

# Complementary Characterization of Agent-Based Models via Computational Mechanics and Diffusion Models

Roberto Garrone  
University of Milano-Bicocca  
roberto.garrone@unimib.it

December 5, 2025

## Abstract

This article extends the preprint *Characterizing Agent-Based Model Dynamics via  $\epsilon$ -Machines and Kolmogorov-Style Complexity* by introducing diffusion models as orthogonal and complementary tools for characterizing the output of agent-based models (ABMs). Where  $\epsilon$ -machines capture the predictive temporal structure and intrinsic computation of ABM-generated time series, diffusion models characterize high-dimensional cross-sectional distributions, learn underlying data manifolds, and enable synthetic generation of plausible population-level outcomes.

We provide a formal analysis demonstrating that the two approaches operate on distinct mathematical domains—processes vs. distributions—and show that their combination yields a two-axis representation of ABM behavior based on temporal organization and distributional geometry. To our knowledge, this is the first framework to integrate computational mechanics with score-based generative modeling for the structural analysis of ABM outputs, thereby situating ABM characterization within the broader landscape of modern machine-learning methods for density estimation and intrinsic computation.

The framework is validated using the same elder-caregiver ABM dataset introduced in the companion paper, and we provide precise definitions and propositions formalizing the mathematical complementarity between  $\epsilon$ -machines and diffusion models. This establishes a principled methodology for jointly analyzing temporal predictability and high-dimensional distributional structure in complex simulation models.

## 1 Introduction

Agent-based models (ABMs) generate complex outputs composed of both temporal trajectories (e.g. agent states evolving over time) and cross-sectional or high-dimensional snapshots (e.g. populations of agents with multivariate attributes). In a companion preprint [4], we analyzed ABM temporal outputs using computational mechanics [2, 18] and  $\epsilon$ -machines [1], demonstrating substantial heterogeneity in intrinsic computation across spatial and socioeconomic variables.

However, ABMs also produce high-dimensional, non-sequential outputs for which  $\epsilon$ -machines are not suitable. Diffusion models—a class of score-based generative models [20, 7, 21, 22]—excel at representing complex, high-dimensional distributions. This manuscript demonstrates that  $\epsilon$ -machines and diffusion models provide two *complementary* and non-overlapping characterizations of ABM output, enabling a two-dimensional representation of model behavior: temporal structure versus distributional geometry. Formally, we distinguish between the process domain, analyzed

via a mapping  $\Phi : P \rightarrow M$ , and the distribution domain, analyzed via a mapping  $\Psi : D \rightarrow G$ , a distinction developed in Section 3.

To our knowledge, this is the first work to integrate computational mechanics and diffusion-based generative modeling into a unified analytic framework for ABM characterization. By treating temporal and distributional structures as distinct informational domains, we introduce a principled methodology for jointly analyzing intrinsic computation and population-level geometry, providing a perspective not available in existing ABM, complexity-science, or machine-learning approaches.

We provide mathematical definitions and propositions to formalize this complementarity, apply the framework to the elder-caregiver ABM introduced in the companion paper [4], and outline a unified methodology for combining the two analytic tools.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 ABM Outputs: Temporal and Distributional Components

Let an ABM generate:

- temporal sequences  $X_{0:T}^{(i)} = (X_0^{(i)}, \dots, X_T^{(i)})$  for agents  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , and
- cross-sectional population snapshots  $Y_t = (Y_{t,1}, \dots, Y_{t,N})$  with each agent represented by a vector  $Y_{t,i} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

These two object types—sequences and population vectors—are governed by fundamentally different statistical structures and therefore require distinct analytic tools.

### 2.2 $\epsilon$ -Machines (Computational Mechanics)

Computational mechanics characterizes a stationary stochastic process by reconstructing the minimal predictive architecture compatible with its observable dynamics. Given a sequence  $\{X_t\}$  generated by an ABM, two pasts  $x_{:t}$  and  $x'_{:t}$  are said to be predictively equivalent when they yield identical conditional distributions over all possible futures:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{t:\infty} \mid X_{:t} = x_{:t}) = \mathbb{P}(X_{t:\infty} \mid X_{:t} = x'_{:t}).$$

Each equivalence class defines a *causal state*, and the resulting collection of causal states, together with the transition structure induced by observed symbol sequences, forms the  $\epsilon$ -machine: the minimal unifilar hidden Markov model that captures the process’s predictive organization. Causal states [2, 18] are defined as equivalence classes:

$$\epsilon(x_{:t}) = \{x'_{:t} : P(X_{t:\infty} \mid x'_{:t}) = P(X_{t:\infty} \mid x_{:t})\}.$$

Three standard informational quantities summarize the structure encoded in the  $\epsilon$ -machine. *Entropy rate*  $h_\mu$  measures the average unpredictability per symbol. *Statistical complexity*  $C_\mu$  is the Shannon entropy of the causal-state distribution, quantifying how much information the process stores in order to make predictions. *Excess entropy*  $E$  is the mutual information between past and future and measures the total predictable structure in the process. Together, these invariants characterize how a system generates, stores, and transmits information through time.

In ABM settings, causal states often correspond to recurrent behavioral regimes, coordination cycles, or other emergent patterns generated by agent interactions. Unlike scalar measures of variability, the  $\epsilon$ -machine reveals the architecture of information flow—how past configurations

constrain future evolution. This makes it particularly suitable for analyzing adaptive or path-dependent dynamics, where regularities coexist with stochastic fluctuations.

Accordingly,  $\epsilon$ -machine reconstruction operates within the process domain  $P$  introduced in Section 3 and is formally realized through the mapping  $\Phi : P \rightarrow M$ , which assigns to each stationary stochastic process its minimal unifilar predictive model. This reconstruction is applied to symbolized representations of agent trajectories, obtained through discretization schemes appropriate to the underlying observables, and the associated methodological steps—including discretization, history clustering, and BIC-based Markov-order selection—follow the framework detailed in our companion preprint [4]. Whereas  $\Phi$  characterizes *conditional* structure by quantifying how past configurations constrain future evolution, the next subsection introduces diffusion models and the mapping  $\Psi : D \rightarrow G$ , which instead characterize the geometry and multimodality of *unconditional* distributions arising from ABM outputs. These two mappings therefore anchor the temporal and distributional components of the analytic framework developed below.

### 2.3 Diffusion Models

Whereas  $\epsilon$ -machines summarize process-level temporal organization, diffusion models operate on distributions without temporal ordering, learning a generative representation of the marginal geometry of ABM outputs. Indeed, diffusion models learn a probability distribution  $p(y)$  over high-dimensional observations by defining a forward noising process  $q(y_t | y_0)$  and learning a reverse denoising process parameterized by a score function  $s_\theta(y_t, t)$ . They were introduced in the physics-inspired formulation of nonequilibrium diffusion [20] and later developed into practical generative models [7, 21, 22].

Diffusion models exemplify the integration of algorithmic learning with formal stochastic processes. Their forward noising dynamics implement a discretized diffusion or stochastic differential equation, progressively mapping data toward a tractable reference distribution such as an isotropic Gaussian [20]. The learned reverse process then approximates the time-reversal of this diffusion, yielding an efficient sampling mechanism for distributions that are otherwise computationally intractable to draw from [21, 7]. In score-based formulations, this reverse flow is parameterized through neural estimators of the score function, enabling a continuous-time interpretation in terms of stochastic and deterministic flows [23]. The methodological core therefore lies in learning a family of parameterized transformations—stochastic SDE reversals or deterministic ODE flows—that convert simple base measures into complex high-dimensional data distributions.

This positions diffusion models within the broader lineage of machine-learning methods for high-dimensional density estimation. Like variational autoencoders, they construct generative mappings through latent-variable-based inference [10]; like normalizing flows, they define invertible or approximately invertible transformations of probability mass [15]; and like energy-based models, they leverage score estimation and gradient-field matching to characterize complex distributions [8]. Diffusion models unify these perspectives through a stochastic-process-driven learning framework that is both mathematically principled and computationally scalable, contributing to the ongoing development of probabilistic generative modeling in informatics.

Their purpose is orthogonal to computational mechanics: they model the geometry and variation of the distribution of ABM outputs rather than temporal predictability.

## 3 Mathematical Complementarity

We now formalize the domains in which  $\epsilon$ -machines and diffusion models operate.

### 3.1 Processes vs. Distributions

**Assumptions.** The analysis in this section relies on two standard assumptions. First, temporal observables used for  $\epsilon$ -machine reconstruction are assumed to be stationary (or weakly stationary), ensuring the existence of well-defined predictive distributions and intrinsic computation measures. Second, diffusion models operate on high-dimensional cross-sectional snapshots rather than full trajectories; the distributions they learn are therefore interpreted as static population-level marginals at a given simulation time. These assumptions clarify the distinct informational domains on which the two methods operate and ensure that their mathematical characterizations remain well-posed.

**Definition 1** (Process Domain). *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  denote the set of all stationary stochastic processes  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ . An  $\epsilon$ -machine is a mapping  $\Phi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  where  $\mathcal{M}$  denotes the set of minimal unifilar HMMs.*

**Definition 2** (Distribution Domain). *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  denote the set of all probability distributions over high-dimensional vectors  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . A diffusion model is a mapping  $\Psi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$  where  $\mathcal{G}$  denotes the set of parameterized generative models.*

**Proposition 1** (Disjoint Analytical Domains).  *$\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  are mathematically distinct:  $\mathcal{P}$  defines laws over infinite sequences, while  $\mathcal{D}$  defines laws over static vectors. Hence  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  operate on orthogonal domains.*

*Sketch.* A stochastic process is a measure over trajectories in  $\mathcal{X}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ , whereas a probability distribution over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is a measure on finite-dimensional space. No representation in  $\mathcal{M}$  recovers full distributions over  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and no model in  $\mathcal{G}$  recovers conditional futures of sequences.  $\square$

### 3.2 Orthogonality of Extracted Information

**Proposition 2 (Complementary Representational Axes).** Let  $P$  denote the process domain and  $D$  the distribution domain, and let  $I_{\text{seq}}$  and  $I_{\text{dist}}$  denote the informational content made accessible by the mappings  $\Phi : P \rightarrow M$  and  $\Psi : D \rightarrow G$ , respectively. Under the representational constraints of  $\epsilon$ -machines and diffusion models as employed here,  $I_{\text{seq}}$  and  $I_{\text{dist}}$  capture disjoint aspects of ABM outputs:

$$I_{\text{seq}} \cap I_{\text{dist}} = \emptyset,$$

in the sense that  $\Phi$  encodes temporal predictability and causal-state organization, whereas  $\Psi$  captures the geometry and multimodality of instantaneous distributions. This statement concerns the *representable information* extractable under the two mappings and does not assert disjointness for arbitrary stochastic processes.

*Sketch.*  $\epsilon$ -machines recover invariants of predictive structure (state transitions, entropy rate), which diffusion models cannot represent. Diffusion models recover geometric and distributional properties (covariance, multimodality, manifold structure), which  $\epsilon$ -machines cannot represent due to the unifilar constraint. Thus the two information sets are disjoint and jointly sufficient.  $\square$

## 4 Analytical Extensions for Parameter-Space Structure

Understanding how agent-based model (ABM) behavior varies across parameter space requires analytic tools that extend beyond variance-based global sensitivity methods. While Sobol or Saltelli indices provide valuable information about how parameters contribute to variability in specific summary statistics [19, 16], they offer a limited view of the *structural* organization of the model's behavior. ABMs often exhibit qualitatively distinct *behavioral regimes*: regions of parameter space

that generate stable, coherent emergent patterns, separated by transitions that may resemble bifurcations or phase changes [24, 11]. Identifying and characterizing these regimes calls for a complementary set of analytical approaches, including regime analysis, qualitative pattern mapping, and behavioral clustering.

#### 4.1 Regime Analysis.

Regime analysis seeks to partition parameter space into domains that yield qualitatively different emergent behaviors, in line with ideas from bifurcation theory and dynamical transitions [24, 11, 17]. Within the present framework, regime boundaries may appear as abrupt shifts in  $\epsilon$ -machine invariants—such as changes in  $h_\mu$ ,  $C_\mu$ , or causal-state topology—or as structural changes in diffusion-based density estimates, including the emergence or disappearance of modes, variations in effective dimensionality, or expansions of tail mass. These discontinuities or inflection points reveal transitions between behavioral regimes that cannot be inferred from variance-based indices alone. Monitoring the evolution of  $h_\mu(\theta)$ ,  $C_\mu(\theta)$ ,  $E(\theta)$ , diffusion-derived metrics such as KL or Wasserstein divergences, or ABM-specific indices provides an operational route to detecting such transitions.

#### 4.2 Qualitative Pattern Mapping.

Beyond detecting regime boundaries, qualitative pattern mapping aims to describe how emergent patterns evolve as parameters vary. This includes transitions from stationary to oscillatory dynamics, reconfiguration of multimodality in population outcomes, or changes in the coupling among variables such as walkability and caregiver burden. Pattern-oriented approaches in ABM research highlight the importance of relating qualitative macropatterns to underlying mechanisms [5, 6]. Pattern mapping involves examining causal-state diagrams across parameter settings, characterizing distributional shape descriptors (e.g., skewness, covariance, modality), or inspecting geometric summaries derived from diffusion manifolds. Such analyses are particularly valuable for avoiding equifinality, wherein distinct parameter combinations produce similar scalar summaries but differ markedly in their underlying emergent structures.

#### 4.3 Behavioral Clustering.

A further complementary approach treats the ABM as a mapping  $\theta \mapsto I(\theta)$ , where  $I(\theta)$  denotes a vector of  $\epsilon$ -machine and diffusion-based descriptors. Clustering these descriptors reveals *behavioral classes* within parameter space. Methods such as  $k$ -means [12, 13], Gaussian mixture models [14], hierarchical clustering [9], or density-based techniques such as DBSCAN [3] can identify families of parameter settings that yield similar emergent behaviors, as well as isolated islands of atypical or extreme behavior. This produces a higher-level taxonomy of ABM dynamics that complements both regime detection and variance-based sensitivity.

#### 4.4 Complementarity with Sensitivity Analysis.

Variance-based indices such as those of Sobol or Saltelli offer a useful decomposition of parameter influence on specific response variables [19, 16], but they do not reveal the structural organization of ABM behavior. Regime analysis identifies qualitative transitions; pattern mapping traces the evolution of emergent structures; and behavioral clustering uncovers latent families of behaviors and regions of equifinality. Together, these methods provide a comprehensive analytical framework for characterizing how ABM behavior unfolds across parameter space, complementing the temporal and distributional perspectives offered by  $\epsilon$ -machines and diffusion models.

## 5 Application to ABM Output Characterization

The analytical extensions introduced in the previous section establish a general framework for exploring how emergent temporal and distributional signatures change across parameter space. In this section, we apply the dual characterization framework to the elder-caregiver ABM introduced in the companion paper, illustrating how  $\epsilon$ -machine invariants and diffusion-derived descriptors jointly illuminate heterogeneity, scenario differences, and population-level structure within a concrete simulation environment. The goal is not to provide a full empirical analysis, but to show how  $\epsilon$ -machine invariants and diffusion-derived descriptors jointly reveal temporal organization and distributional geometry.

### 5.1 Temporal Characterization via $\epsilon$ -Machines

Using the dataset from [4], we summarize temporal organization of variables such as walkability, caregiver efforts, and mobility. The  $\epsilon$ -machines reveal variable-specific intrinsic computation and distinguish memoryless dynamics from structured ones. For example, walkability shows low entropy rate but non-zero statistical complexity, indicating stable but nontrivial temporal organization.

### 5.2 Distributional Characterization via Diffusion Models

The same ABM outputs are treated as high-dimensional population-state vectors. The models learn:

- multimodal agent distributions,
- joint variation across outcomes,
- cross-sectional heterogeneity,
- generative synthesis of alternative ABM outcomes.

Diffusion models trained on such cross-sectional population vectors uncover multimodal agent distributions and joint correlations between variables such as efforts and walkability. The learned manifolds reveal clusters corresponding to heterogeneous caregiver-elder conditions and enable synthetic generation of plausible population-level outcomes.

### 5.3 Combined Analysis

The complementary roles of  $\epsilon$ -machines and diffusion models become most apparent when their outputs are examined jointly. We compare:

1. the  $\epsilon$ -machine complexity profile of each variable, as summarized by  $(h_\mu, C_\mu, E)$ ,
2. the geometry of the learned diffusion manifolds, and
3. correlations between intrinsic computation and distributional variability.

This joint perspective yields a two-axis characterization of the ABM, capturing both the temporal organization of agent-level trajectories and the high-dimensional distributional structure of population snapshots.

Joint inspection of  $(h_\mu, C_\mu, E)$  and diffusion-derived descriptors—such as effective dimensionality, local score norms, and measures of multimodality—reveals coordinated structure across temporal and distributional domains. Variables exhibiting higher intrinsic computation (e.g., elevated  $C_\mu$  or nontrivial causal-state topology) tend to produce sharper or more articulated diffusion manifolds, indicating richer heterogeneity and stronger geometric organization in the corresponding

cross-sectional distributions. This alignment suggests a systematic relationship between temporal predictability and distributional heterogeneity in ABM outputs, providing a coherent joint summary of emergent model behavior.

## 6 Limitations, Technical Extensions, and Future Work

The dual characterization introduced in this work focuses on two complementary facets of ABM behavior: the temporal organization of observable sequences, captured via  $\epsilon$ -machines, and the high-dimensional distributional geometry of population-level outcomes, captured via diffusion models. While this provides a non-overlapping, output-centric representation of model behavior, the framework remains limited in scope and naturally suggests several technically substantive extensions. This section outlines the main methodological limitations of the current work and describes promising directions for future development, including multiscale analysis and joint temporal–distributional response mappings.

### 6.1 Current Limitations

First, the present methodology does not incorporate any analysis of the interaction topology among agents. For ABMs with explicit spatial or social network structures, properties such as degree distributions, clustering, or modularity may have significant effects on emergent outcomes. Because the current analysis focuses exclusively on observable sequences and population snapshots, it cannot quantify how interaction structure influences temporal organization or distributional geometry.

Second, the analysis is conducted at a single temporal resolution. Neither multiscale  $\epsilon$ -machines nor diffusion models trained on temporally aggregated population snapshots are considered. This prevents assessment of scale-dependent predictive structure, distributional variability, or coarse-grained regime transitions.

Finally, the characterization is intentionally output-based. It does not attempt to infer or analyze the rule-level mechanisms that generate the observed dynamics. Methods such as symbolic regression, surrogate modeling, or micro-level rule mining would be required to connect intrinsic computation and distributional geometry back to agent decision heuristics.

### 6.2 Multiscale Extensions

A technically rich extension involves reconstructing  $\epsilon$ -machines at multiple temporal scales. Let

$$X_n^{(k)} = f_k(X_{nk:(n+1)k-1})$$

denote a  $k$ -aggregated observable. For each scale  $k$ , the process  $\{X_n^{(k)}\}$  yields a corresponding causal-state partition  $\epsilon_k$  and  $\epsilon$ -machine  $\mathcal{M}_k$ , together producing a family of scale-indexed invariants

$$h_\mu(k), \quad C_\mu(k), \quad E(k).$$

These sequences can reveal whether predictive structure persists, strengthens, or collapses under coarse-graining, and whether the ABM exhibits scale-dependent regime transitions.

Analogously, diffusion models may be trained on aggregated population snapshots,

$$Y_n^{(k)} = g_k(Y_{nk:(n+1)k-1}),$$

producing a hierarchy of distributions  $p_k(y)$  and associated generative models  $\Psi_k$ . This multiresolution family supports analysis of how multimodality, correlation structure, and manifold geometry evolve with temporal granularity and enables cross-scale consistency checks analogous to renormalization operators.

### 6.3 Parameter–Response Mappings

Another promising extension involves studying how  $\epsilon$ -machine invariants and diffusion-based descriptors vary across parameter space. Let  $\theta \in \Theta$  denote ABM parameters. The mapping

$$\Gamma_\epsilon(\theta) = (h_\mu(\theta), C_\mu(\theta), E(\theta))$$

defines a temporal-response surface, while

$$\Gamma_\Psi(\theta) = G(\theta)$$

collects diffusion-based geometric descriptors such as score norms, effective dimensionality, higher-order moments of  $p_\theta$ , or  $\text{KL}(p_\theta \parallel p_{\theta_0})$ . Sobol or Morris variance decompositions applied to the coordinates of  $\Gamma_\epsilon$  and  $\Gamma_\Psi$  would quantify parameter influence on intrinsic computation and population-level geometry. Sharp changes in these summaries as functions of  $\theta$  may indicate dynamical regime shifts or structural transitions in the ABM.

A combined representation,

$$\Gamma(\theta) = (\Gamma_\epsilon(\theta), \Gamma_\Psi(\theta)),$$

yields a joint temporal–distributional response landscape. Such a representation enables sensitivity analysis, bifurcation detection, and parameter-based clustering of model behaviors.

### 6.4 Joint Scale–Parameter Extensions

Combining the multiscale and parameter-sweep perspectives produces a tensor-valued descriptor

$$\mathcal{T}_{i,j} = (R_\epsilon^{(k_i)}(\theta_j), G^{(k_i)}(\theta_j)),$$

where  $i$  indexes temporal aggregation scales and  $j$  indexes parameter settings. This representation may support techniques such as tensor decomposition, manifold learning, or sparse structure discovery over the joint scale–parameter domain. Together, these directions outline a path toward a comprehensive, multi-resolution, parameter-aware characterization of ABM dynamics.

## 7 Discussion

The results presented in this work demonstrate that  $\epsilon$ -machines and diffusion models provide two non-overlapping and mutually reinforcing perspectives on agent-based model outputs.  $\epsilon$ -machines characterize temporal organization by reconstructing the minimal predictive structure compatible with observed trajectories, yielding quantities such as entropy rate, statistical complexity, and excess entropy. Diffusion models, in contrast, operate on high-dimensional population snapshots, learning the geometry of the underlying distribution and providing a flexible generative representation of cross-sectional variability.

Because these methods operate on distinct mathematical domains—process spaces for  $\epsilon$ -machines and distribution spaces for diffusion models—the information each extracts is representationally orthogonal within the framework defined here. Together, they form a two-axis analytic framework capturing both the sequential dynamics of agent observables and the multivariate structure of population-level outcomes. The combined approach does not seek to describe the internal mechanisms or rule sets of an ABM; instead, it provides a principled summary of observable behavior in terms of temporal predictability and distributional geometry.

This division of analytic responsibilities proves particularly advantageous for ABMs whose outputs intertwine heterogeneous temporal processes with complex multivariate agent states. By



separating the temporal and distributional components of the output space, the framework enables clearer interpretation, facilitates comparisons across scenarios, and supplies structured targets for model validation or surrogate modeling. The extensions outlined in the preceding section—including multiscale analysis, parameter–response modeling, and integration with interaction topology—demonstrate how the complementary roles of  $\epsilon$ -machines and diffusion models can support broader analytic pipelines for simulation-based research.

## 8 Conclusion

This paper extends the analysis introduced in our companion preprint by combining computational mechanics and diffusion models to obtain a two-axis characterization of agent-based model outputs.  $\epsilon$ -machines capture the temporal organization and intrinsic predictive structure of simulation trajectories, while diffusion models provide a complementary description of high-dimensional distributional geometry in population-level outcomes. Together, these tools yield a non-overlapping representation of ABM behavior that separates sequential dynamics from cross-sectional variability.

The framework presented here is general and can be applied to a wide range of agent-based models. By delineating the distinct informational domains associated with process-based and distribution-based characterizations, this work provides a foundation for richer methodological pipelines integrating temporal, spatial, and distributional analyses within a unified analytic structure. The extensions outlined above point toward several promising areas for future research, including multiscale characterization, joint parameter–response analysis, and connecting output-based summaries to interaction topology or rule-level inference. We expect the combined use of computational mechanics and diffusion models to serve as a flexible and powerful methodology for the study of complex adaptive systems in simulation.

## References

- [1] James P Crutchfield. Between order and chaos. *Nature Physics*, 8(1):17–24, 2012. ISSN 1745-2473. doi: 10.1038/nphys2190. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys2190>.
- [2] James P Crutchfield and Karl Young. Inferring statistical complexity. *Physical Review Letters*, 63(2):105–108, 1989. ISSN 0031-9007. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.63.105. URL <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.63.105>.
- [3] Martin Ester, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Jörg Sander, and Xiaowei Xu. A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise. In *KDD*, pages 226–231, 1996. URL <http://www.aaai.org/Papers/KDD/1996/KDD96-037.pdf>.
- [4] Roberto Garrone. Characterizing agent-based model dynamics via  $\epsilon$ -machines and kolmogorov-style complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.12729*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.12729>.
- [5] Volker Grimm and Steven F Railsback. Pattern-oriented modeling of agent-based complex systems: Lessons from ecology. *Science*, 310(5750):987–991, 2005. ISSN 0036-8075. doi: 10.1126/science.1116681. URL <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1116681>.
- [6] Volker Grimm et al. The odd protocol for describing agent-based models: A review and first update. *Ecological Modelling*, 346:3–17, 2017. ISSN 0304-3800. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2010.08.019. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2010.08.019>.

- [7] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020. URL <https://papers.nips.cc/paper/2020/hash/4c5bcfec8584af0d967f1ab10179ca4b-Abstract.html>.
- [8] Aapo Hyvärinen. Estimation of non-normalized statistical models by score matching. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 6:695–709, 2005. ISSN 1533-7928. URL <https://www.jmlr.org/papers/v6/hyvarinen05a.html>.
- [9] Anil K Jain, M Narasimha Murty, and Patrick J Flynn. Data clustering: A review. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 1999. ISSN 0360-0300. doi: 10.1145/331499.331504. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/331499.331504>.
- [10] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2014. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6114>.
- [11] Christian Kuehn. A mathematical framework for critical transitions: Bifurcations, fast–slow systems and stochastic dynamics. *Physica D*, 240(12):1020–1035, 2011. ISSN 0167-2789. doi: 10.1016/j.physd.2011.02.012. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physd.2011.02.012>.
- [12] Stuart Lloyd. Least squares quantization in pcm. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 28(2):129–137, 1982. ISSN 0018-9448. doi: 10.1109/TIT.1982.1056489. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.1982.1056489>.
- [13] J. MacQueen. Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Statistics*, pages 281–297. University of California Press, 1967. URL <https://projecteuclid.org/euclid.bsmsp/1200512992>.
- [14] Geoffrey McLachlan and David Peel. *Finite Mixture Models*. Wiley, 2000. ISBN 9780471721187. doi: 10.1002/0471721182. URL <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471721182>.
- [15] Danilo J Rezende and Shakir Mohamed. Variational inference with normalizing flows. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1530–1538, 2015. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.1505.05770. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.05770>.
- [16] Andrea Saltelli, Paola Annoni, Ivano Azzini, Francesca Campolongo, Marco Ratto, and Stefano Tarantola. Variance based sensitivity analysis of model output: Design and estimator for the total sensitivity index. *Computer Physics Communications*, 181(2):259–270, 2010. ISSN 0010-4655. doi: 10.1016/j.cpc.2009.09.018. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2009.09.018>.
- [17] Marten Scheffer, Jordi Bascompte, William A. Brock, et al. Early-warning signals for critical transitions. *Nature*, 461(7260):53–59, 2009. ISSN 0028-0836. doi: 10.1038/nature08227. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08227>.
- [18] Cosma Rohilla Shalizi and James P Crutchfield. Computational mechanics: Pattern and prediction, structure and simplicity. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 104(3–4):817–879, 2001. ISSN 0022-4715. doi: 10.1023/A:1010388907793. URL <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010388907793>.
- [19] Ilya M Sobol. Global sensitivity indices for nonlinear mathematical models and their monte carlo estimates. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 55(1–3):271–280, 2001. ISSN 0378-4754. doi: 10.1016/S0378-4754(00)00270-6. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4754\(00\)00270-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4754(00)00270-6).

- [20] Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Eric Weiss, Niru Maheswaranathan, and Surya Ganguli. Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2256–2265, 2015. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.1503.03585. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1503.03585>.
- [21] Yang Song and Stefano Ermon. Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, 2019. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.1907.05600. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.05600>.
- [22] Yang Song, Conor Durkan, Iain Murray, and Stefano Ermon. Maximum likelihood training of score-based diffusion models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 1415–1428, 2021. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2101.09258. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.09258>.
- [23] Yang Song, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Diederik P Kingma, Abhishek Kumar, Stefano Ermon, and Ben Poole. Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.13456>.
- [24] Steven H Strogatz. *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos*. CRC Press, 2018. ISBN 9780367026509. URL <https://www.routledge.com/Nonlinear-Dynamics-and-Chaos-With-Applications-to-Physics-Biology-Chemistry-and-Engineering/Strogatz/p/book/9780367026509>.