Structure or Noise?

NSF Workshop on Uncertainty in Complex Interacting Systems

University of Southern California, Los Angeles

James P. Crutchfield Complexity Sciences Center, Director Physics Department University of California, Davis cse.ucdavis.edu/~chaos 13 April 2009

Joint work with

Susanne Still: Information and Computer Sciences University of Hawaii at Manoa Chris Ellison

 Complexity Sciences Center Physics Department, UC Davis

Why We Must Model I

Nature spontaneously organizes

Why We Must Model 2 Engineered systems spontaneously organize \bullet Internet route flapping Power-law Internet organization Financial markets crash Power grids fail spectacularly Social pattern formation on the web

...

And so ...

Problem:

 Emergent structures not given directly by the system coordinates or governing equations of motion

Consequence: Each system needs its own explanatory basis

Why we must Model 3 Fundamental: Mathematics of Intrinsic Randomness Nonlinear dynamical systems [Kolmogorov 1958]: Chaotic systems: Shannon entropy *h^µ >* 0 Kolmogorov-Chaitin complexity of Data [1963]: Size of shortest Turing Machine Program to predict Data KC complexity = f(Shannon entropy) [Brudno 1978] : *[|]*Program*[|]* [∝] *^e^hµ|*Data*[|]*

Exponential Increase in Prediction Resources *|*Compute time*|* $\propto e^T$ $|Measurements| \propto e^T$ Accuracy $\propto e^{-T}$

Consequence

No short cuts!

- No closed-form solutions
- No computational speed-ups
- Must compute full trajectory

Right representation is critical for reducing the prediction error as far as possible (but no further!) Cannot estimate uncertainty unless you know the right model.

Fundamental in Complex Systems! Each nonlinear system requires its own representation Selecting balance between ascribing structure or noise to a measurement depends on representation

Fundamental issue: Theory building Subsidiary issue: Statistical fluctuations due to finite data sample (This is NOT a talk about machine learning.)

Learning a Model

• Problem: Learn from Observations The world behaves: Given $Pr(X, X)$, agent learns model: States R and Dynamic Pattern Discovery: Learn the world's hidden states Pr(*R|* past future \leftrightarrow *X*= \leftarrow *X* \overrightarrow{r} *X* \leftarrow *X,* \overrightarrow{r} *X*)

JPC & K. Young, Inferring Statistical Complexity, Physical Review Letters 63 (1989) 105-108. C. R. Shalizi & JPC, Journal Statistical Physics 104 (2001) 817-879.

 \leftarrow

X)

Causal shielding: Pr(\leftarrow *X* $\rightarrow \overrightarrow{z}$ $X) = Pr($ \leftarrow *X |R*)Pr($\rightarrow \overrightarrow{z}$ *X |R*)

Dynamics of learning: Search in the space of models: *R* ∈ *M*

(Susanne Still, Chris Ellison, & JPC)

Causal shielding objective function

min Pr(*R|* \leftarrow *X*) $\sqrt{ }$ *I*[\leftarrow $[X; R] + \beta I$ [\leftarrow *X*; \overrightarrow{r} *X |R*] "

Model: Map from histories to states Info states contain about histories

Reduce info history has about future

β ∼ 1*/T* Structure/Noise Design Control:

arxiv.org: [0708.0654](http://arxiv.org/abs/0708.0654v1) [physics.gen-ph] & [0708.1580\[](http://arxiv.org/abs/0708.1580v1)cs.IT]

Learning a Model ... Optimal states $Pr(R|X)$ are Gibbs states: \leftarrow *X*)

$$
\mathrm{Pr}_{\mathrm{opt}}(\mathcal{R} | \overleftarrow{X}) = \frac{\mathrm{Pr}(\mathcal{R})}{Z(\overleftarrow{X}, \beta)} e^{-\beta E(\mathcal{R}, \overleftarrow{X})}
$$

where

$$
E(\mathcal{R}, \overleftarrow{X}) = \mathcal{D}\left(\Pr(\overrightarrow{X} | \overleftarrow{X}) || \Pr(\overrightarrow{X} | \mathcal{R})\right)
$$

$$
\Pr(\overrightarrow{X} | \mathcal{R}) = \frac{1}{\Pr(\mathcal{R})} \sum_{\overleftarrow{X}} \Pr(\overrightarrow{X} | \overleftarrow{X}) \Pr(\mathcal{R} | \overleftarrow{X}) \Pr(\overleftarrow{X})
$$

$$
\Pr(\mathcal{R}) = \sum_{\overleftarrow{X}} \Pr(\mathcal{R} | \overleftarrow{X}) \Pr(\overleftarrow{X})
$$

Solve these equations self-consistently (Analytical in special cases; numerical generally) Parametrized family of models: Pr(*R|* \leftarrow $R_\beta \colon \Pr(\mathcal{R} \mid X)$

Structure or Noise?

 β trades-off model size against prediction error Structure versus Noise

What Do Solutions Mean? Causal Models Causal architecture given by ϵ -Machine M: Optimal predictor: Minimal size (within optimal predictors R): Unique (within min, opt predictors) $h_\mu(M) \leq h_\mu(\mathcal{R})$ $C_\mu(M) \leq C_\mu(\mathcal{R})$)

JPC & K. Young, Inferring Statistical Complexity, Physical Review Letters 63 (1989) 105-108. C. R. Shalizi & JPC, Journal Statistical Physics 104 (2001) 817-879.

Theorem: Low-temperature limit

Recover E-Machine:

 $R_{\beta} \rightarrow M$

Conclusion:

 At given prediction error is best causal approximate. *R*^β

Optimally balance structure & error At each level β of approximation

In practice: Learn an oo-state world (SNS: "simple nondeterminstic source")

Causal compressibility: Shape of RD curve Benefit of choosing smaller model for loss in predictability Deviation from straight-line RD curve IID: No Predictively reversible: No SNS: Yes

Conclusions

- Causal shielding principle leads to Process's organization: E-Machine Family of best approximations to ϵ -M Structure or Noise?
	- Cannot estimate uncertainty until you know structure.
	- First-principle distinction
	- Principled trade-off

Thanks!

All papers online at the Computational Mechanics Archive <http://cse.ucdavis.edu/~cmg/>