

From monoliths to modules: Decomposing transducers for efficient world modelling

Alexander Boyd^{1,2}, Franz Nowak^{3,4}, David Hyland⁵, Manuel Baltieri^{6,1},
Fernando E. Rosas⁷⁻⁹

alecboy@gmail.com, franz.nowak@inf.ethz.ch, manuel_baltieri@araya.org,
david.hyland@stx.ox.ac.uk, f.rosas@sussex.ac.uk

¹Department of Informatics, University of Sussex

²Beyond Institute for Theoretical Science (BITS)

³ETH Zürich

⁴Principles of Intelligent Behaviour in Biological and Social Systems (PIBBSS)

⁵Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford

⁶Araya Inc.

⁷Sussex AI and Sussex Centre for Consciousness Science, University of Sussex

⁸Centre for Complexity Science and Center for Psychedelic Research, Department of Brain Sciences, Imperial College London

⁹Center for Eudaimonia and Human Flourishing, University of Oxford

Abstract

World models have been recently proposed as sandbox environments in which AI agents can be trained and evaluated before deployment. Although realistic world models often have high computational demands, efficient modelling is usually possible by exploiting the fact that real-world scenarios tend to involve subcomponents that interact in a modular manner. In this paper, we explore this idea by developing a framework for decomposing complex world models represented by transducers, a class of models generalising POMDPs. Whereas the composition of transducers is well understood, our results clarify how to invert this process deriving sub-transducers operating on distinct input-output subspaces, enabling parallelizable and interpretable alternatives to monolithic world modelling that can support distributed inference. Overall, these results lay a groundwork for bridging the structural transparency demanded by AI safety and the computational efficiency required for real-world inference.

1 Introduction

Advances in deep reinforcement learning have produced agents that can operate in increasingly complex environments, from dexterous robotic control and large-scale games to open-ended dialogue and tool use (Andrychowicz et al., 2020; Berner et al., 2019; Ouyang et al., 2022; Rajeswaran et al., 2017). As these systems become more powerful and autonomous and are considered for deployment in high-stakes settings, questions about reliability, safety, and interpretability are beginning to take central stage (Bengio et al., 2024; Glanois et al., 2024; Tang et al., 2024). One way to address these questions is by adopting world models as controlled testbeds, serving as synthetic environments in which agents can be trained, probed, and stress-tested before deployment (Dalrymple et al., 2024; Bruce et al., 2024; Díaz-Rodríguez et al., 2023). However, the usefulness of such sandboxing depends critically on our ability to build world models that are faithful enough to guarantee that the agent’s behaviour in simulation can be transferred to real-world settings (Rosas et al., 2025; Ding et al., 2025).

An environment can be formally described as a transducer that turns input sequences (e.g., actions) into output sequences (e.g., observations and rewards) (Ding et al., 2025). This transduction, however, happens via interwoven dynamics often involving co-occurring physical processes alongside social interactions, biological rhythms, or engineered feedback loops. A surfer, for instance, must simultaneously navigate the ocean’s turbulence and the coordinated movements of their companions; naively modelling all of this as a single high-dimensional mechanism makes learning and inference expensive and blurs the underlying structure. For world models to be useful as scientific tools, they should instead expose *modularity*: distinct components should track different aspects of the world, while still interacting and combining to produce coherent global behaviour. Prior work related to the modularity of transduction has mostly approached this from a bottom-up perspective, focusing on how small components can be composed into layered networks that capture complex input-output relationships (Hopcroft & Ullman, 1979; Mohri, 1997; Mohri et al., 2002).

From the perspective of model-based reinforcement learning, one is typically concerned with learning a model of the underlying transition dynamics of the environment, which can be used for several downstream tasks such as planning and training policies (Hafner et al., 2020; 2025; Hansen et al., 2024). However, simulating and learning the transition dynamics of high-dimensional data (such as video data) in “entangled” latent spaces is complex, computationally expensive, and less interpretable. Leveraging the fact that ordinary human-scale environments often consist of sparse interactions between multiple distinct entities, several works have demonstrated the benefits of incorporating inductive biases to force neural networks to represent the world as a set of discrete objects, such as generalisation (Goyal et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2022; Feng & Magliacane, 2023), sample efficiency (Rodriguez-Sanchez et al., 2025), interpretability (Mosbach et al., 2025), compositional generation (Baek et al., 2025), and robustness to noise (Liu et al., 2023).

While composition explains how modular systems can be built, for AI safety and interpretability, we often face the inverse problem: given a large, seemingly entangled world model, how can we decompose it into simpler, interpretable pieces without sacrificing predictive power?




Figure 1: In this work, we first present a method for composing stochastic environments into larger ones. We then use this framework to identify procedures that reverse the process, decomposing complex environments into simpler, modular subcomponents.

This work develops a framework to address this question in the language of computational mechanics (Crutchfield & Young, 1989; Shalizi & Crutchfield, 2001), which is used to explain when and how a complex transducer can be factored into interacting sub-transducers. This provides a way to move from a single high-dimensional transducer to a collection of modular low-dimensional ones, each associated with a functional subsystem of the world model. Crucially, this factorisation does more than aid understanding: it enables distributed inference, where each sub-transducer can update its own beliefs locally, given only the parts of the input-output history that matter to it. Thus, as shown in Figure 1, our analysis reveals how transducers can be both composed and decomposed, moving between levels of complexity.

In summary, in this paper we take the perspective of a designer who wishes to model an agent-environment interface in a way that is faithful enough for prediction, but also structured enough to support analysis and control. Within this perspective, transducers provide a canonical representation, and our main contribution is to show how such representations can themselves be decomposed into interpretable, modular components. The rest of the paper formalises transducers and their interfaces (Sec. 2), introduces a general notion of transducer composition (Sec. 3), to then develop decomposition algorithms (Sec. 4) and coarse-graining approaches (Sec. 5). We also investigate how this approach can be used to decompose the causal states of an AI system doing inference tasks (Sec. 6), opening the way to extend ongoing efforts to interpret the internal representations of transformers (Shai et al., 2025; Piotrowski et al., 2025) to high-dimensional settings.

Overview and roadmap

This work develops an information-theoretic framework for representing, composing, and decomposing modular world models as networks of transducers. The roadmap ahead and main contributions are as follows:

1. **Interfaces and transducers as a common language (Sec. 2).** We use the ideas of *interfaces* and *transducers* as a general representation for world models that can capture agents, environments, and predictive models within a single framework.
2. **Composition of world models as networks of transducers (Sec. 3).** We show how transducers compose in series, parallel, and convergent configurations, and give a linear-operator view that treats a network of transducers as a single composite world model.
3. **Decomposition with latent variables via intransducibility (Sec. 4.1).** We introduce *intransducibility*, an information-theoretic diagnostic that detects when a set of variables cannot be generated by a causal transducer, and use it to factor a monolithic transducer into a sparse network when latent variables are available.
4. **Decomposition without latents via acausality (Sec. 4.2).** We define an *acausality* measure that can be computed directly from observable signals, and show how it recovers minimally acausal wiring diagrams in the absence of explicit latent variables.
5. **Coarse-graining networks of transducers (Sec. 5).** We characterize when blocks of a transducer network can be merged without changing its observable interface, yielding principled multiscale coarse-grainings of world models.
6. **Factoring causal states and belief states (Sec. 6).** We relate our framework to ϵ -transducers and predictive belief states, showing how minimal predictive representations inherit and expose the modular structure of the underlying transducer network.




Figure 2: A general interface and two illustrations of a causal interface: An unravalled general interface (a) takes a semi-infinite sequence of inputs $X_0, X_1, X_2 \dots$ and stochastically transforms it to a semi-infinite sequence of outputs $Y_0, Y_1, Y_2 \dots$, without any constraints on dependencies between inputs and outputs. An unravalled causal interface (b) shows individual inputs X_t and outputs Y_t unravalled into a semi-infinite sequence in time. The same object can be condensed (c) into a mapping from input pasts \overleftarrow{X}_t and futures \overrightarrow{X}_t to output pasts \overleftarrow{Y}_t and futures \overrightarrow{Y}_t .

2 Interfaces and transducers

2.1 Interfaces

Agents and environments can be described operationally by how they map input sequences to output sequences. In probabilistic terms, a mapping of this kind is fully specified by the conditional distribution of outputs given inputs, which we call an *interface*.

Definition 1. An interface \mathcal{I} is a conditional input-output process characterized by the family of consistent conditional probabilities

$$\mathcal{I}(Y|X) \equiv \{ \Pr(Y_{0:t}|X_{0:t}), \forall t \in \{0, \dots, \infty\} \}, \quad (1)$$

where X_t are inputs and Y_t are outputs.

Here, uppercase variables denote random variables and lowercase represent specific realizations. We use the shorthand $X_{0:t} \equiv (X_0, \dots, X_{t-1})$ for ordered sequences of random variables, and the random variable notation $\Pr(A|B) \equiv \{\Pr(A = a|B = b)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}, b \in \mathcal{B}}$ is used to describe all elements of a conditional probability. An interface specifies a semi-infinite stochastic process for every semi-infinite input string, describing a transformation from increasingly long strings of inputs $x_{0:t}$ to corresponding lengths of outputs $y_{0:t}$ — like an information ratchet that performs stochastic operations on time series in sequence (Boyd et al., 2016; Mandal & Jarzynski, 2012). However, this temporal interpretation is only appropriate for certain subclasses that we call **causal interfaces**, for which future inputs $\overrightarrow{X}_t \equiv X_{t:\infty}$ cannot causally influence past outputs $\overleftarrow{Y}_t \equiv Y_{0:t}$. Hence, causal interfaces can be interpreted as a circuit in time, as shown in Figure 2.

While causal interfaces are well-suited to describe actions and agents in perception-action loops and feedback¹, this manuscript exclusively addresses *feedforward* networks of interfaces, where past outputs cannot influence future inputs. In this context, the condition for causality can be expressed in terms of a probabilistic relation

$$\Pr(\overleftarrow{Y}_t | \overleftarrow{X}_t, \overrightarrow{X}_t) = \Pr(\overleftarrow{Y}_t | \overleftarrow{X}_t). \quad (2)$$

¹Interfaces can also be used to describe agents and feedback, as discussed in App. A




Figure 3: A transducer is a general model that transforms an input process X to an output process Y using a latent process R as memory, which can be used to generate interfaces. The *network representation* draws an arrow from the input process X with unknown source ($\frac{X}{-}$) to the output process Y with latent variable R ($\frac{Y}{R}$). The *circuit element* representation takes two inputs (X_t and R_t) to two outputs (Y_t and R_{t+1}). The *interface circuit* representation exhibits multiple timepoints resulting from applying the circuit element in series.

An interface $\mathcal{I}[Y|X]$ in a feedforward context is causal iff Eq. (2) holds, and implies that the interface is anticipation-free or *nonanticipatory* (Barnett & Crutchfield, 2015; Rosas et al., 2025). If the non-anticipatory condition isn't satisfied in a feedforward network, then the interface somehow utilizes future inputs before receiving them, violating causality. Thus, causal interfaces are the only ones that are physically realizable in time.

2.2 Transducers

There are several models in the literature that can be used to implement causal interfaces, including Markov Decision Processes (MDP) (Sutton & Barto, 1998) and partially observed Markov Decision Processes (POMDP) (Kaelbling et al., 1998). These approaches are generalized by *transducers*, which specify a repeating circuit relying on a latent variable that evolves in tandem with inputs and outputs to carry memory from past to future (Figure 3).

Definition 2. A *transducer* T is a tuple $\{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{R}, \{T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)}\}_{r, r' \in \mathcal{R}, x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}}\}$ consisting of an input alphabet \mathcal{X} , an output alphabet \mathcal{Y} , a latent memory alphabet \mathcal{R} , and a stochastic kernel $T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)}$ that determines the following probability:

$$T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)} = \Pr(Y_t = y, R_{t+1} = r' | X_t = x, R_t = r). \quad (3)$$

Transducers can be used to implement interfaces by applying the kernel repeatedly and summing over all latent memory sequences as follows:

$$\Pr(Y_{0:t} = y_{0:t} | X_{0:t} = x_{0:t}) = \sum_{r_{0:t+1} \in \mathcal{R}^{t+1}} \Pr(R_0 = r_0) \prod_{i=0}^{t-1} T_{r_i \rightarrow r_{i+1}}^{(y_i|x_i)}, \quad (4)$$

where $\Pr(R_0)$ is a prior distribution for R_0 . We say that T is a *transducer presentation* of the interface \mathcal{I} if there exists an initial distribution $\Pr(R_0)$ such that the transducer satisfies Eq. (4) for all $\Pr(Y_{0:t} = y_{0:t} | X_{0:t} = x_{0:t}) \in \mathcal{I}(Y|X)$.

In line with past explorations of transducers (Barnett & Crutchfield, 2015; Boyd et al., 2024; 2018), here we define the stochastic kernel $T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)}$ to be independent of the time-step t . As shown in Figure 3, this means the same operation T is applied repeatedly, making it *mechanistically stationary*.

Rosas et al. (2025) consider time-dependent kernels, such that the relationship between random variables shown in Eq. (3) can change as a function of time. However, App. B shows that mechanistically stationary transducers are just as expressive, capable of realizing any interface that their time-dependent counterparts can produce, given sufficient latent memory. Defined as such, transducers closely align with Hidden Markov Models, which implement stochastic processes (Jurgens & Crutchfield, 2021b). Our first result identifies nonanticipatory interfaces with collections of conditional distributions that can be generated by transducers (see proof in App. C).

Theorem 1. *A collection of conditional distributions of the form $\Pr(Y_{0:t} = y_{0:t} | X_{0:t} = x_{0:t})$ constitutes a causal interface iff it has a transducer presentation.*

This result emphasizes the generality of transducers as a model for environments and agents. As long as these entities respect causality (information flowing from past to future), a transducer can fully capture their behaviour.

3 Networks of composed transducers

As an input-to-output map, transducers can be used as elementary components of more complex circuits. Here, we specifically consider a feedforward circuit.

3.1 Composing two transducers

Two transducers of the form $T = \{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{R}, T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)}\}$ and $U = \{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{S}, U_{s \rightarrow s'}^{(z|xy)}\}$ can be composed as shown in Figure 4, where both the input and output of T are used to drive U and generate the interface $\mathcal{I}[Y|Z|X]$. We formalize this in the next definition.

Definition 3. *The composition of transducers $T = \{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{R}, T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)}\}$ and $U = \{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{S}, U_{s \rightarrow s'}^{(z|xy)}\}$ is a new transducer $V = \{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}, V_{rs \rightarrow r's'}^{(yz|x)}\}$ with input alphabet \mathcal{X} , output alphabet $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$, latent memory alphabet $\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}$, and a stochastic kernel $V_{rs \rightarrow r's'}^{(yz|x)} \equiv U_{s \rightarrow s'}^{(z|xy)} T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)}$ that determines the following probability:*

$$V_{rs \rightarrow r's'}^{(yz|x)} = \Pr(Z_t = z, Y_t = y, R_{t+1} = r', S_{t+1} = s' | X_t = x, R_t = r, S_t = s). \quad (5)$$

For mathematical convenience, we introduce linear operators for the kernel. For transducer T , the kernel has a linear operator on a vector space of the latent memory \mathcal{R} :

$$\hat{T}^{(y|x)} = \sum_{r, r'} T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)} |r'\rangle \langle r|. \quad (6)$$

The bra-ket notation allows us to concisely express row and column vectors in the associated vector space of the latent memory, where $\langle r | r' \rangle = \delta_{r, r'}$. The notation $|v\rangle$ represents a column vector and $\langle v|$ denotes the conjugate transpose. In the appropriate basis, $|r\rangle$ is a column vector with a 1 in the r th row and 0s everywhere else. Using this notation we can state our next result, whose proof is found in App. D.

Proposition 1. *The operator associated to the composition of transducers is the Kronecker product of the linear operators of each transducer:*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}^{(yz|x)} &= \hat{U}^{(z|xy)} \otimes \hat{T}^{(y|x)} \\ &= \sum_{r, r', s, s'} T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)} U_{s \rightarrow s'}^{(z|xy)} |r'\rangle \langle r| \otimes |s'\rangle \langle s|, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

which operates on the joint latent space.

This result makes Def. 3 to inherit the properties of the Kronecker product, which we state next.

Corollary 1. *Transducer composition is associative but not commutative.*




Figure 4: The network in the top left shows the most general way of composing two transducers, T with latent states R , inputs X , and outputs Y , and U with latent states S , inputs XY , and outputs Z . A circuit element that implements this composite transducer is shown on the top right, with time proceeding from left to right. The composite transducer V , when applied in sequence at the bottom, produces the interface from X to YZ .

3.2 Special cases of transducer composition

Using the composite transducer $V = UT$ as the baseline, we see that by restricting dependencies and making the transducers agnostic to certain inputs, we obtain various sub-classes of transducer composition that can be partially ordered by their restrictions (see Figure 5). Some notable examples of these sub-classes include:

- (a) *Series*: If the second transducer U does not depend on the input X of the transducer T , then $\hat{U}^{(z|xy)} = \hat{U}^{(z|y)}$ and the two transducers compose sequentially (while outputting a copy of the outputs of all transducers, in this case U, T).
- (b) *Convergent*: If the first transducer T is input-agnostic, i.e., $\hat{T}^{(y|x)} = \hat{T}^{(y)}$, then information from X and Y converges to produce Z .
- (c) *Parallel*: If the second transducer U is agnostic of input Y , i.e., $\hat{U}^{(z|xy)} = \hat{U}^{(z|x)}$, then information from X diverges to produce Y and Z in parallel.

Note that in the figures of one transducer or two composed transducers, the outputs Y and Z were conditional on the input X , meaning that the composed transducers generate the conditional distribution $\Pr(YZ|X)$. However, this is functionally equivalent to considering X as the result of a memoryless IID input-agnostic transducer.

3.3 Transducer networks

Let us now use Def. 3 to build transducers networks. Consider a collection of N transducers $\{T(n)\}_{n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}}$, whose respective latent memory alphabets are denoted by $\mathcal{R}(n)$ and their observable alphabets by $\mathcal{X}(n)$. Since outputs flow through the network, these variables may function as both inputs and outputs of the transducers, depending on the context. For simplicity, here we focus on networks without loops, leaving the treatment of feedback for future work.




Figure 5: Lattice of sub-classes of transducer composition, ordered according to the number of restrictions they consider. Pruning edges from left to right corresponds to limiting dependencies on the inputs — these limitations are enumerated in conditions 1 through 5. The arrows with dotted lines are labelled with the number of the condition that is necessary to prune each edge. In this lattice, we highlight three notable cases: (a) series, (b) convergent, and (c) parallel composition.

For convention, we assume that the numbering of the transducers is such that it respects their causal ordering, meaning that T_n can only influence $T_{n'}$ if $n' > n$, which guarantees *no feedback* in the system. Thus, we assume that $\mathcal{X}(n)$ serves as both the output of transducer n and part of the input of transducers $n + 1$ onwards. Most generally, the linear operator of a transducer $T(n)$ depends on all previous observable outputs and can be expressed as $\hat{T}(n)^{(x(n)|x(0:n))}$ where $x(0 : n) \equiv \{x(0), \dots, x(n-1)\}$. These assumptions lead to the next, which is a direct consequence of [Prop. 1](#).

Proposition 2. *Under the above conditions, the resulting joint transducer operator of the composition of N transducers $\otimes_{n=0}^{N-1} T_n$ is given by*

$$\hat{T}^{(x(0:N))}(0 : N) = \bigotimes_{n=0}^{N-1} \hat{T}(n)^{(x(n)|x(0:n))}, \quad (8)$$

where \bigotimes denotes the Kronecker product.

The condition of having no feedback in the dependency of transducers means that information proceeds from one layer of the network system to the next, and the interdependency can be expressed as a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG), as shown in [Figure 6](#). Graphically, the network representation of a composition of multiple transducers consists of a set of nodes n , each labelled $\frac{X(n)}{R(n)}$, where $X(n)$ is the random variable for the output process of node n , and $R(n)$ is the latent memory process. If the transducer at node n has a directed edge to the transducer at node n' , it implies that transducer n' depends on $T(n)$'s output process $X(n)$. Thus, the arrows from node n determine which latent variables and outputs are affected by the output process $X(n)$. For instance, the [Figure 4](#) shows arrows going from X to $Y|R$ and $Z|S$, meaning that the current outputs Y_t and Z_t and the next latent states R_{t+1} and S_{t+1} are dependent on the current output X_t . This is shown explicitly in the circuit diagram next to the network representation of the composed transducer.




Figure 6: A network of $N + 1$ transducers can be expressed as a single transducer (left), or as a compositional network (middle). In this fully connected composition, we see that the n th transducer, with random variables $\frac{X(n)}{R(n)}$ depends on all prior outputs $X(0 : n) = \{X(0), \dots, X(n - 1)\}$. This composition allows us to examine sparse networks (right), where dependencies are pruned between elements.

As shown in Figure 4, it is also possible for nodes to leave latent variables, which is denoted as $\underline{X(n)}$. This indicates that this node functions as an input to the transducer to which it has arrows.

If a subset of nodes $\mathcal{N}' \subseteq \{0, \dots, N - 1\}$ has directed edges to the node n , that means that the corresponding linear operator has simplified dependencies as follows:

$$\hat{T}(n)^{(x(n)|x(0:n))} = \hat{T}(n)^{(x(n)|x(\mathcal{N}'))}, \quad (9)$$

where $x(\mathcal{N}') \equiv \{x(n')|n' \in \mathcal{N}'\}$. Figure 6 shows an example where the dependencies between nodes are restricted by choosing a subset of all possible antecedent processes. This includes the possibility where there are no antecedent processes, such as for the node $\frac{X(3)}{R(3)}$. This node only creates information and feeds it into the network in Figure 6, but does not receive any information from prior nodes. Such a node without antecedents can be conditioned out, and used as an input process $\underline{X(3)}$.

In summary, using sequences of transducer composition one can build any feed-forward network of transducers. Any set of feedforward dependencies between processes is accessible through this formalism.

3.4 Related work on transducer composition

The study of transducers and their composition has a long history in computational linguistics, based on the key result by Schützenberger (1961b) that the composition of two transducers yields another transducer. In the linguistics literature, transducers are usually assumed to have a finite set of (latent) states and are thus referred to as finite-state transducers (FSTs). The transitions between states are weighted by elements from a semiring, and need not be stochastic. One basic form of composition of FSTs is *parallel composition*, where two FSTs transducing distinct input processes to output processes are combined into a single larger FST (Reape & Thompson, 1988; Mohri, 1997). When the output set of one FST is equal to the input set of another, the two can also be composed *in series*




Figure 7: We can shift between two equivalent viewpoints: one which is conditional on inputs \underline{X} , and one which addresses the joint process.

by piping the output of the first to the input of the second, while the output of the second becomes the output of the resulting composed transducer (Mohri et al., 2002). Note that this is an extension of the classic algorithm for intersecting finite state automata (FSTs without outputs) as described by Hopcroft & Ullman (1979). A third form of transducer composition that relates closely to ours appears in the context of algebraic automata theory in the form of *cascade products* of FSTs (Maler, 2010; 1993), where the output of the first transducer is its latent state, and the input of the second is the combination of the input and output of the first. This type of composition is commonly used in the decomposition of finite state automata (Krohn & Rhodes, 1965; Eilenberg & Tilson, 1976; Maler, 1993).

Our formulation of transducer composition generalizes the aforementioned types of composition, meaning each of them can be embedded in ours (see App. E). Furthermore, our definition of transducers does not require the number of states to be finite, whereas we impose that the transitions are stochastic (see Def. 2).

4 Decomposing transducers through factorization

We now investigate under what conditions the composition of transducers, as established by Def. 3, can be inverted. We call the process of inverting composition *factorization*, because it results in expressing the original transducer as a product of “prime” components.

In the following, we first explore the problem of transducer factorisation in scenarios where latent processes are known (Sec. 4.1), and then address the question of how to do this in situations where latents are not accessible (Sec. 4.2).

4.1 Factoring with latents

Our starting point for this procedure is a collection of random variables with no predefined causal ordering. Instead, we just consider random variables categorised into two classes: observable variables, indexed by the set \mathcal{I} , and latent variables, indexed by the set \mathcal{I}' . Hence, each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ has a corresponding observable random variable $X(i)$, and each $i' \in \mathcal{I}'$ has a corresponding latent random variable $R(i')$. The overall process is represented by a single node $\frac{X(\mathcal{I})}{R(\mathcal{I}')}$, where $X(\mathcal{I}) = \{X(i)|i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ and $R(\mathcal{I}') = \{R(i')|i' \in \mathcal{I}'\}$. The goal will be to cluster subsets of \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{I}' into smaller nodes, which will correspond to elementary transducers. This can be done using our understanding of the statistics of single transducers, as explained next.

4.1.1 Identifying transduction via intransducibility

Consider the random variables for an input process X , latent memory process R , and output process Y . Given the distribution $\Pr(X, Y, R)$ over these variables, we now wish to know whether this represents the operation of a transducer. As shown in Figure 7, while we started talking about




Figure 8: Two illustrations of a transducer: An unravalled transducer (a) shows individual inputs X_t , outputs Y_t , and latent states R_t unravalled into a semi-infinite sequence. The same object can be condensed (b) into a mapping from input pasts \overleftarrow{X}_t , input futures \overrightarrow{X}_t , and latent state pasts \overleftarrow{R}_t to output pasts \overleftarrow{Y}_t , output futures \overrightarrow{Y}_t , latent state futures \overrightarrow{R}_t via the present latent state R_t .

conditional processes that depend on unspecified input sequences, there is an equivalence with the joint distribution when driven by a known input distribution. [Rosas et al. \(2025\)](#) established that this distribution represents the operation of a transducer iff the following equality holds for all times t :

$$I[\overrightarrow{R}_{t+1}, \overrightarrow{Y}_t; \overleftarrow{Y}_t, \overleftarrow{R}_t, \overleftarrow{X}_t | \overrightarrow{X}_t, R_t] = 0. \quad (10)$$

As shown in [Figure 8](#), the present latent state R_t of a transducer shields the future of the latent states \overrightarrow{R}_{t+1} , and outputs \overrightarrow{Y}_t , from the past $\overleftarrow{Y}_t, \overleftarrow{X}_t, \overleftarrow{R}_t$, when you condition on future inputs \overrightarrow{X}_t . Conditioning on the input future is necessary, because information can be carried between the input past and input future outside of the latent memory of the transducer. This measure allows us to determine the causal influence of the processes on each other.

We now wish to answer the question, given a joint distribution over processes $\Pr(X, Y, R)$, can X be interpreted as the input of a transducer with latent states R and outputs Y ? Our shorthand notation for the answer to this question is as follows:

- X **can** be transduced to Y via R : $X \Rightarrow Y | R$.
- X **cannot** be transduced to Y via R : $X \not\Rightarrow Y | R$.

We introduce a measure that is the sum of the mutual information for each time step:

Definition 4. The *Intransducibility* of a joint distribution over processes $\Pr(X, Y, R)$ is

$$f(X \Rightarrow Y | R) \equiv \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} I[\overrightarrow{R}_{t+1}, \overrightarrow{Y}_t; \overleftarrow{Y}_t, \overleftarrow{R}_t, \overleftarrow{X}_t | \overrightarrow{X}_t, R_t]. \quad (11)$$

Informally, intransducibility is large when the joint process (X, Y, R) behaves in a way that cannot be implemented by any causal transducer with latent state R : even after conditioning on the present latent state and future inputs, the future latent states and outputs still reveal extra information about the past. This leads to a measure that allows us to determine the causal influence between variables in a network from the statistics of the observed and latent variables

Lemma 1. X can be transduced to Y via R ($X \Rightarrow Y | R$) iff the Intransducibility is zero ($f(X \Rightarrow Y | R) = 0$).

Proof. Since each term is non-negative, the Intransducibility is only zero when all terms are zero. Thus, the condition for the distribution $\Pr(X, Y, R)$ to be consistent with a transducer that transforms X to Y with latent state R is met. In the reverse direction, if we assume the distribution is generated by a transducer, each term of the measure is zero, so the measure is zero overall. \square

4.1.2 Factoring high-dimensional processes with latents

Let us consider a general high-dimensional process, which is described via a collection of observed processes $X(\mathcal{J}) = \{X(j)\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ and latent state processes $R(\mathcal{J}') = \{R(j)\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}'}$. Our starting point is the joint probability distribution $\Pr(X(\mathcal{J}), R(\mathcal{J}'))$, which is accessible either through an analytical model or sufficient data to estimate mutual informations over time. \mathcal{J} and \mathcal{J}' are finite sets that index the observable and latent processes, respectively. Each element $X(j)$ is the random variable for a probability distribution over observable words, like the data one may take from outputs of a transformer, and each $R(j)$ is the random variable for a probability distribution over latent words, like the residual stream of the same transformer. One might imagine that a larger environment is composed of many such transformers, feeding into each other, and our task is to determine how information flows between these different elements of this complex world. The algorithm described here provides a strategy for determining this network of dependencies, paralleling factoring a large integer into primes. In this process, the measure of Intransducibility we introduced in the last section functions like the remainder of a division operation, indicating how far we are from an exact product of terms. The result of the factorization algorithm will be an ordered set of nodes, each labeled with a subset of the observable processes and a (possibly null) subset of the latent processes. The ordering of the nodes is a viable causal ordering of the processes.

In factorizing a joint process $\Pr(X(\mathcal{J}), R(\mathcal{J}'))$ of observables and latents, it is useful to define prime processes, which cannot be decomposed. For subsets of the observable and latent spaces, $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ and $\mathcal{O}' \subseteq \mathcal{J}'$ respectively, we can use the Intransducibility to determine whether the subset of observable processes $X(\mathcal{J} - \mathcal{O})$ can be interpreted as the input for a transducer that outputs $X(\mathcal{O})$ with latent memory $R(\mathcal{O}')$, meaning $X(\mathcal{J} - \mathcal{O}) \Rightarrow X(\mathcal{O})|R(\mathcal{O}')$.

Definition 5. The joint set of observables and latents $(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{J}')$ is **prime** if there does not exist a pair of subsets $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ and $\mathcal{O}' \subseteq \mathcal{J}'$ such that the observable subset is nonempty $\mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$ and $X(\mathcal{J} - \mathcal{O}) \Rightarrow X(\mathcal{O})|R(\mathcal{O}')$.

Figure 9 shows a recursive process that decomposes a large transducer into smaller prime elements, and Algorithm 1 provides the pseudocode². The input to the algorithm is the joint process over observables and latents $\Pr(X(\mathcal{J}), R(\mathcal{J}'))$, and the sets of observables and latents themselves $(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{J}')$. The output \mathcal{M} is an ordered list of subsets, where the n th element of \mathcal{M} is $(\mathcal{O}(n), \mathcal{O}'(n))$, where $\mathcal{O}(n) \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ and $\mathcal{O}'(n) \subseteq \mathcal{J}'$, and specifies the node $\frac{X(\mathcal{O}(n))}{R(\mathcal{O}'(n))}$ in the dependency graph. By construction, this node can only be directly influenced by the node $\frac{X(\mathcal{O}'(n'))}{R(\mathcal{O}'(n'))}$ if $n' < n$, which reconstructs the ordering that is consistent with our original composition of transducers. The process requires finding the smallest set of observable variables and latent states (characterized by the sets \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{O}') such that the remaining observables (characterized by $\mathcal{J} - \mathcal{O}$) are inputs to the causal channel $X(\mathcal{J} - \mathcal{O}) \Rightarrow X(\mathcal{O})|R(\mathcal{O}')$. If we apply this test recursively, we will discover a feedforward network of dependencies of the transducer. However, this decomposition may not be unique in general, as there may be several smallest sets of variables satisfying the above condition for a given joint process. Thus, depending on how ties are broken in selecting this set, the resulting decompositions may be different.

To illustrate this algorithm with an example, if we are given the data for a transducer $\frac{X(0:N)}{R(0:N)}$ where the elements are composed $\frac{X(n)}{R(n)}$ with $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ in ascending order, applying the algorithm would first identify the last element $\frac{X(N-1)}{R(N-1)}$ as the two smallest sets of random variables that can be transduced from the remaining observables.

²In general, additional assumptions such as a finite horizon, convergence of the infinite series in Equation 11, or stationarity would be required for the algorithms to be computable.




Figure 9: By finding the smallest sets of observables \mathcal{O} and latents \mathcal{O}' such that the remaining observables $\mathcal{J} - \mathcal{O}$ function as the input to a transducer with output $X(\mathcal{O})$ and latents $R(\mathcal{O}')$, we can decompose the transducer network. This provides a factorization of the overall transducer $\frac{X(\mathcal{J})}{R(\mathcal{J})}$.

Algorithm 1: Decomposition via Intransducibility

```

 $P := \Pr(X(\mathcal{J}), R(\mathcal{J}')) ;$ 
 $R_{\text{obs}} := \mathcal{J} ;$ 
 $R_{\text{lat}} := \mathcal{J}' ;$ 
 $\mathcal{M} := \emptyset ;$ 
while  $(R_{\text{obs}}, R_{\text{lat}})$  is not prime do
    Find smallest  $(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}')$  such that  $\mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$  and  $f(X(R_{\text{obs}} - \mathcal{O}) \Rightarrow X(\mathcal{O}) \mid R(\mathcal{O}')) = 0 ;$ 
    (Note: Intransducibility  $f$  is evaluated using the joint process  $P$ ) ;
    Prepend module  $(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}')$  to  $\mathcal{M} ;$ 
     $R_{\text{obs}} := R_{\text{obs}} - \mathcal{O} ;$ 
     $R_{\text{lat}} := R_{\text{lat}} - \mathcal{O}' ;$ 
Prepend  $(R_{\text{obs}}, R_{\text{lat}})$  to  $\mathcal{M} ;$ 
return  $\mathcal{M} ;$ 

```

4.2 Factoring without latents

In the absence of explicit latent variables, we can no longer appeal to Intransducibility directly, but we can still exploit the nonanticipatory constraint to probe causal structure from observables alone. To do so, we now introduce an observable-only diagnostic (Acausality) which quantifies how much an interface deviates from being realizable as a feedforward transducer.

4.2.1 Measuring dependency without latents

When viewing the behavior of an environment, we may not have access to the latent parameters that carry information between inputs and outputs. In this case, it is still possible to determine a causal architecture for the data using the constraints of transduction. As shown in [Theorem 1](#), being non-anticipatory (i.e., an interface) is a necessary and sufficient condition for the joint process $\Pr(X, Y)$ to be describable via the application of a transducer. Therefore, for two processes X and Y , we can introduce a measure which tells us whether X could be the input to a transducer that produces outputs Y , a condition we denote $X \Rightarrow Y$.

We define the *Acausality* of an interface $\mathcal{I}[Y|X]$, which is a measure that allows us to determine the degree to which it violates the non-anticipatory condition.

Definition 6. *The Acausality of an interface $\mathcal{I}[Y|X]$ is the sum over all time steps of the mutual information between past outputs and future inputs conditioned on past inputs*

$$AC[X \Rightarrow Y] = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} I[\vec{Y}_t; \vec{X}_t | \vec{X}_t]. \quad (12)$$

Informally, Acausality is large when past outputs of the interface depend on future inputs, even after conditioning on past inputs. In other words, it quantifies how much the interface “looks like it needs to see the future” to explain its behavior. This measure can be used to determine whether the flow of information can be interpreted as proceeding from X to Y .

Lemma 2. *The interface $\mathcal{I}[Y|X]$ can be expressed as a transducer from X to Y iff the Acausality is zero $AC[X \Rightarrow Y] = 0$.*

Proof. Let us prove in both directions:

- \Rightarrow If $\mathcal{I}[Y|X]$ can be expressed as a transducer, then it is nonanticipatory, and $\Pr(\vec{Y}_t | \vec{X}_t, \vec{X}_t) = \Pr(\vec{Y}_t | \vec{X}_t)$, which further implies that $I[\vec{Y}_t; \vec{X}_t | \vec{X}_t] = 0$ for all t . Therefore, all elements of the sum of the Acausality are zero, and the Acausality is zero.
- \Leftarrow Because conditional mutual information is always greater than zero, $I[A; B|C] \geq 0$, this implies that all elements of the sum of Acausality must be zero

$$I[\vec{Y}_t; \vec{X}_t | \vec{X}_t] = 0 \text{ for all } t. \quad (13)$$

The conditional mutual information $I[A; B|C]$ is zero iff $\Pr(A|BC) = \Pr(A|C)$, so we arrive at the condition for being nonanticipatory $\Pr(\vec{Y}_t | \vec{X}_t, \vec{X}_t) = \Pr(\vec{Y}_t | \vec{X}_t)$. Thus, the interface can be expressed as a transducer from X to Y .

□

The Acausality $AC[X \Rightarrow Y]$ of the interface is zero iff $X \Rightarrow Y$. Therefore, there exists a latent variable R that can transform X into Y . A strong candidate is the set of causal states of the ϵ -transducer (Barnett & Crutchfield, 2015). As before, we can apply this simple measure recursively to determine the dependency between many observed variables.

4.2.2 Factoring high-dimensional processes without latents

The measure of Acausality allows us to build a network of dependencies between random variables $X(\mathcal{J})$, where there is an edge from node j to j' iff $X(j) \Rightarrow X(j')$. Once again, it is useful to define primes in the context of an observable process

Definition 7. *The set of observables \mathcal{J} is **prime** if there does not exist a subset of the observables $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ such that the observable subset is nonempty $\mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$ and $X(\mathcal{J} - \mathcal{O}) \Rightarrow X(\mathcal{O})$.*

The Acausality allows us to factor a process composed of many elements in the same way as before, functioning as the remainder in the “division” operation.

Algorithm 2 shows the general method for discovering such a network given the probabilities $\Pr(X(\mathcal{J}))$ of that set of random variables. It effectively mirrors the strategy when the probability of latent variables $R(\mathcal{J}')$ is also known, but reduces the difficulty of those calculations. Once you have factored the set of observable random variables, inference becomes simpler. Rather than infer the ϵ -transducer from the *whole system*, we can infer the causal structure of subcomponents of the factorized transducer. This is sufficient to reconstruct the overall causal architecture of the whole system.

Algorithm 2: Decomposition via Acausality

```
 $P := \Pr(X(\mathcal{J})) ;$   
 $R_{\text{obs}} := \mathcal{J} ;$   
 $\mathcal{M} := \emptyset ;$   
while  $R_{\text{obs}}$  is not prime do  
  Find smallest  $\mathcal{O}$  such that  $\mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$  and  $AC[X(R_{\text{obs}} - \mathcal{O}) \Rightarrow X(\mathcal{O})] = 0 ;$   
  (Note: Acausality  $AC$  is evaluated using the joint process  $P$ ) ;  
  Prepend module  $\mathcal{O}$  to  $\mathcal{M} ;$   
   $R_{\text{obs}} := R_{\text{obs}} - \mathcal{O} ;$   
Prepend  $R_{\text{obs}}$  to  $\mathcal{M} ;$   
return  $\mathcal{M} ;$ 
```

4.2.3 Relation to causal discovery

Our Acausality-based factorization relates to a broader literature on discovering causal links between subsystems in dynamical processes (Glymour et al., 2019; Nogueira et al., 2022). Time-series causal discovery methods such as PCMCi+ (Runge et al., 2019) estimate directed networks by combining conditional independence tests with graph search, under time-series Markov and faithfulness assumptions. In contrast, we start from a representation of the agent–environment interface and use an information-theoretic notion of Acausality—essentially directed information from future inputs to past outputs—to decide when that interface can be realized as a feedforward transducer and how it factors into composable modules. Our method is capable of detecting non-Markovian dependencies between time series.

Our approach also is complementary to recent information-theoretic causality measures such as SURD (Martínez-Sánchez et al., 2024; Jansma, 2025), which decompose the strength of multi-variable causal influence into unique, redundant, and synergistic contributions: Acausality provides a structural test for when a module can be treated as causally downstream of another, while SURD-style decompositions can, in principle, be applied within each module to analyze the nature of multi-parent influences. Finally, empirical work on compositional neural subspaces in cortex (Tafazoli et al., 2025) suggests that biological agents may realize world-models as compositions of reusable latent subspaces; our results provide a normative framework for such ‘cognitive building blocks’ in terms of composable transducers.

5 Coarse-graining networks of transducers

Decomposition recovers a fine-grained network of interacting transducers whose joint operation generates a high-dimensional observable process. Once this network has been identified, one might well want to operate at a reduced level of description — e.g. eliminating variables that are not relevant for a given predictive or inferential task.

Coarse-graining, in this setting, refers to reducing the state space of the overall transducer by removing nodes entirely: their observable processes and the latent states required to model them. This operation must preserve the marginal interface among the remaining nodes. Thus, coarse-graining is only valid when the nodes being removed can be ‘lumped out’ without altering the conditional distribution governing the surviving observables. This extends the idea of ‘lumpability’ from Markov chains (Kemeny et al., 1969, Ch. 6.3) to multi-transducer networks with both inputs and outputs.

5.1 A multiscale perspective on transducer networks

A network of N transducers may be viewed as a single input-independent transducer with joint latent state $R(0 : N)$, generating the observable process $\Pr(X(0 : N))$ (see Figure 6). From this perspective, different descriptive scales correspond to retaining only a subset of nodes and eliminating the rest while preserving the marginal interface on the nodes we keep.

Consider selecting a contiguous block of nodes composed of the transducers $T(n), T(n+1), \dots, T(n+a-1)$, whose observables $X(n : n+a)$ and latents $R(n : n+a)$ we wish to track explicitly. We call such a block causally adjacent when every node outside it lies entirely upstream or entirely downstream. In this case, all predictive influence from the eliminated nodes reaches the retained block only through its boundary observables, ensuring that those external nodes can be coarse-grained without altering the conditional dynamics of the block.

This viewpoint provides a clean multiscale structure: once a block has been identified, nodes before it may be eliminated by conditioning on their observables, and nodes after it may be eliminated by marginalizing over theirs. These coarse-grainings are consistent because they preserve the marginalized interface. In other words, we can “lump” latent states together as long as they are consistent within this causally adjacent chain. The following subsections detail these two forms of coarse-graining and their role in reducing the state space of the transducer network. This is useful in extrapolating less complex structures from the overall network.




Figure 10: The total transducer network can be simplified from the bottom by conditioning on upstream observables, and from the top by marginalizing downstream observables.

5.1.1 Simplifying from the top

If our objective is to describe the system only up to $X(b-1)$, then all nodes $X(b : N)/R(b : N)$ lie strictly downstream of the region of interest. Their influence on earlier nodes occurs solely through the observable variables we choose not to retain. Thus, we may marginalize over these downstream observables:

$$\mathcal{I}[X(0 : b) | \emptyset] = \sum_{x(b:N)} \Pr(X(0 : b), X(b : N) = x(b : N)). \quad (14)$$

Marginalizing over $X(b : N)$ also removes any dependence on the downstream latent variables $R(b : N)$, whose only predictive role is mediated through the eliminated observables. This yields a reduced transducer representation that exactly preserves the interface on the retained variables.

5.1.2 Simplifying from the bottom

Consider a contiguous block of nodes $X(0 : a)/R(0 : a)$ forming the bottom of the network. Even though individual nodes within the block may have internal dependencies, the block as a whole has no incoming edges from the outside. Therefore, its joint observable trajectory $X(0 : a)$ can be treated as an externally supplied input.

Conditioning on these observables removes any dependence on their latent states:

$$\mathcal{I}[X(a : b)|X(0 : a)] = \frac{\Pr(X(0 : b))}{\Pr(X(0 : a))}. \quad (15)$$

Once the entire block’s upstream observables are fixed, the latent variables $R(0 : a)$ make no further predictive distinctions for downstream nodes. They can therefore be coarse-grained out, yielding an exact reduced complexity representation of the system’s behavior above the block.

5.2 Simplifying sparse networks

In a fully connected network, coarse-graining is only possible at the very top or bottom of the system. Sparse networks, however, contain many internal clusters that can be simplified.

If a group of nodes has no incoming edges from outside, we may condition on its observables and remove its latent states, as in bottom simplification. If it has no outgoing edges, we may marginalize its observables and remove its latents, as in top simplification.

Both operations preserve the marginal interface on the remaining nodes. This provides a framework for lumpability in transducers (Rosas et al., 2024): a cluster may be removed whenever it introduces no additional predictive distinctions for the rest of the network. Sparse dependency structure, therefore, provides many more opportunities to reduce state-space complexity.

5.3 Parallelizable inference

Coarse-graining simplifies the latent space, but parallelizable inference relies only on observable processes. After applying Algorithm 2, the system is decomposed into an ordered set of modules, each with its own interface:

$$\mathcal{I}[X(n)|X(0 : n)]. \quad (16)$$

Because these modules have zero Acausality, each one can be inferred independently from data. This breaks the global modeling task into a set of smaller sub-problems, each corresponding to a different component of the decomposed observable process.

Thus, even without access to latent variables, decomposition yields a complete set of structurally independent pieces. Each can be learned in parallel, providing a direct way to build models from coarse-grained observations while avoiding the complexity of inferring a single high-dimensional latent representation.

6 Decomposing causal states

In previous sections, we showed how nonanticipation and sparsity jointly induce hierarchical decompositions of dynamical processes: first by factoring monolithic interfaces into networks of transducers (Sec. 4), and then by moving up and down these networks to obtain emergent macroscopic levels (Sec. 5). In this section, we apply this approach to decompose minimal predictive representations of a process, known as ϵ -machines and ϵ -transducers. The ϵ -machine (Crutchfield, 2012), a special case of the ϵ -transducer, is a powerful tool for mechanistic interpretability which captures the minimal ‘causal states’ for a process, providing a theoretical prediction for what *should* be stored in the latent states of an optimal predictor (Marzen & Crutchfield, 2017). Recent studies are revealing that

such causal state structures are reconstructed inside the latent space of neural networks (Shai et al., 2025; Piotrowski et al., 2025).

We therefore investigate how the decomposition principles developed earlier act on these canonical representations: when and how can a monolithic minimal representation can be factorized into interacting modules, and what kinds of hierarchies arise from this.

To study this, let us first note that the composition of the two transducers T and U corresponds to the composition of the interface $\mathcal{I}[Z|XY]$ with the interface $\mathcal{I}[Y|X]$ to generate the interface $\mathcal{I}[YZ|X]$. If both T and U are the ϵ -transducers (minimal predictive model) for their respective interfaces, then they are both unifilar (Barnett & Crutchfield, 2015; Rosas et al., 2025). Unifilarity means that the next latent variable is a function of the present latent variable, inputs, and outputs

$$R_{t+1} = \epsilon_T(R_t, Y_t | X_t), \quad (17)$$

$$S_{t+1} = \epsilon_U(S_t, Z_t | X_t, Y_t). \quad (18)$$

Here ϵ_T and ϵ_U are the ϵ -maps for the two transducers T and U respectively, which are the functions that take present inputs, outputs, and latent variables, to the next latent variable. This also implies that the joint transducer is unifilar with the ϵ -map for the composed transducer UT

$$[R_{t+1}, S_{t+1}] = \epsilon_{UT}([R_t, S_t], Y_t, Z_t | X_t) \quad (19)$$

$$= [\epsilon_T(R_t, Y_t | X_t), \epsilon_U(S_t, Z_t | X_t, Y_t)], \quad (20)$$

as well as an ϵ -mapping from histories to states of the composite machine:

$$[R_t, S_t] = \epsilon_{UT}(\overleftarrow{Y}_t, \overleftarrow{Z}_t | \overleftarrow{X}_t) \quad (21)$$

$$= [\epsilon_T(\overleftarrow{Y}_t | \overleftarrow{X}_t), \epsilon_U(\overleftarrow{Z}_t | \overleftarrow{X}_t, \overleftarrow{Y}_t)]. \quad (22)$$

Theorem 2. *The ϵ -transducer of the composite interface $\mathcal{I}[YZ|X]$ of two interfaces $\mathcal{I}[Y|X]$ and $\mathcal{I}[Z|YX]$ is the composition of the ϵ -transducers of those two interfaces.*

Proof. It can be shown that the product ϵ -transducer only distinguishes states when they have different predictions. See App. F for details. Thus, the product ϵ -transducer is both predictive (a function of the past) and minimal, making its states equivalent to the causal states of the composite interface. \square

If the building-block models of a complex graph of interfaces are each minimal predictors, then so too is the composite model. This guarantees closure of minimal predictive transducers under composition, allowing us to build larger interfaces from smaller ones while preserving minimality. This also allows us to consider how we might *decompose* ϵ -transducers as the composition of other ϵ -transducers.

Crucially, transducer factorization provides a principled route to modular causal-state decomposition: it breaks a monolithic belief state into interpretable sub-belief states, each aligned with a particular informational subsystem. This links structural decomposability with semantic interpretability. The causal states of a machine reflect belief states (Rosas et al., 2025). Rather than inferring intractably complex belief states from high-dimensional data in a large environment, we can leverage its natural modularity to localize causal structure within subcomponents, substantially accelerating computation. This creates a bridge between structural transparency and computational efficiency, with direct implications for AI safety and interpretability. By making inference tractable and modular, factored transducers open the door to scalable, mechanistically grounded world models.

7 Discussion

We have developed a framework for composing, decomposing, and coarse-graining transducers that treats world models as modular input-output machines rather than opaque monoliths. Starting from

the notion of interfaces and their realization as transducers, we showed how layered structures of stochastic dynamics can be represented algebraically and combined into larger feedforward networks. Building on a long line of work on transducer and automata composition (Schützenberger, 1961a; Hopcroft & Ullman, 1979; Mohri, 1997; Mohri et al., 2002), our composition is formulated both in terms of stochastic kernels and their associated linear operators, and can be used to ensure that complex world models formed by stacking and wiring simpler components are still describable as a single higher-level transducer. This gives a principled way to move between ‘micro’ and ‘macro’ views of an environment (Rosas et al., 2024), treating networks of mechanisms and their aggregate behaviour within one unified formalism.

The central contribution of this work is to highlight conditions under which a large transducer can be factored into a network of simpler sub-transducers, following similar approaches specialised in deterministic automata (Krohn & Rhodes, 1965; Eilenberg & Tilson, 1976; Maler, 2010; Egri-Nagy & Nehaniv, 2005). That said, it is important to note that our results do not factor a single process into prime processes — as e.g. the Krohn-Rhodes decomposition (Krohn & Rhodes, 1965) does for semigroups (see (Maler, 1993) for probabilistic extensions). Instead, our results decompose multiple processes according to their causal dependencies, being closer to the causal graph discovery literature (Glymour et al., 2019; Nogueira et al., 2022). Using novel information-theoretic quantities — Intransducibility when latents are available, and Acausality when they are not — we provide tests for when a subset of variables can be treated as the output of a causal module driven by the rest. These conditions lead to decomposition algorithms that ‘peel off’ modules one by one, yielding a directed acyclic graph that captures a causal architecture implicit in the joint process.

Using these methods, we show how a seemingly entangled world model can — when it obeys appropriate conditional independence constraints — be rewritten as a composition of prime transducers, each associated with a distinct functional subsystem. This structural decomposition is not only conceptually clarifying but also computationally useful. Once a process has been factored into an ordered set of modules, learning and inference can proceed locally within each sub-transducer conditioned on the upstream modules that influence it. Instead of inferring a single huge latent state space, we can learn smaller modules, each with its own belief dynamics, and then compose them. This creates natural opportunities for parallelizable inference and training (Guestin et al., 2003) — provided that the factorization captures genuine conditional independence rather than merely approximate separation.

We also showed how these ideas interact with coarse-graining and minimal predictive models. Sequences of causally adjacent transducers can be grouped into larger effective units without violating the feedforward structure, enabling multiscale descriptions that range from fine-grained micro-dynamics to high-level macro-modules. When each component is represented by its ϵ -transducer, we proved that composition preserves minimality: the product of minimal predictors is itself the minimal predictor of the composed interface. This result connects our structural factorization to the emerging literature on belief states and geometric causal structure in neural networks, suggesting that the belief states of AI systems may themselves be decomposable into interacting belief subspaces, rather than taking place in a monolithic high-dimensional latent space.

There are, however, several important limitations. First, computing Intransducibility or Acausality requires access to joint distributions over long histories (Jurgens & Crutchfield, 2021a; Marzen & Crutchfield, 2016), which can make it intractable. In practice one may only need finite-horizon, low-order, or variational approximations, together with statistical tests that distinguish genuine structure from sampling noise (Fiderer et al., 2025; Rosas et al., 2025). Second, we have restricted attention to feedforward, mechanistically stationary transducers, whereas many realistic agent–environment systems involve feedback, non-stationarity, and adaptation (Beer, 1995; Zhu et al., 2022). Extending our results to such settings — while preserving a useful notion of modularity — remains an open challenge. Third, we have focused on formal properties and did not include empirical case studies; validating these ideas on trained world models, reinforcement learning environments, and large neural networks is a priority for future work.

Despite these caveats, we believe the framework developed here offers a promising route toward structurally transparent and computationally efficient world models. By treating environments and agents as composable, decomposable transducers, we gain a language in which to design, analyse, and interrogate complex AI systems. For safety and alignment, this provides a way to link mechanistic interpretability — through causal states and belief dynamics — to the modular organization of the broader agent-environment loop. Ultimately, our hope is that tools of this kind will help support AI systems whose internal structure is not only powerful and data-efficient, but also intelligible, auditable, and amenable to principled control.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Artemy Kolchinsky, Daniel Polani, Paul Riechers, Adam Shai, and Lucas Teixeira for insightful discussions that helped to shape this work. The work of A.B. and F.R. was supported by the UK ARIA Safeguarded AI programme. The work of F.R. was also supported by the PIBBSS Affiliateship programme and by Open Philanthropy. The work of D.H. was supported by a UKRI AI World Leading Researcher Fellowship (grant number EP/W002949/1) awarded to Michael Wooldridge. M.B. was supported by JST, Moonshot R&D, Grant Number JPMJMS2012.

References

- OpenAI: Marcin Andrychowicz, Bowen Baker, Maciek Chociej, Rafal Jozefowicz, Bob McGrew, Jakub Pachocki, Arthur Petron, Matthias Plappert, Glenn Powell, Alex Ray, et al. Learning dexterous in-hand manipulation. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 39(1):3–20, 2020.
- Junyeob Baek, Yi-Fu Wu, Gautam Singh, and Sungjin Ahn. Dreamweaver: Learning compositional world representations from pixels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.14174*, 2025.
- Nix Barnett and James Crutchfield. Computational mechanics of input–output processes: Structured transformations and the ϵ -transducer. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 161(2):404–451, 2015.
- Randall D Beer. A dynamical systems perspective on agent-environment interaction. *Artificial intelligence*, 72(1-2):173–215, 1995.
- Yoshua Bengio, Sören Mindermann, Daniel Privitera, Tamay Besiroglu, Rishi Bommasani, Stephen Casper, Yejin Choi, Danielle Goldfarb, Hoda Heidari, Leila Khalatbari, et al. International scientific report on the safety of advanced ai (interim report). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05282*, 2024.
- Christopher Berner, Greg Brockman, Brooke Chan, Vicki Cheung, Przemysław Dębiak, Christy Dennison, David Farhi, Quirin Fischer, Shariq Hashme, Chris Hesse, et al. Dota 2 with large scale deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.06680*, 2019.
- Alexander Boyd, Dibyendu Mandal, and James Crutchfield. Thermodynamics of modularity: Structural costs beyond the landauer bound. *Physical Review X*, 8(3):031036, 2018.
- Alexander B Boyd, Dibyendu Mandal, and James P Crutchfield. Identifying functional thermodynamics in autonomous maxwellian ratchets. *New Journal of Physics*, 18(2):023049, 2016.
- Alexander B Boyd, James P Crutchfield, Mile Gu, and Felix C Binder. Thermodynamic overfitting and generalization: Energetic limits on predictive complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16995*, 2024.
- Jake Bruce, Michael D Dennis, Ashley Edwards, Jack Parker-Holder, Yuge Shi, Edward Hughes, Matthew Lai, Aditi Mavalankar, Richie Steigerwald, Chris Apps, et al. Genie: Generative interactive environments. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.

-
- Gunnar Carlsson and Jun Yu. A prime decomposition of probabilistic automata. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.01502*, 2015.
- James Crutchfield. Between order and chaos. *Nature Physics*, 8(1):17–24, 2012.
- James Crutchfield and Karl Young. Inferring statistical complexity. *Physical review letters*, 63(2):105, 1989.
- David Dalrymple, Joar Skalse, Yoshua Bengio, Stuart Russell, Max Tegmark, Sanjit Seshia, Steve Omohundro, Christian Szegedy, Ben Goldhaber, Nora Ammann, et al. Towards guaranteed safe AI: A framework for ensuring robust and reliable ai systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.06624*, 2024.
- Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez, Javier Del Ser, Mark Coeckelbergh, Marcos López de Prado, Enrique Herrera-Viedma, and Francisco Herrera. Connecting the dots in trustworthy artificial intelligence: From AI principles, ethics, and key requirements to responsible AI systems and regulation. *Information Fusion*, 99:101896, 2023.
- Jingtao Ding, Yunke Zhang, Yu Shang, Yuheng Zhang, Zefang Zong, Jie Feng, Yuan Yuan, Hongyuan Su, Nian Li, Nicholas Sukiennik, et al. Understanding world or predicting future? a comprehensive survey of world models. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 58(3):1–38, 2025.
- Attila Egri-Nagy and Chrystopher L. Nehaniv. Algebraic hierarchical decomposition of finite state automata: Comparison of implementations for krohn-rhodes theory. In Michael Domaratzki, Alexander Okhotin, Kai Salomaa, and Sheng Yu (eds.), *Implementation and Application of Automata*, pp. 315–316, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-30500-2.
- S. Eilenberg and B. Tilson. *Automata, Languages, and Machines*. Pure and Applied Mathematics. Academic Press, 1976. ISBN 9780080873756.
- Fan Feng and Sara Magliacane. Learning dynamic attribute-factored world models for efficient multi-object reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:19117–19144, 2023.
- Lukas J Fiderer, Paul C Barth, Isaac D Smith, and Hans J Briegel. The work capacity of channels with memory: Maximum extractable work in percept-action loops. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.06209*, 2025.
- Claire Glanois, Paul Weng, Matthieu Zimmer, Dong Li, Tianpei Yang, Jianye Hao, and Wulong Liu. A survey on interpretable reinforcement learning. *Machine Learning*, 113(8):5847–5890, 2024.
- Clark Glymour, Kun Zhang, and Peter Spirtes. Review of causal discovery methods based on graphical models. *Frontiers in genetics*, 10:524, 2019.
- Anirudh Goyal, Alex Lamb, Jordan Hoffmann, Shagun Sodhani, Sergey Levine, Yoshua Bengio, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Recurrent independent mechanisms. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Carlos Guestrin, Daphne Koller, Ronald Parr, and Shobha Venkataraman. Efficient solution algorithms for factored mdps. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 19:399–468, 2003.
- Danijar Hafner, Timothy Lillicrap, Jimmy Ba, and Mohammad Norouzi. Dream to control: Learning behaviors by latent imagination. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR’20)*, 2020.
- Danijar Hafner, Wilson Yan, and Timothy Lillicrap. Training agents inside of scalable world models, 2025.

-
- Nicklas Hansen, Hao Su, and Xiaolong Wang. TD-MPC2: Scalable, robust world models for continuous control. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR'24)*, 2024.
- John Hopcroft and Jeffrey Ullman. *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA, 1979.
- Abel Jansma. Decomposing interventional causality into synergistic, redundant, and unique components. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.11447*, 2025.
- Alexandra M Jurgens and James P Crutchfield. Divergent predictive states: The statistical complexity dimension of stationary, ergodic hidden markov processes. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 31(8), 2021a.
- Alexandra M Jurgens and James P Crutchfield. Shannon entropy rate of hidden markov processes. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 183(2):32, 2021b.
- Leslie Pack Kaelbling, Michael Littman, and Anthony Cassandra. Planning and acting in partially observable stochastic domains. *Artificial intelligence*, 101(1-2):99–134, 1998.
- John G Kemeny, J Laurie Snell, et al. *Finite markov chains*, volume 26. van Nostrand Princeton, NJ, 1969.
- Kenneth Krohn and John Rhodes. Algebraic theory of machines. i. prime decomposition theorem for finite semigroups and machines. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 116: 450–464, 1965. ISSN 00029947, 10886850.
- Yuren Liu, Biwei Huang, Zhengmao Zhu, Honglong Tian, Mingming Gong, Yang Yu, and Kun Zhang. Learning world models with identifiable factorization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:31831–31864, 2023.
- Oded Maler. A decomposition theorem for probabilistic transition systems. In *Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, pp. 323–332. Springer, 1993.
- Oded Maler. *On the Krohn-Rhodes cascaded decomposition theorem*, pp. 260–278. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. ISBN 3642137539.
- Dibyendu Mandal and Christopher Jarzynski. Work and information processing in a solvable model of maxwell’s demon. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(29):11641–11645, 2012.
- Álvaro Martínez-Sánchez, Gonzalo Arranz, and Adrián Lozano-Durán. Decomposing causality into its synergistic, unique, and redundant components. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):9296, 2024.
- Sarah E Marzen and James P Crutchfield. Predictive rate-distortion for infinite-order markov processes. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 163:1312–1338, 2016.
- Sarah E Marzen and James P Crutchfield. Nearly maximally predictive features and their dimensions. *Physical Review E*, 95(5):051301, 2017.
- Mehryar Mohri. Finite-state transducers in language and speech processing. *Computational Linguistics*, 23(2):269–311, 1997.
- Mehryar Mohri, Fernando Pereira, and Michael Riley. Weighted finite-state transducers in speech recognition. *Computer Speech & Language*, 16(1):69–88, 2002.
- Malte Mosbach, Jan Niklas Ewertz, Angel Villar-Corrales, and Sven Behnke. SOLD: Slot object-centric latent dynamics models for relational manipulation learning from pixels. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 267, pp. 44911–44935, 2025.

-
- Ana Rita Nogueira, Andrea Pugnana, Salvatore Ruggieri, Dino Pedreschi, and João Gama. Methods and tools for causal discovery and causal inference. *Wiley interdisciplinary reviews: data mining and knowledge discovery*, 12(2):e1449, 2022.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35: 27730–27744, 2022.
- Mateusz Piotrowski, Paul M Riechers, Daniel Filan, and Adam S Shai. Constrained belief updates explain geometric structures in transformer representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.01954*, 2025.
- Aravind Rajeswaran, Vikash Kumar, Abhishek Gupta, Giulia Vezzani, John Schulman, Emanuel Todorov, and Sergey Levine. Learning complex dexterous manipulation with deep reinforcement learning and demonstrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.10087*, 2017.
- Mike Reape and Henry Thompson. Parallel intersection and serial composition of finite state transducers. In *Coling Budapest 1988 Volume 2: International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 1988.
- Rafael Rodriguez-Sanchez, Cameron Allen, and George Konidaris. From pixels to factors: Learning independently controllable state variables for reinforcement learning, 2025.
- Fernando Rosas, Alexander Boyd, and Manuel Baltieri. Ai in a vat: Fundamental limits of efficient world modelling for safe agent sandboxing. In *Reinforcement Learning Conference*, 2025.
- Fernando E Rosas, Bernhard C Geiger, Andrea I Luppi, Anil K Seth, Daniel Polani, Michael Gastpar, and Pedro AM Mediano. Software in the natural world: A computational approach to hierarchical emergence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09090*, 2024.
- Jakob Runge, Peer Nowack, Marlene Kretschmer, Seth Flaxman, and Dino Sejdinovic. Detecting and quantifying causal associations in large nonlinear time series datasets. *Science advances*, 5(11):eaau4996, 2019.
- Marcel P Schützenberger. *A remark on finite transducers*. Mathematical Sciences Directorate, Air Force Office of Scientific Research, 1961a.
- M.P. Schützenberger. A remark on finite transducers. *Information and Control*, 4(2):185–196, 1961b. ISSN 0019-9958. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958\(61\)80006-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(61)80006-5).
- Adam Shai, Lucas Teixeira, Alexander Oldenziel, Sarah Marzen, and Paul Riechers. Transformers represent belief state geometry in their residual stream. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:75012–75034, 2025.
- Cosma Shalizi and James Crutchfield. Computational mechanics: Pattern and prediction, structure and simplicity. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 104(3-4):817–879, 2001.
- Richard S. Sutton and Andrew G. Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1998.
- Sina Tafazoli, Flora M Bouchacourt, Adel Ardalani, Nikola T Markov, Motoaki Uchimura, Marcelo G Mattar, Nathaniel D Daw, and Timothy J Buschman. Building compositional tasks with shared neural subspaces. *Nature*, 2025. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-025-09805-2.
- Xiangru Tang, Qiao Jin, Kunlun Zhu, Tongxin Yuan, Yichi Zhang, Wangchunshu Zhou, Meng Qu, Yilun Zhao, Jian Tang, Zhuosheng Zhang, et al. Prioritizing safeguarding over autonomy: Risks of llm agents for science. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Large Language Model (LLM) Agents*, 2024.

-
- Linfeng Zhao, Lingzhi Kong, Robin Walters, and Lawson LS Wong. Toward compositional generalization in object-oriented world modeling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 26841–26864. PMLR, 2022.
- Jin Zhu, Yutong Wei, Yu Kang, Xiaofeng Jiang, and Geir E Dullerud. Adaptive deep reinforcement learning for non-stationary environments. *Science China Information Sciences*, 65(10):202204, 2022.

Supplementary Materials

The following content was not necessarily subject to peer review.

A Feedback interfaces

In the context of a perception-action loop linking an agent and an environment, the environment can be thought of as a system that stochastically turns action sequences $x_{0:t} = x_0 \cdots x_{t-1}$ into observation sequences $y_{0:t} = y_0 \cdots y_{t-1}$ for any time length t . Similarly, the agent does the same by stochastically transforming observation sequences into action sequences. The action sequence is the agent’s output and the environment’s input, while the observation sequence is the agent’s input and the environment’s output. Both agent and environment are specified by an interface \mathcal{I} (Rosas et al., 2025), which produces an output process for each input sequence (Fiderer et al., 2025)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_E(y_{0:t}|x_{0:t}) &= \Pr(Y_{0:t} = y_{0:t}|X_{0:t} = x_{0:t}) \\ \mathcal{I}_A(x_{0:t}|y_{0:t}) &= \Pr(X_{0:t} = x_{0:t}|Y_{0:t} = y_{0:t}).\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

Here, the capital variables represent random variables while the lowercase represent specific realizations. Together, they produce the joint probability of an action-observation sequence in the perception-action loop (Fiderer et al., 2025):

$$\Pr(X_{0:t} = x_{0:t}, Y_{0:t} = y_{0:t}) = \mathcal{I}_E(y_{0:t}|x_{0:t})\mathcal{I}_A(x_{0:t}|y_{0:t}).\tag{24}$$

While it may appear that this equality does not obey Bayes’ rule, it can be derived using the causal architecture of an interface and the fact that it can be described via a transducer. Let us say that the environment is given by a kernel $e(y, r'|x, r) = \Pr(Y_t = y, R_{t+1} = r'|X_t = x, R_t = r)$, and the kernel of the agent is given by $a(x, s'|y, s) = \Pr(X_{t+1} = x, S_{t+1} = s'|Y_t = y, S_t = s)$, where S_t is the latent of the agent and R_t is the latent of the environment. From this, we can determine the joint distribution of the perception-action loop through recursive operation

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(X_{0:t} = x_{0:t}, Y_{0:t} = y_{0:t}) \\ = \sum_{s_{0:t}, r_{0:t+1}} \Pr(X_{0:t} = x_{0:t}, Y_{0:t} = y_{0:t}, R_{0:t+1} = r_{0:t+1}, S_{0:t+1} = s_{0:t+1})\end{aligned}\tag{25}$$

$$= \sum_{s_{0:t}, r_{0:t+1}} \Pr(X_0 = x_0, S_0 = s_0) \Pr(R_0 = r_0) e(y_{t-1}, r_t | x_{t-1}, r_{t-1})\tag{26}$$

$$\times \prod_{i=0}^{t-2} a(x_{i+1}, s_{i+1} | y_i, s_i) e(y_i, r_{i+1} | x_i, r_i)\tag{27}$$

$$= \left(\sum_{s_{0:t}} \Pr(X_0 = x_0, S_0 = s_0) \prod_{i=0}^{t-2} a(x_{i+1}, s_{i+1} | y_i, s_i) \right)\tag{28}$$

$$\times \left(\sum_{r_{0:t+1}} \Pr(R_0 = r_0) \prod_{i=0}^{t-1} e(y_i, r_{i+1} | x_i, r_i) \right)\tag{29}$$

$$= \Pr(X_{0:t} = x_{0:t} | Y_{0:t} = y_{0:t}) \Pr(Y_{0:t} = y_{0:t} | X_{0:t} = x_{0:t})\tag{30}$$

$$= \mathcal{I}_A(x_{0:t}|y_{0:t})\mathcal{I}_E(y_{0:t}|x_{0:t}).\tag{31}$$

The interface characterizes the behavior of the agent or environment, independent of the details of their internal models or other latents. Figure 11 shows how the perception-action loop can be decomposed into distinct interfaces in this way.

Causal interfaces are well-suited to describe environments within perception-action loops, where X_t corresponds to actions that precede observations Y_t . In a feedforward context, the conditional




Figure 11: A perception-action loop (top) operates through the exchange of actions X_t that pass information from agent to environment, and observations Y_t that pass information from the environment to the agent. This interwoven circuit produces a joint process over actions and observations. We can isolate the dynamics of either the agent or the environment, which are both represented by an interface. This is a stochastic circuit from an input sequence to an output sequence.

probabilities in the definition of the interface exactly match observed probabilities $\Pr(Y_{0:t}|X_{0:t})$. However, a perception-action loop involves *feedback*, which can change the associated distributions by allowing past outputs \overleftarrow{Y}_t to influence future inputs \overrightarrow{X}_t *indirectly* through a channel outside the interface in question. Nevertheless, the interface allows us to exactly calculate observed probabilities of the feedback process through a product of the probabilities in the two interacting interfaces as shown above (Fiderer et al., 2025).

In the feedforward case, the conditional probabilities that specify an interface are the same as observed conditional probabilities. The independence of past outputs from future inputs is expressed in terms of distributions induced by a causal interface that satisfy

$$\Pr(\overleftarrow{Y}_t | \overleftarrow{X}_t, \overrightarrow{X}_t) = \Pr(\overleftarrow{Y}_t | \overleftarrow{X}_t). \quad (32)$$

This probabilistic relation will not necessarily hold in a perception-action loop, because feedback from output pasts \overleftarrow{Y}_t can indirectly influence the future inputs \overrightarrow{X}_t . If the non-anticipatory condition isn't satisfied in a feedforward network, then the interface somehow utilizes future inputs before receiving them, violating causality. However, feedback networks can violate this condition, because the output past is processed and returned to the input future.

B Universality of mechanically stationary transducers

Recall that *any* nonanticipatory interface can be generated by a transducer. Let us label the kernel of this transducer $T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)}(t)$ with latent memory space \mathcal{R} . We can construct a mechanically stationary transducer with kernel $T_{m \rightarrow m'}^{(y|x)}$ with a latent memory space \mathcal{M} that is the direct product of the original latent memory space \mathcal{R} and the space of time indices $\mathcal{T} = \{0, 1, \dots\}$. We define the probabilities of this modified transducer via relation to the original kernel:

$$T_{r, t \rightarrow r', t'}^{(y|x)} = T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)}(t) \delta_{t', t+1}. \quad (33)$$

Thus, the probability of following the input/output trajectory $y_{0:t}|x_{0:t}$ is the same

$$\mathcal{I}[y_{0:\tau}|x_{0:\tau}] = \sum_{m_{0:\tau+1}} \Pr(M_0 = m_0) \prod_{i=0}^{\tau-1} T_{m_i \rightarrow m_{i+1}}^{(y_i|x_i)} \quad (34)$$

$$= \sum_{r_{0:\tau+1}, t_{0:\tau+1}} \Pr(R_0 = r_0, T_0 = t_0) \prod_{i=0}^{\tau-1} T_{r_i, t_i \rightarrow r_{i+1}, t_{i+1}}^{(y_i|x_i)} \quad (35)$$

$$\text{assuming the initial time latent memory state is } t_0 = 0 \quad (36)$$

$$= \sum_{r_{0:\tau+1}, t_{0:\tau+1}} \Pr(R_0 = r_0) \delta_{t_0, 0} \prod_{i=0}^{\tau-1} T_{r_i \rightarrow r_{i+1}}^{(y_i|x_i)}(t_i) \delta_{t_{i+1}, t_{i+1}} \quad (37)$$

$$\text{delta function selects out single trajectory } t_{0:\tau} = \{0, \dots, \tau-1\} \quad (38)$$

$$= \sum_{r_{0:\tau+1}} \Pr(R_0 = r_0) \prod_{i=0}^{\tau-1} T_{r_i \rightarrow r_{i+1}}^{(y_i|x_i)}(i). \quad (39)$$

This final line is precisely the expression for the interface that one arrives at from the general transducer. Therefore, the mechanically stationary transducer we design produces the same interface.

C Nonanticipatory transducers

Proof. We have our two properties:

1. $\Pr(Y|X)$ is nonanticipatory, meaning that

$$\Pr(\bar{Y}_t | \bar{X}_t, X_{t:t+dt}) = \Pr(\bar{Y}_t | \bar{X}_t) \quad (40)$$

2. $\Pr(Y|X)$ has a transducer presentation, meaning that there exists a R process such that

$$\Pr(\bar{Y}_{t+1}, \bar{R}_{t+2} | \bar{X}_{t+1}) = \Pr(Y_t, R_{t+1} | X_t, R_t) \Pr(\bar{Y}_t, \bar{R}_{t+1} | \bar{X}_t) \quad (41)$$

- 1. \Rightarrow 2.: Let us decompose the probability of an output given an input

$$\Pr(\bar{Y}_{t+1} | \bar{X}_{t+1}) = \Pr(\bar{Y}_t Y_t | \bar{X}_t X_t) \quad (42)$$

$$= \Pr(Y_t | \bar{Y}_t \bar{X}_t X_t) \Pr(\bar{Y}_t | \bar{X}_t X_t) \quad (43)$$

$$\text{using the nonanticipatory condition} \quad (44)$$

$$= \Pr(Y_t | \bar{Y}_t \bar{X}_t X_t) \Pr(\bar{Y}_t | \bar{X}_t). \quad (45)$$

Thus, we have a recursive relation for building up the interface time-step by time-step as a transducer. We can implement the transducer by simply choosing the latent memory to be a copy of the input-output history $R_t = \bar{X}_t \bar{Y}_t$.

$$\Pr(Y_t, R_{t+1} | X_t, R_t) \Pr(\bar{Y}_t, \bar{R}_{t+1} | \bar{X}_t) = \Pr(Y_t, \bar{X}_{t+1} \bar{Y}_{t+1} | X_t, \bar{X}_t \bar{Y}_t) \Pr(\bar{Y}_t, \bar{X}_t \bar{Y}_t | \bar{X}_t) \quad (46)$$

$$\text{eliminating redundancy using } \Pr(A, B, B | A) = \Pr(B | A) \quad (47)$$

$$= \Pr(Y_t, | X_t, \bar{X}_t \bar{Y}_t) \Pr(\bar{Y}_t | \bar{X}_t) \quad (48)$$

$$= \Pr(\bar{Y}_{t+1} | \bar{X}_{t+1}) \quad (49)$$

$$\text{reintroducing redundancy} \quad (50)$$

$$= \Pr(\bar{Y}_{t+1}, \bar{R}_{t+2} | \bar{X}_{t+1}). \quad (51)$$

Thus, this satisfies the condition of being a transducer.

- 2. \Rightarrow 1. : Let us decompose an expression for the output future and past, and the latent memory R_t that links them, conditioned on the input past and history using the fact that the latent memory partitions past and future

$$\Pr(\overleftarrow{Y}_t, \overrightarrow{Y}_t, R_t | \overleftarrow{X}_t, \overrightarrow{X}_t) = \Pr(\overleftarrow{Y}_t | R_t, \overrightarrow{X}_t) \Pr(\overleftarrow{Y}_t, R_t | \overleftarrow{X}_t). \quad (52)$$

We simply sum to marginalize over the latent memory state R_t and future outputs \overrightarrow{Y}_t to obtain our desired expression for being nonanticipatory

$$\Pr(\overleftarrow{Y}_t | \overleftarrow{X}_t, \overrightarrow{X}_t) = \Pr(\overleftarrow{Y}_t | \overleftarrow{X}_t). \quad (53)$$

□

D Proof of Prop. 1

Proof. The linear operator notation allows us to evaluate the probability of an output sequence given a sequence of inputs via the product of operators:

$$\Pr(Y_{0:L} = y_{0:L} | X_{0:L} = x_{0:L}) = \langle 1 | \hat{T}^{(y_{0:L} | x_{0:L})} | \rho_{R_0} \rangle. \quad (54)$$

Here,

$$\hat{T}^{(y_{0:L} | x_{0:L})} \equiv \prod_{t=0}^{L-1} \hat{T}^{(y_t | x_t)} \quad (55)$$

is the composition of the transducer operators for the particular input-output sequence $y_{0:L} | x_{0:L}$,

$$|1\rangle \equiv \sum_r |r\rangle \quad (56)$$

is the vector of all 1s in the latent memory basis,

$$|\rho_{R_0}\rangle \equiv \sum_r \Pr(R_0 = r) |r\rangle \quad (57)$$

is the vector of initial memory probability. □

E Other types of transducer composition

Here, we formally define common types of weighted transducer composition used in the literature, and discuss how they relate to our definition in Def. 3.

There are two main types of composition of weighted finite state transducers (WFSTs): in parallel and in series (Mohri, 1997; Mohri et al., 2002).

Definition 8 (Parallel composition). *Let $T = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{R}, T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)})$ and $U = (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{S}, U_{s \rightarrow s'}^{(w|z)})$ be transducers. The parallel composition of T and U is a new transducer $V = (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}, V_{rs \rightarrow r's'}^{(yw|rz)})$ with input alphabet $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z}$, output alphabet $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{W}$, and stochastic kernel $V_{rs \rightarrow r's'}^{(yw|rz)} = T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)} U_{s \rightarrow s'}^{(w|z)}$.*

This is case c) from Sec. 3.2, where U is not dependent on the output \mathcal{Y} of T . Note that, in our formulation in Def. 3, both T and U take in the same input, while the parallel composition defined above assumes separate inputs. This can be easily reconciled by taking the single input to both transducers to be $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z})$ and letting T ignore the second argument and U ignore the first argument.

Definition 9 (Serial composition). Let $T = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{R}, T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)})$ and $U = (Y, Z, S, U_{s \rightarrow s'}^{(z|y)})$ be transducers. The serial composition of T and U is a new transducer $V = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}, V_{rs \rightarrow r's'}^{(z|x)})$ with input alphabet X , output alphabet Z , and stochastic kernel $V_{rs \rightarrow r's'}^{(z|x)} = \sum_{y \in Y} T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)} U_{s \rightarrow s'}^{(z|y)}$.

This corresponds to case a) discussed in [Sec. 3.2](#), where U takes only the output of T as its input and ignores the original input \mathcal{X} of T . The combined kernel of the composition then just marginalizes out all the possible intermediate symbols from \mathcal{Y} .

A third type of composition of transducers is the cascade composition. In the literature, this type was originally defined for unweighted transducers or finite semigroups ([Krohn & Rhodes, 1965](#); [Eilenberg & Tilson, 1976](#); [Egri-Nagy & Nehaniv, 2005](#); [Maler, 2010](#)), and has also been extended to stochastic semigroups and automata ([Carlsson & Yu, 2015](#); [Maler, 1993](#)). Here, we give a definition of explicit stochastic transducers.

Definition 10 (Cascade composition). Let $T = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{R}, T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)})$ with $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{R}$, such that $T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)} \neq 0$ only if $y = r$, and let $U = (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{S}, U_{s \rightarrow s'}^{(z|xy)})$. Then the cascade composition of T and U is a new transducer $V = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}, V_{rs \rightarrow r's'}^{(z|x)})$ with $V_{rs \rightarrow r's'}^{(z|x)} = \sum_{y \in Y} T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(y|x)} U_{s \rightarrow s'}^{(z|xy)} = T_{r \rightarrow r'}^{(r|x)} U_{s \rightarrow s'}^{(z|xr)}$.

This is also a special case of our construction, again marginalizing out the intermittent symbols. Because of the special constraint on the kernel that the output of T has to be its state $r \in \mathcal{R}$ before transitioning, there is only one possible intermittent symbol for each transition, eliminating the need to sum over multiple symbols.

F Proving composite causal states

We wish to show that the composite map ϵ_{UT} is the ϵ -map for the interface $\mathcal{I}[YZ|X]$. For this to be true, it must be true that the following conditions are equivalent:

$$\epsilon_{UT}(\overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t | \overleftarrow{x}_t) = \epsilon_{UT}(\overleftarrow{y}'_t, \overleftarrow{z}'_t | \overleftarrow{x}'_t) \quad (58)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \quad (59)$$

$$p(\overrightarrow{y}_t, \overrightarrow{z}_t | \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t) = p(\overrightarrow{y}_t, \overrightarrow{z}_t | \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{y}'_t, \overleftarrow{z}'_t, \overleftarrow{x}'_t) \text{ for all } \overrightarrow{x}, \overrightarrow{y}, \overrightarrow{z}. \quad (60)$$

We can factor the probabilities in the equivalence expression

$$p(\overrightarrow{z}_t, \overrightarrow{y}_t | \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t) = p(\overrightarrow{z}_t | \overrightarrow{y}_t, \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t) p(\overrightarrow{y}_t | \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t), \quad (61)$$

where we use the shorthand notation $p(a|b) = \Pr(A = a | B = b)$. Note that the future of \overrightarrow{y}_t doesn't depend on the past \overleftarrow{z}_t outside of its own past \overleftarrow{y}_t , meaning that

$$p(\overrightarrow{y}_t | \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t) = p(\overrightarrow{y}_t | \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t), \quad (62)$$

and

$$p(\overrightarrow{z}_t, \overrightarrow{y}_t | \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t) = p(\overrightarrow{z}_t | \overrightarrow{y}_t, \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t) p(\overrightarrow{y}_t | \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t). \quad (63)$$

This means that the condition for ϵ_{UT} to be the ϵ -map reduces to

$$\epsilon_{UT}(\overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t | \overleftarrow{x}_t) = \epsilon_{UT}(\overleftarrow{y}'_t, \overleftarrow{z}'_t | \overleftarrow{x}'_t) \quad (64)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \quad (65)$$

$$p(\overrightarrow{z}_t | \overrightarrow{y}_t, \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t) p(\overrightarrow{y}_t | \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t) = p(\overrightarrow{z}_t | \overrightarrow{y}_t, \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}'_t, \overleftarrow{y}'_t, \overleftarrow{x}'_t) p(\overrightarrow{y}_t | \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}'_t, \overleftarrow{y}'_t, \overleftarrow{x}'_t). \quad (66)$$

We break the proof that the composite map is the correct forward and reverse step

-
1. \Rightarrow : If ϵ_{UT} maps two histories \overleftarrow{xyz}_t and \overleftarrow{xyz}'_t to identical causal states, then $\epsilon_T(\overleftarrow{y}|\overleftarrow{x}) = \epsilon_T(\overleftarrow{y}'|\overleftarrow{x}')$ and $\epsilon_U(\overleftarrow{z}|\overleftarrow{y}, \overleftarrow{x}) = \epsilon_U(\overleftarrow{z}'|\overleftarrow{y}', \overleftarrow{x}')$. Furthermore, this implies that

$$p(\overrightarrow{y}_t|\overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t) = p(\overrightarrow{y}_t|\overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{y}'_t, \overleftarrow{x}'_t) \quad (67)$$

$$p(\overrightarrow{z}_t|\overrightarrow{y}_t, \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t) = p(\overrightarrow{z}_t|\overrightarrow{y}_t, \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}'_t, \overleftarrow{y}'_t, \overleftarrow{x}'_t), \quad (68)$$

and therefore by multiplying these equalities together, we arrive at the condition that the future distributions are equivalent

$$p(\overrightarrow{z}_t|\overrightarrow{y}_t, \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t)p(\overrightarrow{y}_t|\overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t) = p(\overrightarrow{z}_t|\overrightarrow{y}_t, \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}'_t, \overleftarrow{y}'_t, \overleftarrow{x}'_t)p(\overrightarrow{y}_t|\overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{y}'_t, \overleftarrow{x}'_t), \quad (69)$$

and equivalence is half-proved.

2. \Leftarrow : We begin with the equality of future distributions and sum over z future to obtain:

$$p(\overrightarrow{y}_t|\overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t) = p(\overrightarrow{y}_t|\overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{y}'_t, \overleftarrow{x}'_t). \quad (70)$$

This implies that $\epsilon_T(\overleftarrow{y}'|\overleftarrow{x}') = \epsilon_T(\overleftarrow{y}|\overleftarrow{x})$, leveraging the assumption that T is the ϵ -transducer for $\mathcal{I}[Y|X]$.

Plugging the equality of y future distribution back into the original equality and factoring out, an equality for the future distribution of z :

$$p(\overrightarrow{z}_t|\overrightarrow{y}_t, \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t, \overleftarrow{x}_t) = p(\overrightarrow{z}_t|\overrightarrow{y}_t, \overrightarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{z}'_t, \overleftarrow{y}'_t, \overleftarrow{x}'_t), \quad (71)$$

meaning that $\epsilon_U(\overleftarrow{z}|\overleftarrow{y}, \overleftarrow{x}) = \epsilon_U(\overleftarrow{z}'|\overleftarrow{y}', \overleftarrow{x}')$, and therefore the causal states are identical $\epsilon_{UT}(\overleftarrow{z}'_t, \overleftarrow{y}'_t|\overleftarrow{x}'_t) = \epsilon_{UT}(\overleftarrow{z}_t, \overleftarrow{y}_t|\overleftarrow{x}_t)$.