

Chaos or Noise — Difficulties of a Distinction

M. Cencini ^(a,b), M. Falcioni^(a), H. Kantz^(b), E. Olbrich^(b) and A. Vulpiani ^(a)

(a) Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma "La Sapienza"

and INFN, Unitá di Roma,

p.le Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy

(b) Max-Planck-Institut für Physik komplexer Systeme,

Nöthnitzer Str. 38, D-01187 Dresden, Germany

Abstract

In experiments, the dynamical behavior of systems is reflected in time series. Due to the finiteness of the observational data set it is not possible to reconstruct the invariant measure up to arbitrary fine resolution and arbitrary high embedding dimension. These restrictions limit our ability to distinguish between signals generated by different systems, such as regular, chaotic or stochastic ones, when analyzed from a time series point of view. We propose to classify the signal behavior, without referring to any specific model, as stochastic or deterministic on a certain scale of the resolution ϵ , according to the dependence of the (ϵ, τ) -entropy, $h(\epsilon, \tau)$, and of the finite size Lyapunov exponent, $\lambda(\epsilon)$, on ϵ .

PACS:05.45.Tp, 05.45.-a

Keywords: Time series analysis, ϵ -entropy, distinguishing determinism from noise

I. INTRODUCTION

It is a long debated question if and by what means we can distinguish whether an observed irregular signal is deterministically chaotic or stochastic [1–5]. If the signal was obtained by iterating a certain model on a computer, we can give a definite answer, because we know the law which generated the signal.

In the case of time series recorded from experimental measurements, we are in a totally different situation. Indeed, in most of cases, there is no unique model of the “system” which produced the data. Moreover we will see that knowing the character of the model might not be an adequate answer to the question of the character of the signal. For example, data of Brownian motion can be modeled by a deterministic regular process as well as by a deterministic chaotic or stochastic process, as we will show in section IV.

In principle, if we were able to determine the maximum Lyapunov exponent (λ) or the Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy per unit time (h_{KS}) of a data sequence, we know, with no uncertainty, whether the sequence is generated by a deterministic law (in which case $\lambda, h_{KS} < \infty$) or by a stochastic law (in which case $\lambda, h_{KS} \rightarrow \infty$).

In spite of their conceptual relevance, there are evident practical problems with such quantities that are defined as infinite time averages taken in the limit of arbitrary fine resolution, since, typically, we have access only to a finite (and often very limited) range of scales. In order to cope with these limitations, in this paper we make use of the “finite size Lyapunov exponent” (FSLE) [6], a variant of the maximum Lyapunov exponent, and the (ϵ, τ) -entropy per unit time [7–9], a generalization of the Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy per unit time. Basically, while for evaluating λ and h_{KS} one has to detect the properties of a system with infinite resolution, for determining the FSLE, $\lambda(\epsilon)$, or the (ϵ, τ) -entropy per unit time, $h(\epsilon, \tau)$, the investigation on the system is performed at a finite scale ϵ , i.e. with a finite resolution. $\lambda(\epsilon)$ gives us the average exponential rate of the divergence between close (on scale ϵ) trajectories of a system, and $h(\epsilon, \tau)$ is the average rate of information needed for prediction. If properly defined $h(\epsilon, \tau) \xrightarrow{\epsilon, \tau \rightarrow 0} h_{KS}$ and that $\lambda(\epsilon) \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lambda$, if $\lambda \geq 0$. Thus, if we have the possibility of determining the behavior of $\lambda(\epsilon)$ or $h(\epsilon, \tau)$ for arbitrarily small scales, as pointed out above, we could answer the original question about the character (deterministic or stochastic) of the law that generated the recorded signal.

However, the limits of infinite time and resolution, besides being unattainable when dealing with experimental data, may also result to be physically uninteresting. As a matter of fact, it is now clear that the maximum Lyapunov exponent and the Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy are not completely satisfactory for a proper characterization of the many faces of complexity and predictability of nontrivial systems, such as, for instance, intermittent systems [10] or systems with many degrees of freedom [6,11]. For example, in the case of the maximum Lyapunov exponent, one has to consider infinitesimal perturbations, i.e. infinitesimally close trajectories resp. infinite resolution. In systems with many degrees of freedom (e.g. turbulence) an infinitesimal perturbation means, from a physical point of view, that the differences $\delta x_k = x'_k - x_k$ of the components, x'_k and x_k , of the initially close state vectors \mathbf{x}' and \mathbf{x} , have to be much smaller than the typical values \tilde{x}_k of the variables x_k . If the \tilde{x}_k -s take very different values, then the concept of infinitesimal perturbation becomes physically unimportant, in the case one is interested only in the evolution of the components with the largest typical values [12,6] (e.g., the large scales in a turbulent motion).

Taking into account all the limitations mentioned above, in particular the practical impossibility to reach arbitrary fine resolution, we propose a different point of view on the distinction between chaos and noise. Neither it relies on a particular model for a given data set nor it ignores the fact that the character of a signal may depend on the resolution of the observation. Indeed $h(\epsilon, \tau)$ (or equivalently $\lambda(\epsilon)$) usually displays different behaviors as the range of scales is varied. According to these different behaviors, as it will become clear through the paper, one can define a notion of deterministic and stochastic behavior, respectively, on a certain range of scales.

In section II we recall the definitions of the (ϵ, τ) -entropy and the finite size Lyapunov exponent. In section III we discuss how one can consistently classify the stochastic or chaotic character of a signal by using the information theory concepts as the (ϵ, τ) -entropy and the redundancy and compare our approach with previous attempts. In section IV we discuss some examples showing that systems at the opposite in the realm of complexity can give similar results when analyzed from a time series point of view. Section V is devoted to a critical discussion of some recent, intriguing and (sometimes) controversial results for data analysis of “microscopic” chaos, in particular we comment the point of view to be adopted in interpreting the result of sec. IV. In section VI the reader finds the conclusions and some remarks on non trivial behaviors of high dimensional systems.

II. TWO CONCEPTS FOR A RESOLUTION DEPENDENT TIME SERIES ANALYSIS

A. (ϵ, τ) -entropy and redundancy

In this section we recall the definition of the (ϵ, τ) -entropy discussing its numerical computation, the possible technical problems as well as its properties.

We start with a continuous (in time) variable $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, which represents the state of a d -dimensional system, we discretize the time by introducing a time interval τ and we consider the new variable

$$\mathbf{X}^{(m)}(t) = (\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{x}(t + \tau), \dots, \mathbf{x}(t + m\tau - \tau)). \quad (1)$$

Of course $\mathbf{X}^{(m)}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{md}$ and it corresponds to the discretized trajectory in a time interval $T = m\tau$.

Usually, in data analysis, the space where the state vectors of the system live is not known. Mostly, only a scalar variable $u(t)$ can be measured. In these cases one considers vectors $\mathbf{X}^{(m)}(t) = (u(t), u(t + \tau), \dots, u(t + m\tau - \tau))$, that live in \mathbb{R}^m and allow a reconstruction of the original phase space, known as delay embedding in the literature [13,14]. It can be viewed as a special case of (1).

We introduce now a partition of the phase space \mathbb{R}^d , using cells of edge ϵ in each of the d directions. Since the region where a bounded motion evolves contains a finite number of cells, each $\mathbf{X}^{(m)}(t)$ can be coded into a word of length m , out of a finite alphabet:

$$\mathbf{X}^{(m)}(t) \longrightarrow W^m(\epsilon, t) = (i(\epsilon, t), i(\epsilon, t + \tau), \dots, i(\epsilon, t + m\tau - \tau)), \quad (2)$$

where $i(\epsilon, t + j\tau)$ labels the cell in \mathbb{R}^d containing $\mathbf{x}(t + j\tau)$. From the time evolution of $\mathbf{X}^{(m)}(t)$ one obtains, under the hypothesis of ergodicity, the probabilities $P(W^m(\epsilon))$ of the

admissible words $\{W^m(\epsilon)\}$. We can now introduce the (ϵ, τ) -entropy per unit time, $h(\epsilon, \tau)$ [8]:

$$h_m(\epsilon, \tau) = \frac{1}{\tau} [H_{m+1}(\epsilon, \tau) - H_m(\epsilon, \tau)] \quad (3)$$

$$h(\epsilon, \tau) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} h_m(\epsilon, \tau) = \frac{1}{\tau} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} H_m(\epsilon, \tau), \quad (4)$$

where H_m is the block entropy of block length m :

$$H_m(\epsilon, \tau) = - \sum_{\{W^m(\epsilon)\}} P(W^m(\epsilon)) \ln P(W^m(\epsilon)). \quad (5)$$

For sake of simplicity, we ignored the dependence on details of the partition. For a more rigorous definition one has to take into account all partitions with elements of size smaller than ϵ , and then define $h(\epsilon, \tau)$ by the infimum over all these partitions (see e.g. [9]). In numerical calculations we circumvent this difficulty by using coverings instead of partitions (see below).

A concept which is complementary to the ϵ -entropy is the ϵ -redundancy (see e.g. [15]) which measures the amount of uncertainty on future observations which can be removed by the knowledge of the past, namely:

$$r_m(\epsilon, \tau) = \frac{1}{\tau} [H_1(\epsilon, \tau) - (H_{m+1}(\epsilon, \tau) - H_m(\epsilon, \tau))], \quad (6)$$

where $H_1(\epsilon)$ estimates the uncertainty of the single outcome of the measurement, i.e. neglecting possible correlations in the signal. If the data are totally independent, i.e. IID, one has $H_m(\epsilon, \tau) = mH_1(\epsilon)$ and, therefore, $r_m(\epsilon, \tau) = 0$. On the opposite side, in the case of a periodic signal the redundancy is maximal $r_m(\epsilon, \tau) = H_1(\epsilon, \tau)/\tau$.

The Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy, h_{KS} , is obtained by taking the limit $\epsilon, \tau \rightarrow 0$:

$$h_{KS} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} h(\epsilon, \tau). \quad (7)$$

The KS-entropy is a dynamical invariant, i.e. it is independent of the used state representation (1), while this is not the case for the ϵ -entropy (4). To simplify the notation we drop the τ dependence in the following, apart from cases in which the τ dependencies is explicitly considered as in section IV.

In a genuine deterministic chaotic system one has $0 < h_{KS} < \infty$ ($h_{KS} = 0$ for a regular motion), while for a random process $h_{KS} = \infty$. The entropies $H_m(\epsilon)$ were above introduced using a partition and the usual Shannon entropy, however it is possible to arrive at the same notion starting from other entropy-like quantities, which are more suitable for numerical investigations. Following Cohen and Procaccia [16] one can estimate $H_m(\epsilon)$ as follows. Given a signal composed of N successive records and the embedding variable $\mathbf{X}^{(m)}$, let us introduce the quantities:

$$n_j^{(m)} = \frac{1}{N - m - 1} \sum_{i \neq j} \Theta(\epsilon - |\mathbf{X}^{(m)}(i\tau) - \mathbf{X}^{(m)}(j\tau)|), \quad (8)$$

then the block entropy $H_m(\epsilon)$ is given by

$$H_m^{(1)}(\epsilon) = -\frac{1}{(N-m)} \sum_j \ln n_j^{(m)}(\epsilon). \quad (9)$$

In practice $n_j^{(m)}(\epsilon)$ is an approximation of $P(W^m(\epsilon))$. From the numerical point of view the even more suited quantities are the correlation entropies [17,18]

$$H_m^{(2)}(\epsilon) = -\ln \left(\frac{1}{N-m} \sum_j n_j^{(m)}(\epsilon) \right) \leq H_m^{(1)}(\epsilon), \quad (10)$$

where one approximates the Shannon entropy by the Renyi entropy of order $q = 2$.

In the determination of h_{KS} by data analysis, one has to consider some subtle points (see [19] for a detailed discussion).

Let us just make some remarks about the general problems in the computation of the Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy from a time series of a deterministic system. The first point is the value of the embedding dimension m . Let us assume that the information dimension of the attractor of the deterministic system is D . In order to be able to observe a finite entropy, m has to be larger than D , since the behavior of the entropies in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ is

$$h_m(\epsilon) = \text{const} + O(\epsilon) \geq h_{KS}, \quad (11)$$

provided $m > D$ [20]. The second relevant point is the fact that the saturation, i.e. the regime where the entropy $h_m(\epsilon)$ does not depend on the length scale ϵ , can be observed only on length scales smaller than some ϵ_u . Thus it is possible to distinguish a deterministic signal from a random one only for $\epsilon < \epsilon_u$. Taking into account the number of points of the series, N , it is possible to give the following relation between the embedding dimension, the KS -entropy, the information dimension and the saturation range ϵ_u/ϵ_l :

$$\frac{\epsilon_u}{\epsilon_l} \leq \left(N e^{-m\tau h_{KS}} \right)^{\frac{1}{D}}, \quad (12)$$

where ϵ_u and ϵ_l are the upper and lower bounds of the interval of scales at which the deterministic character of a deterministic signal shows up [21]. If m is not large enough and/or ϵ is not small enough one can obtain misleading results, e.g. see sec. V.

The ϵ -entropy $h(\epsilon, \tau)$ is well defined also for stochastic processes. Its dependence on ϵ can give some insight in the underlying stochastic process [9]. In the case of finite τ it is possible to define a saturation range: below some length scale $\epsilon_u(\tau)$ we have

$$h_m(\epsilon) = \text{const} - \ln \epsilon + O(\epsilon) \quad (13)$$

But, the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$ will lead to $\epsilon_u \rightarrow 0$, thus the saturation will disappear. As it was shown in [9], for some stochastic processes it is possible to give an explicit expression of $h(\epsilon, \tau)$ in this limit. For instance, in the case of a stationary Gaussian process with spectrum $S(\omega) \propto \omega^{-2}$ one has [7]:

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} h(\epsilon, \tau) \sim \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}, \quad (14)$$

the same scaling behavior is also expected for Brownian motion [9]. It can be recovered by looking at $h(\epsilon, \tau)$ in a certain (ϵ, τ) region. See Ref. [9] for a detailed derivation of (14). We have to stress that the behavior predicted by eq. (14) may be difficult to be experimentally observed due to problems related to the choice of τ (see sect. IV).

B. Finite Size Lyapunov Exponent

The Finite Size Lyapunov Exponent (FSLE) was originally introduced in the context of the predictability problem in fully developed turbulence [6]. Such an indicator, as it will become clear below, is for some aspects the dynamical systems counterpart of the ϵ -entropy.

The basic idea of the FSLE is to define a growth rate for different size of the distance between a reference and a perturbed trajectory. In the following we discuss how the FSLE can be computed, by assuming to know the evolution equations. The generalization to data analysis is obtained following the usual ideas of “embedology” [14]. First one has to define a norm to measure the distance $\epsilon(t) = \|\delta\mathbf{x}(t)\|$ between a reference and a perturbed trajectory. In finite dimensional systems the maximum Lyapunov exponent is independent of the used norm. But when one considers finite perturbations there could be a dependence on the norm (as for infinite dimensional systems). Having defined the norm, one has to introduce a series of thresholds, i.e. $\epsilon_n = r^n \epsilon_0$ ($n = 1, \dots, P$), and to measure the “doubling time” ($T_r(\epsilon_n)$) at different thresholds. $T_r(\epsilon_n)$ is the time a perturbation of size ϵ_n takes to grow up to the next threshold, ϵ_{n+1} . The threshold rate r should not be taken too large, in order to avoid the error to grow through different scales. On the other hand, r cannot be too close to one, because otherwise the doubling time would be of the order of the time step in the integration (sampling time in data analysis) affecting the statistics. Typically, one uses $r = 2$ or $r = \sqrt{2}$. For simplicity T_r is called “doubling time” even if $r \neq 2$.

The doubling times $T_r(\epsilon_n)$ are obtained by following the evolution of the distance $\|\delta\mathbf{x}(t)\|$ from its initial value $\epsilon_{min} \ll \epsilon_0$ up to the largest threshold ϵ_P . Knowing the evolution equations, this is obtained by integrating the two trajectories of the system starting at an initial distance ϵ_{min} . In general, one must choose $\epsilon_{min} \ll \epsilon_0$, in order to allow the direction of the initial perturbation to align with the most unstable direction in the phase-space. Moreover, one must pay attention to keep $\epsilon_P < \epsilon_{saturation}$, so that all the thresholds can be attained ($\epsilon_{saturation}$ is the typical distance of two uncorrelated trajectories).

The evolution of the error from the initial value ϵ_{min} to the largest threshold ϵ_P carries out a single error-doubling experiment. At this point the model trajectory is rescaled at a distance ϵ_{min} with respect to the true one, and another experiment starts out. After \mathcal{N} error-doubling experiments, we can estimate the expectation value of some quantity A as:

$$\langle A \rangle_e = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} A_i. \quad (15)$$

This is not the same as taking the time average because each error doubling experiment may take a different time from the others. For the doubling time we have

$$\lambda(\epsilon_n) = \frac{1}{\langle T_r(\epsilon_n) \rangle_e} \ln r; \quad (16)$$

for details, see [6]. The method described above assumes that the distance between the two trajectories is continuous in time. This is not the case for maps or for discrete sampling in time, thus the method has to be slightly modified. In this case $T_r(\epsilon_n)$ is defined as the minimum time at which $\epsilon(T_r) \geq r\epsilon_n$, and now we have [6]

$$\lambda(\epsilon_n) = \frac{1}{\langle T_r(\epsilon_n) \rangle_e} \left\langle \ln \left(\frac{\epsilon(T_r)}{\epsilon_n} \right) \right\rangle_e. \quad (17)$$

It is worth to note that the computation of the FSLE is not more expensive than the computation of the Lyapunov exponent by the standard algorithm. One has simply to integrate two copies of the system and this can be done also for very complex simulations.

One can expect that in systems with only one positive Lyapunov exponent, one has $\lambda(\epsilon) \simeq h(\epsilon)$, see Ref. [6] for details. Additionally it is shown in Ref. [22] how it is possible to use the FSLE for characterizing the predictability (also from the data analysis point of view) of systems containing a slow component and a fast one. Let us comment on some advantages of the FSLE with respect to the (ϵ, τ) -entropy. For the FSLE it is not necessary to introduce an ϵ -partition and, most important, at variance with the (ϵ, τ) -entropy, the algorithmic procedure automatically finds the “proper time”; so that it is not necessary to decide on the right sampling time and to test the convergence at varying the words block size N . This point will be discussed in section IV C.

III. CLASSIFICATION BY ϵ -DEPENDENCE

In the previous section we discussed the ϵ -entropy and the FSLE as tools to characterize dynamical processes. Let us re-examine the question of distinguishing chaos and noise posed in the Introduction. Equations (11) and (13) allow us to make rigorous statements about the behavior of the entropy and the redundancy in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, which are summarized in the following table.

deterministic ($m > D$)		stochastic	
$r_m(\epsilon) \rightarrow \infty$		$h_m(\epsilon) \rightarrow \infty$	
chaotic	non-chaotic	white noise	colored noise
$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} h_m(\epsilon) > 0$	$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} h_m(\epsilon) = 0$	$r_m(\epsilon) = 0$	$r_m(\epsilon) > 0$

The behavior of the FSLE in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ is similar to that of the ϵ -entropy, $h(\epsilon)$. It is worth noting that the FSLE defined through the doubling times (see sect. II B) is zero also if $\lambda < 0$.

In all practical situations we have only a finite amount of data. Let us assume we have embedded the time series in a m -dimensional space, e.g. by time delay embedding. Then one can relate to this set of points an empirical measure μ^*

$$\mu^*(\mathbf{X}^{(m)}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta(\mathbf{X}^{(m)} - \mathbf{X}^{(m)}(i\tau)). \quad (18)$$

This empirical measure μ^* approximates the true measure only on length scales larger than a finite length scale ϵ_l . This means that we cannot perform the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Of course on a finite scale ϵ_l , both entropy and redundancy are always finite, therefore we are unable to decide which will reach infinity for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. But we can define stochastic and deterministic behavior of a time series at the length scale dependence of the entropy and the redundancy. Fig. 1 shows the typical behavior of the entropy $h_m(\epsilon)$ and the redundancy $r_m(\epsilon)$ in case of a deterministic model (2-dimensional chaotic map) and a stochastic model (autoregressive model of first order).

For a time series long enough, a “typical” system can show a saturation range for both the entropy and the redundancy. For decreasing length scales ϵ with $\epsilon < \epsilon_u$ one observes the following behaviors

deterministic	stochastic
$r_m(\epsilon) \propto -\ln \epsilon$	$h_m(\epsilon) \propto -\ln \epsilon$
$h_m(\epsilon) \approx const$	$r_m(\epsilon) \approx const$

In addition, as far as stochastic behaviors are concerned, the ϵ -entropy can exhibit power laws on large scales, e.g. in the case of diffusion eq. (14) (see section IV and Ref. [9] for further details).

If on some range of length scales either the entropy $h_m(\epsilon)$ or the redundancy $r_m(\epsilon)$ is a constant, we call the signal deterministic or stochastic on these length scales, respectively. Thus we have a practical tool to classify the character of a signal as deterministic or stochastic without referring to a model, and we are no longer obliged to answer the metaphysical question, whether the system which produced the data was a deterministic or a stochastic one.

Moreover, from this point of view, we are now able to give the notion of noisy chaos a clear meaning: chaotic scaling on large scales, stochastic scaling on small scales. We have also the notion of chaotic noise, namely stochastic scaling on large scales and deterministic scaling on small scales. These notions will become more clear with the examples in the following sections.

The presented method for distinguishing between chaos and noise is a refinement and generalization of one of the first discussed methods to approach this problem: estimating the correlation dimension and taking a finite value as a sign for the deterministic nature of the signal [23]. The main criticism to this approach is based on the work of Osborne and Provenzale [2], where they claimed that stochastic systems with a power-law spectrum will produce time series which exhibit a finite correlation dimension. A detailed discussion of this problem is beyond the scope of this paper, but a main step to clarify the problem was taken by Theiler [24]. Firstly he noted that the discussed signals were non-stationary and highly correlated with correlation times of the order of the length of the time series. From a conservative point of view one has to stop at this point with any attempt to calculate dimensions or entropies. If one proceeds nonetheless, Theiler showed that the result will depend on the number of data points and the length scale. If one has a sufficient number of data points one will encounter also for this kind of signals the embedding dimension which leads to the typical behavior as given in (13) for the entropy. Moreover, if one uses the usual time delay embedding like (1) in contrast to [2] and [24], the result depends strongly on the chosen delay time.

We are aware that there are a lot of other attempts to distinguish chaos from noise discussed in the literature. They are based on the difference in the predictability using prediction algorithms rather than the estimating the entropy [3,4] or they relate determinism to the smoothness of the signal [5,25]. All these methods have in common that one has to choose a certain length scale ϵ and a particular embedding dimension m . Thus they could, in principle, shed light at the interesting crossover scenarios we are going to describe in the next chapter.

IV. DIFFICULTIES IN THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN CHAOS AND NOISE: EXAMPLES

In this section we analyze in a detailed way some examples which illustrate how subtle the transition from the large scales behavior to the small scales one can be; and thus the difficulties arising in distinguishing, only from data analysis, a genuine deterministic chaotic system from one with intrinsic randomness.

A. The diffusive regime

We first discuss the problems, due to the finite resolution, which one can have in analyzing experimental data. We consider the following map which generates a diffusive behavior on the large scales [26]:

$$x_{t+1} = [x_t] + F(x_t - [x_t]), \quad (19)$$

where $[x_t]$ indicates the integer part of x_t and $F(y)$ is given by:

$$F(y) = \begin{cases} (2 + \Delta)y & \text{if } y \in [0, 1/2[\\ (2 + \Delta)y - (1 + \Delta) & \text{if } y \in]1/2, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

The maximum Lyapunov exponent λ can be obtained immediately: $\lambda = \ln |F'|$, with $F' = dF/dy = 2 + \Delta$. Therefore one expects the following scenario for $h(\epsilon)$ (and for $\lambda(\epsilon)$):

$$h(\epsilon) \approx \lambda \quad \text{for } \epsilon < 1, \quad (21)$$

$$h(\epsilon) \propto \frac{D}{\epsilon^2} \quad \text{for } \epsilon > 1, \quad (22)$$

where D is the diffusion coefficient, i.e.

$$\langle (x_t - x_0)^2 \rangle \approx 2 D t \quad \text{for large } t. \quad (23)$$

Figs 3 and 4 show $\lambda(\epsilon)$ and $h(\epsilon)$ respectively. Let us briefly comment on a technical aspect. The numerical computation of $\lambda(\epsilon)$ does not present any particular difficulties; on the other hand the results for $h(\epsilon)$ depend from the used sampling time τ . This can be appreciated by looking at Fig. 25b of the Gaspard and Wang review [9], where the power law behavior (22) in the diffusive region is obtained only if one considers the envelope of $h_m(\epsilon, \tau)$ evaluated for different values of τ ; while looking at a single τ one has a rather not conclusive result. This is due to the fact that, at variance with the FSLE, when computing $h(\epsilon, \tau)$ one has to consider very large m , in order to obtain a good convergence for $H_m(\epsilon) - H_{m-1}(\epsilon)$.

Because of the diffusive behavior, a simple dimensional argument shows that, by sampling the system every elementary time step, a good convergence holds for $m \geq \epsilon^2/D$. Thus, for $\epsilon = 10$ and typical values of the diffusion coefficient $D \simeq 10^{-1}$, one has to consider enormous block size. A possible way out of this computational difficulty may be the following. We call $l (= 1)$ the length of the interval $[0, 1]$ where $F(y)$ is defined; if we adopt a coarse-grained description on a scale $\epsilon = l$, i.e. we follow the evolution of the integer part of x_t ,

the dynamical system (19) is well described by means of a random walk [26], with given probability p_0 that in a time step s ($= 1$) the integer part of x does not change: $[x_{t+s}] = [x_t]$, and probabilities p_{\pm} that $[x_{t+s}] = [x_t] \pm 1$. A diffusive behavior means that the probability for a changing of $[x_t]$ by $\pm k$ in n elementary time steps is given by [27]

$$P(k, n) \simeq \frac{e^{-(k^2/2\alpha n)(l^2/s)}}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha n}} \sqrt{\frac{l^2}{s}}, \quad (24)$$

with α a function of p_0 . Now we increase the graining and identify all the x values in a cell of size $\epsilon = L$, with L an integer multiple of l . If we observe the coarse-grained state of the system only every $\tau (> s)$ time steps and we define the variables \tilde{k} and \tilde{n} , such that $kl \simeq \tilde{k}L$ and $ns \simeq \tilde{n}\tau$, we can write

$$P(\tilde{k}, \tilde{n}) \simeq \frac{e^{-(\tilde{k}^2/2\alpha\tilde{n})(L^2/\tau)}}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha\tilde{n}}} \sqrt{\frac{L^2}{\tau}}, \quad (25)$$

for the probability of finding the system \tilde{k} L -cells apart after \tilde{n} τ -intervals. Thus, by choosing $L^2/\tau = l^2/s$, we expect that the sequences generated by checking the system either on a scale L every τ steps or on a scale l every elementary time step s , have the same statistics, in particular the same entropy, as a signature of a diffusive behavior. Note that if $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} H_m(\epsilon, \tau = \epsilon^2)/m$ is constant at varying ϵ , as we found numerically, then the ϵ -entropy per unit time $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} H_m(\epsilon, \tau)/m\tau$ goes like $1/\epsilon^2$.

Since the equality $L^2/\tau = l^2/s$ is assured by the choice $\epsilon = L = \gamma l$ and $\tau = \gamma^2 s$, one can expect that, for a diffusion process, the following scaling relation hold: $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} H_m(\epsilon, \tau)/m = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} H_m(\gamma\epsilon, \gamma^2\tau)/m$, with γ an arbitrary scaling parameter. This scaling relation allows us to see why the power law behavior (14) is expected to be valid generally for the Brownian motion. Indeed, if we choose $\gamma = 1/\epsilon$ we have $H_m(\epsilon, \tau) = H_m(1, \tau/\epsilon^2)$ and, finally, taking the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$ the ϵ -entropy is given by:

$$h(\epsilon) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{[H_{m+1}(1, \tau/\epsilon^2) - H_m(1, \tau/\epsilon^2)]}{\tau} \simeq \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{const \tau/\epsilon^2 + O(\tau^2)}{\tau} \propto \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \quad (26)$$

which is (14). Note that the first equality in (26) has been obtained by a Taylor expansion around $\tau = 0$, and by noting that $h(1, 0) = 0$ otherwise the entropy for unit time will be infinite at finite ϵ which is impossible.

B. Finite resolution effects

We consider now a stochastic system, namely a map with dynamical noise

$$x_{t+1} = [x_t] + G(x_t - [x_t]) + \sigma\eta_t, \quad (27)$$

where $G(y)$ is shown in Fig. 2 and η_t is a noise with uniform distribution in the interval $[-1, 1]$, and no correlation in time. As it can be seen from Fig. 2, the new map $G(y)$ is a piece wise linear map which approximates the map $F(y)$. When $dG/dy < 1$, as is the case we consider, the map (27), in the absence of noise, gives a non-chaotic time evolution.

Now one can compare the chaotic case, i.e. eq. (19) with the approximated map (27) with noise. For example let us start with the computation of the finite size Lyapunov exponent for the two cases. Of course from a data analysis point of view we have to compute the FSLE by reconstructing the dynamics by embedding. However, for this example we are interested only in discussing the resolution effects. Therefore we compute the FSLE directly by integrating the evolution equations for two (initially) very close trajectories, in the case of noisy maps using two different realizations of the noise. In Fig. 3 we show $\lambda(\epsilon)$ versus ϵ both for the chaotic (19) and the noisy (27) map. As one can see the two curves are practically indistinguishable in the region $\epsilon > \sigma$. The differences appear only at very small scales $\epsilon < \sigma$ where one has a $\lambda(\epsilon)$ which grow with ϵ for the noisy case, remaining at the same value for the chaotic deterministic case.

Both the FSLE and the (ϵ, τ) -entropy analysis show that we can distinguish three different regimes observing the dynamics of (27) on different length scales. On the large length scales $\epsilon > 1$ we observe diffusive behavior in both models. On length scales $\sigma < \epsilon < 1$ both models show chaotic deterministic behavior, because the entropy and the FSLE is independent of ϵ and larger than zero. Finally on the smallest length scales $\epsilon < \sigma$ we see stochastic behavior for the system (27) while the system (19) still shows chaotic behavior.

C. Effects of finite block length

In the previous section we discussed the difficulties arising in classifying a signal as chaotic or stochastic because of the impossibility to reach an arbitrary fine resolution. Here we investigate the reasons, which make it difficult to distinguish a stochastic behavior from a deterministic non-chaotic one. In particular, we show that a non-chaotic deterministic system may produce a signal practically indistinguishable from a stochastic one, provided its phase space dimension is large enough.

The simplest way to generate a non-chaotic (regular) signal having statistical properties similar to a stochastic one is by considering the Fourier expansion of a random signal [2]. One can consider the following signal:

$$x(t) = \sum_{i=1}^M X_{0i} \sin(\Omega_i t + \phi_i) \quad (28)$$

where the frequencies are equispaced discrete frequencies, i.e. $\Omega_i = \Omega_0 + i\Delta\Omega$, the phases ϕ_i are random variables uniformly distributed in $[0, 2\pi]$ and the coefficient X_{0i} are chosen in such a way to have a definite power spectrum, e.g. a power law spectrum, which is a common characteristic of many natural signals. Of course (28) can be considered as the Fourier expansion of a stochastic signal only if one consider a set of $2M$ points such that $M\Delta\Omega = \pi/\Delta t$, where Δt is the sampling time [2]. Time series as (28) have been used to claim that suitable stochastic signals may display a finite correlation dimension [2,28], see the discussion in sect. III.

Here we adopt a slightly different point of view. The signal (28) can also be considered as the displacement of a harmonic oscillator linearly coupled to other harmonic oscillators. Indeed, it is well known since long times that a large ensemble of harmonic oscillators can originate stochastic-like behaviors [29]. In particular, we refer to [29], where it was proved

that an impurity of mass μ linearly coupled to a one-dimensional equal mass, μ_0 , chain of M oscillators coupled by a nearest-neighbor harmonic interaction, in the limit of $\mu \gg \mu_0$ and of infinite oscillators ($M \rightarrow \infty$), undergoes a Brownian motion. Practically our observable is given by the sum of harmonic oscillations as in eq. (28), where the frequencies Ω_i have been derived in the limit $\mu_0/\mu \ll 1$ by Cukier and Mazur [29]. The phases ϕ_i are chosen as uniformly distributed random variables in $[0, 2\pi]$ and the amplitudes X_{0i} are chosen as follows:

$$X_{0i} = C\Omega_i^{-1} \quad (29)$$

where the C is an arbitrary constant and the Ω dependence is just to obtain a diffusive-like behavior. Note that for a signal of length $2M$ the random phases and the X_{0i} 's represent a initial condition of the M oscillators, because their phase space is $2M$ -dimensional.

In Fig 5a we show an output of the signal (28) and, for comparison, in Fig 5b we also show an artificial continuous time Brownian motion obtained integrating the following equation

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = \xi(t) \quad (30)$$

where $\xi(t)$ is a Gaussian white noise, produced by a random number generator (the variance of the process is chosen as to mimic that obtained by (28)). Because the random number generator uses a high entropic one dimensional deterministic map, this is an example for a high entropic low dimensional system, which produces stochastic behavior. As it is possible to see the two signals appears to be very similar already at a first sight.

Now it is important to stress that if $M < \infty$ the signals obtained according to (28) cannot develop a true Brownian motion especially if one is interested in long time series. Indeed for a long enough record one should be able to recognize the regularities in the trajectory of $x(t)$. However, even if the time record is long enough, in order to give a definite answer about the value of the entropy one also needs very large embedding dimensions. The basic fact is that deterministic behavior can be observed only, if the embedding dimension m is larger than the dimension of the manifold where the motion takes place, which is M for M harmonic oscillators. This means that although the entropy h_{KS} is zero, the conditional entropies, $h_m(\epsilon, \tau) = (H_{m+1}(\epsilon) - H_m(\epsilon))/\tau$, for finite m are nonzero and maybe even slowly decreasing for $m > M$. Moreover, one can encounter some quasi-convergences with respect to m for $m < M$, if τ is large enough, i.e. the entropy can seem to be independent of m , e.g. see Fig. 6.

In Fig. 7a-b we show the ϵ -entropy, calculated by the Grassberger-Procaccia method [17]. The deterministic signal (28) and the stochastic one (30) produce indeed very similar results. Note that we calculated $h_m^{(2)}(\epsilon, \tau)$ instead of $h_m^{(1)}(\epsilon, \tau)$ because it is used more often due to better statistics in most cases. However, in Fig. 8 one can see, that on the relevant length scales both entropies are almost equal.

As in Refs. [9,30,31] we have considered different time delays, τ , in computing the ϵ -entropy because of the problems discussed in the previous section. The power law behavior ϵ^{-2} for the ϵ -entropy is finally obtained only as the envelope of different computations with different delay times. The results for the FSLE calculated from the time series are shown in Fig. 9. Both the ϵ -entropy and the FSLE display the $1/\epsilon^2$ behavior, which denotes that the signals can be classified as Brownian motion [9]. It is worth noting that the FSLE computed from

the time record is not too sensitive on the choice of the delay time τ and the embedding dimension m .

From this simple example is it easy to understand that the impossibility of reaching high enough embedding dimensions severely limits our ability to make definite statements about the "true" character of the system which generated a given time series as well as the already analyzed problem of the lack of resolution.

V. SOME REMARKS ON A RECENT DEBATE ABOUT "MICROSCOPIC" CHAOS

The issue of the detection of "microscopic" chaos by data analysis has recently received some attention [31,32] after a work of Gaspard et al. [30]. Gaspard et al., from an entropic analysis of an ingenious experiment on the position of a Brownian particle in a liquid, claim to give an empirical evidence for microscopic chaos, i.e.: they claim to give evidence that the diffusive behavior observed for a Brownian particle is the consequence of chaos on the molecular scale. Their work can be briefly summarized as follows: from a long ($\approx 1.5 \cdot 10^5$ data) record on the position of a Brownian particle they compute the ϵ -entropy with the Cohen-Procaccia [16] method, described in section II, from which they obtain:

$$h(\epsilon) \sim \frac{D}{\epsilon^2} \quad (31)$$

where D is the diffusion coefficient. Then they *assume* that the system is deterministic and therefore, because of the inequality $h(\epsilon > 0) \leq h_{KS}$, they conclude that the system is chaotic. However, from the results presented in the previous sections we can understand that their result does not give a direct evidence that the system is deterministic and chaotic. Indeed, the power law (31) can be produced in different ways:

1. a genuine chaotic system with diffusive behavior (as the map (20) of sect. IV A);
2. a non chaotic system with some noise, as the map (27);
3. a genuine Brownian system, as (30);
4. a deterministic linear non chaotic system with many degrees of freedom (as the example 28);
5. "complicated" non chaotic system as the Ehrenfest wind-tree model where a particle diffuses in a plane due to collisions with randomly placed, fixed oriented square scatters (as discussed by Cohen et al. [31] in their comment to Gaspard et al. [30]).

It seems to us that the very weak points of Gaspard et al. are:

- a) the explicit assumption that the system is deterministic
- b) the limited number of data points and therefore both limitations in the resolution and the block length.

The point (a) is crucial, without this assumption (even with an enormous data set) it is not possible to distinguish between 1) and 2). One has to say that in the cases 4) and 5) at least in principle it is possible to understand that the systems are “trivial” (i.e. not chaotic) but for this one has to use a very huge number of data. For example Cohen et al. estimated that in order to distinguish between 1) and 5) using realistic parameters of a typical liquid, the number of data points required has to be at least $\sim 10^{34}$. Let us remind that Gaspard et al. [30] used $\sim 1.5 \cdot 10^5$ points!

It seems to us that the distinction between chaos and noise makes sense only in very peculiar cases, e.g. very low dimensional systems. Nevertheless even in such a case an entropic analysis can be unable to recognize the “true” character of the system due to the lack of resolution. This is particularly evident in the comparison between the diffusive map (20) and the noisy map (27), if one only observes at scales $\epsilon > \sigma$.

According to the pragmatic proposal of classification discussed in sect. III one has that for $\sigma \leq \epsilon \leq 1$ both the system (20) and (27), in spite of their “true” character can be classified as chaotic, while for $\epsilon \geq 1$ both can be considered as stochastic.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

We have shown how an entropic analysis at different resolution scales (in terms of ϵ -entropy and Finite Size Lyapunov Exponent) of a given data record allows us for a classification of the stochastic or chaotic character of a signal.

In practice, without any reference to a particular model, one can define the notion of deterministic or chaotic behavior of a system on a certain range of scales. In our examples we show that, according to the pragmatic classification proposed in Sect. III, one can consider (on a certain resolution) a system as random or deterministic independently from its “true” nature. At first glance this can appear disturbing, however, if one adopts a non “metaphysical” point of view there is an advantage in the freedom of modeling the behavior of the system at least if one is interested on a certain (non infinitesimal) coarse-graining property.

We conclude with a brief discussion on high-dimensional systems that show non-trivial behavior at varying the resolution scales.

Olbrich et al. [33] analyzed an open flow system described by unidirectionally coupled map lattice:

$$x_j(t+1) = (1 - \sigma)f(x_{j+1}(t)) + \sigma x_j(t) \quad (32)$$

where $j = 1, \dots, N$ denotes the site of a lattice of size N , t the discrete time and σ the coupling strength. A detailed numerical study (also supported by analytical arguments) of the ϵ -entropy $h(\epsilon)$ at different ϵ , in the limit of small coupling, gives the following scale-dependent scenario: for $1 \geq \epsilon \geq \sigma$ there is a plateau $h(\epsilon) = \lambda_s$ where λ_s is the Lyapunov exponent of the single map $x(t+1) = f(x(t))$. For $\sigma \geq \epsilon \geq \sigma^2$ another plateau appears at $h(\epsilon) \approx 2\lambda_s$, and so on for $\sigma^{n-1} \geq \epsilon \geq \sigma^n$ one has $h(\epsilon) \approx n\lambda_s$. Similar results hold for the correlation dimension which increases step by step as the resolution increases, showing that the high-dimensionality of the system becomes evident only as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Therefore one has a strong evidence that the dynamics at different scales is basically ruled by a hierarchy of low-dimensional systems whose “effective” dimension $n_{eff}(\epsilon)$ increase as ϵ decreases:

$$n_{eff}(\epsilon) \sim \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\epsilon)}{\ln(1/\sigma)} \right\rceil, \quad (33)$$

where $[\dots]$ indicates the integer part. In addition, for a resolution larger than ϵ , it is possible to find a suitable low-dimensional noisy system (depending on ϵ) which is able to mimic $x_1(t)$ given by eq. (32). It is interesting to note that, looking at $h(\epsilon)$ on an extended range of values of ϵ , one observes for $\epsilon \geq \sigma^N$

$$h(\epsilon) \sim \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} \quad (34)$$

i.e. the typical behavior of a stochastic process. Of course for $\epsilon \leq \sigma^N$ one has to realize that the system is deterministic and $h(\epsilon) \approx N\lambda_s$. Even if this study mainly concerns the small unidirectional coupling, the diffusive and strong coupling case deserves further analysis, it represents a first step toward the understanding of the issue of data analysis of high-dimensional systems.

Let us now briefly discuss the issue of the macroscopic chaos, i.e. the hydro-dynamical-like irregular behavior of some global observable, with typical times much longer than the times related to the evolution of the single (microscopic) elements composing a certain system. This interesting kind of dynamical behavior has been studied in some recent works [34,35] for globally coupled maps evolving according to the equation:

$$x_i(t+1) = (1-\sigma)f_a(x_i(t)) + \frac{\sigma}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f_a(x_j(t)) \quad (35)$$

where N is the total number of elements and f_a is a nonlinear function depending on a parameter a . Cencini et al. [34] (see also Shibata and Kaneko [35] for a related work) studied the behavior of a global variable (i.e. the center of mass) using the FSLE analysis. Their results can be summarized as follows:

- at small ϵ ($\ll 1/\sqrt{N}$) one recovers the “microscopic” Lyapunov exponent, i.e. $\lambda(\epsilon) \approx \lambda_{micro}$
- at large ϵ ($\gg 1/\sqrt{N}$) one observe another plateau (corresponding to what we can call the “macroscopic” Lyapunov exponent) $\lambda(\epsilon) \approx \lambda_{macro}$ which can be much smaller than the microscopic one.

The above results suggest that at a coarse-grained level, i.e. $\epsilon \gg 1/\sqrt{N}$, the system can be described by an “effective” hydro-dynamical equation (which in some cases can be low-dimensional), while the “true” high-dimensional character appears only at very high resolution, i.e.

$$\epsilon \leq \epsilon_c \approx O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right).$$

The presence of two plateaux for the FSLE at different length scales is present in generic systems with slow and fast dynamics [22]. The interesting fact is that in systems like (35) the two temporal scales are generated by the dynamics itself.

Let us stress that the behavior $h(\epsilon) = const$ at small ϵ and $h(\epsilon)$ decreasing for larger ϵ is not a peculiarity of the diffusive map (20). In typical high-dimensional chaotic systems one

has $h(\epsilon) = h_{KS} \sim O(N)$ for $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_c$ (where N is the number of degrees of freedom and $\epsilon_c \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$) while for $\epsilon \geq \epsilon_c$, $h(\epsilon)$ decreases (often with a power law). From this point of view, the fact that in certain stochastic processes $h(\epsilon) \sim \epsilon^{-\alpha}$ can be indeed extremely useful for modeling such high-dimensional systems. As a relevant example we just mention the fully developed turbulence which is a very high-dimensional system whose non infinitesimal (the so-called inertial range) properties can be successfully mimicked in terms of a suitable stochastic process [36].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank R. Hegger and T. Schreiber for useful discussions and suggestions. M.C., M.F. and A.V. have been partially supported by INFM (PRA-TURBO) and by the European Network *Intermittency in Turbulent Systems* (contract number FMRX-CT98-0175).

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Nicolis and G. Nicolis, *Nature* **311**, 529 (1984); P. Grassberger, *Nature* **323**, 609 (1986); C. Nicolis and G. Nicolis, *Nature* **326**, 523 (1987); P. Grassberger, *Nature* **326**, 524 (1987).
- [2] A. R. Osborne and A. Provenzale, *Physica D* **35**, 357 (1989).
- [3] G. Sugihara and R. May, *Nature* **344**, 734 (1990).
- [4] M. Casdagli, *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **54**, 303 (1991).
- [5] D. T. Kaplan and L. Glass, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 427 (1992).
- [6] E. Aurell, G. Boffetta, A. Crisanti, G. Paladin and A. Vulpiani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 1262 (1996); *J. Phys. A* **30**, 1 (1997).
- [7] A. Kolmogorov, *IRE Trans. Inf. Theory* **1**, 102 (1956).
- [8] C. Shannon and W. Weaver, *The Mathematical Theory of Communication* (University of Illinois Press, Illinois, 1993).
- [9] P. Gaspard and X.-J. Wang, *Physics Reports* **235**, 291 (1993).
- [10] R. Benzi, G. Paladin, G. Parisi, and A. Vulpiani, *J. Phys. A* **18**, 2157 (1985).
- [11] P. Grassberger, *Physica Scripta* **40**, 346 (1989).
- [12] E. Lorenz, *Tellus* **21**, 3 (1969).
- [13] F. Takens, in *Dynamical Systems and Turbulence (Warwick 1980)*, Vol. 898 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, edited by D. A. Rand and L.-S. Young (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980), pp. 366–381.
- [14] T. Sauer, J. A. Yorke, and M. Casdagli, *J. Stat. Phys.* **65**, 579 (1991).
- [15] A. M. Fraser, *IEEE Trans. Information Theory* **35**, 245 (1989).
- [16] A. Cohen and I. Procaccia, *Phys. Rev. A* **31**, 1872 (1985).
- [17] P. Grassberger and I. Procaccia, *Phys. Rev. A* **28**, 2591 (1983).
- [18] F. Takens and E. Verbitski, *Nonlinearity* **11**, 771 (1998).
- [19] H. Kantz and T. Schreiber, *Nonlinear Time Series Analysis* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 1997).
- [20] M. Ding, C. Grebogi, E. Ott, T. Sauer, J.A. Yorke, *Physica D* **69**, 404 (1992); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 3872 (1993).
- [21] E. Olbrich and H. Kantz, *Phys. Lett. A* **232**, 63 (1997).
- [22] G. Boffetta, A. Crisanti, F. Paparella, A. Provenzale and A. Vulpiani, *Physica D* **116**, 301 (1998); G. Boffetta, P. Giuliani, G. Paladin, and A. Vulpiani, *J. Atm. Sci.* **55**, 3409 (1998).
- [23] P. Grassberger and I. Procaccia, *Physica D* **9**, 189 (1983).
- [24] J. Theiler, *Phys. Lett.* **155**, 480 (1991).
- [25] D. T. Kaplan and L. Glass, *Physica D* **64**, 431 (1993).
- [26] M. Schell, S. Fraser, and R. Kapral, *Physical Review A* **26**, 504 (1982).
- [27] W. Feller, *An Introduction to Probability theory and its Applications* (Wiley and Sons, New York, 1968).
- [28] A. Provenzale, L. Smith, R. Vio, and G. Murante, *Physica D* **58**, 31 (1992).
- [29] P. Mazur and E. Montroll, *J. Math. Phys.* **1**, 70 (1960); R. I. Cukier and P. Mazur, *Physica* **53**, 157 (1971).
- [30] P. Gaspard, M. E. Briggs, M. K. Francis, J. V. Sengers, R.W. Gammon, J.R. Dorfman and R. V. Calabrese, *Nature* **394**, 865 (1998).
- [31] C. Dettman, E. Cohen, and H. van Beijeren, *Nature* **401**, 875 (1999).

- [32] P. Grassberger and T. Schreiber, *Nature* **401**, 875 (1999).
- [33] E. Olbrich, R. Hegger, and H. Kantz, *Phys. Lett. A* **244**, 538 (1998).
- [34] M. Cencini, M. Falcioni, D. Vergni, and A. Vulpiani, *Physica D* **130**, 58 (1999).
- [35] T. Shibata and K. Kaneko, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 4116 (1998).
- [36] L. Biferale, G. Boffetta, A. Celani, A. Crisanti and A. Vulpiani, *Phys. Rev. E* **57**, R6261 (1998).

FIGURES




FIG. 1. (a) $h(\epsilon, m)$ -dashed - and $r(\epsilon, m)$ - solid - for the Henon map with the standard parameters ($a = 1.5$ and $b = 0.3$), with $m = 1, 6$ and (b) the same for an AR(1) process, with $m = 1, 2$.




FIG. 2. The map $F(x)$ (20) for $\Delta = .4$ is shown with superimposed the approximating (regular) map $G(x)$ (27) obtained by using 40 intervals of slope 0.




FIG. 3. $\lambda(\epsilon)$ versus ϵ obtained with the map $F(y)$ (20) with $\Delta = .4$ (\circ) and with the noisy (regular) map (\square) (27) with 10000 intervals of slope .9 with $\sigma = 10^{-4}$. The straight lines indicates the Lyapunov exponent $\lambda = \ln 2.4$ and the diffusive behavior $\lambda(\epsilon) \sim \epsilon^{-2}$.




FIG. 4. (ϵ, τ) -entropy for the noisy (\square) and the chaotic maps (\circ) with the same parameters as Fig. 3, the encoding method is explained in the text. The straight lines indicates the KS -entropy $h_{KS} = \lambda = \ln 2.4$ and the diffusive behavior $h(\epsilon) \sim \epsilon^{-2}$. The region $\epsilon < \sigma$ has not be explored for computational costs.




FIG. 5. (a) Time record obtained from eq. (28) with the frequencies chosen as discussed in the text with $M = 10^4$, $C = .005$ and $\mu_0/\mu = 10^{-6}$, the numerically computed diffusion constant is $D \approx 0.007$. The length of the data set is 10^5 , and the data are sampled with $\Delta t = 0.02$. (b) Time record obtained from an artificial Brownian motion (30) with the same value of the diffusion constant as in (a).




FIG. 6. Dependence from the embedding dimension of the ϵ -entropy calculated with the Grassberger-Procaccia algorithm using at $\epsilon = 1.85$ from the time series shown in Fig. 5a. The horizontal line only indicates a possible numerically evaluated value for the saturation of the entropy.




FIG. 7. ϵ -entropy calculated with the Grassberger-Procaccia algorithm using using 10^5 points from the time series shown in Fig. 5. We show the results for embedding dimension $m = 50$. The two straight-lines show the D/ϵ^2 behavior.




FIG. 8. ϵ -entropy estimated by the Cohen-Procaccia algorithm ($q = 1$) compared to the entropies calculated by the Grassberger-Procaccia algorithm ($q = 2$) for $m = 20$ and $\tau = 0.2$. Let us stress that the behavior below $\epsilon = 0.2$ is essentially a finite sample effect.




FIG. 9. Finite size Lyapunov-Exponent from a artificial Brownian motion (right) and for the time series (28) (left). Embedding dimension $m = 20$. Theiler window 1000, i.e. we consider only neighbors which are distant in time more than 1000 sampling times. The straight lines show the behavior D/ϵ^2 , where $D = 0.007$ is the diffusion constant. The analysis has been performed on 10^5 points. Different computation by changing τ and m have lead to the same result.