

Cellular automata can really solve the parity problem

Barbara Wolnik^{1,4}, Anna Nenca^{*2}, Pedro Paulo Balbi³, and Bernard De Baets⁴

¹Institute of Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, University of Gdańsk,
80-308 Gdańsk, Poland

²Institute of Informatics, Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, University of Gdańsk,
80-308 Gdańsk, Poland

³Faculdade de Computação e Informática, Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie, Rua da
Consolação 896, Consolação; 01302-907 São Paulo, SP, Brazil

⁴KERMIT, Department of Data Analysis and Mathematical Modelling, Faculty of Bioscience
Engineering, Ghent University, Coupure links 653, B-9000 Gent, Belgium

January 16, 2025

Abstract

Determining properties of an arbitrary binary sequence is a challenging task if only local processing is allowed. Among these properties, the determination of the parity of 1s by distributed consensus has been a recurring endeavour in the context of automata networks. In its most standard formulation, a one-dimensional cellular automaton rule should process any odd-sized cyclic configuration and lead the lattice to converge to the homogeneous fixed point of 0s if the parity of 1s is even and to the homogeneous fixed point of 1s, otherwise. The only known solution to this problem with a single rule was given by Betel, de Oliveira and Flocchini (coined BFO rule after the authors' initials). However, three years later the authors of the BFO rule realised that the rule would fail for some specific configuration and proposed a computationally sound fix, but a proof could not be worked out. Here we provide another fix to the BFO rule along with a full proof, therefore reassuring that a single-rule solution to the problem really does exist.

Keywords: *Parity problem, cellular automata, automata networks, distributed consensus, classification problem.*
MSC numbers :37B15 and 68Q80

1 Introduction

Determining properties of an arbitrary binary sequence is a challenging task if only local processing is allowed. Among these properties, the determination of the parity of 1s has been a recurring endeavour in the context of automata networks. In its most standard formulation, a one-dimensional cellular automaton rule should process any odd-sized cyclic configuration and lead the lattice to converge to the homogeneous fixed point of 0s if the parity of 1s is even and to the homogeneous fixed point of 1s, otherwise. As such, the solution is achieved by a process of distributed consensus that is reached by all cells in the lattice. Many attempts to find a single rule that would solve this so-called *parity problem* have been reported, the most successful one being [12], where an evolutionary search process allowed to find various extremely good, though not perfect rules. The only known solution to the problem with a single rule was given in [2], coined BFO rule after the authors' alphabetically ordered initials. The BFO rule is a radius-4 one-dimensional cellular automaton, *i.e.*, with its state transitions acting on nine neighbouring cells. It has also been shown that any solution to the classical parity problem cannot be too simple, as it requires a neighbourhood containing at least 7 cells [9].

Alternative formulations to tackle the problem, quite often and surprisingly with the much simpler rules of the elementary space – where neighbourhoods of only 3 cells are considered – have appeared in the literature. Among them, it is worth mentioning the use of a non-uniform cellular automaton [11]; the employment of distinct rules at different moments along the time evolution [7, 8]; a rule (the local parity of the elementary space) updating the lattice in a deterministic asynchronous fashion [10]; automata networks operating not on the regular connection pattern of the cells that characterise cellular automata but on a family of connection graphs [1, 4]; and the use of stochastic

*Corresponding author anna.nenca@ug.edu.pl

asynchronous updating [5]. These efforts testify that the parity problem remains relevant today and they provide a benchmark view on the possibilities and limitations of computing in a totally local distributed fashion.

Back to the aforementioned BFO solution, three years after its proposal, the authors of [2] realised that the rule would not work for the specific initial configuration 0001110101001 of size 13. The same counterexample was independently discovered and presented in [6]. The problem occurs because three tasks simultaneously perform joint transformations in the configuration that end up leading the configuration back to itself, with a spatial displacement, in a periodic regime. As soon as the authors realised the issue they proposed a fix that led to a new rule they named BFOm rule. This rule was then computationally probed for all configurations up to size 35 and all the details of the fix were explained in detail in [3], which was kept unpublished because a proof could not be worked out. Here we provide another fix to the BFO rule along with a full proof, therefore reassuring that (at least) one single-rule solution to the problem really does exist, contrarily to a recent conjecture about this possibility [6].

In the next section, we provide the necessary background for this paper (definitions and notations), together with results on the original BFO rule that remain valid. In Section 3 we consider the mechanisms underlying the temporal evolution associated with the alleged solution and amend the one that was failing in the original BFO rule. Section 4 contains the proof that the new rule indeed solves the parity problem for any arbitrary initial configuration. In the last section we finish with some concluding remarks.

2 Notation and main definitions

We consider one-dimensional binary cellular automata on finite grids with periodic boundary conditions. For a positive integer n , the n -cell grid (or lattice) \mathcal{G}_n refers to the grid of cells numbered by $0, 1, \dots, n-1$, from left to right, *i.e.*,

$$\mathcal{G}_n = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\},$$

and we assume that the last (rightmost) cell $n-1$ is adjacent to the first cell 0 (the cells are arranged along a circle). Any n -tuple $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in X_n = \{0, 1\}^n$ is called a *configuration* (of length n) and represents the states of the cells in \mathcal{G}_n : the state of cell $i \in \mathcal{G}_n$ in a configuration \mathbf{x} is denoted by x_i . For the sake of brevity, we will often express configurations in a more compact form and write them without commas. We will also drop the index n and write \mathcal{G} instead of \mathcal{G}_n , whenever the context is clear.

To consider the parity problem, we will not limit ourselves to a single grid, but we will consider an entire family of grids at the same time. For this purpose, we consider the following set of configurations:

$$X_{\text{odd}} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} X_{2n-1} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{0, 1\}^{2n-1},$$

i.e., the set of all configurations of all possible odd lengths. The *parity* of a configuration $\mathbf{x} \in X_n$ is denoted by $\text{Par}(\mathbf{x})$, *i.e.*,

$$\text{Par}(\mathbf{x}) = x_0 \oplus x_1 \oplus x_2 \oplus \dots \oplus x_{n-1}.$$

In other words, $\text{Par}(\mathbf{x})$ equals 0 or 1, depending on whether there is an even or an odd number of 1s in the configuration \mathbf{x} .

In each subsequent time step, each cell $i \in \mathcal{G}$ updates its state based on its current state and the states of its r left and r right neighbours, where $r \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Formally speaking, there is a local rule $f : \{0, 1\}^{2r+1} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, which generates the global rule $F : X_{\text{odd}} \rightarrow X_{\text{odd}}$ in the following way:

$$F(\mathbf{x})_i = f(x_{i-r}, x_{i-r+1}, \dots, x_{i+r-1}, x_{i+r}),$$

for any $\mathbf{x} \in X_{\text{odd}}$. Further, $F^t(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the result of the t -th application of F to the configuration \mathbf{x} , corresponding to the t -th time step.

Definition 1. A local rule f is said to solve the parity problem if for each $\mathbf{x} \in X_{\text{odd}}$ there exists a time step $t_0 \geq 0$ such that for all $t \geq t_0$ the configuration $F^t(\mathbf{x})$ is homogeneous and consists either of 1s if $\text{Par}(\mathbf{x}) = 1$, or consists of 0s if $\text{Par}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$.

This paper focuses on the proof that there exists such a local rule that can solve the parity problem. In fact, such a rule has been described in [2] and is referred to as the BFO rule. This local rule has radius 4 (*i.e.*, its neighbourhood consists of nine cells) and, in general, the idea underlying the BFO rule design is to reduce the number of blocks of 0s and 1s present in the initial configuration. This is accomplished by propagating blocks of 1s to the right side, two cells per iteration, combined with the simultaneous propagation of 0s to the left. Actually, the BFO rule is much more complicated, as it must include appropriate stopping conditions for these two major trends to coexist.

However, in its original formulation in [2] a slight inaccuracy was present that can easily be corrected; namely, the sentence “*Local shift*: a (101) block is transformed into (110) if there are a 0 on its left and at least two 0s on its right (combination of transitions T_7 and T_8)” should be in fact “*Local shift*: a (101) block is transformed into (011) if there are at least two 0s on its left and a 0 on its right (combination of transitions T_7 and T_8)”. As will become clear below, T_7 and T_8 refer to condensed representations of a subset of the *active state transitions* (ATs) of the rule, which are those associated with a state change in the central cell of the neighbourhood.

Consequently, T_7 and T_8 had to be properly redefined, which is achieved by simply mirror-reflecting them. Such a corrected version of the BFO rule is the subject of this paper; and although the correction is quite simple, the proof of its correctness ended up leading to a completely new proof technique. Since the state transition table of the BFO rule contains 512 values, it is not necessary to specify it in full, but only the active state transitions, as indicated in Table 1, already with the corrected versions of T_7 and T_8 . In terms of its representation in the space of binary cellular automata with radius 4 (neighbourhoods with 9 cells), its rule number is: 1276601957992788774882830865366310927730160391522096793337785052737964273352395268521715449368631189141265922117328783160550362758681395203209811341541376 (following Wolfram’s lexicographic ordering of the neighbourhoods).

$T_1 : [\bullet 11100 \bullet \bullet \bullet]$	$T_5 : [\bullet \bullet \bullet 0110 \bullet \bullet]$
$T_2 : [11100 \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet]$	$T_6 : [\bullet \bullet 0110 \bullet \bullet \bullet]$
$T_3 : [\bullet 00100 \bullet \bullet \bullet]$	$T_8 : [\bullet \bullet 001010 \bullet]$
$T_4 : [00100 \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet]$	$T_9 : [\bullet \bullet \bullet 11101 \bullet]$
$T_7 : [\bullet 001010 \bullet \bullet]$	$T_{10} : [111010 \bullet \bullet \bullet]$
	$T_{11} : [1110111 \bullet \bullet]$
	$T_{12} : [\bullet \bullet 1110110]$

Table 1: The state transition table of the BFO rule, from the viewpoint of its active transitions; the central position in the neighbourhood is indicated in boldface and the symbol \bullet refers to *don’t care* positions.

The explicit blocks in the ATs allow to define seven pairs of ATs, each one acting on a block that leads to a corresponding image, as shown in Table 2 (with both kinds of blocks represented between vertical dashes).

$T_{1,2}$	$T_{3,4}$	$T_{5,6}$	$T_{7,8}$	$T_{9,10}$	$T_{9,11}$	$T_{9,12}$
111 00	001 00	0 11 0	00 10 10	11 10 10	1110 11 1	11101 10
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
??? 11	??? 11	? 00 ?	?? 01 ??	? 0 ?? 0 ?	? 0 ?? 0 ??	? 00 ????

Table 2: The seven AT pairs.

We refer to each of the blocks at the top as the domain D of the corresponding AT pair, and denote them by $D_{1,2}$, $D_{3,4}$ and so on; analogously, we refer to each of the blocks at the bottom as the image V of the corresponding AT pair, and denote them by $V_{1,2}$, $V_{3,4}$ and so on. With the use of Table 1, we can partially complete the image blocks as shown in Table 3.

Generally, in place of every question mark in V the same value as above should appear, unless some domains overlap. Since by convention we view each configuration from left to right, then we say that, for example, in the configuration $\mathbf{x} = 111001010$ the domain $D_{1,2}$ is overlapped by the domain $D_{7,8}$ (or that $D_{7,8}$ overlaps $D_{1,2}$).

In [2] it has been shown that the following theorems hold (the correction of the BFO has no influence on these results).

Theorem 1. *The BFO rule preserves the parity of the configuration.*

Theorem 2. *The only fixed points of the BFO rule are the homogeneous configurations.*

$D_{1,2}$	$D_{3,4}$	$D_{5,6}$	$D_{7,8}$	$D_{9,10}$	$D_{9,11}$	$D_{9,12}$
11100	00100	0110	001010	111010	1110111	1110110
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
?1111	??111	?000	??0110	?01000	?0100??	?000000
$V_{1,2}$	$V_{3,4}$	$V_{5,6}$	$V_{7,8}$	$V_{9,10}$	$V_{9,11}$	$V_{9,12}$

Table 3: The domains and partially completed images of all seven AT pairs.

The latter theorem means that if $\mathbf{x} \in X_{odd}$ is not homogeneous, then at least one AT pair will act during the next update of \mathbf{x} .

To express how different a given configuration is from a homogeneous one, we will use a slightly modified measure of the one introduced in [2]. More explicitly, instead of counting all places where 0 changes to 1 or vice versa in the entire configuration, we propose to first extract some parts of the configuration and only then count such changes in the retained part.

Definition 2. Let $\mathbf{x} \in X_{odd}$. We say that $x_i x_{i+1}$ is a box if $x_i x_{i+1} = 01$, $x_{i-1} = 1$ and $x_{i+2} x_{i+3} = 00$.

In other words, a box is the pattern ‘01’ preceded by 1 and followed by 00.

In a given configuration there might be one or more boxes, but there might also be no box at all. Below we give some sample configurations with all boxes (if they appear) marked with gray rectangles:

$$1110101\boxed{01}000111, \quad 111\boxed{01}001\boxed{01}00111, \quad 111011100001111.$$

Definition 3. Let $\mathbf{x} \in X_{odd}$. We say that \mathbf{x} has a *b-switch* (block switch) at position i if $x_{i+1} x_{i+2}$ is a box. We say that \mathbf{x} has an *r-switch* (regular switch) at position i if $x_i \neq x_{i+1}$ and both x_i and x_{i+1} do not belong to any box. By $s(\mathbf{x})$ we denote the number of all switches in \mathbf{x} .

The following are sample configurations with all switches numbered, and the boxes identified by gray rectangles. Note that if a given switch is at position i , its identifying number is placed in between the cells i and $i + 1$, at the top:

$$1110101\boxed{01}000111, \quad 111\boxed{01}001\boxed{01}00111, \quad 1110111\boxed{0000}1111.$$

Note that \mathbf{x} is a homogeneous configuration if and only if $s(\mathbf{x}) = 0$.

Figure 1 presents a sample configuration \mathbf{x} in which all switches have been numbered. This allows us to track how they are affected by the action of the BFO rule. One should note that, as time evolves, the switches from the initial configuration subsequently move to the right or to the left, or simply disappear; but no new ones appear. As a result, after 27 updates, all switches disappear and $F^{27}(\mathbf{x})$ is a homogeneous configuration. This is reflected in the sequence $(s(F^t(\mathbf{x})))_{t=0}^{\infty}$, which is monotonically decreasing, reaching zero for $t \geq 27$. As will become apparent later in the paper, the same scenario unfolds for any configuration $\mathbf{x} \in X_{odd}$.

3 The dynamics of switches

In this section we study how every particular AT pair affects the total number of switches. Our goal is to show that the number of switches is non-increasing, *i.e.*, that for any configuration $\mathbf{x} \in X_{odd}$ the sequence $(s(F^t(\mathbf{x})))_{t=0}^{\infty}$ monotonically decreases.

In the following subsections, we compare the switches in every domain D and corresponding image V in detail to justify that every switch present in V is actually a switch from D , which may have moved to the left or to the right (in order to make it easier to track the movement of the switches, they are identified with markers from the set of symbols $\{*, \circ, \iota, \diamond, b\}$, also placed in between the corresponding cells, at the top). This task is complicated by the fact that sometimes we cannot resolve what type of switch is in D , or some domains may overlap, all of which require consideration of cases.

In what follows, we assume that $\mathbf{x} \in X_{odd}$ and $\mathbf{y} = F(\mathbf{x})$, and that all values given in V are calculated based on Table 1.

$t = 0$	00000 ¹²³ 10111001011111 ⁸	$s(\mathbf{x}) = 8$
$t = 1$	11000 ¹²³ 1111110111111 ⁸⁷	$s(F(\mathbf{x})) = 6$
$t = 2$	11110 ¹²³ 11111 ⁶ 0100 ⁷ 1111	$s(F^2(\mathbf{x})) = 6$
$t = 3$	11 ⁸ 01000 ³ 1 ⁶ 010000 ⁷ 1111	$s(F^3(\mathbf{x})) = 4$
$t = 4$	⁸ 0100000000 ³ 10000 ⁷ 1111	$s(F^4(\mathbf{x})) = 4$
$t = 5$	0000000000 ³ 1100 ⁷ 1 ⁸ 01	$s(F^5(\mathbf{x})) = 4$
$t = 6$	0000000000 ³ 11111000 ⁷⁸ 1	$s(F^6(\mathbf{x})) = 4$
$t = 7$	1100000000 ³ 1111110 ⁷ 1	$s(F^7(\mathbf{x})) = 4$
$t = 8$	1111000000 ³ 11111 ⁶ 0100 ⁷	$s(F^8(\mathbf{x})) = 4$
$t = 9$	1111110000 ³ 111 ⁶ 010000 ⁷	$s(F^9(\mathbf{x})) = 4$
$t = 10$	1111111100 ³⁶ 101000000 ⁷	$s(F^{10}(\mathbf{x})) = 4$
$t = 11$	11111111110 ³ 11000000 ⁷	$s(F^{11}(\mathbf{x})) = 4$
$t = 12$	1111111110000000000 ⁷	$s(F^{12}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 13$	1111111111000000000 ⁷	$s(F^{13}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 14$	1111111111110000000 ⁷	$s(F^{14}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 15$	1111111111111100000 ⁷	$s(F^{15}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 16$	1111111111111111000 ⁷	$s(F^{16}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 17$	1111111111111111110 ⁸⁷	$s(F^{17}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 18$	0 ⁷ 1111111111111111 ⁸ 010	$s(F^{18}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 19$	0 ⁷ 11111111111111 ⁸ 01000	$s(F^{19}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 20$	0 ⁷ 111111111111 ⁸ 0100000	$s(F^{20}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 21$	0 ⁷ 1111111111 ⁸ 010000000	$s(F^{21}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 22$	0 ⁷ 1111111 ⁸ 01000000000	$s(F^{22}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 23$	0 ⁷ 11111 ⁸ 0100000000000	$s(F^{23}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 24$	0 ⁷ 1111 ⁸ 01000000000000	$s(F^{24}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 25$	0 ⁷ 1 ⁸ 0100000000000000	$s(F^{25}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 26$	00 ⁷ 1100000000000000	$s(F^{26}(\mathbf{x})) = 2$
$t = 27$	000000000000000000	$s(F^{27}(\mathbf{x})) = 0$

Figure 1: The space-time diagram for the sample configuration $\mathbf{x} = 0000010111001011111$ with all switches numbered.

3.1 The pairs $T_{1,2}$ and $T_{3,4}$

The pair $T_{1,2}$ acts always when the configuration \mathbf{x} contains $D_{1,2} = |11100|$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $|x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5| = |11100|$. Note that the pair $T_{1,2}$ changes $x_4x_5 = 00$ to $y_4y_5 = 11$, thus it can only affect switches at positions 3 and 5; therefore, we do not need to care about the question mark at position y_1 . If $y_6 = 0$, then $V_{1,2}$ has a switch at position 5, but it is the switch from position 3 in $D_{1,2}$ that has moved two cells to the right (Figure 2a). If $y_6 = 1$, then $V_{1,2}$ neither has a switch at position 3 nor at position 5, which means that both switches from $D_{1,2}$ disappear, since two blocks of 1s merge (Figures 2b).




Figure 2: The effect of $T_{1,2}$ on switches in $D_{1,2}$ in the case (a) $y_6 = 0$, (b) $y_6 = 1$.

We can recognize both situations in Figure 1 when going from $t = 0$ to $t = 1$: switch 4 disappears, while switch 8 moves two cells to the right. We summarize our analysis below.

Lemma 1. *The action of the pair $T_{1,2}$ does not produce new switches. Moreover, if as a result of its action two blocks of 1s merge, then this leads to a reduction in the number of switches.*

Analogous considerations for the pair $T_{3,4}$ are presented in Figure 3.



Figure 3: The effect of $T_{3,4}$ on switches in $D_{3,4}$ in the case (a) $y_6 = 0$, (c) $y_6 = 1$.

As a result we get the following conclusion.

Lemma 2. *The action of the pair $T_{3,4}$ does not produce new switches. Moreover, if as a result of its action two blocks of 1s merge, then this leads to a reduction in the number of switches.*

3.2 The pair $T_{5,6}$

Assume that $|x_1x_2x_3x_4| = |0110| = D_{5,6}$. Since the pair $T_{5,6}$ only changes $x_2x_3 = 11$ to $y_2y_3 = 00$, it can only effect switches at positions 1 and 3. However, we should be careful, because the switch at position 3 can be a b-switch, in which case its coverage is wider. For this reason, it is convenient to consider two variants of the domain $D_{5,6}$: $D_{5,6}^r = |0110|$ with $x_5x_6x_7 \neq 100$, and $D_{5,6}^b = |0110100|$. In $D_{5,6}^r$ there are two r-switches, while $D_{5,6}^b$ contains one r-switch and one b-switch.

Figure 4 shows the effect of the pair $T_{5,6}$ on the switches when assuming that $y_1 = 0$. In the case of $D_{5,6}^r$, both r-switches at positions 1 and 3 disappear (Figure 4a). In the case of $D_{5,6}^b$, both the r-switch at position 1 and the b-switch at position 4 move to the right; moreover, the b-switch turns into an r-switch (Figure 4b).



Figure 4: The effect of $T_{5,6}$ on the switches in the case $y_1 = 0$ and (a) $D_{5,6}^r$, (b) $D_{5,6}^b$.

We can also recognize both situations in Figure 1: switches 3 and 6 move to the right at time step 4, and disappear at time step 12.

Next, assume that $y_1 = 1$, which must have resulted from T_2 or T_4 (Table 1); so, as described in the previous subsection, the switch at position 1 in $V_{5,6}$ is in fact the switch from $D_{1,2}$ or $D_{3,4}$, respectively, which has moved two cells to the right. Figure 5 depicts the situation in the case of T_2 .



Figure 5: The effect of $T_{5,6}$ on the switches in the case $y_1 = 1$ and (a) $D_{5,6}^r$, (b) $D_{5,6}^b$.

We summarize our analysis below.

Lemma 3. *The action of the pair $T_{5,6}$ does not produce new switches. Moreover, if $T_{5,6}$ acts on $D_{5,6}^r$, then it leads to a reduction in the number of switches.*

3.3 The pair $T_{7,8}$

Let $|x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6| = |001010| = D_{7,8}$. Since the pair $T_{7,8}$ only changes $x_3x_4 = 10$ to $y_3y_4 = 01$, it can only effect switches at positions 2, 3 and 4. Thus, there is no need to consider the switches at positions 1 and 5. As before, it is convenient to distinguish two variants of the domain $D_{7,8}$: $D_{7,8}^r = |0010101|$ and $D_{7,8}^b = |0010100|$.

Let us first assume that $y_2 = 0$. In the case of $D_{7,8}^r = |0010101|$, all three switches at positions 2, 3, 4 are regular; as shown in Figure 6a, the action of $T_{7,8}$ on $D_{7,8}^r$ reduces the number of these switches. In turn, $D_{7,8}^b = |0010100|$ has an r-switch at position 2 and a b-switch at position 3, which in the next time step both move to the right while the b-switch turns into an r-switch. Moreover, as a result we obtain $D_{5,6}^b$ in \mathbf{y} (Figure 6b).



Figure 6: The effect of $T_{7,8}$ on the switches in the case $y_2 = 0$ and (a) $D_{7,8}^r$, (b) $D_{7,8}^b$.

Next, assume that $y_2 = 1$, then it must be the result of T_2 or T_4 , so, the switch at position 2 in $V_{5,6}$ is in fact the switch from $D_{1,2}$ or $D_{3,4}$ (overlapped by the considered $D_{7,8}$), which moved two cells to the right. We present such a situation in Figure 7 in the case of T_2 .



Figure 7: The effect of $T_{7,8}$ on the switches in the case $y_2 = 1$ and (a) $D_{7,8}^r$, (b) $D_{7,8}^b$.

We summarize our analysis below.

Lemma 4. *The action of the pair $T_{7,8}$ does not produce new switches. Moreover, if $T_{7,8}$ acts on $D_{7,8}^r$, then it leads to a reduction in the number of switches; if it acts on $D_{7,8}^b$, then $D_{5,6}^r$ is created in the next time step.*

Note that, due to Lemma 3, the action of the pair $T_{7,8}$ always leads to a reduction in the number of switches, either immediately or after two time steps.

3.4 The pair $T_{9,10}$

To compare the switches in $D_{9,10} = |x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6| = |111010|$ and $V_{9,10}$, we need to consider three variants of this domain: $D_{9,10}^r = |1110101|$ with $x_8x_9 \neq 00$, $D_{9,10}^b = |1110100|$, and $D_{9,10}^{rb} = |111010100|$.

Let us first assume that $y_1 = 1$. In $D_{9,10}^r$ there are three r-switches at positions 3, 4 and 5. In the next time step, the first one moves two cells to the left and turns into a b-switch, whereas the others disappear (Figure 8a). In $D_{9,10}^b$ there is only one b-switch at position 3, which moves two cells to the left (Figure 8b). In $D_{9,10}^{rb}$ there are two r-switches at positions 3 and 4 and a b-switch at position 5. In \mathbf{y} , the first moves two cells to the left and turns into a b-switch, whereas the other ones move two cells to the right and the b-switch turns into an r-switch (Figure 8c).




Figure 8: The effect of $T_{9,10}$ on the switches in the case $y_1 = 1$ and (a) $D_{9,10}^r$, (b) $D_{9,10}^b$, (c) $D_{9,10}^{rb}$.

Let us next assume that $y_1 = 0$. This must be the result of T_9 , thus the considered domain $D_{9,10}$ overlaps the domain $D_{9,11}$ in such a way that $|x_{-3}x_{-2}x_{-1}x_0x_1x_2x_3| = D_{9,11} = |1110111|$ (Table 1). But then, as shown in Figure 9, the number of switches in $V_{9,10}^r$ decreases, whereas it does not increase in $V_{9,10}^b$ and $V_{9,10}^{rb}$, since the switch at position 2 stems from the domain $D_{9,11}$ being overlapped. (It will be shown in the next subsection that the r-switch \diamond in $D_{9,11} = |1110\overset{\circ}{1}11|$ in such situations always moves two cells to the right.)




Figure 9: The effect of $T_{9,10}$ on the switches in the case $y_1 = 0$ and (a) $D_{9,10}^r$, (b) $D_{9,10}^b$, (c) $D_{9,10}^{rb}$.

Lemma 5. *The action of the pair $T_{9,10}$ does not produce new switches. Moreover, if $T_{9,10}$ acts on $D_{9,10}^r$, then it leads to a reduction in the number of switches.*

3.5 The pair $T_{9,11}$

The consideration of the pair $T_{9,11}$ is a bit more involved, because there are three question marks in $V_{9,11}$. Let $|x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6x_7| = |1110111| = D_{9,11}$. The pair $T_{9,11}$ changes the values $x_2 = x_5 = 1$ to $y_2 = y_5 = 0$.

Let us first assume that $y_1 = 1$, then $y_2y_3 = 01$ is a box, so in $V_{9,11}$ there is a b-switch at position 1, which was previously an r-switch at position 3 in $D_{9,11}$. If $y_6y_7 = 11$, $y_6y_7 = 01$ or $y_6y_7 = 00$, then there may be at most one more switch in $V_{9,11}$, since the switch at position 4 in $D_{9,11}$ has simply moved to the right or disappeared (Figures 10a, 10b, 10c, respectively).




Figure 10: The effect of $T_{9,11}$ on switches in $D_{9,11}$ in the case $y_1 = 1$ and (a) $y_6y_7 = 11$, (b) $y_6y_7 = 01$, (c) $y_6y_7 = 00$.

If $y_6y_7 = 10$, then the change from $x_7 = 1$ to $y_7 = 0$ must be the result of T_9 (Table 1). Therefore, the considered domain is overlapped by one of the domains $D_{9,10}$, $D_{9,11}$ or $D_{9,12}$. In these situations, the switch at position 6 in $V_{9,11}$ stems from position 3 of the domain that overlap the considered domain (Figures 11a, 11b and 11c, respectively).

Next, let us assume that $y_1 = 0$, then the considered domain overlaps another $D_{9,11}$ in such a way that $|x_{-3}x_{-2}x_{-1}x_0x_1x_2x_3| = |1110111|$ (Table 1). Also then the number of switches in the considered $V_{9,11}$ does not increase, since the switch at position 2 stems from the domain being overlapped, as we have shown during the analysis of $D_{9,10}$.

Lemma 6. *The action of the pair $T_{9,11}$ does not produce new switches.*




Figure 11: The effect of $T_{9,11}$ on switches in $D_{9,11}$ in the case $y_1 = 1$ and $y_6y_7 = 10$, being overlapped by (a) $D_{9,10}$, (b) $D_{9,11}$, (c) $D_{9,12}$.

3.6 The pair $T_{9,12}$

To describe the effect of the pair $T_{9,12}$ on the switches in $D_{9,12} = |x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6x_7| = |1110110|$, we need to consider two variants of this domain: $D_{9,12}^r = |1110110|$ with $x_8x_9x_{10} \neq 100$ and $D_{9,12}^b = |1110110100|$.

In $D_{9,12}^r = |1110110|$ there are three r-switches at positions 3, 4 and 6. The latter two disappear and the first one moves to the left: if $y_1 = 1$, then only two cells (Figure 12a), whereas if $y_1 = 0$, then more than two cells, thus landing in front of $V_{9,12}^r$ or disappearing (Figure 12b).



Figure 12: The effect of $T_{9,12}$ on the switches in $D_{9,12}^r$: (a) if $y_1 = 1$, (b) if $y_1 = 0$.

In $D_{9,12}^b = |1110110100|$ there are two r-switches at positions 3 and 4 and one b-switch at position 6. The latter two move to the right and the b-switch turns into an r-switch. As for the first one, it moves to the left: if $y_1 = 1$, then two cells (Figure 13a), while if $y_1 = 0$, then more than two cells, thus landing in front of $V_{9,12}^r$ or disappearing (Figure 13b).



Figure 13: The effect of $T_{9,12}$ on the switches in $D_{9,12}^b$: (a) if $y_1 = 1$, (b) if $y_1 = 0$.

Lemma 7. *The action of the pair $T_{9,12}$ does not produce new switches. Moreover, the action of $T_{9,12}$ on $D_{9,12}^r$ leads to a reduction in the number of switches.*

The results of this section can be summarized as follows.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathbf{x} \in X_{odd}$. Then $s(F(\mathbf{x})) \leq s(\mathbf{x})$, which means that the sequence $(s(\mathbf{x}^t))_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is monotonically decreasing. Moreover, if \mathbf{x} contains $D_{5,6}^r$, $D_{7,8}^r$, $D_{9,10}^r$, $D_{9,12}^r$ or two blocks of 1s merge according to $T_{1,2}$ or $T_{3,4}$, then $s(F(\mathbf{x})) < s(\mathbf{x})$.*

4 The main theorem

In this section we prove that the BFO rule solves the parity problem by showing that it transforms any cyclic configuration of odd length into a homogeneous configuration after finitely many time steps (it suffices to prove this because the BFO rule preserves parity).

We start by proving some facts about configurations for which the number of switches remains constant during the entire evolution of the system. We denote the set of all such configurations by X_s , *i.e.*

$$X_s = \{\mathbf{x} \in X_{odd} \mid \text{the sequence } (s(F^t(\mathbf{x})))_{t=0}^{\infty} \text{ is constant}\}.$$

Therefore, if $\mathbf{x} \in X_s$, then

$$s(\mathbf{x}) = s(F(\mathbf{x})) = s(F^2(\mathbf{x})) = s(F^3(\mathbf{x})) = \dots,$$

thus also $F^t(\mathbf{x}) \in X_s$ for any $t \geq 0$. Of course, all homogeneous configurations from X_{odd} , like 0, 1, 000, 111, 00000, 11111 and so on, belong to X_s . We will show that X_s does not contain any other configurations, and for this purpose we will rely upon the tool below.

Let $\mathbf{x} \in X_{odd}$. The block $x_i x_{i+1} \dots x_{i+2k+1}$ of \mathbf{x} , for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, will be referred to as *an ordered block* if it satisfies the following three conditions:

- (i) All two-symbol blocks $x_i x_{i+1}, x_{i+2} x_{i+3}, \dots, x_{i+2k} x_{i+2k+1}$ belong to $\{00, 01, 11\}$.
- (ii) $x_i x_{i+1} = 01$ and $x_{i+2k} x_{i+2k+1} \neq 01$.
- (iii) If $x_{i+2k} x_{i+2k+1} = 11$, then $x_{i+2k+2} = 0$.

In words, a block $x_i x_{i+1} \dots x_{i+2k+1}$ is ordered if (i) it is formed by a concatenation of only the symbol pairs 00, 01 and 11, (ii) it begins with and does not end with 01, and (iii) if it ends with 11, then it has to be followed by 0. Note that condition (ii) guarantees that $k \geq 1$, which means that an ordered block has a length of at least 4.

Furthermore, we say that an ordered block is *maximal* if it is not a proper sub-block of another ordered block. Figure 14 depicts sample configurations from X_{odd} with some maximal ordered blocks marked in gray.

```

0011111001101000011110111010110
0110000000101101000001010111110
011001100001001010001111110111
1110101010001010010010000110011
1110101010001010010010000110011

```

Figure 14: Sample configurations from X_{31} with selected maximal ordered blocks marked in gray.

Two points are worth noting. First, the choice of maximal ordered blocks is not unique, as the last two configurations in Figure 14 illustrate, since they are actually the same; however, this fact can be ignored as it does not affect our considerations. Second, the intersection of two maximal ordered blocks can be at most one cell (compare, for example, the maximal ordered blocks marked in the fourth and fifth configurations in Figure 14), and thereby an ordered block in $\mathbf{x} \in X_{2n-1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, may have a length of at most $2n$.

Next, all the information about X_s obtained in the previous section is grouped together, with additional explanation of what it implies for ordered blocks.

Theorem 4. *Let $\mathbf{x} \in X_s$. Then \mathbf{x} does not contain $D_{5,6}^r, D_{7,8}^r, D_{9,10}^r$ or $D_{9,12}^r$ and the action of $T_{1,2}$ and $T_{3,4}$ cannot lead to the merging of two blocks of 1s. Moreover, if $b = x_i x_{i+1} \dots x_{i+2k+1}$ is an ordered block in \mathbf{x} and $\mathbf{y} = F(\mathbf{x})$, then there is a maximal ordered block in \mathbf{y} containing $y_i y_{i+1} \dots y_{i+2k+1}$.*

Proof. The fact that \mathbf{x} does not contain $D_{5,6}^r, D_{7,8}^r, D_{9,10}^r$ or $D_{9,12}^r$ and that the action of $T_{1,2}$ and $T_{3,4}$ cannot lead to the merging of two blocks of 1s is obvious from Theorem 3. Moreover, if \mathbf{x} contains $D_{7,8}^b$ then, according to Lemma 4, $F(\mathbf{x})$ contains $D_{5,6}^r$, thus implying that $s(F^2(\mathbf{x})) < s(F(\mathbf{x}))$, which is impossible since $F(\mathbf{x}) \in X_s$.

For proving the second statement, it suffices to look at Table 4, which presents a summary of the above considerations, namely, the only domains that can possibly occur in a configuration belonging to X_s along with their images.

Indeed, let $b = x_i x_{i+1} \dots x_{i+2k+1}$ be an ordered block in $\mathbf{x} \in X_s$ and let $\mathbf{y} = F(\mathbf{x})$. In order to prove that there is a maximal ordered block in \mathbf{y} containing $y_i y_{i+1} \dots y_{i+2k+1}$, let us use Table 4 to demonstrate that:

- (i) Each two-symbol block $y_i y_{i+1}, y_{i+2} y_{i+3}, \dots, y_{i+2k} y_{i+2k+1}$ belongs to $\{00, 01, 11\}$.
- (ii) If the first two-symbol block $y_i y_{i+1}$ is not 01, then it is preceded by 01.
- (iii) If the last two-symbol block $y_{i+2k} y_{i+2k+1}$ is equal to 01, then it is followed by 00, and if it is equal to 11, then it is followed by 0 or 110.

For proving (i), let us choose any two-symbol block $y_{i+2m} y_{i+2m+1}$, $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$, and suppose that $y_{i+2m} y_{i+2m+1} = 10$. Since b is an ordered block, it holds that $x_{i+2m} x_{i+2m+1} \in \{00, 01, 11\}$. We consider each of these cases separately.

- (a) If $x_{i+2m} x_{i+2m+1} = 00$ and $y_{i+2m} y_{i+2m+1} = 10$, then it must be the result of the active transition T_2 or T_4 , but this means that $x_{i+2m} x_{i+2m+1} = 00$ is preceded by 10 (see Table 4). But this is a contradiction, since the two-symbol block 00 is part of an ordered block and therefore it cannot be at the beginning, so it cannot be preceded by 10.

$D_{1,2}$	$D_{3,4}$	$D_{5,6}^b$	$D_{9,10}^b$
$ 111\mathbf{00} $	$ 001\mathbf{00} $	$ 011\mathbf{0}100 $	$ 111\mathbf{0}100 $
\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow
$?11\mathbf{11} 0$	$??1\mathbf{11} 0$	$?00\mathbf{0}100 $	$?01\mathbf{000} $
$D_{9,10}^r$	$D_{9,11}$	$D_{9,12}^b$	
$ 111\mathbf{0}10100 $	$ 111\mathbf{0}111 $	$ 111\mathbf{0}110100 $	
\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow	
$?01\mathbf{00}0100 $	$?01\mathbf{00}?? $	$?000\mathbf{00}0100 $	

Table 4: The only domains that can possibly occur in a configuration belonging to X_s along with their images. The numbers in boldface shown on top of each domain are the AT numbers that act at those locations.

- (b) If $x_{i+2m}x_{i+2m+1} = 11$ and $y_{i+2m}y_{i+2m+1} = 10$, then it must be the result of the active transition T_9 , but this means that $x_{i+2m}x_{i+2m+1} = 11$ is followed by 10 (see Table 4). And this is also a contradiction, since then the two-symbol block 11 would be the end of the ordered block b , and then it cannot be followed by 1.
- (c) If $x_{i+2m}x_{i+2m+1} = 01$ and $y_{i+2m}y_{i+2m+1} = 10$, then two active state transitions are at play, the first one having to be the result of T_2 or T_4 , but this means that $x_{i+2m-1} = 0$. If so, then the second active transition must be T_5 , which requires that $x_{i+2m+2}x_{i+2m+3} = 10$. But this is impossible, since the two-symbol block 01 is part of an ordered block and therefore cannot be at its end, so it cannot be followed by 10.

In conclusion, the three contradictions above prove that for any m , $y_{i+2m}y_{i+2m+1}$ cannot be equal to 10.

Carrying on, in order to prove (ii), let us assume that $y_i y_{i+1} \neq 01$. Note that $y_i y_{i+1}$ cannot be 11, as this would require the action of the pair $T_{1,2}$ or $T_{3,4}$ that would entail the merging of two blocks of ones. Hence, it necessarily holds $y_i y_{i+1} = 00$. However, since we know that $x_{i+2}x_{i+3} \neq 10$, if $x_i x_{i+1} = 01$ and $y_i y_{i+1} = 00$, this must be the result of T_{10} or T_{11} , but in both cases $y_{i-2}y_{i-1}y_i y_{i+1} = 0100$.

Finally, to prove (iii), let us consider the end of the ordered block b . Note that if $x_{i+2k}x_{i+2k+1} = 00$, then $y_{i+2k}y_{i+2k+1}$ cannot be 01 (since there is no active transition realizing this); also, if $y_{i+2k}y_{i+2k+1} = 11$, then $y_{i+2k+2} \neq 1$, because otherwise there would be a merging of two blocks of ones. Now, if $x_{i+2k}x_{i+2k+1} = 11$ (and $x_{i+2k+2} = 0$), then if $y_{i+2k}y_{i+2k+1} = 01$, this must be the result of T_9 , but this implies that $y_{i+2k+2}y_{i+2k+3} = 00$, which means that $y_{i+2k}y_{i+2k+1}y_{i+2k+2}y_{i+2k+3} = 0100$; alternatively, if $y_{i+2k}y_{i+2k+1} = 11$, then $y_{i+2k+2} = 1$ only if it is the result of T_1 or T_3 , but then $y_{i+2k+2}y_{i+2k+3}y_{i+2k+4} = 110$, which means that $y_{i+2k}y_{i+2k+1}y_{i+2k+2}y_{i+2k+3}y_{i+2k+4} = 11110$. □

In order to proceed, we need to establish some facts regarding ordered blocks.

Lemma 8. *If $\mathbf{x} \in X_s$, then \mathbf{x} does not contain 010101.*

Proof. Instead, let us suppose that \mathbf{x} does contain 010101. Since the length of the configuration \mathbf{x} is odd, there exists $i \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $x_i x_{i+1} x_{i+2} x_{i+3} x_{i+4} x_{i+5} = 010101$ and $x_{i-2} x_{i-1} \neq 01$. However, if $x_{i-1} = 0$, then $x_{i-1} x_i x_{i+1} x_{i+2} x_{i+3} x_{i+4} = 001010 = D_{7,8}$, which is impossible according to Theorem 4. On the other hand, if $x_{i-2} x_{i-1} = 11$, then, depending on x_{i-3} , \mathbf{x} contains $D_{5,6}^r$ or $D_{9,10}^r$, which is also impossible. □

Lemma 9. *Let $\mathbf{x} \in X_s$ and let b be an ordered block in \mathbf{x} . Then b does not contain 001100. Also, if b is maximal, then it does not end with 0011.*

Proof. For the first part, it is sufficient to note that if b contains 001100, then \mathbf{x} contains $D_{5,6}^r$. The same applies to the second part. Indeed, if $b = x_i x_{i+1} \dots x_{i+2k+1}$ ends with 0011, then, according to (iii), $x_{i+2k+2} = 0$. Additionally, since b is maximal, it holds that $x_{i+2k+3} = 1$ and $x_{i+2k+4} x_{i+2k+5} \neq 00$, and hence \mathbf{x} contains $D_{5,6}^r$. □

Lemma 10. *Let $\mathbf{x} \in X_s$ and let b be a maximal ordered block in \mathbf{x} . If b ends with 11, then $F(\mathbf{x})$ contains an ordered block longer than b .*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $b = x_0x_1 \dots x_{2k+1}$ be a maximal ordered block in $\mathbf{x} \in X_{\text{odd}}$ and $\mathbf{y} = F(\mathbf{x})$. If $x_{2k}x_{2k+1} = 11$, then, according to Lemma 9, $x_{2k-2}x_{2k-1} \neq 00$, and $x_{2k-1} = 1$. Furthermore, condition (iii) guarantees that $x_{2k+2} = 0$ and, since b is maximal, $x_{2k+3} = 1$. But this entails that $x_{2k-1}x_{2k}x_{2k+1}x_{2k+2}x_{2k+3} = 11101$, which implies that in the next time step the AT pairs $T_{9,10}$, $T_{9,11}$ or $T_{9,12}$ will apply, leading to $y_{2k+2}y_{2k+3} = 00$. Consequently, according to Theorem 4, b (in \mathbf{x}) will evolve into an ordered block b' (in \mathbf{y}) containing at least $y_0y_1 \dots y_{2k+1}y_{2k+2}y_{2k+3}$. \square

The following result is crucial.

Theorem 5. *If $\mathbf{x} \in X_s$, then \mathbf{x} does not contain any ordered block.*

Proof. First of all, let us recall that if $\mathbf{x} \in X_s$, then, according to Theorem 4, the ordered blocks in \mathbf{x} do not get shortened as time evolves.

Let us assume that some configurations from X_s contain an ordered block, from which we choose those that have the shortest length and the longest ordered block at the same time. Let \mathbf{x} be one of them and, without loss of generality, assume that $b = x_0x_1 \dots x_{2k+1}$ is the longest ordered block in \mathbf{x} (so, it is maximal).

First, we show that b cannot end with 11. Indeed, according to Lemma 10, if b ends with 11, there should be a longer ordered block than b in $F(\mathbf{x})$, contradicting our choice of \mathbf{x} and b .

Next, we analyse whether b might end with 00. Thus, suppose that $x_{2k}x_{2k+1} = 00$ and let $x_{2m}x_{2m+1}$ be the last block in b that is not equal to 00. If $x_{2m}x_{2m+1} = 11$, then also $x_{2m-1} = 1$ (according to Lemma 9), which means that the end of b would look as follows:

$$b = ? \dots ? 111 \underbrace{00 \dots 00}_{2(k-m)} ;$$

however, due to $T_{1,2}$, after $k - m$ time steps the ordered block b would evolve into b' in $F^{k-m}(\mathbf{x})$, having at least the same length as b , but ending with a block of 1s, which, as already shown, would be a contradiction. Therefore, b cannot end with 00 either.

We are left to consider the case $x_{2m}x_{2m+1} = 01$, which means that the end of b would look as follows:

$$b = ? \dots ? 01 \underbrace{00 \dots 00}_{2(k-m)} .$$

Note that if $b = x_{2m}x_{2m+1} \dots x_{2k}x_{2k+1} = 0100 \dots 00$ is preceded by 111, then there would be an ordered block b' in $F(\mathbf{x})$, at least as long as b , and ending with the longer block $0100 \dots 00$, *i.e.*:

$$\mathbf{x} = ? \dots ? 11101 \underbrace{00 \dots 00}_{2(k-m)} ? ,$$

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = ? \dots ? 10100 \underbrace{00 \dots 00}_{2(k-m)} ? .$$

With an induction argument, it is straightforward to assume that b is not preceded by 111, and check all other possibilities for the part of \mathbf{x} preceding b , which leads to four possibilities:

Case 1: If $x_{2m-1} = 0$, due to $T_{3,4}$, after $k - m$ time steps the ordered block b would evolve into b' ending with 11, which, as we already know, cannot happen.

Case 2: If $x_{2m-3}x_{2m-2}x_{2m-1} = 001$, then \mathbf{x} contains $D_{7,8}$, which is forbidden according to Theorem 4.

Case 3: If $x_{2m-3}x_{2m-2}x_{2m-1} = 011$, then due to $T_{5,6}$, b would evolve into b' in $F(\mathbf{x})$ with at least the same length as b , but ending with $00b$ and we are in Case 1.

Case 4: If $x_{2m-3}x_{2m-2}x_{2m-1} = 101$, then $x_{2m-4} = 1$ (due to Lemma 8) and $x_{2m-5} = 1$ (otherwise, \mathbf{x} would contain $D_{5,6}^r$). But then $F(\mathbf{x})$ would contain $00b$, which leads again to Case 1. \square

As a direct consequence, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *If $\mathbf{x} \in X_s$, then \mathbf{x} does not contain $D_{5,6}^b$, $D_{9,10}^b$, $D_{9,10}^{rb}$, $D_{9,11}$ or $D_{9,12}^b$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to check that each of the domains $D_{5,6}^b$, $D_{9,10}^b$, $D_{9,10}^{rb}$ and $D_{9,12}^b$ contains an ordered block, and that the presence of $D_{9,11}$ in \mathbf{x} implies an ordered block in $F(\mathbf{x})$ (see Table 4). \square

Using the above results, proving the main theorem is very simple.

Theorem 6. *The BFO rule solves the parity problem.*

Proof. As already mentioned, according to Theorem 1 it is sufficient to show that for each $\mathbf{x} \in X_{\text{odd}}$ there exist $t \geq 0$ such that $F^t(\mathbf{x})$ is a homogeneous configuration. Let us suppose, on the contrary, that there exists a configuration $\mathbf{x} \in X_{\text{odd}}$ such that for each time step $t \geq 0$, the configuration $F^t(\mathbf{x})$ is not homogeneous, which would mean that $s(F^t(\mathbf{x})) \neq 0$. Since $(s(F^t(\mathbf{x})))_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is a monotonically decreasing sequence of natural numbers, there exists a time step t_0 such that

$$s(F^{t_0}(\mathbf{x})) = s(F^{t_0+1}(\mathbf{x})) = s(F^{t_0+2}(\mathbf{x})) = s(F^{t_0+3}(\mathbf{x})) = \dots = s \neq 0.$$

Since no configuration in this sequence is homogeneous, at each time step at least one pair of active transitions has to apply (see Theorem 2). However, according to Theorem 4 and Corollary 1, none of the AT pairs $T_{5,6}$, $T_{7,8}$, $T_{9,10}$, $T_{9,11}$ and $T_{9,12}$ is permitted, so that at each time step it would be either $T_{1,2}$ or $T_{3,4}$ that should apply. However, since both these AT pairs increase the number of 1s in a configuration by two, this leads to a contradiction with the fact that the length of $F^{t_0}(\mathbf{x})$ is finite. \square

5 Concluding remarks

The parity problem is an important benchmark problem in the setting of solving a global problem by means of a consensus that has to be achieved via totally local actions. As such, it has received continued attention in the automata network literature over the years, with various distinct formulations being proposed to solve it. Therefore, it was imperative to correct the original BFO rule, as it was the only proposed solution to the problem (so far) by means of a standard cellular automaton rule.

Although the corrections we had to make to the active state transitions represented by T_7 and T_8 were trivial (since both patterns only had to be individually mirror reflected), this represents the actual change in 24 specific state transitions of the original version.

As for the proof technique we employed, it departs from the original version in [2], where a form of DeBuijn graph was used as the basic construct for the analyses. As explained, we essentially relied on the notion of symbol switches during the time evolution, especially in the context of the block 10100 (referred to herein as the *box*), the reason being that such a block is present (in reverse order) in both T_7 and T_8 . Our approach required a large number of detailed analyses, but allowed us to track all possibilities of block creations and destructions until consensus is achieved.

In addition to the correct proof given, the rule was successfully tested on all odd-sized initial configurations from 3 to 29. Now, with the fix we have provided, the BFO rule remains the only known single rule solution to the parity problem.

Acknowledgements

The work of Anna Nenca and Barbara Wolnik in this project is supported by Grant SONATA-18 of the National Science Centre, Poland, no. 2022/47/D/ST6/00416. P.P.B. thanks Paola Flocchini and Heather Betel for our previous work on BFO; Pacôme Perrotin for computationally testing the updated version of the rule; and the Brazilian agencies CNPq for the research grant PQ 303356/2022-7, and CAPES for the research grants STIC-AmSud no. 88881.694458/2022-01 and Mackenzie-PrInt no. 88887.310281/2018-00.

References

- [1] Pedro Paulo Balbi, Eurico Ruivo, and Fernando Faria. “Synchronous solution of the parity problem on cyclic configurations, with elementary cellular automaton rule 150, over a family of directed, non-circulant, regular graphs”. In: *Information Sciences* 615 (2022), pp. 578–603. ISSN: 0020-0255. DOI: 10.1016/j.ins.2022.10.045.
- [2] Heather Betel, Pedro P. B. de Oliveira, and Paola Flocchini. “Solving the Parity Problem in One-Dimensional Cellular Automata”. In: *Natural Computing* 12.3 (2013), 323–337. ISSN: 1567-7818. DOI: 10.1007/s11047-013-9374-9.
- [3] Heather Betel et al. “Solving the Parity Problem in One-Dimensional Cellular Automata: Proposal of a fix to the BFO rule”. Unpublished manuscript. 2016.
- [4] Fernando Faria, Eurico Ruivo, and Pedro Paulo Balbi. “Generalisation of a synchronous solution of the parity problem on cyclic configurations over a non-circulant graph”. In: *Information Sciences* 666 (2024), p. 120387. ISSN: 0020-0255. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2024.120387>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science>
- [5] Nazim Fatès. “Asynchronous Cellular Systems that Solve the Parity Problem”. In: *Cellular Automata and Discrete Complex Systems*. Ed. by Maximilien Gadouleau and Alonso Castillo-Ramirez. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024, pp. 133–145. ISBN: 978-3-031-65887-7.

- [6] Celestine P. Lawrence. “Realizability of Parity Logic in Finite Cellular Automata”. In: *Complex Systems* 33(1) (2024), pp. 125–132. DOI: 10.25088/ComplexSystems.33.1.125.
- [7] K. M. Lee, Hao Xu, and H. F. Chau. “Parity problem with a cellular automaton solution”. In: *Physical Review E* 64 (2 2001), p. 026702. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.64.026702.
- [8] Claudio L.M. Martins and Pedro P.B. de Oliveira. “Improvement of a result on sequencing elementary cellular automata rules for solving the parity problem”. In: *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 252 (2009), pp. 103–119. ISSN: 1571-0661. DOI: 10.1016/j.entcs.2009.09.017.
- [9] Anna Nenca, Barbara Wolnik, and Bernard De Baets. “No six-cell neighborhood cellular automaton solves the parity problem.” In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 1021 (2024), p. 114923. ISSN: 0304-3975. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2024.114923>.
- [10] Eurico L.P. Ruivo and Pedro P.B. de Oliveira. “A perfect solution to the parity problem with elementary cellular automaton 150 under asynchronous update”. In: *Information Sciences* 493 (2019), pp. 138–151. ISSN: 0020-0255. DOI: 10.1016/j.ins.2019.04.045.
- [11] Moshe Sipper. “Computing with cellular automata: Three cases for nonuniformity”. In: *Physical Review E* 57.3 (1998), p. 3589. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.57.3589.
- [12] Dietmar Wolz and Pedro P.B. de Oliveira. “Very Effective Evolutionary Techniques for Searching Cellular Automata Rule Spaces.” In: *Journal of Cellular Automata* 3.4 (2008).