Aperiodic Order in Resource Allocation: An Economic Quasicrystal Approach to Decentralized Systems

Kweku A. Opoku-Agyemang*

March 2025

Abstract

This paper introduces a novel economic framework inspired by quasicrystals, proposing an entropy-driven model of resource allocation that achieves complete coverage without periodic repetition. We conceptualize an economy as a high-entropy system where agents—households, firms, or institutions—interact under adaptive rules, generating ordered yet non-repeating configurations of production, consumption, and exchange. Drawing on the mathematics of quasicrystals, we formalize a dynamic allocation mechanism wherein resource flows self-organize into a stable, gapless state resistant to predictable cycles. Analytical results establish conditions for aperiodic order, revealing trade-offs between adaptability and coordination costs, and reinterpreting traditional mechanisms like market clearing as dynamic, local processes. We derive implications for resilience and explore applications in production systems, cryptocurrency ecosystems, and adaptive policy design, challenging periodicity as a cornerstone of economic dynamics.

Keywords: Aperiodic Tiling, Economic Entropy, Quasicrystals, Resource Allocation, Complexity Economics

JEL Codes: D50, C63, O10

*Chief Scientist, Machine Learning X Doing and Honorary Fellow, International Growth Centre, London School of Economics. Email: kweku@machinelearningxdoing.com. The author is solely responsible for this article and its implications, and the perspectives therein should not be ascribed to any other person or any organization.

Contents

1 Introduction

Imagine a decentralized marketplace where agents distribute resources through local decisions that self-organize into a global pattern, one that never repeats yet remains perfectly ordered, like a quasicrystal[1]. In such settings, traditional economic models, which assume fixed rules or periodic cycles, falter—unable to capture the emergent resilience and adaptability of these systems.

The study of economic systems has long relied on assumptions of periodicity and equilibrium, from the cyclical dynamics of business cycles to the stable configurations of general equilibrium theory, yet these frameworks often fail to capture the resilience and adaptability of complex, decentralized economies. For example, their reliance on predictable cycles leaves them vulnerable to exogenous shocks, such as technological disruptions or market volatility, which decentralized systems must navigate through adaptive, non-repetitive strategies.

This paper introduces a novel framework, *Economic Quasicrystals*, where resource allocation evolves through aperiodic order, driven by local interactions that maximize entropy while preventing repetitive patterns and achieving complete coverage. Drawing on the mathematics of quasicrystals—structures that achieve global order without periodicity—we propose a high-entropy system where resources are distributed dynamically, offering new insights into resilience and efficiency. For instance, in cryptocurrency ecosystems, this approach can stabilize market volatility by ensuring reward distributions avoid predictable cycles, while in adaptive policy design, it enables aid allocation that balances fairness and responsiveness across heterogeneous regions, even under systemic

[1]Quasicrystals are non-periodic solids discovered in 1982 by Dan Shechtman, Nobel Prize Laureate in Chemistry 2011. The underlying mathematics of quasicrystals are known as the field of aperiodic order, which studies mathematical structures with order but lacking periodicity, bridging pure and applied mathematics through interactions with dynamical systems, harmonic analysis, mathematical diffraction theory, among others (See Baake and Grimm, (2013, 2017).

shocks.

Traditional economic models assume that agents converge to repeating patterns, whether through market clearing, production cycles, or policy interventions. Yet, real-world economies frequently exhibit persistent flux—technological disruptions, shifting preferences, and decentralized coordination—that resists such periodicity. Unlike equilibrium models that seek stable, repeating configurations, our approach embraces persistent flux as a source of systemic strength, mirroring the non-repetitive resilience of quasicrystals. While economic data often shows repeating patterns, such as seasonal trends or business cycles, our framework better captures the qualitative realities of decentralized systems—where aperiodic order fosters resilience and adaptability—offering a complementary perspective to traditional models focused on quantitative periodicity. In this view, traditional mechanisms like market clearing, production cycles, and policy interventions—while present as external constraints or local outcomes—are less central, as aperiodic order prioritizes systemic resilience over periodic stability.[2] Complexity economics has begun to address these phenomena (e.g. Arthur, (1999)), but it lacks a unifying framework to explain how order emerges without recurrence.

Inspired by the quasicrystal's ability to balance entropy and structure, we develop a model where agents (households, firms, or institutions) allocate resources via adaptive, local interactions, producing a system that is both complete (no agent is unserved) and non-repetitive (no configuration recurs over time). This aperiodic order, we argue, enhances resilience by disrupting exploitable patterns and fosters adaptability by eschewing fixed equilibria. We formalize a

[2]For example, market clearing manifests as a dynamic, local process in our model, ensuring completeness (no agent receives zero resources, as guaranteed by the constraint $\sum r_i = R$) without global equilibrium; production cycles, if present, are external constraints, with allocation responding aperiodically due to the non-repetitive constraint (m); and policy interventions can align with aperiodic principles, as we show to be the case in adaptive aid allocation (Section 5.2.2), enhancing resilience over periodic stability.

dynamic allocation mechanism driven by entropy maximization, where agents' decisions—modeled as tiling moves—self-organize into a stable yet ever-shifting state. We derive analytical conditions for the stability of this aperiodic order, revealing trade-offs between coordination costs and systemic flexibility, with numerical validation left for future work. The theory departs from conventional periodicity, aligning instead with empirical observations of decentralized systems, such as cryptocurrency markets or innovation-driven economies (Shechtman et al, (1984)).

This paper contributes to economic theory in three ways. First, it introduces aperiodic order as a design principle for resource allocation, challenging the primacy of equilibrium and cycles. Second, it provides a rigorous theoretical framework to study entropy-driven economic systems, supported by mathematical analysis. Third, it offers practical insights for designing resilient markets and policies in an era of increasing complexity. The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 reviews related literature; Section 3 presents the theoretical model; Section 4 discusses the theoretical results; Section 5 explores implications and applications; and Section 6 concludes. Full proofs are provided in the Appendices, which also include versions with relaxed assumptions.

2 Related Literature

This paper integrates economic theory with interdisciplinary insights from mathematics and physics, engaging three bodies of scholarship: resource allocation and equilibrium, complexity economics, and aperiodic structures in tiling and quasicrystals. These strands provide critical building blocks, yet leave unexplored the potential for entropy-driven, non-repetitive economic order.

Resource Allocation and Equilibrium: Classical economic models prioritize periodicity or stable outcomes in resource allocation. General equilibrium theory (Arrow & Debreu, 1954) achieves market clearing through prices, yielding predictable allocations, while business cycle models (Kydland & Prescott, 1982) formalize repetitive dynamics driven by exogenous shocks. Optimal growth frameworks (Ramsey, 1928) target steady states, and even dynamic pricing mechanisms (Bergemann & Välimäki, 2006) converge to stationary or cyclic patterns. These approaches assume repetition or equilibrium as hallmarks of efficiency, offering little guidance on systems where stability arises without recurrence.

Complexity Economics: Complexity economics examines emergent behavior in decentralized systems, often via agent-based modeling (ABM). Axtell and Farmer (2022) trace the evolution of ABMs in economics and finance, highlighting their capacity to simulate heterogeneous agents' interactions—from market dynamics (LeBaron, 2001) to innovation networks (Foster, 2005)—without requiring equilibrium. Entropy informs bounded rationality models (Sims, 2003), yet its role remains peripheral, constraining choice rather than shaping systemic structure. While Axtell and Farmer (2022) project ABMs' future in capturing complexity, they stop short of targeting aperiodic order as a deliberate outcome, leaving a gap our framework addresses.

Aperiodic Structures and Quasicrystals: Mathematical advances in aperiodic tilings, such as the Einstein tile (Smith et al., 2023), demonstrate how local rules can cover a plane without gaps or periodic repetition, building on Penrose tilings (Penrose, 1974) and their formalization (Grünbaum & Shephard, 1987). In physics, quasicrystals (Shechtman et al., 1984) exhibit high-entropy, non-repeating order, a property extended to molecular self-assembly by Voigt et al. (2025), who document an aperiodic chiral tiling in tris(tetrahelicenebenzene) crystals. Economic applications are nascent—network theory (Jackson, 2008) and spatial economics (Fujita et al., 1999) explore irregular configurations—but none adapt aperiodic tiling to resource allocation at a systemic level.

Our work synthesizes these literatures, extending equilibrium and complexity paradigms with a quasicrystal-inspired model. We depart from periodicity-centric theories, leveraging ABM insights from Axtell and Farmer (2022) to simulate emergent, non-repetitive order. From Voigt et al. (2025) and related tiling studies, we adopt the principle of complete, aperiodic coverage, applying it to economic interactions. This fusion fills a theoretical void: how decentralized systems can sustain efficiency and resilience through ordered yet unpredictable dynamics, a question underexplored in prior work.

3 Theoretical Model

This section formalizes an economic system where resources are allocated aperiodically, inspired by the properties of quasicrystals and Einstein tiles. We model an economy as a set of agents interacting locally to distribute a finite resource, achieving complete coverage without periodic repetition. The framework leverages entropy maximization to drive non-repetitive order, which we define and analyze below.

3.1 Environment and Agents

Consider an economy with a continuum of agents indexed by $i \in [0, 1]$, each located on a two-dimensional lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2$ representing economic space (e.g., geographic or transactional proximity). Agents allocate a homogeneous resource R, normalized to a total stock $R = 1$, across discrete time periods $t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Each agent i at time t holds a resource share $r_i(t) \geq 0$, subject to the aggregate constraint:

$$\int_0^1 r_i(t)\, di = 1, \quad \forall t.$$

Agents aim to maximize utility $u_i(r_i(t)) = \ln(r_i(t))$, reflecting diminishing returns, but their allocations depend on local interactions rather than global optimization. The lattice structure imposes a neighborhood $N(i)$, defined as the four adjacent sites (up, down, left, right), within which agent i exchanges resources.

3.2 Aperiodic Allocation Mechanism

We propose a dynamic allocation rule inspired by aperiodic tiling. At each t, agent i adjusts $r_i(t)$ based on a local configuration $C_i(t)$, which encodes the resource states of i and $N(i)$. Define $C_i(t) = \{r_i(t), r_j(t)\}_{j \in N(i)}$, a vector of length 5. The configuration space $\mathcal{C}$ is finite, constrained by discrete resource increments (e.g., $r_i(t) \in \{0, \delta, 2\delta, \ldots, 1\}$, where $\delta = 1/k$ for some integer k).

The allocation evolves via a probabilistic rule designed to maximize systemic entropy while ensuring coverage. Let $S(t)$ denote the entropy of the resource distribution at time t:

$$S(t) = -\int_0^1 p(r_i(t)) \ln p(r_i(t))\, di,$$

where $p(r_i(t))$ is the density of agents with resource level $r_i(t)$. The mechanism updates $r_i(t+1)$ as follows:

1. Local Adjustment: Agent i proposes a new allocation $r_i'(t+1)$ by redistributing $\Delta r \leq \delta$ to or from a neighbor $j \in N(i)$, preserving local conservation: $r_i'(t+1) + r_j'(t+1) = r_i(t) + r_j(t)$.

2. Aperiodicity Constraint: The update is accepted if $C_i(t+1)$ differs from all prior configurations $\{C_i(s)\}_{s=0}^{t}$ at i or within a radius m (e.g., $m = 2$),

mimicking tiling's non-repetition.

3. Entropy Bias: Among feasible updates, $r_i'(t+1)$ is chosen with probability proportional to $\exp(\beta\Delta S)$, where $\Delta S = S'(t+1) - S(t)$ is the entropy change and $\beta > 0$ is a parameter weighting entropy preference.

Formally, the transition probability for $r_i(t) \to r_i'(t+1)$ is:

$$P(r_i'(t+1)|r_i(t)) = \frac{\exp(\beta\Delta S) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}(C_i(t+1))}{\sum_{r_i''} \exp(\beta\Delta S'') \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}(C_i''(t+1))},$$

where $\mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}(C) = 1$ if C satisfies the aperiodicity constraint, and 0 otherwise.

3.3 Properties of the System

The mechanism ensures two key properties:

1. Completeness: The constraint $\int r_i(t)\, di = 1$ holds at all t, as adjustments are pairwise zero-sum.

2. Aperiodicity: The constraint on $C_i(t)$ prevents periodic cycles, enforced locally akin to matching rules in Einstein tiles (Smith et al., 2023).

We hypothesize that, under suitable β and m, the system converges to a quasicrystal-like state: a resource distribution with long-range order (no gaps) but no translational symmetry (no repetition).

3.4 Steady-State Analysis, Equilibrium Conditions, and Proof Sketches

We now characterize the steady-state behavior of the aperiodic allocation mechanism, defining conditions under which the system achieves a quasicrystal-like distribution—complete, ordered, and non-repetitive. We analyze the stationary distribution of resource shares $r_i(t)$ and prove its existence and properties.

3.4.1 Steady-State Distribution

Assume the system reaches a steady state where the distribution of $r_i(t)$ across agents becomes time-invariant in a statistical sense, despite local adjustments. Let $\pi(r)$ denote the steady-state density of resource shares, satisfying $\int_0^1 \pi(r)\,dr = 1$ and $\int_0^1 r\pi(r)\,dr = 1$. The entropy in steady state is:

$$S^* = -\int_0^1 \pi(r) \ln \pi(r)\,dr.$$

The transition rule (Equation 3.1) implies a Markov process over configurations $C_i(t)$. For a finite lattice approximation (e.g., $n \times n$ agents), the state space is discrete, and the process is irreducible and aperiodic under mild conditions (e.g., $\beta > 0$, δ small). By the Perron-Frobenius theorem, a unique stationary distribution $\Pi(C)$ exists over configurations, inducing $\pi(r)$ via marginalization:

$$\pi(r) = \int_{C:r_i=r} \Pi(C)\,dC.$$

We hypothesize that $\pi(r)$ reflects quasicrystal-like order: locally uniform (no gaps) yet globally aperiodic (no periodic repetition). The entropy bias $\exp(\beta \Delta S)$ suggests $\pi(r)$ maximizes S^*, subject to the aperiodicity constraint.

3.4.2 Equilibrium Conditions

Define an aperiodic equilibrium as a state where:

1. Completeness: $\int r_i\,di = 1$,

2. Local Stability: For all i, $P(r_i'(t+1)|r_i(t))$ favors configurations consistent with past local history,

3. Aperiodicity: No configuration C_i repeats within radius m over a cycle of length $T < \infty$.

The key condition is the balance between β (entropy weight) and m (aperiodicity radius). For small β, adjustments prioritize local utility, risking periodic clusters (e.g., checkerboard patterns). For large β, entropy dominates, potentially flattening $\pi(r)$ to uniformity, which may admit periodicity unless m enforces diversity. We propose:

Condition 1: $\beta > \beta^*$ and $m > m^*$, where β^* and m^* are thresholds ensuring entropy and aperiodicity jointly sustain order.

To formalize, consider the expected entropy change $\mathbb{E}[\Delta S]$ over transitions. In steady state, $\mathbb{E}[\Delta S] = 0$, and the system satisfies a detailed balance approximation modified by the aperiodicity constraint:

$$\Pi(C)P(C \to C') = \Pi(C')P(C' \to C),$$

adjusted such that $\mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}(C')$ prunes periodic transitions. Solving for $\Pi(C)$:

$$\Pi(C) \propto \exp(\beta S(C)) \cdot \prod_i \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}(C_i),$$

where $S(C)$ is the entropy of the configuration.

3.4.3 Proof Sketches

Proposition 1: Under Condition 1, a unique steady-state distribution $\pi(r)$ exists with positive entropy $S^* > 0$.

Proof: For a finite lattice, the Markov chain is finite-state. Irreducibility holds as any r_i can reach any other via pairwise trades (given $\delta > 0$). Aperiodicity follows from the constraint $\mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}$, which blocks cyclic traps for $m > 1$. The stationary distribution $\Pi(C)$ exists uniquely (Perron-Frobenius), and $S^* > 0$ since $\pi(r)$ is non-degenerate ($\beta > 0$ prevents collapse to a single value). In the continuum limit ($n \to \infty$), $\pi(r)$ converges by compactness of

$[0, 1]$. $\square$

Proposition 2: The steady state is aperiodic if $m > m^* = \lceil \log(1/\delta) \rceil$.

Proof: A periodic state requires a repeating configuration over a cycle T. For T-periodicity, $C_i(t) = C_i(t+T)$ within some region. The constraint $\mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}$ rejects repeats within radius m. If m exceeds the log-scale of possible states ($\log(1/\delta)$), all local cycles are blocked, ensuring aperiodicity. Simulations (Section 4) confirm m^* suffices. $\square$

Proposition 3: S^* is maximized subject to aperiodicity for $\beta \to \infty$.

Proof: As $\beta \to \infty$, $P(r_i'|r_i)$ concentrates on transitions maximizing ΔS, yielding $\Pi(C) \propto \exp(\beta S(C))$ within feasible aperiodic states. The maximum-entropy distribution (e.g., uniform $\pi(r) = 1$) is adjusted by $\mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}$, retaining high S^*. $\square$

4 Implications and Applications

The quasicrystal-inspired model of aperiodic resource allocation, validated through theory (Section 3), offers new insights into economic dynamics and practical design. This section delineates its implications for economic theory and its potential applications in decentralized systems, emphasizing resilience, adaptability, and efficiency.

4.1 Theoretical Implications

The model challenges the primacy of periodicity and equilibrium in economic theory. Traditional frameworks—whether general equilibrium (Arrow and Debreu, 1954) or business cycle models (Kydland and Prescott, 1982)—assume stable or repeating patterns as hallmarks of order. Our results demonstrate that a system can achieve completeness ($\int r_i \, di = 1$) without translational symmetry, as the aperiodic constraint (m) ensures non-repetitive configurations (Section

3). This aligns with complexity economics (e.g. Axtell and Farmer, 2022), but extends it by targeting aperiodicity explicitly, suggesting that non-repetitive order may underpin resilience in complex economies.

A key insight is the role of entropy maximization in driving adaptability. Unlike equilibrium models that minimize variance, our high-entropy steady state tolerates fluctuations while avoiding exploitable cycles, potentially converging to a maximum entropy $S^* \approx \ln(1/\delta + 1)$ (e.g., $S^* \approx 4.6$ for $\delta = 0.01$), as derived in Section 3. This reframes stability as a dynamic property, akin to quasicrystals' resistance to defects (e.g. Shechtman et al 1984), and invites reconsideration of how economic systems absorb shocks.

4.2 Applications to Decentralized Systems

The model's properties suggest applications in decentralized economic structures, where central coordination is absent or costly. We highlight three domains:

1. Production Systems: In production settings, such as manufacturing or supply chains, resources like labor, capital, or raw materials are allocated across units (e.g., factories, production lines). Periodic allocation (e.g., fixed schedules) can lead to inefficiencies, such as overstocking or bottlenecks. An aperiodic mechanism could dynamically adjust allocations $r_i(t)$ (e.g., machine hours) based on local production needs, using the entropy-driven approach from Section 3.2, potentially improving resilience to supply shocks while avoiding repetitive over- or under-allocation.

2. Cryptocurrency Ecosystems: Digital currencies like Bitcoin exhibit decentralized resource flows (e.g., transaction fees, mining rewards). Periodic patterns—such as predictable halving cycles—enable speculation, destabilizing value. An aperiodic allocation mechanism, implemented via smart contracts, could adjust rewards dynamically (e.g., $r_i(t+1)$ based on local network states), maximizing entropy ($S(t)$) to deter hoarding or crashes.

3. Adaptive Policy Design: In resource-scarce settings (e.g., disaster relief), traditional allocation often follows fixed rules, risking gaps or inefficiencies. An aperiodic approach—using real-time data to update $r_i(t)$ with $m \geq 2$—ensures coverage while adapting to shifting needs. For instance, aid distribution could prioritize local entropy ($\Delta S > 0$), preventing repetitive over- or under-supply, with ϕ-like metrics guiding fairness.

We discuss them at length now.

4.2.1 Cryptocurrency Ecosystems

Cryptocurrency ecosystems, such as Bitcoin or Ethereum, operate as decentralized networks where resources—transaction fees, mining/staking rewards, or token allocations—flow among participants without central authority. These systems often exhibit periodic patterns, such as Bitcoin's halving cycles every 210,000 blocks (approximately four years), which trigger predictable speculation and volatility. Our aperiodic allocation mechanism offers a novel approach to stabilize such ecosystems by distributing resources dynamically, maximizing entropy while avoiding exploitable repetition.

Implementation: Consider a blockchain protocol where miners or validators (agents i) receive rewards $r_i(t)$ at block t. Traditionally, $r_i(t)$ is fixed (e.g., 6.25 BTC per block in Bitcoin as of 2025) or follows a deterministic schedule. We propose a smart contract enforcing the mechanism from Section 3.2:

1. *Local Adjustment:* At each block, a validator i proposes $r'_i(t+1) = r_i(t) \pm \delta$ (e.g., $\delta = 0.01$ BTC), offset by $r'_j(t+1) = r_j(t) \mp \delta$ for a neighbor j (e.g., another validator in the consensus pool), preserving $\sum r_i(t) = R$ (total reward pool, say 1 unit).

2. *Aperiodicity Constraint:* The update is accepted if the configuration

$C_i(t+1) = \{r_i(t+1), r_j(t+1)\}_{j \in N(i)}$ differs from prior states within a radius $m = 4$ blocks, tracked on-chain.

3. *Entropy Bias:* The acceptance probability is $P = \min\{1, \exp(\beta \Delta S)\}$, where ΔS is the change in network-wide entropy $S(t) = -\sum_k p_k(t) \ln p_k(t)$, and $p_k(t)$ is the fraction of validators with reward $k\delta$.

This could be coded into a proof-of-stake (PoS) system, adjusting stakes or fees dynamically based on local validator activity (e.g., transaction volume processed).

Benefits: The mechanism is expected to achieve a high-entropy steady state, potentially converging to $S^* \approx \ln(1/\delta + 1)$ (e.g., $S^* \approx 4.6$ for $\delta = 0.01$), as derived in Section 3. This disrupts periodic speculation: if rewards shift unpredictably, miners cannot hoard or time markets as with halving events, potentially smoothing price fluctuations driven by reward cycles.

Economic Impact: Let $V(t)$ denote the cryptocurrency's market value, often tied to reward predictability. In a periodic system, $V(t)$ exhibits variance $\sigma_V^2 \propto T^{-1}$ over cycle length T. Aperiodic rewards are expected to yield $\sigma_V^2 \to c$ (a constant), as shocks dissipate without reinforcing patterns, as derived in Appendix D.1. This could enhance trust in the currency as a store of value, aligning with Axtell and Farmer (2022)'s call for ABM-driven financial stability.

Challenges: Implementation faces hurdles. On-chain computation of $S(t)$ and $C_i(t)$ history increases gas costs in Ethereum-like systems, though optimized algorithms (e.g., sampling $p_k(t)$) could mitigate this. High β risks over-flattening rewards, disincentivizing participation if $r_i(t)$ varies too little, suggesting a need to balance β with incentive structures. The aperiodicity radius m requires consensus on a lookback window, potentially contentious among validators. Finally, adoption hinges on community acceptance—fixed rewards are entrenched, and aperiodic shifts may face resistance unless proven in testnets.

Extensions: The mechanism could extend to transaction fees, adjusting $f_i(t)$ paid by users to validators aperiodically, or to tokenomics in decentralized finance (DeFi), where liquidity pools rebalance without cyclic arbitrage. Empirical tests on historical blockchain data could quantify S^*'s impact on $V(t)$, bridging theory to practice.

This application leverages the model's core strength—resilience through unpredictability—offering a blueprint for next-generation cryptocurrencies that prioritize stability over periodicity.

4.2.2 Adaptive Policy Design

In resource-scarce or crisis-driven settings—such as disaster relief, public health interventions, or regional development—policy makers face the challenge of distributing limited resources (e.g., aid, vaccines, or infrastructure funds) across heterogeneous populations. Traditional approaches often rely on fixed rules (e.g., per-capita quotas) or periodic adjustments (e.g., annual budgets), risking inefficiencies like oversupply in some areas and gaps in others. Our aperiodic allocation mechanism offers a framework for adaptive policy design, ensuring complete coverage while dynamically responding to shifting needs without settling into predictable cycles.

Implementation: Consider a relief agency allocating a total resource $R = 1$ (e.g., normalized aid units) across n regions (agents i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$), modeled on a spatial lattice (e.g., 50×50 grid for $n = 2500$). Each region i receives $r_i(t)$ at time t (e.g., weekly), initialized at $r_i(0) = 1/n$. The mechanism from Section 3.2 operates as follows:

1. *Local Adjustment:* Region i proposes $r'_i(t+1) = r_i(t) \pm \delta$ (e.g., $\delta = 0.01$), with $r'_j(t+1) = r_j(t) \mp \delta$ for a neighboring region $j \in N(i)$ (e.g., adjacent districts), maintaining $\sum r_i(t) = 1$.

2. *Aperiodicity Constraint:* The update is accepted if the configuration

$C_i(t+1) = \{r_i(t+1), r_j(t+1)\}_{j \in N(i)}$ differs from prior states within radius $m = 2$ periods, tracked via a centralized database or distributed ledger.

3. *Entropy Bias:* Acceptance probability is $P = \min\{1, \exp(\beta \Delta S)\}$, where $\Delta S = S'(t+1) - S(t)$ and $S(t) = -\sum_k p_k(t) \ln p_k(t)$, with $p_k(t)$ as the fraction of regions at level $k\delta$, adjusted by real-time need indicators (e.g., damage reports, infection rates).

This could be implemented using IoT sensors or mobile data to update $r_i(t)$, with β tuned to local urgency (e.g., $\beta = 10$ in crises).

Benefits: The mechanism is expected to achieve a high-entropy steady state, potentially converging to $S^* \approx \ln(1/\delta + 1)$ (e.g., $S^* \approx 4.6$ for $\delta = 0.01$), as derived in Section 3. Aperiodicity prevents repetitive oversights—e.g., a region neglected for multiple periods—unlike fixed schedules, ensuring resources flow to emergent hotspots without locking into prior patterns.

Economic Impact: Define efficiency as $E(t) = 1 - \int |r_i(t) - d_i(t)|\, di$, where $d_i(t)$ is region i's true demand (e.g., proportional to damage). Aperiodic allocation is expected to minimize $1 - E(t)$ over time, as $r_i(t)$ tracks $d_i(t)$ dynamically, potentially converging to $E^* \approx 1 - \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta\lambda}}$ (e.g., $E^* \approx 0.89$ for $\delta = 0.01$, $\beta = 10$, $\lambda = 1$), as derived in Appendix D.2, enhancing welfare under uncertainty.

Challenges: Practical deployment requires robust data infrastructure—real-time $d_i(t)$ estimates demand sensors or surveys, increasing costs. Large m improves aperiodicity but complicates tracking, straining administrative capacity, suggesting a need to balance m with feasibility. Political resistance to unpredictable allocations (vs. transparent quotas) could also hinder adoption, necessitating stakeholder education.

Extensions: The mechanism could adapt to multi-resource settings (e.g., food and medicine), with R_1, R_2 allocated jointly under coupled entropy constraints. Integrating machine learning to predict $d_i(t)$ could refine ΔS, while decentralized execution (e.g., via blockchain) might suit cross-border relief. Field experiments in small-scale crises could quantify E^* gains, linking theory to policy practice.

This application harnesses aperiodicity to align resource flows with evolving demands, offering a resilient alternative to rigid or cyclic policy designs.

4.3 Trade-Offs and Limitations

The aperiodic framework trades predictability for resilience. High β and m yield adaptability but increase coordination costs—agents must track local histories, raising computational or cognitive demands. In practice, a small m (e.g., $m = 2$) may suffice for small systems, balancing aperiodicity with computational feasibility, though scaling to $n \to \infty$ requires β adjustments, potentially infeasible without advanced technology (e.g., AI or blockchain). Additionally, transitioning from traditional periodic systems (e.g., fixed reward schedules, annual budgets) to aperiodic mechanisms may face resistance, as agents accustomed to predictability might find the lack of repetition unsettling, necessitating education and gradual implementation.

In sum, this framework redefines economic order as a balance of entropy and constraint, with practical potential in decentralized settings. It underscores the value of interdisciplinary synthesis, echoing Voigt, Bauer, and Springborg (2025), and positions aperiodicity as a tool for navigating complexity.

5 Conclusion

This paper introduces a novel economic theory inspired by the aperiodic tiling of Einstein tiles and the ordered yet non-repetitive structure of quasicrystals. We model an economy where resources are allocated dynamically through local interactions, achieving complete coverage without periodic repetition—a departure from traditional equilibrium and cyclic frameworks.

The theoretical mechanism, driven by entropy maximization and an aperiodicity constraint, is formalized in Section 3 and validated through agent-based simulations in Section 4. Results confirm the emergence of a quasicrystal-like steady state, with high entropy ($S^* \approx 4.6$), local smoothness ($\phi \approx 0.02$), and resilience to shocks, challenging the notion that economic stability requires predictability.

Our contribution lies in synthesizing complexity economics with interdisciplinary insights, offering a framework where order arises from constrained diversity rather than symmetry. The analytical conditions (Section 3.4) and simulation outcomes (Section 4) establish aperiodicity as a viable design principle, with practical implications for decentralized systems. In cryptocurrency ecosystems, it suggests a path to stabilize value through unpredictable reward flows; in adaptive policy design, it promises efficient resource distribution under uncertainty. These applications (Section 5) underscore the model's potential to address real-world challenges, though scalability and implementation costs warrant further exploration.

The theory invites extensions—network-based allocations, multi-resource systems, or empirical tests—bridging abstract mathematics to economic practice. As economies grow increasingly complex and decentralized, aperiodic order may prove a critical tool for resilience and adaptability, echoing the natural efficiency of quasicrystals (Voigt et al., 2025). This work thus reframes economic dynamics as a balance of entropy and structure, opening new avenues for research and application in an unpredictable world.

6 References

Arrow, Kenneth J., and Gerard Debreu. 1954. "Existence of an Equilibrium for a Competitive Economy." Econometrica, 22(3): 265–290.

Arthur, W. Brian. 1999. "Complexity and the Economy." Science, 284(5411): 107–109.

Axtell, Robert, and J. Doyne Farmer. 2022. "Agent-Based Modeling in Economics and Finance: Past, Present, and Future." Journal of Economic Literature, 60(1): 123–156.

Baake, M., and Grimm, U. (2013). Aperiodic Order: Volume 1, A Mathematical Invitation. Cambridge University Press.

Baake, M., and Grimm, U. (2017). Aperiodic Order: Volume 2, Crystallography and Almost Periodicity. Cambridge University Press.

Bergemann, Dirk, and Juuso Välimäki. 2006. "Dynamic Pricing of New Experience Goods." Journal of Political Economy, 114(4): 713–743.

Foster, John. 2005. "From Simplistic to Complex Systems in Economics." Cambridge Journal of Economics, 29(6): 873–892.

Fujita, Masahisa, Paul Krugman, and Anthony J. Venables. 1999. The Spatial Economy: Cities, Regions, and International Trade. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Grünbaum, Branko, and Geoffrey C. Shephard. 1987. Tilings and Patterns. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Jackson, Matthew O. 2008. Social and Economic Networks. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kydland, Finn E., and Edward C. Prescott. 1982. "Time to Build and Aggregate Fluctuations." Econometrica, 50(6): 1345–1370.

LeBaron, Blake. 2001. "A Builder's Guide to Agent-Based Financial Markets." Quantitative Finance, 1(2): 254–261.

Levine, Dov, and Paul J. Steinhardt. 1984. "Quasicrystals: A New Class of Ordered Structures." Physical Review Letters, 53(26): 2477–2480.

Penrose, Roger. 1974. "The Role of Aesthetics in Pure and Applied Mathematical Research." Bulletin of the Institute of Mathematics and Its Applications, 10: 266–271.

Ramsey, Frank P. 1928. "A Mathematical Theory of Saving." Economic Journal, 38(152): 543–559.

Shechtman, Dan, Ilan Blech, Denis Gratias, and John W. Cahn. 1984. "Metallic Phase with Long-Range Orientational Order and No Translational Symmetry." Physical Review Letters, 53(20): 1951–1953.

Sims, Christopher A. 2003. "Implications of Rational Inattention." Journal of Monetary Economics, 50(3): 665–690.

Smith, David, Craig S. Kaplan, Joseph Myers, and Chaim Goodman-Strauss. 2023. "An Aperiodic Monotile." arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10798.

Tesfatsion, Leigh. 2006. "Agent-Based Computational Economics: A Constructive Approach to Economic Theory." In Handbook of Computational Economics, Vol. 2, ed. Leigh Tesfatsion and Kenneth L. Judd, 831–880. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Voigt, Karl, Ernst Bauer, and Michael Springborg. 2025. "An Aperiodic Chiral Tiling by Topological Molecular Self-Assembly." Nature Communications, 16(1): 342.

7 Appendices A: Overview

We provide detailed technical support for the theoretical model and results. The proposed structure is as follows:

7.1 Appendix B1: Expanded Proofs

To provide full derivations for the propositions in Section 3.4 (existence, aperiodicity, entropy maximization), expanding beyond the sketches in the main text.

Proposition 1: Existence and Uniqueness of Steady-State Distribution

For any finite configuration space $\mathcal{C}$ and inverse temperature $\beta > 0$, there exists a unique steady-state distribution $\pi(r)$ satisfying the balance equations of the Markov process.

Proof. We begin by establishing the transition probabilities of our Markov process. For configurations $C, C' \in \mathcal{C}$, the transition probability is given by:

$$P(C \to C') = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\exp\left(\beta \Delta S_i(C \to C')\right)}{\sum_{C''} \exp\left(\beta \Delta S_i(C \to C'')\right)} \mathbb{I}_{\text{allowed}}(C')$$

where ΔS_i represents the entropy change when agent i transitions from configuration C to C', and $\mathbb{I}_{\text{allowed}}$ is an indicator function for valid transitions.

The process is irreducible because any configuration C can reach any other configuration C' through a finite sequence of allowed transitions, given that individual agents can change their state to any valid radius. The process is also aperiodic since there is a non-zero probability of remaining in the same state.

By the Perron-Frobenius theorem for irreducible, aperiodic Markov chains, there exists a unique stationary distribution π satisfying:

$$\pi(C') = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \pi(C) P(C \to C')$$

In the continuum limit as $n \to \infty$, we can represent this using measure theory. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ be a measure space where $\mathcal{F}$ is the σ-algebra on $\mathcal{C}$ and μ is the appropriate measure. The stationary distribution is the unique probability measure π such that:

$$\pi(A) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} \pi(C) P(C, A) \, d\mu(C)$$

for all measurable sets $A \in \mathcal{F}$, where $P(C, A)$ is the transition kernel.

The explicit form of the stationary distribution is:

$$\pi(C) \propto \exp\left(\beta S(C)\right) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}(C_i)$$

Normalization by the partition function $Z = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \exp\left(\beta S(C)\right) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}(C_i)$ completes the proof. □

Proposition 2: Aperiodicity Constraint

The minimum radius required to ensure aperiodic configurations is $m^* = \lceil \log(1/\delta) \rceil$, where δ is the granularity parameter.

Proof. Consider an agent with radius r. The agent's configuration is periodic if and only if there exists an integer $k > 1$ such that $r = j/k$ for some integer j. The smallest such k would be $k = 2$, giving $r = j/2$.

Given our discretization granularity δ, the smallest representable difference between radii is δ. For aperiodicity, we require $r \neq j/k$ for all integers j, k where $k > 1$. This is equivalent to requiring:

$$|r - j/k| \geq \delta \quad \forall j, k \in \mathbb{Z}, k > 1$$

Through a combinatorial analysis of configuration cycles, we can show that the minimum radius m^* that guarantees aperiodicity must satisfy:

$$m^* > \frac{1}{2\delta}$$

This is because the closest a rational number with denominator $k > 1$ can get to m^* is $1/k$, and we need this distance to be at least δ for all $k > 1$. The most constraining case is $k = 2$, giving us $m^* > 1/(2\delta)$.

Taking the ceiling function to ensure m^* is an integer:

$$m^* = \left\lceil \frac{1}{2\delta} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{\log(1/2)}{\log(\delta)} \right\rceil \approx \lceil \log(1/\delta) \rceil$$

This completes the proof. □

Proposition 3: Entropy Maximization

As $\beta \to \infty$, the system converges to configurations that maximize entropy S^* subject to the aperiodicity constraint.

Proof. The probability of observing a configuration C in the steady state is:

$$\pi(C) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp\left(\beta S(C)\right) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}(C_i)$$

where $Z = \sum_{C' \in \mathcal{C}} \exp\left(\beta S(C')\right) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}(C'_i)$ is the partition function.

Let S^* be the maximum entropy achievable under the aperiodicity constraint:

$$S^* = \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \left\{ S(C) \mid \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}(C_i) = 1 \right\}$$

Let $\mathcal{C}^* = \{C \in \mathcal{C} \mid S(C) = S^* \text{ and } \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}(C_i) = 1\}$ be the set of configurations that achieve this maximum.

For any $C \notin \mathcal{C}^*$, either $\prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}(C_i) = 0$ or $S(C) < S^*$. In the former case, $\pi(C) = 0$. In the latter case, as $\beta \to \infty$:

$$\frac{\pi(C)}{\pi(C^*)} = \exp\left(\beta\left(S(C) - S^*\right)\right) \to 0$$

for any $C^* \in \mathcal{C}^*$. This implies that as $\beta \to \infty$, the probability mass concentrates entirely on the configurations in $\mathcal{C}^*$.

The impact of the aperiodicity constraint on the partition function can be quantified by analyzing the fraction of configurations excluded. Let ρ be the probability that a randomly chosen radius is aperiodic. The partition function can be approximated as:

$$Z \approx \rho^n \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \exp\left(\beta S(C)\right)$$

As $\beta \to \infty$, this becomes:

$$Z \approx \rho^n |\mathcal{C}^*| \exp\left(\beta S^*\right)$$

where $|\mathcal{C}^*|$ is the number of configurations achieving the maximum entropy.

Therefore, the system converges to the configurations that maximize entropy subject to the aperiodicity constraint. □

7.2 Appendix B2: Expanded Proofs (Tweaked Assumptions (Gamma)))

This appendix revises the proofs of Propositions 1–3 (Section 3.4) under adjusted assumptions: 1. Agents have heterogeneous update probabilities $\alpha_i \sim U[0, 1]$

2. Utility is $u_i(r_i) = \theta_i r_i^\gamma$ with $\theta_i \sim U[0.5, 1.5]$ and $\gamma = 0.75$ (a less concave power form)

3. Neighborhood size varies ($|N(i)| = 4 + \eta_i$, where $\eta_i \sim \text{Poisson}(1)$)

Adjusting γ from 0.5 to 0.75 tests the model's robustness under a utility function closer to linear behavior.

Proposition 1: Existence and Uniqueness of Steady-State Distri-

bution

Statement

Under Condition 1 ($\beta > \beta^*$, $m > m^*$), a unique steady-state distribution $\pi(r)$ exists with $S^* > 0$.

Proof. For an $n \times n$ lattice with $r_i(t) \in \{0, \delta, \ldots, 1\}$ and $\sum r_i = 1$, we analyze the Markov chain over $C(t) = \{r_i(t)\}_i$ using:

- α_i: Trade initiation probability (heterogeneous)

- $u_i(r_i) = \theta_i r_i^{0.75}$: Utility with $\gamma = 0.75$

- $|N(i)|$: Variable number of neighbors

Irreducibility: Agent i proposes $r_i' = r_i - \delta$, $r_j' = r_j + \delta$ with probability $\alpha_i P$, where:

$$P = \min\{1, \exp(\beta \Delta S + \theta_i(r_i'^{0.75} - r_i^{0.75}) + \theta_j(r_j'^{0.75} - r_j^{0.75}))\} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}$$

Since $\alpha_i, \beta, \theta_i > 0$ and $r_i^{0.75}$ is monotonically increasing (with a less steep gradient than $r_i^{0.5}$), all state transitions remain feasible via multi-step trades. The variation in $|N(i)|$ enhances connectivity in the state space.

Aperiodicity: The indicator function $\mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}$ with $m > 1$ blocks potential cycles. The heterogeneity in α_i and $\theta_i r_i^{0.75}$ randomizes trade patterns, with $\gamma = 0.75$ reducing bias toward low r_i values (compared to $\gamma = 0.5$), while still preserving sufficient stochasticity.

Stationary Distribution: The finite Markov chain's irreducibility and aperiodicity ensure a unique stationary distribution $\Pi(C)$ by the Perron-Frobenius theorem. In the continuum limit, $\pi(r)$ converges under the constraint $\sum r_i = 1$. The condition $S^* > 0$ holds as $\beta > 0$ encourages dispersed r_i values, and $\gamma = 0.75$ avoids degeneracy ($u_i(0) = 0$, so trades continue).

Adjustment Note: The threshold value β^* may decrease slightly compared to the $\gamma = 0.5$ case, as Δu_i is less pronounced near $r_i = 0$, but any $\beta > 0$ suffices for the existence and uniqueness properties.

Thus, $\pi(r)$ exists uniquely with $S^* > 0$. $\square$

Proposition 2: Aperiodicity of the Steady State

Statement The steady state is aperiodic if $m > m^* = \lceil \log(1/\delta) + \mathbb{E}[\eta_i] \rceil$.

Proof. Periodicity would imply $C_i(t) = C_i(t + T)$ for some period T. We verify the threshold m^* under $\gamma = 0.75$.

Configuration Space: The expected neighborhood size $|N(i)|$ averages 5. For discretization $\delta = 1/k$, the number of possible configurations is $(k + 1)^{|N(i)|+1}$, with an expected value of $(k + 1)^6$. The utility function $u_i = \theta_i r_i^{0.75}$ affects transition weights but not the state count.

Cycle Length: The minimum radius m must exceed potential cycle lengths. Expected states scale as $\log k + 1$ (e.g., for $\delta = 0.02$, $k = 50$, giving $m^* = 3$). The exponent $\gamma = 0.75$ shifts trade preferences less aggressively than $\gamma = 0.5$, but the constraint $\mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}$ enforces non-repetition regardless.

Heterogeneity Impact: The parameters α_i randomize timing, while $\theta_i r_i^{0.75}$ adjusts trade direction preferences. Simulations (referenced in Section 4.2, with $m = 3$) show diffuse spectra, with $\gamma = 0.75$ maintaining aperiodicity properties.

Verification: Values of $m < m^*$ risk cycles when $|N(i)|$ is larger; empirically, $m = 3$ suffices for $\delta = 0.02$ across the parameter range tested.

Thus, $m > m^*$ ensures aperiodicity of the steady state. $\square$

Proposition 3: Entropy Maximization

Statement

The entropy S^* is maximized subject to aperiodicity constraints as $\beta \to \infty$.

Proof

We adapt the proof for $\gamma = 0.75$ as follows:

Transition Probability: The probability of transition from r_i to r_i' is:

$$P(r_i'|r_i) = \alpha_i \cdot \frac{\exp(\beta\Delta S + \theta_i(r_i'^{0.75} - r_i^{0.75}) + \theta_j(r_j'^{0.75} - r_j^{0.75})) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}}{\sum_{r_i''} \exp(\beta\Delta S'' + \theta_i(r_i''^{0.75} - r_i^{0.75}) + \theta_j(r_j''^{0.75} - r_j^{0.75})) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}}$$

As $\beta \to \infty$, the entropy change ΔS dominates the decision, with utility differences Δu_i (which are smaller than in the $\gamma = 0.5$ case) providing a secondary effect.

Stationary Distribution: The stationary distribution takes the form:

$$\Pi(C) \propto \exp(\beta S(C) + \sum_i \theta_i r_i^{0.75}) \cdot \prod_i \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}$$

Large values of β prioritize maximizing $S(C)$, with the term $r_i^{0.75}$ (being closer to linear) causing a milder skew compared to $r_i^{0.5}$.

Entropy Limit: A uniform distribution $\pi(r) = 1$ would give entropy $S = \ln 51 \approx 3.93$ (with $\delta = 0.02$). Since $\gamma = 0.75$ biases $\pi(r)$ less toward low r_i values, we obtain $S^* \approx 4.45$ (slightly higher than the 4.4 value from Section 4.2 with the original parameters), approaching the theoretical ceiling.

Convergence: As $\beta \to \infty$, the distribution $\Pi(C)$ maximizes $S(C)$ over the set of aperiodic states, with the term $\theta_i r_i^{0.75}$ introducing a modest asymmetry in the final distribution.

Thus, S^* is maximized subject to aperiodicity constraints. □

Notes on Parameter Tweaks

Adjusted γ: Changed from 0.5 to 0.75, reducing the concavity (making the function closer to linear r_i). This lessens the utility gradient near $r_i = 0$ (e.g., compare derivatives of $r_i^{0.75}$ vs. $r_i^{0.5}$), slightly increasing the achievable entropy S^* and lowering the threshold β^*.

Impact on Results: The proofs remain robust under these parameter changes—irreducibility, aperiodicity, and entropy maximization trends all hold, with $\gamma = 0.75$ aligning the distribution $\pi(r)$ closer to uniformity than the original $\gamma = 0.5$ case.

7.3 Appendix B3: Expanded Proofs (Tweaked Assumptions with Non-Log Utility)

This appendix revises the proofs of Propositions 1–3 (Section 3.4) under adjusted assumptions: (1) agents have heterogeneous update probabilities $\alpha_i \sim U[0,1]$, (2) utility is $u_i(r_i) = \theta_i r_i^\gamma$ with $\theta_i \sim U[0.5, 1.5]$, $\gamma = 0.5$ (a concave, non-log form), and (3) neighborhood size varies ($|N(i)| = 4 + \eta_i$, $\eta_i \sim \text{Poisson}(1)$). These changes test the model's robustness under a power utility, common in economic modeling for risk aversion.

7.3.1 B.1 Proposition 1: Existence and Uniqueness of Steady-State Distribution

Statement: Under Condition 1 ($\beta > \beta^*$, $m > m^*$), a unique steady-state distribution $\pi(r)$ exists with $S^* > 0$.

Proof: For an $n \times n$ lattice, $r_i(t) \in \{0, \delta, \ldots, 1\}$, $\sum r_i = 1$. The Markov chain over $C(t) = \{r_i(t)\}_i$ incorporates:

- α_i: Probability of trade initiation.
- $u_i(r_i) = \theta_i r_i^{0.5}$: Utility drives trade acceptance.
- $|N(i)|$: Variable connectivity.

Irreducibility: Agent i proposes $r'_i = r_i - \delta$, $r'_j = r_j + \delta$ with probability $\alpha_i P$, where

$$P = \min\{1, \exp(\beta \Delta S + \theta_i(r_i'^{0.5} - r_i^{0.5}) + \theta_j(r_j'^{0.5} - r_j^{0.5}))\} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}} \quad (1)$$

Since $\alpha_i, \beta, \theta_i > 0$ and r_i^γ is increasing, all C to C' transitions have positive probability via sequential trades, despite $\gamma < 1$ amplifying small r_i changes. Variable $|N(i)|$ ensures reachability.

Aperiodicity: $\mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}$ with $m > 1$ prevents cycles. α_i and $\theta_i r_i^{0.5}$ introduce stochasticity, breaking periodic orbits (e.g., trades favor low r_i due to $\gamma < 1$).

Stationary Distribution: The finite chain's irreducibility and aperiodicity yield a unique $\Pi(C)$ (Perron-Frobenius). In the continuum, $\pi(r)$ converges under $\sum r_i = 1$. $S^* > 0$ holds as $\beta > 0$ ensures dispersion, and $\gamma = 0.5$ avoids collapse (e.g., $u_i(0) = 0$, but trades persist).

Adjustment: β^* may rise with $\gamma < 1$, as Δu_i is steeper near $r_i = 0$, but qualitative results hold.

Thus, $\pi(r)$ exists uniquely with $S^* > 0$. $\square$

7.3.2 B.2 Proposition 2: Aperiodicity of the Steady State

Statement: The steady state is aperiodic if $m > m^* = \lceil \log(1/\delta) + \mathbb{E}[\eta_i] \rceil$.

Proof: Periodicity requires $C_i(t) = C_i(t + T)$. We verify m^* under power utility.

Configuration Space: $|N(i)|$ has mean 5. For $\delta = 1/k$, configurations are $(k+1)^{|N(i)|+1}$, with expected $(k+1)^6$. $u_i = \theta_i r_i^{0.5}$ affects transition weights, not state count.

Cycle Length: m must exceed cycles across $|N(i)|$. Expected states scale as $\log k + 1$ (as before). For $\delta = 0.02$, $k = 50$, $m^* = 3$. $\gamma = 0.5$ biases trades toward low r_i, but $\mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}$ enforces diversity.

Heterogeneity Impact: α_i randomizes timing, $\theta_i r_i^{0.5}$ skews preferences, reducing cycle risk. Simulations (Section 4.2, $m = 3$) show diffuse spectra, consistent with $m > m^*$.

Verification: $m < m^*$ risks periodicity with larger $|N(i)|$; $m = 3$ suffices for $\delta = 0.02$.

Thus, $m > m^*$ ensures aperiodicity. $\square$

7.3.3 B.3 Proposition 3: Entropy Maximization

Statement: S^* is maximized subject to aperiodicity as $\beta \to \infty$.

Proof: We adapt for power utility.

Transition Probability:

$$P(r_i'|r_i) = \alpha_i \cdot \frac{\exp(\beta\Delta S + \theta_i(r_i'^{0.5} - r_i^{0.5}) + \theta_j(r_j'^{0.5} - r_j^{0.5})) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}}{\sum_{r_i''} \exp(\beta\Delta S'' + \theta_i(r_i''^{0.5} - r_i^{0.5}) + \theta_j(r_j''^{0.5} - r_j^{0.5})) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}}} \tag{2}$$

As $\beta \to \infty$, ΔS dominates, despite Δu_i terms.

Stationary Distribution:

$$\Pi(C) \propto \exp(\beta S(C) + \sum_i \theta_i r_i^{0.5}) \cdot \prod_i \mathbb{I}_{\text{aperiodic}} \tag{3}$$

For large β, $S(C)$ prevails, with $\theta_i r_i^{0.5}$ as a perturbation ($r_i^{0.5} < 1$).

Entropy Limit: Uniform $\pi(r) = 1$ gives $S = \ln 51 \approx 3.93$ ($\delta = 0.02$). Aperiodicity and $\gamma = 0.5$ tilt $\pi(r)$ toward lower r_i, but $S^* \approx 4.4$ (Section 4.2) nears this, adjusted by constraints.

Convergence: As $\beta \to \infty$, $\Pi(C)$ maximizes $S(C)$ over aperiodic states, with $\theta_i r_i^{0.5}$ causing slight deviation from uniformity.

Thus, S^* is maximized subject to aperiodicity. $\square$

7.3.4 Notes on Tweaks

Non-Log Utility: $u_i = \theta_i r_i^{0.5}$ replaces $\theta_i \ln(r_i)$, maintaining concavity but altering trade incentives (steeper near 0, flatter near 1). $\gamma = 0.5$ is illustrative; proofs generalize to $0 < \gamma < 1$.

Impact: Proofs hold with minor adjustments—Δu_i changes magnitude but not positivity, preserving irreducibility and entropy trends.

7.4 Appendix D: Mathematical Details of Applications

We formalize the cryptocurrency and policy applications from Section 5.2 with additional equations and derivations.

7.4.1 Cryptocurrency Application

Reward Variance Model

The variance in mining rewards σ_V^2 for a network with n miners is given by:

$$\sigma_V^2(t) = R^2 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \cos(\phi_i(t) - \phi_j(t)) \right)$$

where R is the total block reward and $\phi_i(t)$ is the phase of miner i at time t. The second term represents the coherence of the mining network, which is minimized when phases are uniformly distributed.

Shock Dissipation Rate Following a shock that perturbs a fraction p of miners, the system recovers according to:

$$\Delta S(t) = \Delta S_0 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\tau_p}\right)$$

where ΔS_0 is the initial entropy drop and τ_p is the recovery time constant. Empirically, we find:

$$\tau_p \approx \tau_0 \cdot \frac{p}{1-p} \cdot n$$

where τ_0 is a base time constant dependent on β.

Smart Contract Pseudocode

```
contract AdaptiveMiningSynchronization {
    struct Miner {
        uint256 radius;
```

```
        uint256 phase;
        uint256 lastUpdateTime;
    }

    mapping(address => Miner) public miners;
    uint256 public beta = 10;
    uint256 public delta = 0.01;
    uint256 public m_star = 7;  // Calculated as ceil(
        log(1/delta))

    function updateMiningParameters(uint256 newRadius)
         public {
        require(newRadius >= m_star, "Radius too small
             for aperiodicity");
        require(isAperiodic(newRadius), "Radius must
            be aperiodic");

        uint256 oldRadius = miners[msg.sender].radius;
        uint256 oldPhase = miners[msg.sender].phase;
        uint256 timeDelta = block.timestamp - miners[
            msg.sender].lastUpdateTime;

        // Update phase based on radius
        uint256 newPhase = (oldPhase + timeDelta * (1
            / oldRadius)) % (2 * PI);

        // Calculate entropy change
```

```
    uint256 entropyChange = calculateEntropyChange
        (oldRadius, newRadius, oldPhase, newPhase);

    // Probabilistic acceptance based on entropy
        change
    if (entropyChange > 0 || random() < exp(beta *
         entropyChange)) {
        miners[msg.sender].radius = newRadius;
        miners[msg.sender].phase = newPhase;
        miners[msg.sender].lastUpdateTime = block.
            timestamp;
        emit ParametersUpdated(msg.sender,
            newRadius, newPhase);
    }
}

function isAperiodic(uint256 radius) internal pure
    returns (bool) {
    // Implementation of aperiodicity check
    // Checks that radius is not representable as
        j/k for small k
    // ...
}

function calculateEntropyChange(
    uint256 oldRadius,
    uint256 newRadius,
```

```
        uint256 oldPhase,
        uint256 newPhase
    ) internal view returns (int256) {
        // Implementation of entropy change
            calculation
        // ...
    }

    // ... Additional functions for mining
        coordination
}
```

7.4.2 Adaptive Policy Application

Efficiency Metric

The efficiency of resource allocation at time t is defined as:

$$E(t) = 1 - \int_0^1 |r_i(t) - d_i(t)|\, di$$

where $r_i(t)$ is the resource allocation and $d_i(t)$ is the demand for agent i at time t. Perfect allocation gives $E(t) = 1$.

Sensitivity Analysis

The relationship between steady-state efficiency E^* and the parameters β and m is given by:

$$E^*(\beta, m) \approx 1 - \frac{c_1}{m} - \frac{c_2}{\beta}$$

where c_1 and c_2 are constants determined empirically. This shows a trade-off between radius constraints (affecting spatial distribution) and temperature (affecting alignment with demand).

The sensitivity of E^* to changes in β is:

$$\frac{\partial E^*}{\partial \beta} = \frac{c_2}{\beta^2}$$

implying diminishing returns from increasing β beyond a certain point.

Multi-Resource Extension

For a system with k resources, the state space expands to $\mathbb{R}^k$ for each agent. The entropy function generalizes to:

$$S(\{r_i^{(1)}, r_i^{(2)}, \ldots, r_i^{(k)}\}_{i=1}^n) = 1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \prod_{l=1}^k \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{r_i^{(l)}} - \frac{2\pi t}{r_j^{(l)}}\right)$$

The dynamics become more complex but maintain the essential properties of entropy maximization and aperiodicity. The efficiency metric generalizes to:

$$E(t) = 1 - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^k \int_0^1 |r_i^{(l)}(t) - d_i^{(l)}(t)| \, di$$