

the configurations 0 and 15 are visited again, but the configuration 5 can never be visited. Here, configuration 5 is a non-reachable configuration. Similarly, if the t -NUCA starts journey from 9, configurations 2 and 12 are recurrent. However, if the t -NUCA starts journey from 4, then configuration 2, which was recurrent, becomes transient here. Note that, configuration 2 is a reachable configuration in both the scenarios.

There are three parameters to decide if a configuration of a t -NUCA is recurrent: the rules (f and g), a rule sequence, and a set of initial configurations (\mathcal{C}_{in}). We next explore the recurrent configurations in a t -NUCA.

V.1. The recurrent configurations and cycles

The recurrent configurations are visited many times during evolution of a t -NUCA. Let us call the time required to recur a configuration as *recurrent length*. Then, for a recurrent configuration, we can get a sequence of *recurrent lengths*. We shall denote this sequence by Λ_x^c , where x is the recurrent configuration for the initial configuration c .

Let us consider a 4-cell t -NUCA with ECA rules 7 and 40 where rule 7 is applied in the following sequence: 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, \dots (see Figure 10). Here, 10 is a recurrent configuration for the initial configuration 5. One can check that $\Lambda_{10}^5 = (1, 1, 4, 1, 1, 4, 1, \dots)$.

In some cases, it is observed that a sub-sequence of recurrent lengths repeats in the sequence. In the above example, the lengths (1, 1, 4) repeats in Λ_{10}^5 . Hence, this sequence is periodic. Following is an interesting result.

Proposition 5. *The sequence of recurrent lengths in Λ_x^c of a recurrent configuration c is periodic iff the rule sequence is periodic.*

Proof. Let $\Lambda_x^c = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$. Suppose the recurrent length λ_1 is obtained by applying the rule sequence s_1 , λ_2 by s_2 and so on. So, the rule sequence for this case is $S = (s_1, s_2, \dots)$. Suppose, S is periodic. Then s_1 will periodically be observed. Since x is a recurrent configuration, at same time the CA is to be at configuration x before following the rule sub-sequence s_1 . Then the recurrent length λ_1 is to be observed. Subsequently, the recurrent lengths $\lambda_2, \lambda_3, \dots$ will be observed. This makes Λ_x^c as periodic.

Now consider Λ_x^c as periodic. That is, $\Lambda_x^c = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_l)^+$ for some $l \geq 1$ corresponding rule sequence become $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_l)^+$. This is obviously a periodic rule sequence. Hence the proof. □

We now define cycle and cycle lengths for recurrent configuration.

Definition 8. *A configuration is cyclic if it repeats after a fixed (say, \mathcal{K}) number of time steps. All the configurations, visited in the \mathcal{K} time steps form a cycle, and \mathcal{K} is called the cycle length.*

Hence, according to Proposition 5, recurrent configurations of a t -NUCA with periodic rule sequence can form cycles. Unlike the cycle of classical CAs, a cycle of t -NUCA may contain a configuration multiple times. If $\Lambda_x^c = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_l)^+$, then the corresponding cycle length $\mathcal{K} = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \dots + \lambda_l$. A t -NUCA with aperiodic rule sequence has no such \mathcal{K} . Hence, all the configurations of such t -NUCAs may cyclic in their configuration space, but the exact cycle length can not be found.

Proposition 6. *All configurations of a reversible t -NUCA with finite lattice size and periodic rule sequence are recurrent.*

Proof. Let us consider the rule sequence is periodic and the t -NUCA is reversible. That implies, the rules f and g are bijective. Also assume that the t -NUCA is finite. It is obvious that, if the rule sequence consists of only one rule (say f), then for a finite t -NUCA all configurations are recurrent (since both the rules are bijective).

Let us consider such rule sequences, where both the rules have been utilized. Since the sequence is periodic, f and g are utilized repeatedly after fixed time interval. That implies, a configuration can be reached multiple times (since, the t -NUCA is finite). An initial configuration can also be reached multiple times during evolution since, there exists no non-reachable configuration of f and g , if we consider all configurations as initial configurations, then each configuration is reached multiple times during evolution. Hence the proof. \square

Let us now study the graph theoretic properties of a combined transition diagram to explore more about cycles of a t -NUCA. Each transition diagram consists of several connected components (connected sub-graphs). A connected component of a graph is a sub-graph.

V.2. Cycles of t -NUCA from cycles of f and g

For a lattice size n , we can get transition diagram for CAs f and g . These two diagrams can be combined into a single one, and the cyclic behavior of the t -NUCA can be examined from this combined transition diagram. Let us

assume $G_1 = (V, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (V, E_2)$ be the transition diagrams (labelled graph) of CAs f and g respectively. This combined transition diagram is a *multigraph*, which is constructed by combining G_1 and G_2 , i.e., the combined transition diagram is defined by $G = (V, E)$, where $E = E_1 \cup E_2$. All the edges of E_1 and E_2 are labelled by different indicators in the *multigraph* G . The labelled *multigraph* G contains edges with own identity (in Figure 12(c), the edges are labelled as black or blue for f and g respectively). A pair of nodes may be connected by more than one labelled edge.


Example 10. *Let us consider a finite t -NUCA with ECAs rules 15 and 180. The number of cells (lattice size) is assumed as 5 and the boundary condition is periodic. The transition diagrams of two 5-cell ECAs 15 and 180 are shown in Figure 12(a) and Figure 12(b) respectively. We merge these two diagrams into a single one, keeping all the transitions of the original diagrams. The edges of the new diagram is labelled by the corresponding rule. We call this diagram as combined transition diagram. The combined transition diagram of ECAs 15 and 180 is shown in Figure 12(c), where the transitions by different rules are marked by different colors. Black arrows (resp. blue arrows) indicate the transitions by rule 15 (resp. rule 180).*

A combined transition diagram can be used for a set of t -NUCAs for same f and g . It is mentioned that, a t -NUCA consists of two rules and a rule sequence. Hence, the transition diagram of a t -NUCA can be obtained from the combined transition diagram by traversing the diagram using the rule sequence. Hence, the cycles of the t -NUCA also can be obtained from the combined transition diagram and the rule sequence.

V.3. Hamiltonian cycles in t -NUCA


Recall that, a transition diagram of a classical CA is a disconnected graph, and the diagram has several connected components. Therefore, such a diagram is not Hamiltonian in classical sense. In this section, we investigate whether or not such a connected component is Hamiltonian-connected. Note that, a graph is Hamiltonian-connected if it contains a Hamiltonian cycle and Hamiltonian sub-graph can be Hamiltonian. A transition diagram is referred to as a fully hamiltonian graph if all of its connected components are Hamiltonian-connected.

Definition 9. *A transition diagram is called a fully hamiltonian graph if it contains hamiltonian cycles for each connected sub-graph.*



a. ECA 15

b. ECA 180



c. Combined transition diagram ECAs 15 and 180

Figure 12: Combined transition diagram of ECAs 15 and 180 of lattice size 5; a) Transition diagram of a 5-cell ECA 15; b) Transition diagram of a 5-cell ECA 180; c) Combined transition diagram of ECAs 15 and 180 .

Lemma 2. *The transition diagram of a CA is fully hamiltonian graph if it is bijective.*

Proof. If a CA is bijective, then each of the configurations have unique predecessor. That is, each sub-graph in the transition diagram is hamiltonian. Hence the transition diagram is fully hamiltonian graph. \square

Classically, for a finite CA, if the CA is bijective then each vertex is reached only once in a cycle. Here, we consider the transition diagram of such CA as fully hamiltonian graph.

Lemma 3. *Let $G_1 = (V, E_1)$, $G_2 = (V, E_2)$ and $G = (V, E_1 \cup E_2)$. The graph G , combining of G_1 and G_2 , is fully hamiltonian graph if any of the graph is a fully hamiltonian graph.*

Proof. Since the configurations of individual CAs f and g , and t -NUCA are same, if CA f (or CA g) is fully hamiltonian graph, then by construction of combined transition diagram, it remains fully hamiltonian. □

Proposition 7. *A combined transition diagram is a fully hamiltonian graph if one rule is bijective.*

Proof. Let us first assume two CAs f and g in which f is bijective. The transition diagram of f is fully hamiltonian (by Lemma 2). Now, let us consider a combined transition diagram is constructed based on the transition diagrams of two CAs f and g , where one graph (transition diagram of f) is fully hamiltonian graph. Hence, by Lemma 3, we conclude that the combined transition diagram is a fully hamiltonian graph.

Hence the proof. □

For example, Figure 12 shows the combined transition diagram of ECAs 15 and 180 of lattice size 5. Since, both the rules are bijective, the combined transition diagram is a fully hamiltonian graph.

Note that, if the transition diagram of a t -NUCA is fully hamiltonian graph then the t -NUCA can be considered as reversible or restricted reversible t -NUCA. However, weakly reversibility of a t -NUCA does not implies that the transition diagram of the t -NUCA is fully hamiltonian graph.

V.4. Eulerian cycles in t -NUCA

This section considers the t -NUCAs with a rule sequence $(10)^+$ or $(01)^+$. Now, we explore whether a connected sub-graph is Eulerian or not. A graph is Eulerian if there exists a Eulerian cycle. It is already mentioned that, a transition diagram of a classical CA is a disconnected graph, and the diagram has several connected components. Hence, such a diagram is not Eulerian in classical sense. However, the sub-graphs can be Eulerian. A transition diagram is referred to as a fully Eulerian if all of its connected components are Eulerian.

Definition 10. *A graph is fully Eulerian if contains a Eulerian cycle for each connected sub-graph.*

A t -NUCA employs two rules f and g . Since, for a bijective CA all the configurations are reachable. If both the rules in a t -NUCA are bijective then all the configurations can be reached twice, that is, every configuration has in-degree of 2. Similarly, every configuration has out-degree of 2 (since we use two rules). Euler demonstrated that the even degree of all the graph's vertices is a crucial need for the existence of Eulerian circuits [24]. In these scenarios, an Eulerian cycle is contained in each connected sub-graph of the diagram. As a result, this sort of diagram is known as fully Eulerian.

Proposition 8. *A t -NUCA with a periodic rule sequence $(10)^+$ or $(01)^+$ construct Euler cycles if both the rules are bijective.*

Proof. Since, both the CAs are bijective, each vertex of the combined transition diagram has two in-degree and two out-degree. Hence, every vertex can be reached at most twice during traversal if we are not allowed to repeat the edges. For the best case, we can construct an Euler trails for each connected component which covers all the edges (here, two types of edges). Hence, the combined transition diagram is fully Eulerian.

Let us assume a traversal sequence, $(10)^+$ (or $(01)^+$). That is, the traversal of two different edges are considered alternatively. Since, the graph contains only two types of edges, an Euler trails can be achieved for each connected component.

Hence the proof. □

Figure 13 shows Euler trials of a combined diagram of ECAs 210 and 51 of lattice size 5. Since both the ECAs are bijective, Each vertex of a connected component is achieved twice and the graph is fully Eulerian.

Note that, we may identify a rule sequence for which the Eulerian cycle is developed for each sub-graph in a fully Eulerian graph. The rule sequence can be regarded as periodic if it has a sub-sequence of rules that repeats. In this instance, the Euler walk on combined transition diagram might be thought of as a tool to identify the presence of periodic rule sequences for which t -NUCA forms cycles.




Figure 13: T-NUCA cycles of a 5-cell t-NUCA $(210, 51)[(10)^+]$. The rule sequence is: $10101010\dots$, where 1 (resp 0) indicates the application of rule 210 (resp. rule 51). Here, the large cycle length is 60 (Eulerian cycle).

VI. Conclusion

In this work, we have introduced a variant of Cellular Automata, named as *Temporally Non-Uniform Cellular Automata (t-NUCA)*. The proposed *t-NUCA* uses two rules, f and g , and a rule sequence \mathcal{R} . \mathcal{R} has been constructed using a function $\Theta(t)$, where rule f was used at time t in \mathcal{R} when $\Theta(t)$ holds, rule g was used otherwise. The sequence has been represented by the series of t when $\Theta(t)$ holds. As per OEIS, the sequence has been denoted as a sequence number [23]. For a sequence number (say χ), and the rules f and g , one can find the notation of *t-NUCA* is $(f, g)[\chi]$. We have observed that the behavior of *t-NUCA*s are varied based on the rule sequence. Here, two possible rule sequences have been studied, *periodic* and *aperiodic*.

Another important issue we have discussed was the *set theoretic properties* of the proposed *t-NUCA*. To study the *reversibility* of *t-NUCA*, we have observed *injectivity*, *surjectivity* and *bijectivity* of *t-NUCA*. We first divided the *t-NUCA*s into two categories, *reversible t-NUCA* and *irreversible*

t-NUCA. We have observed that some of the irreversible *t-NUCA*s, however have shown some interesting behavior. We have imposed restriction on the domain, that is, for a given set of initial configuration (\mathcal{C}_{in}) the CA has shown injectivity and all possible configurations was reached. In this direction, we have introduced *restricted surjective* and *restricted injective* property of *t-NUCA*. We have shown that a *t-NUCA* is *restricted reversible* if the *t-NUCA* is *restricted injective* and *restricted surjective*.

We have also defined *weak reversibility* of *t-NUCA*s based on the *restricted surjectivity* of *t-NUCA*. In addition to that, we have explored the *cyclic behavior* of the proposed CA, and found the possible recurrent lengths of *t-NUCA* configurations. We have explored *t-NUCA* cycles for given rules and periodic rule sequences when the lattice is considered as finite. We have explored two case studies – explored the existence of Hamiltonian cycle in a combined transition diagram of f and g , and explored the large cycle length with the help of Eulerian cycle as case studies. Our upcoming research will focus on the theory of obtaining the cycle structure of a *t-NUCA*, where the cycle length of the *t-NUCA* can be estimated.

In addition to this, the following are the necessary future directions needed to be established after this theoretical analysis of *t-NUCA*:

- Let us assume \mathcal{C}_{in} be the set of initial configurations for which a *t-NUCA* is restricted reversible, then we need to develop an algorithm to find \mathcal{C}_{in} .
- To develop an algorithmic approach to study the *reversibility*, *restricted reversibility*, *weak reversibility* and *irreversibility* of *t-NUCA*.
- Our model may be useful for several areas of applications, i.e., pseudo random number generator, pattern classification, pattern recognition, clustering etc.

In addition to this, it is remain to explore the nature of *t-NUCA* when more than two rules are used in a rule sequence. In literature, we have already studied, the local rule can be varied temporarily as well as spatially during evolution. The nature of stochastic cellular automata, where rules are varied spatially, have explored in literature. However, till now we have not compare the dynamical properties of these classes of non-uniform CAs. Hence, this could be an interesting research direction to investigate the relationship between spatial and temporal non-uniformity.

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to Dr. Kamalika Bhattacharjee for her insightful comments and discussions which have been useful for this work.

References

- [1] K. Bhattacharjee, N. Naskar, S. Roy, S. Das, A survey of cellular automata: types, dynamics, non-uniformity and applications, *Natural Computing* 19 (2020) 433–461.
- [2] W. Pries, A. Thanailakis, H. C. Card, Group properties of cellular automata and VLSI applications, *IEEE Transactions on Computers* C-35 (1986) 1013–1024.
- [3] P. D. Hortensius, R. D. McLeod, H. C. Card, Parallel random number generation for VLSI systems using cellular automata, *IEEE Transactions on Computers* 38 (1989) 1466–1473.
- [4] A. K. Das, A. Sanyal, P. Pal Chaudhuri, On characterization of cellular automata with matrix algebra, *Information Sciences* 61 (1992) 251–277.
- [5] D. R. Chowdhury, I. Sengupta, P. P. Chaudhuri, Ca-based byte error-correcting code, *IEEE Trans. Computers* 44 (1995) 371–382.
- [6] K. Cattell, J. C. Muzio, Synthesis of one-dimensional linear hybrid cellular automata, *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems* 15 (1996) 325–335.
- [7] P. Pal Chaudhuri, D. Roy Chowdhury, S. Nandi, S. Chattopadhyay, *Additive Cellular Automata – Theory and Applications*, volume 1, IEEE Computer Society Press, USA, ISBN 0-8186-7717-1, 1997.
- [8] S. Das, B. K. Sikdar, A scalable test structure for multicore chip, *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems* 29 (2010) 127–137.
- [9] G. Cattaneo, A. Dennunzio, E. Formenti, J. Provillard, Non-uniform cellular automata, in: *Proceedings of 3rd International Conference Language and Automata Theory and Applications*, LATA, 2009, pp. 302–313.

- [10] A. Dennunzio, E. Formenti, J. Provillard, Non-uniform cellular automata: Classes, dynamics, and decidability, *Information and Computation* 215 (2012) 32–46.
- [11] A. Dennunzio, E. Formenti, J. Provillard, Three research directions in non-uniform cellular automata, *Theoretical Computer Science* 559 (2014) 73–90.
- [12] K. Nakamura, Asynchronous cellular automata and their computational ability, *Systems, Computers, Controls* 5 (1974) 58–66.
- [13] N. Fatès, E. Thierry, M. Morvan, N. Schabanel, Fully asynchronous behavior of double-quiescent elementary cellular automata, *Theoretical Computer Science* 362 (2006) 1–16.
- [14] A. Dennunzio, E. Formenti, L. Manzoni, G. Mauri, M-asynchronous cellular automata: From fairness to quasi-fairness, *Natural Computing: An International Journal* 12 (2013) 561–572.
- [15] E. Formenti, A survey on m-asynchronous cellular automata, in: J. Kari, M. Kutrib, A. Malcher (Eds.), *Cellular Automata and Discrete Complex Systems*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013, pp. 46–66.
- [16] N. Fatès, A guided tour of asynchronous cellular automata, *Journal of Cellular Automata* 9 (2014) 387–416.
- [17] L. Manzoni, Asynchronous cellular automata and dynamical properties, *Natural Computing* 11 (2012) 269–276.
- [18] A. Sarkar, A. Mukherjee, S. Das, Reversibility in asynchronous cellular automata., *Complex Systems* 21 (2012) 72 – 84.
- [19] N. Fatès, B. Sethi, S. Das, On the reversibility of ecas with fully asynchronous updating: The recurrence point of view, in: A. Adamatzky (Ed.), *Reversibility and Universality, Essays Presented to Kenichi Morita on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, volume 30 of *Emergence, Complexity and Computation*, Springer, 2018, pp. 313–332.
- [20] H. Fukś, Solution of the density classification problem with two cellular automata rules, *Physics Review E* 55 (1997) R2081–R2084.

- [21] S. GHOSH, S. BASU, Study of evolution patterns of some one-dimensional spatial and temporal non-uniform cellular automata., Journal of Cellular Automata 17 (2023).
- [22] S. Roy, S. Paul, S. Das, Temporally stochastic cellular automata: Classes and dynamics, International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos 32 (2022) 2230029.
- [23] N. J. A. Sloane, The on-line encyclopedia of integer sequences® (oeis®), <https://oeis.org/>, 1964.
- [24] N. Biggs, Lloyd, R. J. Wilson, Graph theory, 1736-1936, Clarendon Press, 1986.