Maksim Barziankou

Structural Coherence and Drift in Adaptive Systems

Structural integrity is a critical but often implicitly treated property of adaptive and complex systems. Conventional approaches infer integrity indirectly through error magnitude, stability margins, or performance metrics, which frequently fail to distinguish transient perturbations from persistent structural degradation.

This work introduces structural coherence as an explicit measure of system integrity. Structural coherence is defined as the degree of internal alignment and consistency within a system's state representation, independent of any specific control or optimization strategy. We show how coherence can be quantified, tracked over time, and interpreted as an indicator of structural drift, enabling early detection of irreversible degradation before observable performance failure occurs.

The proposed framework is agnostic to system domain and applies to adaptive control systems, distributed artificial intelligence, multi-agent coordination, and complex monitored infrastructures. This work focuses on coherence measurement and drift interpretation, without prescribing control mechanisms, thereby providing a theoretical foundation for coherence-aware system analysis.

1 Introduction

Adaptive systems operating in dynamic and uncertain environments are commonly evaluated using performance- or error-based criteria. While such metrics are effective for short-term optimization, they provide limited insight into the long-term integrity of system structure. Systems may exhibit acceptable performance while undergoing gradual internal degradation, ultimately leading to brittle behavior or sudden failure. In complex adaptive systems, internal consistency, alignment, and relational structure play a central role in determining survivability under sustained perturbation. However, these properties are rarely represented explicitly. Instead, they are treated implicitly through noise models, parameter adaptation, or stability heuristics. This work proposes structural coherence as a first-class measure of system integrity. Rather than focusing on instantaneous outcomes, structural coherence characterizes the internal organization of system state and its persistence over time. By making coherence explicit, it becomes possible to distinguish transient disturbances from accumulated structural drift and to reason about degradation as a structural phenomenon rather than as noise. This work deliberately avoids prescribing any form of control or corrective action.

2 Structural Coherence

Structural coherence refers to the degree of internal alignment and consistency within a system's state representation. A system is considered structurally coherent when its internal components, representations, or agents maintain stable relational organization over time. Coherence is not restricted to physical phase alignment or synchronization. Depending on the system, it may reflect alignment in temporal behavior, relational consistency across a network, stability of internal representations, or concentration within an abstract configuration space. Importantly, coherence is a structural property and is independent of any specific task objective or reward signal. Structural coherence may be represented using scalar, vector, or field-based representations, including wave-based or phase-augmented formulations. These representations allow coherence to be measured as a distributed property rather than as a point estimate, enabling richer interpretation of internal system state.

3 Measuring Structural Coherence

Structural coherence can be quantified using a variety of metrics that capture internal alignment, dispersion, or consistency. Such metrics may include measures of phase dispersion, relational variance, synchronization stability, or persistence of structural patterns across successive observations.

Crucially, coherence measurement does not depend on a single instantaneous value. Instead, coherence is evaluated as an evolving quantity, reflecting both current structural organization and its short-term persistence. This temporal aspect allows coherence to function as an indicator of structural health rather than momentary disturbance.

The specific form of coherence measurement is system-dependent and may vary across domains. However, the unifying principle is that coherence reflects internal structural integrity rather than external performance.

4 Structural Drift

Structural drift is defined as the accumulated degradation of structural coherence over time. Unlike stochastic noise or transient perturbations, structural drift represents persistent and often partially irreversible deformation of internal system organization.

Drift emerges when coherence degradation accumulates across successive updates without full recovery. This accumulation may result from sustained misalignment, delayed feedback, environmental non-stationarity, or internal over-adaptation. Because drift develops gradually, it is frequently undetected by conventional error-based monitoring until failure occurs.

By tracking coherence over time, structural drift can be identified as a monotonic or trending loss of integrity, providing early warning of long-term instability even when short-term performance remains acceptable.

5 Anti-Drift Interpretation of Coherence

From an interpretative perspective, structural coherence may be viewed as an anti-drift quantity. High coherence corresponds to resistance against structural degradation, while declining coherence reflects increasing susceptibility to drift.

This interpretation aligns with Lyapunov-style reasoning, in which coherence serves as a measure of structural stability. However, unlike classical stability analysis, coherence-based interpretation does not require a predefined equilibrium or objective function. Instead, it evaluates the persistence of internal structure itself.

Such an interpretation enables system integrity analysis without prescribing corrective actions, making coherence suitable as a monitoring and diagnostic primitive across diverse system architectures.

6 Applicability Across Domains

The concept of structural coherence applies broadly to adaptive and complex systems. In distributed artificial intelligence and multi-agent systems, coherence may reflect coordination stability or consensus integrity. In adaptive control systems, coherence may capture internal consistency of state estimation or representation. In infrastructure and cybersecurity monitoring, coherence degradation may indicate emerging structural anomalies or system degradation.

Because coherence is defined independently of control strategy, it may be integrated into existing systems as an analytical layer without altering operational behavior. This separation allows coherence analysis to complement, rather than replace, conventional performance metrics.

7 Discussion

By introducing structural coherence as an explicit measure of system integrity, this work shifts analysis from outcome-focused evaluation to structure-focused monitoring. This perspective enables earlier detection of degradation, clearer distinction between noise and drift, and more principled reasoning about long-term system viability.

Importantly, this work does not prescribe specific control or adaptation mechanisms. Instead, it establishes coherence and drift as foundational analytical concepts, providing a theoretical basis for future coherence-aware system architectures.

8 Conclusion

Structural coherence provides a meaningful and generalizable measure of system integrity for adaptive and complex systems by explicitly characterizing the internal organization and alignment of system state. Unlike conventional performance- or error-based metrics, structural coherence captures properties of internal consistency that may degrade gradually and remain undetected until failure becomes inevitable.

By making internal structural consistency explicit and trackable over time, coherence enables early identification of drift and degradation processes that are invisible to instantaneous metrics, threshold-based alarms, or short-horizon optimization criteria. This allows system integrity to be assessed independently of task performance, reward structure, or control objectives, and supports analysis of long-term survivability under sustained perturbation, non-stationarity, and delayed feedback.

This work establishes structural coherence as a foundational analytical concept rather than a control mechanism. Coherence is introduced as a system-level property that can be measured, interpreted, and monitored without prescribing specific corrective actions or adaptation strategies. As such, the proposed framework is compatible with a wide range of existing system architectures and may be integrated as a complementary layer for integrity assessment and diagnostics.

By reframing drift as accumulated coherence degradation and interpreting coherence as an anti-drift quantity, this work provides a principled lens for reasoning about structural stability in adaptive systems. The resulting perspective shifts system analysis from outcome-driven evaluation to structure-driven monitoring and lays the groundwork for future research into coherence-aware monitoring, integrity assessment, and adaptive system design across diverse domains. Practical control architectures that make operational use of structural coherence or drift metrics are intentionally not detailed in this report, as such implementations fall outside the scope of the present conceptual analysis and are addressed separately through protected technical disclosures.

MxBv, Poznan 2025

10.5281/zenodo.18098437