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**ABSTRACT**

**The introduction of Machine Learning and Deep Neural Networks has revolutionized a variety of task. Our project explores the potential of using Deep Neural Networks to detect interesting Cellular Automata. A cellular automaton is a collection of colored cells on a grid that evolves according to a set of rules. The rules are applied iteratively for as many time steps as desired.**

One challenge is that Cellular Automata tend to have huge parameter search spaces to find interesting results within. The vast majority of rules within this space will be junk rules with only a small fraction of a percentage being interesting rules. Between the boring rules that either die out tend to chaos, there is a tiny sweet spot of interesting patterns. Manually searching for these patterns would be unrealistic. In this paper, we will discuss our approach to detect the interesting patterns using image processing, Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and ImageNet.
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1 INTRODUCTION / PROBLEM

In this paper, we will focus on outer totalistic generations of two-dimensional Cellular Automata. They consist of a two-dimensional grid of cells, which live, die, or are in a “dying” transition date depending on a set of rules. Specifically, the cells are updated according to their previous values, and the sum of the values of the other cells in the neighborhood. We decided to use Moore neighborhood for the update rules, which are the surrounding eight cells of a center cell. An alternative would be Neumann neighborhood, which only includes four cells. Rules are classified as boring if they lead to a pattern which is static noise with no discernable patterns moving across the screen. For this project, we define interesting rules specifically as those that have clear gliders (small patterns that move across the grid) with some individual characteristics. Under most circumstances, it is impossible to tell whether a rule is interesting or boring just by looking at the parameters. A user would have to randomly go through thousands of random rules before finding an interesting one. Even more daunting, under the assumption that we use a Moore neighborhood and a maximum of 10 possible states, there are 29 survival rules, 29 born rules, and 210 states, which leads to a total of 228 combinations of rules. Because of this gigantic number of possible combinations, automatic detection of interesting rules will be very helpful, and it will make sure that users do not have to manually go through the process.

2  BACKGROUND / RELATED WORK

// TODO

3  METHOD

3.1  Data Collection Pipeline

To obtain boring rules, we manually went through random examples, and collected rules that died out immediately or generated static noise or boring non-glider patterns. For interesting rules, we used Cellular Automata Rules Lexicon, and examples provided in Visions of Chaos and only recorded those with gliders. We ended up with 105 boring and 35 interesting set of rules.

We generalized the Cellular Automata generation algorithm as follows:

**Cellular Automata Generation Algorithm**

if center\_cell == max\_state:

for num\_neighbors in survive\_arr:

if total - 1 == num\_neighbors:

return center\_cell

return center\_cell - 1

elif center\_cell != 0 and center\_cell != max\_state:

return center\_cell - 1

else:

for num\_neighbors in born\_arr:

if total == num\_neighbors:

return max\_state

return 0

We used the algorithm above to generate frames and create images. Next, we applied data augmentation due to the limited number of rules that we identified. We reused the boring rules 10 times, and the interesting rules 30 times with different initial configuration. We generated 140 images for each of the patterns.

Our next step is image stitching. We chose to use frames from 100 to 108. Because when we were running examples, we noticed that this is roughly when the patterns were all apparent. Each pattern corresponds to one stitched together 3 by 3 image. We assembled training data with a 50% interesting and 50% boring split.

3.2  Data Training with CNN

We trained the data set with a Convolutional Neural Network with the following architecture.

Table

Description automatically generated

We tuned the hyperparameters and found out that batch normalization and more data inclusion greatly improved the accuracy of the Neural Network. Without batch normalization, the testing accuracy was only 65.08%. After batch normalization and dropout, we were able to achieve 93.44% training accuracy and 84.12% testing accuracy on the testing set with 10% interesting data. The test recall is 100%, indicating every interesting configuration has been correctly labeled as such.

3.3  Feature Extraction

4  CONTRIBUTIONS AND FUTURE WORK

// TODO

5  CLASS QUESTIONNAIRE

Here the paper will answer the eight questions posted by Professor Friedland to evaluate machine learners.

**Q1: What is the variable the machine learner is supposed to predict? How accurate is the labeling? What is the annotator agreement (measured)?**

Given a set of rules and an initial configuration, the machine learner aims to predict whether the generated Cellular Automata pattern will be interesting or boring. CNN gives a training accuracy of 93.44% and testing accuracy of 84.12%.
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