Dynamic Symmetry Theory as a Candidate Ordering Principle: Promise, Vulnerabilities, and the Work Still to Be Done

---

Abstract: Dynamic symmetry theory, or Edge theory, advances a bold claim: that many adaptive systems achieve resilience and creativity by maintaining a moving balance between order and disorder, and that this balance can be formalised and measured via the Dynamic Symmetry Index (DSI). It aspires to unify patterns observed in critical phenomena, self-organisation, and resilience across domains as diverse as physiology, ecology, markets, institutions, and epistemic communities. This essay argues that dynamic symmetry theory is potentially very significant, in the specific sense that it offers a coherent structural hypothesis, a family of testable models, and a unifying vocabulary that connects complexity science with questions in philosophy, ethics, and institutional design. At the same time, its current evidential base is incomplete, its mathematical apparatus vulnerable to charges of redundancy, and its rhetoric sometimes steps ahead of what has been empirically established. The dynamic symmetry hypothesis risks being mistaken for a merely metaphorical re-packaging of existing edge-of-chaos and criticality ideas unless it is sharpened, constrained, and subjected to demanding comparative tests against alternative frameworks. The essay traces the conceptual strengths of the theory, highlights the places where it already organises disparate results, and then articulates a set of specific weaknesses and research tasks that must be addressed if it is to mature from an ambitious synthesis into an accepted organising idea in the sciences and humanities. The conclusion is two-fold: it is rational to treat dynamic symmetry theory as a serious candidate for a cross-domain ordering principle, yet intellectually responsible to acknowledge that its status remains that of a research programme whose future depends on rigorous empirical, mathematical, and critical work.

Introduction: A Claim about Order, Disorder and Adaptive Life

Dynamic symmetry theory starts from an observation that is now familiar in complexity science and dynamical systems: many systems of interest do not function best when they are perfectly ordered or wholly disordered, but in a regime where patterns are stable enough to sustain identity and loose enough to adapt. Work on critical phenomena, self-organised criticality and edge-of-chaos behaviour in cellular automata, networks and ecosystems has repeatedly suggested that computational richness, evolutionary innovation and structural resilience often peak near boundaries between phases or regimes (Kauffman 1993; Langton 1990; Bak, Tang and Wiesenfeld 1987; Solé and Goodwin 2000; Mitchell 2009).

Dynamic symmetry theory reframes this wide-ranging body of work with two linked moves. First, it treats the balance between order and disorder not as a marginal curiosity, but as a candidate for a general principle of life and organisation, extending from physiology and ecology to institutions, markets, cognition and ethics (Rattigan 2025a; Rattigan 2025b). Second, it proposes that this balance can be given explicit mathematical form through the Dynamic Symmetry Index, which combines a domain-specific measure of order with a domain-specific measure of disorder, both normalised, weighted and interpreted as an indicator of how close a system is to a hypothesised "edge" regime (Rattigan 2025c).

The ambition is considerable. Edge theory aspires not only to import the insights of criticality and self-organisation into new domains, but to offer a shared language for robust-yet-adaptive behaviour in contexts as diverse as heart dynamics, ecological resilience, organisational performance, financial stability, policy design and even epistemic justification. It also makes philosophical claims: that long-standing dichotomies in epistemology and ethics reflect an underlying structural problem of balancing stability and flexibility, and that dynamic symmetry gives a way to diagnose that problem with greater clarity (Haack 1993; Rattigan 2025d).

It is therefore not exaggerated to say that dynamic symmetry theory aspires to be a very significant idea. Yet significance in science and philosophy is not earned by ambition alone. It depends on the depth and clarity of the theory, on its ability to generate testable predictions and conceptual clarity, and on its performance under scrutiny and comparison with existing approaches. The following sections examine both sides of this ledger: the sources of genuine potential and the key points at which that potential remains unproven and fragile.

The Dynamic Symmetry Hypothesis and the DSI Framework

Dynamic symmetry theory rests on what may be called the dynamic symmetry hypothesis: that systems which must remain adaptive over time tend to organise themselves in regimes where neither order nor disorder dominates, and that this balance can be made precise and used for explanation, prediction and design. The formulation is more specific than general appeals to "complexity" or "balance".

In the formal work on the Dynamic Symmetry Index, a system is described by variables or representations that allow one to define two normalised quantities: an order metric $O(t)$ capturing regularity, synchrony, coherence or redundancy, and a disorder metric $D(t)$ capturing variability, uncertainty, diversity or unpredictability (Rattigan 2025c). Examples of order measures include synchrony parameters in neural networks, modularity in graphs, or autocorrelation in time series; disorder measures may involve Shannon entropy, diversity indices or positive Lyapunov exponents (Kuramoto 1975; Shannon 1948; MacArthur and Wilson 1967; Wolf et al. 1985; Newman and Girvan 2004). Both are scaled into the unit interval. The DSI is then defined as a normalised combination of these scores, with weighting parameters calibrated to the domain, so that high values indicate a regime in which order and disorder are both substantial and comparably strong.

The claim is not simply that DSI can be computed. Rather, the theory holds that high DSI regimes correspond to peaks in adaptability, resilience, innovation or cognitive flexibility, whereas low DSI regimes at either extreme—very high order, very low disorder; or the reverse—correspond to brittle or chaotic behaviour (Rattigan 2025c). The framework is designed to be universal in structure but local in implementation: choices of O, D, time scale and weighting differ across domains such as neuroscience, ecology, organisational science and finance, but the surrounding axioms and interpretative scheme remain the same.

This mixture of generality and specificity is one of the theory's strengths. It avoids the trap of proposing a single physical quantity to serve as a universal marker of adaptability, yet insists that successful measures must satisfy a characteristic profile: normalisation, approximate complementarity, sensitivity to the underlying dynamics, and calibratable parameters. It attempts to formalise in a single expression a large class of order–disorder trade-offs that have otherwise been treated separately.

Why Dynamic Symmetry Theory is Potentially Very Significant

There are at least four respects in which dynamic symmetry theory can justifiably be described as potentially very significant. Each corresponds to a different kind of contribution: conceptual, integrative, methodological and normative.

First, the theory offers a crisp structural insight with non-trivial content. It does not merely say that "systems need some flexibility". Rather, it proposes that adaptive capacity depends on being

positioned in a particular region of the order–disorder space, that this region has recurring features across domains, and that systems which drift too far towards either extreme become vulnerable. This is a sharpened version of intuitions long present in discussions of homeostasis, resilience and robustness, but it links these intuitions to specific measurable quantities and to known phenomena such as criticality, self-organised criticality and early-warning indicators of tipping points (Scheffer et al. 2009; Scheffer et al. 2012; Bak, Tang and Wiesenfeld 1987).

Secondly, dynamic symmetry theory has a genuine integrative function. One of the recurring problems in complexity science is that results in different domains—phase transitions in physics, self-organising criticality in sandpiles, resilience in ecosystems, modularity in networks, flexible synchrony in brain dynamics—are expressed in distinct vocabularies, with little communication across fields. Rattigan's work in *Edge of Chaos* and related essays attempts to show that these disparate phenomena can be read as special cases of the same balancing act between stabilising and destabilising forces (Rattigan 2025a; Solé and Goodwin 2000; Sporns 2010; Newman 2010). In his narrative, the fragile regularity of motorway traffic, the structured variability of heart rate, the tipping behaviour of ecosystems and the robustness of certain markets under stress all rhyme with one another. That claim is more than metaphorical; it is backed by the suggestion that appropriate O and D metrics can be defined in each case, and that DSI will take intermediate values in regimes of robust function and extreme values on the way to breakdown or stagnation (Rattigan 2025c). Whether every such claim survives scrutiny is an open question, but the aspiration is clear: to give complexity science something like a shared grammar of stability and failure.

Thirdly, the DSI framework is methodologically ambitious. Instead of treating edge-of-chaos language as a loose analogy, it proposes explicit procedures for metric selection, normalisation, parameter calibration and validation. The formal work describes how to choose O and D so that they capture complementary aspects of a system's behaviour; how to normalise them with respect to baselines or controls; how to calibrate weighting parameters via grid search, Bayesian inference or regression against independent measures of performance; and how to assess predictive value via retrospective analysis, out-of-sample tests and comparison with established indicators (Rattigan 2025c). This is an attempt to move beyond evocative talk of "living on the edge" to a reproducible measurement protocol.

A further issue is how dynamic symmetry theory relates to earlier edge-of-chaos and criticality work, and what—if anything—it adds. Langton's studies of computation at the edge of chaos, Kauffman's accounts of self-organisation and selection in evolution, Bak's theory of self-organised criticality, and subsequent research on networks, brain dynamics and early-warning signals already describe a wide range of phenomena in which systems appear to operate near order–disorder boundaries (Kauffman 1993; Langton 1990; Bak, Tang and Wiesenfeld 1987; Newman 2010; Sporns 2010; Scheffer et al. 2009). Dynamic symmetry theory builds on this tradition in several ways. It treats edge-of-chaos behaviour not as a special property of particular model classes, but as a general order–disorder balance that can, in principle, be made explicit via formally defined order and disorder metrics and combined into a Dynamic Symmetry Index that is designed to be comparable across domains (Rattigan 2025c). It also extends the hypothesis beyond physical and biological systems, arguing that the same kind of dynamic balance underlies the health of epistemic practices, ethical deliberation and institutional design, so that "living near the edge" is not only a feature of certain dynamical systems but a recurring structure in enquiry, governance and social organisation (Rattigan 2025a; Rattigan 2025d).

The difference, on this picture, is partly methodological and partly thematic. Methodologically, dynamic symmetry theory insists on explicit, normalised order and disorder measures and on a simple, transparent index that can be calibrated and tested, rather than relying solely on qualitative

descriptions of critical regimes or on system-specific indicators. Thematically, it claims that the order–disorder balance is a candidate organising principle for domains—such as epistemic communities or public institutions—that earlier edge-of-chaos work tended to treat only metaphorically, if at all. The risk, of course, is that readers steeped in the existing literature will see only a reformulation of familiar ideas. To avoid that, dynamic symmetry theory must demonstrate that it either generates new, non-obvious predictions in canonical systems studied by criticality and edge-of-chaos research, or provides genuinely new quantitative tools in domains that have previously been discussed only in qualitative terms, such as institutional brittleness or epistemic resilience (Rattigan 2025a; Rattigan 2025c; Rattigan 2025d). That programme is under way but remains incomplete.

A similar story appears in ethics, institutional design and education in *Edge of Chaos*. The argument is that policy frameworks, institutions and curricula that are either over-standardised or excessively fluid tend to fail, whereas those that institutionalise feedback, experimentation and revisability while retaining stable norms occupy a more fruitful region (Rattigan 2025a). Dynamic symmetry here is not just an explanatory device but a normative one: it suggests that governance and pedagogy should aim not at maximal order but at sustainable, adaptive middle ground. The potential significance lies in this bridging of descriptive and prescriptive questions, linking what tends to work in complex systems with what we might reasonably try to build.

Taken together, these four features give dynamic symmetry theory a credible claim to potential significance. It articulates a substantive structural hypothesis, offers a unifying idiom across fields, proposes a general measurement strategy and engages with philosophical issues in a way that is neither purely metaphorical nor narrowly technical.

Where the Claim to Significance is Unproven and Fragile

If the positive case is strong, the vulnerabilities are equally important to spell out. There are several respects in which dynamic symmetry theory's current status falls short of what would be required for it to be regarded as a firmly established organising idea.

A first problem lies with scope. Rattigan's writing often describes dynamic symmetry as a "candidate for a fundamental law of life and organisation", and Edge theory is presented as an idea that runs from quantum fields and cosmic evolution to immune systems, markets, cities and intimate relationships (Rattigan 2025a; Rattigan 2025c). The historical examples of major unifying principles in science—such as conservation laws, natural selection or the renormalisation group—suggest that such claims must be earned by repeated, precise and surprising successes across domains, usually over decades. At present, dynamic symmetry theory does not yet have such a record. Its arguments draw heavily on re-interpreting existing results in complexity science, dynamical systems and network theory, and on qualitative case studies in medicine, ecology and organisational behaviour (Mitchell 2009; Newman 2010; Sporns 2010; Scheffer et al. 2009; Scheffer et al. 2012). That re-interpretation may be illuminating, but illumination is not the same as validation.

A second weakness concerns the DSI itself. As defined, DSI is a linear combination of an order metric and a disorder metric, both normalised, with non-negative weights (Rattigan 2025c). The elegance of the expression is appealing, yet it invites a natural question: how is this different, in practice, from existing combinations of entropy, order parameters, correlation lengths or critical-slowing-down measures? Work on critical transitions already uses indicators such as rising variance, increasing autocorrelation, skewness and flickering to forecast tipping points (Scheffer et al. 2009; Scheffer et al. 2012). Neuroscience employs a suite of synchrony and complexity measures

to assess network states (Sporns 2010). Ecology has long used diversity and connectivity metrics to study resilience (MacArthur and Wilson 1967; Solé and Goodwin 2000). Unless DSI can be shown to add predictive value beyond these existing indicators—to detect regime shifts earlier, to distinguish robust from brittle edge regimes, or to travel more easily across domains—it risks being dismissed as "entropy plus something else" with an attractive name.

Rattigan acknowledges this challenge explicitly in the discussion of limitations and validation protocols, where he stresses that the universality of DSI depends critically on careful metric selection, appropriate scaling and rigorous comparison with established approaches (Rattigan 2025c). That acknowledgement itself underscores the fragile status of the current framework: there is a clear path towards stronger validation, but the necessary comparative studies are still largely programmatic, not completed.

A third vulnerability is the dependence on domain-specific choices. The theory rightly insists that O and D must be tailored to the system at hand, yet this introduces degrees of freedom that can undermine claims of universality. In different examples, O may be a Kuramoto order parameter, graph modularity, trophic coherence or volatility autocorrelation; D may be Shannon entropy, multiscale entropy, species diversity or transaction entropy (Kuramoto 1975; Shannon 1948; MacArthur and Wilson 1967; Newman and Girvan 2004; Rattigan 2025c). These are all plausible choices, but the flexibility opens the door to accusations of "fitting the story to the data". Without independent justification for specific metric selections, and without demonstrations that alternative plausible choices produce similar qualitative DSI profiles, it is hard to argue that DSI is measuring something intrinsic rather than reflecting modelling choices.

A fourth issue relates to the relation with existing edge-of-chaos and criticality literature. Langton's work on computation at the edge of chaos, Kauffman's explorations of self-organisation and selection in evolution, Bak's theory of self-organised criticality, and later work on networks, brain dynamics and early-warning signals already map out a substantial territory of edge-like phenomena (Kauffman 1993; Langton 1990; Bak, Tang and Wiesenfeld 1987; Newman 2010; Sporns 2010; Scheffer et al. 2009). Dynamic symmetry theory stands in continuity with this tradition, but also wants to claim something further: that the balance of order and disorder can be captured in a simple general index that travels smoothly between domains, and that this balance underlies not just physical or biological processes but also epistemic, ethical and institutional ones (Rattigan 2025a; Rattigan 2025c; Rattigan 2025d). The danger is that readers trained in these literatures will see only repackaging. To avoid that perception, DST must show that it either (a) yields new, non-obvious predictions within familiar systems, or (b) enables quantitative analysis in domains that have previously only had qualitative treatments of order–disorder issues, such as institutional brittleness or epistemic resilience. That work has begun but is far from complete.

A fifth point concerns breadth of application. The book Edge of Chaos ranges across ancient myth, cosmology, quantum theory, ecology, biology, neuroscience, social systems, the arts, ethics, law, education and personal life (Rattigan 2025a). That breadth is one of the work's attractions, but it also creates a risk. If dynamic symmetry is invoked in too many contexts without discriminating carefully between analogical resonance and genuine explanatory work, the concept can appear fuzzy. In some sections, the balance between order and disorder is made concrete by reference to specific data and models; in others, it functions primarily as a way of naming a tension in human affairs. There is nothing wrong with that, but the danger is that the scientific and philosophical claims are perceived as less sharp.

Finally, there are sociological challenges. Rattigan notes that Susan Haack's foundherentism, despite its clear advantages over pure foundationalist or coherentist models, has remained somewhat

marginal in mainstream epistemology, in part because it does not fit easily into dominant formal frameworks (Haack 1993; Rattigan 2025d). Dynamic symmetry theory faces a similar problem: it is neither a small technical refinement within an existing speciality nor an obvious "killer app" for a mainstream field. The theory cuts across physics, biology, social science, philosophy and policy, and it asks busy specialists to entertain a reframing that is at once broad and demanding. Such proposals can be slow to gain traction, regardless of their intrinsic merit.

What Would Strengthen the Case?

Acknowledging these weaknesses is not an argument against dynamic symmetry theory but a way of clarifying what must happen for its potential significance to be realised. The demands fall into three intertwined groups: empirical, methodological and rhetorical.

Empirically, the most important step is to produce a small number of decisive case studies in which DSI proves its worth against well-established alternatives. The formal paper on DSI already sketches candidate domains: neural systems, ecosystems, organisations and financial markets (Rattigan 2025c). In each, it is possible to define plausible O and D metrics, compute DSI over time and compare its behaviour with known outcomes: cognitive performance and recovery from brain injury; robustness of ecosystems to perturbations; organisational innovation under volatility; the timing of market transitions. What would genuinely move the needle would be results showing that DSI not only correlates with desirable properties (such as resilience or adaptability) but also anticipates transitions more reliably than existing metrics, or distinguishes robust edge regimes from fragile ones where small shocks precipitate collapse.

Methodologically, the framework must be stress-tested. This means, first, making metric selection as transparent and constrained as possible, with justification grounded in domain science rather than purely in the theory's narrative. Secondly, it implies systematic comparisons: holding underlying data fixed while computing DSI alongside established indicators such as entropy, variance, autocorrelation, connectivity measures, and critically evaluating whether DSI adds information conditional on those quantities (Scheffer et al. 2009; Scheffer et al. 2012; Newman 2010; Sporns 2010). Thirdly, it involves exploring the sensitivity of DSI to different plausible choices of O and D in a given domain, clarifying whether it is robust to modelling decisions. A metric that is highly sensitive to arbitrary choices is unlikely to be accepted as a cross-domain standard.

Rhetorically, there is a case for tempering some of the more expansive claims. Describing dynamic symmetry theory as a "candidate ordering principle" or "unifying hypothesis" is ambitious enough; talk of "fundamental law" invites comparisons with well-tested physical principles that DST is not yet in a position to meet. It would be more prudent to separate clearly the parts of the theory that are already well supported—such as the ubiquity of systems with mixed order and disorder near phase boundaries—from those that remain conjectural, such as the universality of DSI as a predictive index or the full extension of DST into quantum gravity and foundational physics (Kauffman 1993; Langton 1990; Bak, Tang and Wiesenfeld 1987; Newman 2010).

The philosophical and normative applications would also benefit from sharper boundary-drawing. Where dynamic symmetry functions mainly as a suggestive parallel—for example, between myths of equilibrium and modern models of resilience—it should be presented as such. Where it is claimed to do explanatory work—for instance, in the reinterpretation of foundherentism as an edge-regime epistemology—arguments need to be spelled out with care, showing exactly what is gained by importing DST vocabulary and how that gain might be made testable, perhaps through connections with empirical work on collective intelligence or social epistemology (Haack 1993; Rattigan 2025d).

The Double Status of Dynamic Symmetry Theory

Dynamic symmetry theory thus occupies an awkward but fertile position. On the one hand, it is not simply a re-labelling of existing edge-of-chaos and criticality ideas. The DSI work attempts a level of mathematical and empirical discipline that many earlier discussions lack, and the extension into epistemology, ethics and institutional design is more systematic than most applications of complexity language in the humanities (Rattigan 2025a; Rattigan 2025c; Rattigan 2025d). On the other hand, it is not yet a mature, widely accepted framework. Key parts of its promise rest on case studies and validation procedures that have been outlined more than they have been completed. The theory is, by its own admission, a research programme rather than a finished system.

To say that dynamic symmetry theory is "potentially very significant" is therefore to make a conditional judgement. It is to say that if the dynamic symmetry hypothesis continues to prove fruitful across domains; if DSI or related measures demonstrate clear predictive and explanatory advantages; if the theory survives critical engagement by physicists, biologists, philosophers and social scientists; and if its normative suggestions turn out to be practically useful in guiding policy and institutional design, then it would warrant a place among those broad organising ideas that shape how we think about complex systems.

At the same time, it is essential to keep in view how contingent this trajectory is. The history of science and philosophy is rich in ambitious frameworks that unified many phenomena in persuasive prose but did not generate the kind of robust, cumulative, testable progress that marks an enduring theory. One of the admirable features of *Edge of Chaos* is its explicit recognition that dynamic symmetry must be judged by its ability to earn a place at the scientific table, not by the elegance of its rhetoric (Rattigan 2025a). That recognition should guide further work.

Conclusion: A Serious Candidate, Not Yet a Settled Principle

Dynamic symmetry theory proposes that living, cognitive and social systems thrive by maintaining a continually renegotiated equilibrium between stabilising and destabilising forces, and that this equilibrium can be described, in many cases quantified, and used to guide intervention. The idea draws strength from its alignment with existing work on critical phenomena, self-organisation and resilience, from its integrative potential across disciplines, from the concrete proposals embodied in the Dynamic Symmetry Index, and from its engagement with philosophical debates about justification, ethics and institutional health.

At the same time, several of its ambitions remain unfulfilled. The universality claim runs ahead of the empirical base; DSI has not yet demonstrated clear superiority over other measures across enough domains to be indispensable; the dependence on domain-specific choices and parameter tuning leaves room for scepticism; and the very breadth that makes Edge theory attractive creates difficulties in maintaining conceptual sharpness.

The responsible stance, then, is two-fold. Dynamic symmetry theory deserves serious attention as a candidate ordering principle that can sharpen complex-systems thinking, inspire new empirical work and bridge scientific and philosophical inquiry. Yet it should be engaged with in a way that insists on stringent tests, careful comparisons and clarity about what has and has not yet been shown. Its potential significance is real; whether that potential is realised will depend less on further eloquent exposition and more on the patient, collaborative work of measurement, modelling and critique that any ambitious framework must survive if it is to endure.

References and further reading

Bak, P., Tang, C., and Wiesenfeld, K. (1987). Self-organized criticality: An explanation of 1/f noise. *Physical Review Letters* 59(4), 381–384.

Bouchaud, J.-P., Farmer, J. D., and Lillo, F. (2009). How markets slowly digest changes in supply and demand. In T. Hens and K. Schenk-Hoppé (eds.), *Handbook of Financial Markets: Dynamics and Evolution* (pp. 57–160). Elsevier.

Centola, D. (2010). The spread of behaviour in an online social network experiment. *Science* 329(5996), 1194–1197.

Haack, S. (1993). Evidence and Inquiry: Towards Reconstruction in Epistemology. Blackwell.

Haack, S. (2009). *Evidence and Inquiry: A Pragmatist Reconstruction of Epistemology* (expanded ed.). Prometheus Books.

Kauffman, S. A. (1993). *The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution*. Oxford University Press.

Kauffman, S. A. (2008). *Reinventing the Sacred: A New View of Science, Reason, and Religion*. Basic Books.

Kuramoto, Y. (1975). Self-entrainment of a population of coupled non-linear oscillators. In H. Araki (ed.), *International Symposium on Mathematical Problems in Theoretical Physics* (pp. 420–422). Springer.

Langton, C. G. (1990). Computation at the edge of chaos: Phase transitions and emergent computation. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* 42(1–3), 12–37.

MacArthur, R. H., and Wilson, E. O. (1967). *The Theory of Island Biogeography*. Princeton University Press.

Mitchell, M. (2009). *Complexity: A Guided Tour*. Oxford University Press.

Newman, M. E. J. (2010). *Networks: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Newman, M. E. J., and Girvan, M. (2004). Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Physical Review E* 69(2), 026113.

Rattigan, B. (2025a). *Edge of Chaos: Unveiling Life's Hidden Symmetry*.

Rattigan, B. (2025b). Edge of Chaos: Dynamic symmetry theory. *Oxford Quarterly Journal of Symmetry & Asymmetry*.

Rattigan, B. (2025c). The Dynamic Symmetry Index: A formal framework for quantifying adaptability at the edge of chaos. *Oxford Quarterly Journal of Symmetry & Asymmetry*.

Rattigan, B. (2025d). Dynamic symmetry and foundherentism: Edge theory's contribution to contemporary epistemology. *Oxford Quarterly Journal of Symmetry & Asymmetry*.

Scheffer, M., Bascompte, J., Brock, W. A., Brovkin, V., Carpenter, S. R., Dakos, V., Held, H., van Nes, E. H., Rietkerk, M., and Sugihara, G. (2009). Early-warning signals for critical transitions. *Nature* 461(7260), 53–59.

Scheffer, M., Carpenter, S. R., Lenton, T. M., Bascompte, J., Brock, W., Dakos, V., van de Koppel, J., van de Leemput, I. A., Levin, S. A., van Nes, E. H., Pascual, M., and Vandermeer, J. (2012). Anticipating critical transitions. *Science* 338(6105), 344–348.

Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal* 27(3–4), 379–423, 623–656.

Solé, R. V., and Goodwin, B. C. (2000). *Signs of Life: How Complexity Pervades Biology*. Basic Books.

Sporns, O. (2010). *Networks of the Brain*. MIT Press.

Strogatz, S. H. (2015). *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos* (2nd ed.). Westview Press.

Wolf, A., Swift, J. B., Swinney, H. L., and Vastano, J. A. (1985). Determining Lyapunov exponents from a time series. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* 16(3), 285–317.