Module 6 — Complexity

Systems Thinking

hbar.university

Complex Adaptive Systems

Position in Knowledge Graph

This node defines complex adaptive systems (CAS) as interacting agent systems with endogenous adaptation.

It builds on: - Complex Collective Behavior (5.5)

It prepares for: - Computational Complexity (6.2) - Information-Theoretic Complexity (6.3)

A CAS is a dynamical system whose interaction rules or internal parameters change in response to experience.

Formal Statement / Definition / Construction

Let there be n agents indexed by $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

For each agent i, define:

- A state space $\mathcal{X}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$,
- An internal parameter space $\Theta_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$,
- A (possibly time-varying) action space $\mathcal{A}_i$.

Let the joint state be:

$$x(t) = (x_1(t), \ldots, x_n(t)) \in \mathcal{X} := \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{X}_i,$$

and the joint parameter be:

$$\theta(t) = (\theta_1(t), \ldots, \theta_n(t)) \in \Theta := \prod_{i=1}^{n} \Theta_i.$$

Let the interaction topology be represented by a (possibly time-varying) adjacency matrix:

$$A(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}.$$

A **complex adaptive system** is a coupled dynamical system on the augmented space $\mathcal{X} \times \Theta$ of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= F(x(t), \theta(t), A(t)), \\ \dot{\theta}(t) &= G(x(t), \theta(t), A(t)), \end{aligned}$$

where:

- $F : \mathcal{X} \times \Theta \times \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \to \mathcal{X}$ is the state evolution rule,
- $G : \mathcal{X} \times \Theta \times \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \to \Theta$ is the adaptation rule.

The defining structural property is that $G \not\equiv 0$: internal parameters evolve endogenously.

Assumptions and Conditions

1. (Well-posedness) F and G are such that solutions exist for given initial conditions; for continuous-time models it is sufficient to assume local Lipschitz continuity in (x, θ) for fixed $A(t)$.
2. (Nontrivial interaction) There exists $i \neq j$ such that influence is nonzero in the sense that changing x_j can change $\dot{x}_i$ for some configurations.
3. (Adaptation) There exists at least one agent i such that $\dot{\theta}_i(t) \neq 0$ on a set of times of positive measure for some initial condition.

No claim is made here about optimality, learning, or convergence of adaptation; those are separate properties.

Proof or Mathematical Development

Separation from Non-Adaptive Multi-Agent Dynamics

A non-adaptive interacting system has the form:

$$\dot{x}(t) = F(x(t); \bar{\theta}, \bar{A}),$$

with fixed parameters $\bar{\theta}$ and fixed topology $\bar{A}$.

In contrast, in a CAS, the parameter vector becomes a dynamical variable:

$$\theta(t) \text{ evolves according to } \dot{\theta}(t) = G(x(t), \theta(t), A(t)).$$

Therefore the effective state dimension increases from $\dim(\mathcal{X})$ to $\dim(\mathcal{X}) + \dim(\Theta)$, and the system becomes non-autonomous in x alone even if the pair (x, θ) is autonomous.

This is a structural distinction: adaptation induces higher-order feedback (state influences parameter, parameter influences future state).

Canonical Adaptive Update Form (Gradient-Type)

A common formal template is:

$$\dot{\theta}_i(t) = -\eta \nabla_{\theta_i} \mathcal{L}_i(x(t), \theta(t)), \quad \eta > 0,$$

where $\mathcal{L}_i : \mathcal{X} \times \Theta \to \mathbb{R}$ is a loss (or cost) functional.

This expresses adaptation as a dynamical system on parameters.

No convergence claim is implied without further assumptions on $\mathcal{L}_i$ (e.g., convexity) and on coupling structure; such results are deferred to modules where optimization and learning theory are developed.

Deferred: formal convergence of gradient flows requires additional analytic infrastructure (Domain: optimization / learning).

Coevolution of Topology (Optional Extension)

Some CAS models also allow topology to adapt:

$$\dot{A}(t) = H(x(t), \theta(t), A(t)),$$

for a rule H. This introduces a third coupled layer of feedback.

This extension is not required by the definition; it is included to mark the structural possibility of coevolving networks.

Structural Role

Complex adaptive systems introduce the key structural transition:

- From fixed-rule dynamics to rule-changing dynamics.

They unify: - networks (structure A), - dynamics (state x), - feedback (recursion), - and adaptation (parameter evolution θ).

CAS is the formal gateway from emergence to quantified complexity: once adaptation is present, complexity must account for computational burden, information constraints, and learning dynamics.

Structural Compression

Invariant

A complex adaptive system is dynamics on an augmented space with endogenous parameter evolution:

$$\dot{x} = F(x, \theta, A), \quad \dot{\theta} = G(x, \theta, A), \quad G \not\equiv 0.$$

Mechanism

Higher-order feedback: state influences parameters, parameters influence future state.

Cross-System Echo

- Control Theory: adaptive control and gain scheduling (parameters as state).
- Economics: agent learning and strategy adjustment in games.
- Biology: evolution and regulatory adaptation.
- Artificial Intelligence: online learning as parameter dynamics under loss gradients.

Computational Complexity

Position in Knowledge Graph

This node formalizes computational complexity as a resource-based measure of problem difficulty.

It builds on: - Complex Adaptive Systems (6.1)

It prepares for: - Information-Theoretic Complexity (6.3) - Kolmogorov Complexity (6.4)

Computational complexity quantifies the cost required to compute system outcomes or solve decision problems.

Formal Statement / Definition / Construction

Let Σ be a finite alphabet.

A **decision problem** is a language:

$$L \subseteq \Sigma^*,$$

where Σ^* denotes all finite strings over Σ.

A deterministic Turing machine M decides L if:

$$x \in L \Rightarrow M(x) = 1, \quad x \notin L \Rightarrow M(x) = 0.$$

Time Complexity

The **time complexity** of M is:

$$T_M(n) = \max_{|x|=n} \text{number of steps } M \text{ takes on } x.$$

Complexity Class P

$$\mathbf{P} = \{L \subseteq \Sigma^* : \exists M \text{ deciding } L \text{ with } T_M(n) \leq Cn^k \text{ for some } C, k > 0\}.$$

Problems solvable in polynomial time.

Complexity Class NP

$$\mathbf{NP} = \{L : \exists \text{ polynomial } p, \exists \text{ verifier } V, \text{ such that}$$

$$x \in L \iff \exists y, |y| \leq p(|x|) \text{ with } V(x, y) = 1\}.$$

Verification is polynomial-time.

Assumptions and Conditions

1. Computation model: deterministic Turing machine.
2. Input size measured as string length $|x|$.
3. Asymptotic bounds refer to $n \to \infty$.
4. Resource measured is time; space complexity analogous.

No assumption is made about $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP}$ (open problem).

Proof or Mathematical Development

Polynomial Closure

If:

$$T_1(n) = O(n^{k_1}), \quad T_2(n) = O(n^{k_2}),$$

then sequential composition satisfies:

$$T(n) = O(n^{\max(k_1,k_2)}).$$

Thus class $\mathbf{P}$ is closed under composition.

Reduction

Let $L_1, L_2 \subseteq \Sigma^*$.

If there exists polynomial-time computable function f such that:

$$x \in L_1 \iff f(x) \in L_2,$$

then $L_1 \leq_p L_2$.

If $L_2 \in \mathbf{P}$, then $L_1 \in \mathbf{P}$.

Thus polynomial reductions preserve tractability.

Structural Role

Computational complexity:

- Quantifies feasibility of prediction and control.
- Separates tractable from intractable coordination problems.
- Links adaptation to resource constraints.
- Provides formal boundary between solvable and computationally prohibitive dynamics.

In complex adaptive systems, agents operate under computational constraints.

Structural Compression

Invariant

Problem difficulty measured by asymptotic time:

$$T(n) \leq Cn^k.$$

Mechanism

Resource growth under composition and reduction.

Cross-System Echo

- Economics: bounded rationality.
- AI: algorithmic efficiency.
- Networks: routing complexity.
- Control Theory: real-time computability constraints.

Information-Theoretic Complexity

Position in Knowledge Graph

This node formalizes complexity as uncertainty and information content of system states.

It builds on: - Computational Complexity (6.2)

It prepares for: - Kolmogorov Complexity (6.4) - Shannon Entropy (7.1)

Information-theoretic complexity quantifies structural variability in probabilistic systems.

Formal Statement / Definition / Construction

Let X be a discrete random variable with finite support $\mathcal{X}$.

Let probability mass function be:

$$p(x) = \mathbb{P}(X = x).$$

Definition (Shannon Entropy)

The entropy of X is:

$$H(X) = -\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x) \log p(x).$$

Entropy measures average information content.

Joint Entropy

For random variables X, Y:

$$H(X, Y) = -\sum_{x,y} p(x, y) \log p(x, y).$$

Conditional Entropy

$$H(X|Y) = H(X, Y) - H(Y).$$

Mutual Information

$$I(X; Y) = H(X) - H(X|Y).$$

Equivalently:

$$I(X; Y) = \sum_{x,y} p(x, y) \log \frac{p(x, y)}{p(x)p(y)}.$$

Assumptions and Conditions

1. Random variables are discrete.
2. Logarithm base fixed (base 2 for bits or natural log).
3. $0 \log 0$ defined as 0 by continuity.
4. Entropy is finite if support finite.

Continuous entropy requires differential entropy (not treated here).

Proof or Mathematical Development

Non-Negativity of Mutual Information

Define:

$$D(p(x,y) \| p(x)p(y)) = \sum_{x,y} p(x,y) \log \frac{p(x,y)}{p(x)p(y)}.$$

This is Kullback–Leibler divergence.

Since KL divergence satisfies:

$$D(p\|q) \geq 0,$$

we have:

$$I(X;Y) \geq 0.$$

Equality holds iff:

$$p(x,y) = p(x)p(y),$$

i.e., independence.

Entropy Bounds

If $|\mathcal{X}| = m$, then:

$$0 \leq H(X) \leq \log m.$$

Proof:

Maximum occurs for uniform distribution:

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{m}.$$

Then:

$$H(X) = -m \frac{1}{m} \log \frac{1}{m} = \log m.$$

Structural Role

Information-theoretic complexity:

- Measures unpredictability.
- Quantifies macroscopic disorder.
- Links probabilistic structure to system variability.
- Connects emergence to statistical description.

Entropy provides scalar measure of state-space dispersion.

Structural Compression

Invariant

Entropy:

$$H(X) = -\sum_{x} p(x) \log p(x).$$

Mechanism

Logarithmic weighting of probability mass.

Cross-System Echo

- Physics: thermodynamic entropy.
- Economics: information in markets.
- Biology: genetic diversity.
- Networks: uncertainty in signal transmission.

Kolmogorov Complexity

Position in Knowledge Graph

This node formalizes complexity as description length of individual objects.

It builds on: - Computational Complexity (6.2) - Information-Theoretic Complexity (6.3)

It prepares for: - Phase Transitions in Complex Systems (6.5)

Kolmogorov complexity shifts from probabilistic ensembles to individual strings.

Formal Statement / Definition / Construction

Let $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$.

Fix a universal prefix Turing machine U.

For a finite binary string $x \in \Sigma^*$, the **Kolmogorov complexity** of x is:

$$K_U(x) = \min\{|p| : U(p) = x\},$$

where:

- $p \in \Sigma^*$ is a program,
- $|p|$ denotes length of p.

When U is fixed, write $K(x)$.

Conditional Kolmogorov Complexity

For strings x, y:

$$K(x \mid y) = \min\{|p| : U(p, y) = x\}.$$

Assumptions and Conditions

1. U is universal and prefix-free.
2. Programs are finite binary strings.
3. Complexity defined up to additive constant depending on U.
4. Machine-independence holds via invariance theorem.

No claim is made about computability.

Proof or Mathematical Development

Invariance Theorem

Let U_1 and U_2 be universal prefix machines.

Then there exists constant c such that:

$$|K_{U_1}(x) - K_{U_2}(x)| \leq c \quad \forall x.$$

Proof sketch:

Since U_2 is universal, there exists program q that simulates U_1.

If p is minimal program for x under U_1, then:

$$U_2(qp) = x.$$

Thus:

$$K_{U_2}(x) \leq |q| + K_{U_1}(x).$$

Symmetric argument gives reverse inequality.

Thus complexity differs only by additive constant.

Non-Computability

Suppose $K(x)$ were computable.

Define string:

$$x^* = \text{first string such that } K(x^*) > n.$$

If K computable, we could enumerate such strings and describe x^* in $O(\log n)$ bits.

Contradiction for sufficiently large n.

Thus $K(x)$ is not computable.

Structural Role

Kolmogorov complexity:

- Measures intrinsic description length.
- Captures algorithmic randomness.
- Distinguishes structured from incompressible strings.
- Removes reliance on probability distributions.

It bridges computation and information.

Structural Compression

Invariant

Kolmogorov complexity:

$$K(x) = \min_{U(p)=x} |p|.$$

Mechanism

Shortest program length on universal machine.

Cross-System Echo

- AI: model compression.
- Physics: algorithmic randomness.
- Economics: minimal description of market states.
- Networks: minimal encoding of topology.

Phase Transitions in Complex Systems

Position in Knowledge Graph

This node formalizes qualitative macroscopic transitions driven by parameter variation in large systems.

It builds on: - Critical Transitions (5.4) - Information-Theoretic Complexity (6.3) - Kolmogorov Complexity (6.4)

It prepares for: - Shannon Entropy and Information Flow (7.1)

Phase transitions connect microscopic interaction rules to discontinuous macroscopic order.

Formal Statement / Definition / Construction

Let a system consist of n interacting components with configuration space:

$$\Omega_n.$$

Let μ denote a control parameter (e.g., temperature, coupling strength).

Define probability distribution over configurations:

$$P_\mu(\omega) = \frac{1}{Z_n(\mu)} e^{-\beta H(\omega,\mu)},$$

where:

- $H(\omega, \mu)$ is an energy functional,
- $\beta > 0$ is inverse temperature,
- $Z_n(\mu)$ is partition function:

$$Z_n(\mu) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_n} e^{-\beta H(\omega,\mu)}.$$

Free Energy Density

Define:

$$f_n(\mu) = -\frac{1}{\beta n} \log Z_n(\mu).$$

Assume thermodynamic limit exists:

$$f(\mu) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(\mu).$$

Definition (Phase Transition)

A **phase transition** occurs at $\mu = \mu^*$ if:

$$f(\mu)$$

is non-analytic at μ^*.

Equivalently, some derivative of $f(\mu)$ is discontinuous at μ^*.

Assumptions and Conditions

1. System size $n \to \infty$ (thermodynamic limit).
2. Partition function finite for each finite n.
3. Limit $f(\mu)$ exists.
4. Analyticity considered in parameter μ.

For finite n, $f_n(\mu)$ is analytic; true singularity emerges only in limit.

Proof or Mathematical Development

Analyticity for Finite Systems

For finite n, partition function:

$$Z_n(\mu) = \sum_{\omega} e^{-\beta H(\omega,\mu)}$$

is finite sum of analytic functions in μ.

Thus:

$$f_n(\mu) = -\frac{1}{\beta n} \log Z_n(\mu)$$

is analytic.

Therefore no true phase transition occurs for finite systems.

Emergence in Thermodynamic Limit

Non-analyticity may appear when:

$$f(\mu) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(\mu)$$

fails to be analytic.

Example: Mean-field Ising model.

Magnetization:

$$m = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i.$$

At critical temperature T_c:

- For $T > T_c$: $m = 0$.
- For $T < T_c$: $m \neq 0$.

Order parameter changes continuously, but derivative of free energy becomes discontinuous.

This is second-order phase transition.

Information-Theoretic Interpretation

Entropy:

$$S(\mu) = -\sum_{\omega} P_\mu(\omega)\log P_\mu(\omega).$$

Near critical point:

- Correlation length diverges,
- Information propagation becomes scale-free,
- System exhibits maximal susceptibility.

Thus complexity peaks near criticality.

Structural Role

Phase transitions:

- Formalize large-scale regime shifts.
- Require large system limit.
- Connect microscopic interaction to macroscopic order.
- Provide foundation for critical phenomena.

They unify:

- Emergence,
- Information,
- Nonlinear instability,
- Scaling laws.

Structural Compression

Invariant

Phase transition $\Leftrightarrow$ non-analytic free energy in limit:

$$f(\mu) = \lim_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{\beta n}\log Z_n(\mu).$$

Mechanism

Collective interaction induces singular behavior only in infinite-size limit.

Cross-System Echo

- Physics: thermodynamic phase changes.
- Economics: market regime shifts.
- Biology: cooperative transitions in populations.
- Networks: percolation thresholds.