Monetary Entropy and the Epistemic Limits of Economic Coordination: An Information-Theoretic Analysis

André Rehbein-Sathler[1]

[1] Centro Universitário IESB, Brazil

Correspondence: André Rehbein-Sathler, Centro Universitário IESB, Brazil. E-mail: andre.sathler@gmail.com

Received: December 10, 2025 Accepted: February 11, 2026 Online Published: February 27, 2026

doi:10.5430/ijba.v17n1p34 URL: https://doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v17n1p34

Abstract

This paper presents the FAURAS (Formal Analytical Unified Restriction on Access to Simultaneity) framework, which demonstrates how informational entropy creates fundamental epistemic barriers to economic coordination by imposing intrinsic limits on the simultaneous processing and aggregation of dispersed information necessary for market clearing. We provide mathematically rigorous definitions of monetary entropy based on volatility distributions, deriving the entropy-cognitive capacity relationship from information-theoretic principles. Complete formal verification in the Lean 4 proof assistant ensures mathematical soundness. Our theoretical framework proves that general equilibrium becomes epistemically unattainable when entropy exceeds critical thresholds. These thresholds are determined by system complexity. Using entropy measures applied to comprehensive daily financial market data (2000–2023; n = 8,309 daily observations), we validate theoretical predictions through multidimensional entropy analysis, capturing sectoral dispersion, yield curve dynamics and stress indicator alignment. The framework provides enhanced empirical support for theoretically grounded thresholds at $H^* = 0.5\times\ln(M)$ and $H^{**} = \ln(M)$, where M represents market complexity. Our optimal entropy combination achieves predictive power for market stress with Granger-causal relationships extending 1-5 days ahead ($p<0.001$). The cognitive capacity degradation follows $K(t)=C\ e^{(-\lambda H(t))}$, where $\lambda=\ln(2)/H_{critical}$, providing a precise quantification of limitations in information processing with formal proofs establishing monotonicity, impossibility conditions, and critical threshold properties. These findings establish entropy monitoring as a scientifically grounded tool for systemic risk assessment, with immediate applications in central bank communication strategies and financial stability policy.

Keywords: information theory, monetary entropy, economic coordination, bounded rationality, financial stability

1. Introduction

In modern economies, financial markets serve as the primary mechanism for economic coordination. They aggregate dispersed information about preferences, technologies, and resource constraints through price signals (Arrow; Debreu; 1954). This fundamental insight, articulated by Hayek (1945) and formalised through decades of economic research, underpins our confidence in market mechanisms as efficient tools for allocating resources and coordinating the economy. However, the repeated occurrence of financial crises and coordination failures raises profound questions about the inherent limits of monetary systems in processing and transmitting information effectively.

The theoretical pursuit of general equilibrium (GE), initiated by Walras (1954) and culminating in the Arrow–Debreu framework, promises complete market coordination through price mechanisms under conditions of perfect information and unlimited computational capacity. However, this theoretical elegance is based on assumptions that conflict with the constraints of communication systems in information theory and the cognitive limitations of economic agents. The growing complexity of modern financial systems, characterised by an increasing number of markets, instruments and interdependencies, suggests that the information-processing requirements may exceed the capacity of individual agents and the monetary system itself.

This paper introduces the FAURAS (Formal Analytical Unified Restriction on Access to Simultaneity) framework, which provides a mathematically precise foundation for understanding how informational entropy creates insurmountable barriers to the simultaneous coordination required by GE theory. The core idea is that coordinating across a multitude of interconnected markets requires access to, and processing of, concurrent information flows, which become increasingly restricted as system entropy rises. Our key theoretical innovation lies in deriving entropy-based coordination limits from first principles of information theory, specifically Shannon's channel capacity theorem (Shannon, 1948), while incorporating Simon's bounded rationality (Simon, 1955).

The mathematical rigour of this framework is further strengthened by complete formal verification using the Lean 4 proof assistant. This represents the first application of computational theorem proving to fundamental economic coordination theory. Our formalisation establishes the FAURAS theorems on rigorous mathematical foundations by deriving the entropy-capacity relationship $K(t) = C\ e^{(-\lambda H(t))}$ directly from Shannon's channel capacity theorem, rather than postulating it as an empirical regularity. The impossibility theorem, which demonstrates that GE becomes epistemically unattainable when $H_M(t) > H^*$, is proven constructively. This involves the explicit derivation of the critical thresholds $H_1^* = 0.5 \times \ln(M)$ and $H_2^* = \ln(M)$ from information-theoretic first principles.

The microfoundations are rigorously derived from the rational inattention framework of Sims (2003), connecting individual cognitive constraints with system-level coordination failures via Shannon's mutual information theory. Rather than assuming specific functional forms, we prove that exponential capacity degradation naturally emerges from optimal information processing under finite channel capacity constraints. The Lean 4 formalisation includes the formal verification of monotonicity properties (i.e. capacity strictly decreases with entropy), positivity constraints (i.e. all measures remain well-defined) and threshold behaviour (i.e. coordination becomes impossible above critical entropy levels).

This work's central contribution is the rigorous mathematical formalisation of monetary entropy as a measure of information degradation in price systems. This is coupled with a derived relationship between entropy and cognitive capacity, which quantifies the epistemic impossibility of perfect coordination above critical thresholds. Unlike previous approaches that treat coordination failures as exogenous shocks or behavioural anomalies, our framework demonstrates that such failures are an inevitable consequence of information-theoretic constraints that become binding as economic complexity increases.

We empirically validate our framework using high-frequency financial market data spanning January 2000 to December 2023. This dataset comprises 8,309 daily observations across multiple market dimensions. This dataset provides statistical power and captures coordination dynamics across various market regimes, including periods of normal functioning, moderate stress and severe crisis conditions. We construct theoretically grounded entropy measures that capture sectoral dispersion in equity markets, yield curve coherence in fixed income markets, and the alignment of stress indicators across the financial system.

The empirical results strongly support our theoretical predictions. We have identified critical entropy thresholds of $H^* = 0.5 \times ln(M)$ and $H^{**} = ln(M)$, where M represents the number of markets or complexity dimensions. These thresholds create distinct coordination regimes with fundamentally different dynamics. Below the first threshold, normal coordination mechanisms function effectively. Between the two thresholds, coordination degrades but remains partially functional. Above the second threshold, however, coordination breakdown becomes inevitable due to cognitive capacity constraints.

Our entropy measures demonstrate superior predictive power compared to traditional financial stress indicators. Granger-causal relationships extend 1–5 days ahead and achieve statistical significance at the $p < 0.001$ level. The optimal combination of entropy components, determined through information-theoretic optimisation, provides early warning capabilities for systemic stress episodes with 87% accuracy and manageable false positive rates.

The policy implications of our findings are immediate and significant. Central banks and financial regulators should implement real-time entropy monitoring systems to track coordination quality across financial markets. Communication strategies should adapt to prevailing entropy regimes, increasing in frequency and clarity as critical thresholds approach. The theoretically grounded nature of our thresholds provides objective criteria for triggering extraordinary policy measures when coordination capacity becomes critically impaired.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides a theoretical framework, positioning our contribution within existing literature and advancing the mathematical foundations. It also presents our empirical methodology and entropy measures. Section 3 presents the materials and methods, section 4 the results, and section 5 the discussion. Section 6 concludes.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Information Theory and Economic Systems

The application of information theory to economic analysis has evolved significantly since Shannon's pioneering work on communication systems. Shannon's mathematical framework for quantifying information content and transmission capacity offers valuable insights into how economic systems process and aggregate dispersed knowledge. The entropy measure $H = -\sum p_i ln(p_i)$ captures the uncertainty or information content of a probability distribution, with higher entropy indicating greater uncertainty or dispersion.

Early applications of information theory to economics primarily focused on decision-making under uncertainty and mechanism design (Cover; Thomas; 2006). Marschak (1971) pioneered the economic interpretation of information theory, demonstrating how information costs affect optimal decision-making and market outcomes. This work established the conceptual foundation for understanding information as an economic good with measurable properties and costs.

Recent developments in information-theoretic economics have expanded to include entropy-based measures of market complexity and systemic risk. Billio et al. (2012) applied transfer entropy to analyse risk spillovers in financial networks, demonstrating how information flow patterns can predict crisis propagation. Diebold and Yılmaz (2014) developed variance decomposition methods based on information theory to measure connectedness in financial markets. Together, these studies demonstrate the practical relevance of entropy measures in understanding the dynamics of financial systems.

However, existing applications usually treat entropy as a statistical tool rather than a fundamental constraint on economic coordination. Our contribution to this literature demonstrates that entropy measures capture essential limitations on the information processing capacity of monetary systems, with direct implications for the feasibility of general equilibrium.

Monetary entropy measures how dispersed market volatility is across different sectors or markets. When volatility is concentrated in a few markets, entropy is low and coordination is easier because agents can focus their attention on fewer sources of uncertainty. Conversely, when volatility is dispersed across many markets simultaneously, entropy is high and coordination becomes difficult because agents must track multiple sources of uncertainty despite having limited cognitive capacity.

The core economic intuition underlying FAURAS can be understood through a simple analogy. Imagine a symphony orchestra, where each musician must coordinate with the others to produce harmonious music. When the score is simple, coordination is straightforward — the musicians can easily follow the conductor and each other. However, as the music becomes more complex (high entropy), with multiple tempo changes, key signatures and intricate harmonies, coordination becomes increasingly difficult despite the musicians' individual skills.

In financial markets, this means agents trying to coordinate their decisions across multiple markets simultaneously. When market volatility is concentrated in a few sectors (low entropy), agents can effectively focus their limited attention. However, when volatility spreads across many markets (high entropy), agents face information overload, which makes accurate price formation and coordination increasingly difficult.

The cognitive capacity relationship, $K(t) = C\, e^{(-\lambda H(t))}$, formalises this intuition: just as the ability of musicians to coordinate degrades with musical complexity, the coordination capacity of agents degrades exponentially with market entropy. The critical thresholds H_1* and H_2* represent the points at which coordination mechanisms begin to fail and ultimately break down, in a manner analogous to an orchestra losing synchronisation when the music becomes too complex.

2.2 Information Aggregation and Market Efficiency

The role of prices as information aggregators has been central to economic theory since Hayek's seminal work on the use of knowledge in society. Hayek (1945) argued that the price system coordinates economic activity by transmitting information about relative scarcity and preference across dispersed agents. This insight provided the intellectual foundation for confidence in market mechanisms as efficient tools for allocating resources.

Grossman and Stiglitz (1980) advanced the formal analysis of information aggregation in markets by demonstrating the fundamental paradox of informationally efficient markets. If prices perfectly reflect all available information, no agent has an incentive to acquire costly information; yet, without information acquisition, prices cannot be informative. This paradox highlights the tension between information efficiency and incentives for information production.

Subsequent research has explored various dimensions of information aggregation in financial markets. For example, Morris and Shin (2002) analysed the social value of public information, showing that transparency can sometimes reduce welfare by encouraging excessive coordination on public signals at the expense of private information. Angeletos and Pavan (2007) studied the efficient use of information in environments with strategic complementarities, demonstrating how the social value of information depends on the degree of coordination required.

The literature on rational inattention, initiated by Sims (2003), incorporates cognitive constraints directly into information processing models. Agents have limited capacity to process information, resulting in optimal inattention to certain signals. This framework provides a foundation for understanding how cognitive limitations affect market outcomes and the efficiency with which information is aggregated.

Our framework builds on this literature by focusing on the information processing capacity of the monetary system itself rather than on the cognitive constraints of individual agents. We demonstrate that, even with unlimited individual capacity and costless information acquisition, the monetary aggregation process imposes fundamental limits on coordination efficiency, which become binding as system complexity increases.

2.3 Bounded Rationality and Cognitive Constraints

Herbert Simon's concept of bounded rationality fundamentally challenged the assumption of unlimited computational capacity in economic models. Simon (1955) argued that real decision-makers face cognitive constraints that prevent optimisation and lead to satisficing behaviour. This insight paved the way for a better understanding of how cognitive limitations affect economic outcomes and market dynamics.

The empirical validation of bounded rationality came through the work of Kahneman and Tversky (1979), whose prospect theory documented systematic deviations from expected utility maximisation. Their research demonstrated that cognitive biases and heuristics play a crucial role in economic decision-making, particularly in situations of uncertainty and complexity.

In macroeconomic contexts, Woodford (2003) emphasised the importance of imperfect common knowledge for policy transmission and effectiveness. When agents have heterogeneous information and beliefs, policy interventions may have unintended consequences due to coordination failures. Angeletos and La'O (2013) further developed this theme, showing how incomplete information complicates economic stabilisation and coordination.

Recent work in behavioural macroeconomics has incorporated entropy-based constraints directly into dynamic models. Gabaix (2020) developed sparse dynamic programming models in which agents incur information-processing costs that result in systematic inattention to certain variables. This approach provides a link between individual cognitive constraints and aggregate economic dynamics.

We derive a precise quantitative relationship between environmental entropy and cognitive capacity. We demonstrate that increased informational entropy consistently reduces agents' effective cognitive capabilities via a relationship derived from information theory: $K(t) = Ce^{(-\lambda H(t))}$, where $\lambda = ln(2)/H_{critical}$. This formulation provides an explicit link between individual cognitive limitations and broader market coordination dynamics.

2.4 Complexity and Entropy in Economic Systems

The literature on complexity economics, pioneered by Arthur (2015), views economies as dynamic, adaptive systems operating far from equilibrium. This perspective contrasts sharply with traditional static equilibrium frameworks, emphasising emergent properties, nonlinear dynamics and path dependence in economic evolution.

Rosser (2000) was among the first to systematically apply entropy concepts within economic analysis, highlighting entropy's role in characterising complex economic interactions and emergent market behaviours. This work paved the way for quantifiable complexity analysis in economics and demonstrated the relevance of thermodynamic concepts for understanding economic systems.

Thurner et al. (2012) expanded complexity frameworks by systematically linking entropy with economic network structures and market instability. Their research demonstrates how network topology affects information transmission and coordination capacity, with implications for systemic risk and crisis propagation.

Recent empirical studies have revealed significant correlations between entropy measures and systemic financial vulnerabilities. Battiston et al. (2012) developed network-based measures of systemic risk that incorporate entropy-like measures of system complexity. Their findings highlight the practical relevance of entropy for identifying and mitigating financial crises.

The connection between general equilibrium (GE) theory and the efficient market hypothesis (EMH) provides additional context for our analysis. Both frameworks assume that markets operate with rational agents who process information optimally, and that prices adjust to reflect underlying economic fundamentals. In GE models, the simultaneous clearing of all markets requires prices to reflect all available information about supply, demand and cross-market interdependencies. This is similar to the EMH's assertion that asset prices fully reflect available information.

Our framework contributes to this body of work by providing rigorous mathematical foundations for understanding how entropy constrains coordination in complex economic systems. We demonstrate that entropy measures are not merely useful statistical tools, but also capture fundamental constraints on economic coordination through monetary systems.

2.5 Financial Crises and Coordination Failures

Traditional explanations of financial crises have focused on specific mechanisms, such as asset price bubbles, bank runs and liquidity spirals, and behavioural biases leading to herding and overreaction. While these explanations capture important aspects of crisis dynamics, they usually treat coordination failures as external events rather than as unavoidable consequences of system constraints.

Some works emphasise the role of information and coordination failures in crisis generation and propagation. For example, Morris and Shin (1998) developed global games models of currency crises driven by information uncertainty and higher-order beliefs. Their framework demonstrates how even minor uncertainty regarding fundamentals can result in significant coordination failures and crisis episodes.

Angeletos and Werning (2006) demonstrated how dispersed information can generate higher-order uncertainty that amplifies coordination problems. When agents are uncertain about others' information and beliefs, small shocks can generate disproportionate responses and coordination breakdowns.

Network-based explanations have become important in understanding the mechanisms by which crises propagate. Allen and Gale (2000) studied how interconnections can propagate local shocks throughout the financial system. Cifuentes et al. (2005) analysed contagion through cross-holdings and mark-to-market accounting, demonstrating how fire sales can generate systemic instability.

Our entropy-based approach provides a unified framework that encompasses these various crisis mechanisms. Asset bubbles, bank runs, behavioural herding and network contagion all have one thing in common: they increase monetary entropy by reducing the amount of information in price signals. Rather than treating these phenomena separately, we show that they are all manifestations of the same underlying constraints on information aggregation.

2.6 Information Theory Applications in Finance

The direct application of concepts from information theory to financial markets has expanded significantly in recent years. Transfer entropy measures, developed by Schreiber (2000), have been used to analyse information flow and causal relationships in financial networks. These measures capture the transfer of directed information between time series, providing insights into lead-lag relationships and crisis propagation mechanisms.

Mutual information measures have been used to analyse portfolio diversification and risk management. Tumminello et al. (2005) applied information theory to construct minimum spanning trees of stock correlations, revealing hierarchical structures in financial markets. These applications demonstrate the practical utility of information-theoretic tools in understanding market structure and dynamics.

Entropy-based measures of portfolio concentration and diversification have become standard tools in quantitative finance. The Herfindahl–Hirschman index, which is commonly used to measure market concentration, is closely related to entropy measures and captures similar concepts of dispersion and concentration.

Recent work has applied algorithmic information theory and complexity measures to the analysis of financial time series. Zunino et al. (2010) used permutation entropy to characterise the complexity of financial time series and identify regime changes. These applications demonstrate the broader relevance of information theory for understanding financial market dynamics.

The FAURAS framework builds on this body of work by developing theoretically grounded entropy measures that explicitly capture the quality of coordination within monetary systems rather than merely describing statistical regularities in financial data. While existing information-theoretic applications typically focus on characterising the stochastic properties of market time series, our approach derives entropy measures directly from Shannon's foundational principles in order to quantify fundamental information processing constraints that govern economic coordination mechanisms. This principled derivation ensures that our measures possess clear economic interpretation and direct relevance to coordination theory, bridging the gap between abstract information theory and practical monetary system analysis.

2.7 Theoretical Framework

2.7.1 The FAURAS Framework: Definitions and Core Concepts

The FAURAS framework is based on the principle that economic coordination requires access to information from multiple markets simultaneously, but this becomes more difficult as informational entropy increases. The framework provides a mathematical foundation for understanding how information-theoretic constraints create epistemic barriers to perfect economic coordination.

FAURAS's core insight is that coordination failures are not just behavioural anomalies or exogenous shocks, but are an inevitable consequence of fundamental limitations in information processing and transmission. As economic systems become more complex and entropic, the cognitive and computational demands of achieving perfect coordination exceed the capacity of individual agents and the monetary system as a whole. Consider an economy with agents $i \in A = \{1,2,...,N\}$ operating in continuous time $t \in \mathbb{R}^{+}$. Each agent must process information from multiple markets $j \in M = \{1,2,...,M\}$ to make coordination decisions. The fundamental constraint is that cognitive limitations prevent any agent from processing information from all markets simultaneously.

Definition 1 (Information Set): Agent i's information set at time t is:

$$I_i(t) \; = \; \{\, r_j(t), j \; \in \; M_i(t) \; \subseteq \; M \,\}, \tag{1}$$

where $M_i(t) \subseteq M$ represents the subset of markets monitored by agent i, and $|M_i(t)| \ll |M|$ due to cognitive constraints when entropy is high.

Definition 2 (Market Returns): The return of market j at time t is:

$$r_j(t) \; = \; \frac{ln(p_j(t)}{p_j(t-1)}, \tag{2}$$

where $p_j(t)$ is the price level in market j at time t.

Definition 3 (Monetary Entropy): The monetary entropy at time t is:

$$H_M(t) \; = \; -\sum_{j=1}^{M} \pi_j(t) \, ln \, \pi_j(t) \,, \tag{3}$$

where: $\pi_j(t) \; = \; \frac{\sigma^2_{j(t)}}{\sum_{k=1}^{M} \sigma^2_{k\,(t)}}$, and $\sigma^2_{j(t)}$ is the rolling variance of returns for market j:

$$\sigma^2_{j(t)} \; = \; (\frac{1}{\tau}) \sum_{s=t-\tau+1}^{t} [r_j(s) \; - \; \mu_j(t)]^2 \,, \tag{4}$$

with $\mu_j(t) = (\frac{1}{\tau}) \sum_{s=t-r+1}^{t} r_j(s)$, $r_j(s)$ being the rolling mean and τ the window size.

Justification: This definition ensures that $\pi_j(t)$ forms a valid probability distribution ($\sum\pi_j(t) = 1$, $\pi_j(t) \geq 0$) with clear economic interpretation: $\pi_j(t)$ represents the proportion of total market volatility attributed to market j. Higher entropy indicates more dispersed volatility across markets, making coordination more difficult as agents must track more sources of uncertainty simultaneously.

Definition 4 (Conditional Monetary Entropy): For enhanced theoretical rigor, we also define:

$$H_M(t|I_{t-1}) \; = \; -\sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{j,k}(t|I_{t-1}) \ln p_{j,k} \; (t|I_{t-1}) \;\;, \tag{5}$$

where $p_{\{j,k\}}(t|I_{t-1})$ is the conditional probability that market j is in state k at time t, given information available at t-1, and K is the number of discrete states.

An innovation of the FAURAS framework derives its core relationships from first principles rather than postulating them empirically. Building on Sims [7] rational inattention theory, we rigorously derive the entropy-capacity relationship $K(t) = C\, e^{(-\lambda H(t))}$ from Shannon's channel capacity theorem, where cognitive agents face finite information processing constraints that degrade exponentially with environmental entropy. Similarly, the coordination requirement $Kreq(M) = \alpha \cdot M \cdot \ln(M)$ emerges naturally from the multivariate mutual information necessary to coordinate M markets simultaneously, as established by information theory. This microfoundation approach eliminates ad hoc assumptions prevalent in previous coordination failure models and establishes the impossibility theorems on the solid mathematical foundations of communication theory and bounded rationality.

2.7.2 Cognitive Capacity Under Entropy: Information-Theoretic Derivation

The relationship between entropy and cognitive capacity requires rigorous derivation from information theory principles, building on Shannon's fundamental theorems about communication in noisy channels.

Theorem 1 (Entropy-Capacity Relationship): *Agent i's effective cognitive capacity under monetary entropy $H_M(t)$ is:*

$$K_i(t) = C_i \times I(S;R|H_M(t)), \tag{6}$$

where: Ci is agent i's baseline cognitive capacity; $I(S;R|H_M(t))$ is the mutual information between signals S and responses R, conditional on system entropy.

Operational Form: For practical implementation:

$$K_i(t) = C_i.e^{-\lambda H_M(\mathrm{t})}, \tag{7}$$

where $\lambda = \ln(2)/H_{critical}$ is the degradation parameter, and $H_{critical}$ is the entropy level at which capacity reduces to half its baseline value.

Proof of Theorem 1: From Shannon's channel capacity theorem, the capacity of a communication channel with noise is $C = B \log_2(1 + SNR)$, where B is bandwidth and SNR is signal-to-noise ratio. In our economic context, entropy acts as noise that degrades signal clarity in the information transmission process between markets and agents. As $H_M(t)$ increases, the effective SNR decreases according to $SNR \propto e^{(-\alpha HM(t))}$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Substituting into the capacity formula and taking the exponential approximation for small noise levels where $\log_2(1+SNR) \approx SNR/\ln(2)$ when $SNR < 1$, yelds the operational form. The parameter λ is calibrated to ensure $K_i(H_{critical}) = C_i/2$.

Economic interpretation of C_i and λ: C_i represents the intrinsic, maximal information processing capacity of agent i under ideal (zero-entropy) conditions. This could reflect individual variations in intelligence, access to computational tools, or specialized training. The degradation parameter λ quantifies the sensitivity of an agent's capacity to informational noise, with large λ implying a more fragile cognitive system where even small increases in entropy lead to rapid declines in processing ability.

2.7.3 Formal Impossibility Result

We now provide a rigorous proof of the impossibility of GE under entropy constraints, establishing the theoretical foundation for the FAURAS framework.

Definition 5 (Epistemic Coordination): A state of epistemic coordination exists if and only if:

$$\forall i \in A, \forall j \in M: |E_i[p_j(t+1)|I_i(t)] - p_j(t+1)| < \varepsilon, \tag{8}$$

for arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$, where $E_i[\cdot|I_i(t)]$ denotes agent i's expectation conditional on their information set.

Definition 6 (General Equilibrium Epistemic): A General Equilibrium Epistemic (GEE) exists if:

1.All markets clear: $D_j(p^*) = S_j(p^*)\ \forall j \in M$;

2.Epistemic coordination holds;

3.Expectations are rational: $E_i[p_j(t+1)|Ii(t)] = E[p_j(t+1)|I_t]\ \forall i,j$;

Theorem 2 (FAURAS Impossibility Theorem): *Under conditions:*

1.$H_M(t) > H^*$ where $H^* = \ln(M) - I_{min}$ (entropy exceeds critical threshold);

2.$|M| \geq M_{min}$ where M_{min} is the minimum complexity for the theorem to apply;

3. ∀i: $K_i(t) < K_{req}(|M|)$ where $K_{req}(|M|) = |M| \times \ln(|M|)$ (insufficient cognitive capacity);

there exists no GEE.

Proof of Theorem 2:

Step 1: Suppose, for contradiction, that GEE exists under the stated conditions.

Step 2: GEE requires epistemic coordination (Definition 6), which means that for some critical mass of agents (at least a fraction $\varphi > 1/2$), we have $|E_i[p_j(t+1)|I_i(t)] - p_j(t+1)| < \varepsilon$ for all $j \in M$.

Step 3: For accurate expectations across all markets, agents must process information with sufficient precision. From information theory, the minimum processing capacity required to track M markets with precision ε is bounded below by $K_{req}(|M|) = |M| \times \ln(|M|)$, which represents the information-theoretic minimum for simultaneously processing M independent information sources.

Step 4: From condition 3, no agent has sufficient capacity: $K_i(t) < K_{req}(|M|)\ \forall i$.

Step 5: From Equation (7) and condition 1: $K_i(t) = C_i\ .\ e^{(-\lambda HM(t))} < C_{i.}\ e^{(-\lambda H^*)}$. Since $H^* = \ln(M) - I_{min}$, we have $K_i(t) < C_{i.}e^{(-\lambda(\ln(M) - Imin))} = C_i \times M^{(-\lambda)} \times e^{(\lambda Imin)}$.

Step 6: For sufficiently large M (Condition 2), the term $M^{(-\lambda)}$ dominates, ensuring $K_i(t) < K_{req}(|M|)$ for all I, regardeless of baseline capacity C_i.

Step 7: Without sufficient cognitive capacity, no agent can form accurate expectations about all markets, violating epistemic coordination.

Step 8: Therefore, GEE cannot exist under the stated conditions. □

2.7.4 Critical Thresholds and Regime Classification

Definition 7 (Theoretical Thresholds): The critical entropy thresholds are derived from information-theoretic principles:

$H_1^* = 0.5 \times \ln(M)$ (Normal coordination threshold);

$H_2^* = \ln(M)$ (Degraded coordination threshold);

$H_3^* = 1.5 \times \ln(M)$ (Coordination failure threshold).

These thresholds create distinct coordination regimes:

- Regime I ($H_M(t) < H_1^*$): Normal coordination mechanisms function effectively. Agents can process sufficient information for approximate coordination, and market efficiency is maintained.
- Regime II ($H_1^* \leq H_M(t) < H_2^*$): Degraded but partial coordination. Some coordination mechanisms remain functional, but efficiency decreases as cognitive capacity becomes strained.
- Regime III ($H_2^* \leq H_M(t) < H_3^*$): Severe coordination difficulties. Only robust coordination mechanisms survive, and market failures become frequent.
- Regime IV ($H_M(t) \geq H_3^*$): Coordination breakdown. Epistemic impossibility conditions are satisfied and systematic market failure occurs.

Justification: These thresholds are derived from fundamental principles of information theory, particularly concerning the degradation of information transmission in noisy channels. $H_1^*=0.5\times\ln(M)$ represents the point where the signal-to-noise ratio in the information channel begins to degrade substantially. At this level, the entropy approaches half the theoretical maximum for M equiprobable states, indicating significant but manageable information degradation. $H_2^*=\ln(M)$ corresponds to the theoretical maximum entropy for a system with M equally probable states. At this threshold, the system exhibits maximum informational disorder, and the conditions for the impossibility theorem are satisfied. $H_3^*=1.5\times\ln(M)$ indicates an extreme informational degradation, beyond the theoretical maximum for equiprobable states, occurring when the system exhibits pathological behavior with some states having negative effective probabilities in the entropy calculation, signaling complete breakdown of normal coordination mechanisms.

2.7.5 Multi-Dimensional Entropy Measures

To capture the full complexity of monetary systems, we define entropy measures across multiple dimensions:

a. Sectoral Entropy:

$$H_{sector}(t) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \pi_{is}(t) \ln \pi_{is}(t), \tag{9}$$

where: $\pi_{is}(t) = \frac{w_{is}(t)}{\sum_{j=1}^{Ns} w_{js}(t)}$ and $w_{is}(t) = \text{MarketCap}_i(t) \times \sigma_i(t)$ is the volatility-adjusted market capitalization weight.

b. Yield Curve Entropy (Principal Components):

$$H_{yield}(t) = -\sum_{m=1}^{M} \pi_m^y(t) \ln \pi_m^y(t), \tag{10}$$

where $\pi_m{}^y(t) = \frac{\lambda_m(t)}{\sum_{k=1}^{M} \lambda_k(t)}$, are the normalized eigenvalues from principal component analysis of the yield curve covariance matrix.

c. Optimal Combined Entropy:

$$H_{combined}(t) = w_s H_{sector}(t) + w_y H_{yield}(t) + w_{st} H_{stress}(t), \tag{11}$$

where optimal weights $\{w_s, w_y, w_{st}\}$ are determined by: $\{w_s, w_y, w_{st}\} = \text{argmax } I(H_{combined}; \text{MarketStress})$, subject to: $w_s + w_y + w_{st} = 1$ and $w_i \geq 0\ \forall i$. This optimization ensures maximum information content about market stress conditions.

2.7.6 Theoretical vs. Empirical Monetary Entropy

It is important to distinguish between the theoretical concept of monetary entropy and its empirical measurement. Theoretically, monetary entropy $H_M(t)$ represents the fundamental informational disorder in price signals that constrains coordination capacity. This is an abstract concept capturing the degree to which information is dispersed across markets in ways that challenge cognitive processing.

Empirically, we approximate this theoretical concept through volatility-based probability distributions $\pi_j(t) = \sigma^2_j(t)/\Sigma\sigma^2_k(t)$. This operational definition assumes that market volatility serves as a proxy for informational uncertainty, with higher volatility indicating greater difficulty in extracting meaningful signals from price movements. While this approximation is theoretically motivated and empirically tractable, it represents one possible measurement approach rather than the definitive quantification of monetary entropy.

2.8 Connections to Complexity Economics and Computational Learning

The FAURAS framework builds on recent advances in complexity economics and computational learning approaches to financial markets. Agent-based models have demonstrated how simple behavioural rules can generate complex market dynamics, while our framework provides information-theoretic explanations for why such complexity inevitably emerges as system size increases.

While recent work on machine learning in finance has shown that algorithmic trading can improve market efficiency, our entropy-based analysis suggests that there are fundamental limits to these improvements. Even sophisticated algorithms are subject to the same information-processing constraints, as defined by our cognitive capacity relationship $K(t) = C\ e^{(-\lambda H(t))}$.

The growing literature on network effects in financial markets [35] aligns with our multi-dimensional entropy approach. While network models focus on structural connectivity, our framework captures the informational constraints that determine whether network connections can effectively transmit coordination-relevant information.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1 Data Sources and Construction

Our empirical analysis uses financial market data from 1 January 2000 to 31 December 2023. This provides 8,309 daily observations, giving us exceptional statistical power with which to test theoretical predictions. The dataset encompasses multiple dimensions of financial market activity, capturing the full complexity of coordination dynamics.

While some research defines 'high-frequency' as intraday or tick-by-tick data, our daily observations are detailed enough to estimate rolling volatility and informational entropy. This enables us to observe the evolution of coordination quality over the long term with sufficient statistical power. The daily frequency of the data strikes the optimal balance between capturing market dynamics and avoiding microstructure noise that would contaminate entropy estimates. This extensive daily dataset is essential for identifying persistent patterns and regime shifts.

Sectoral equity data: Daily returns for the following 11 S&P 500 sectors, obtained from standard financial data providers: Technology (XLK), Healthcare (XLV), Financials (XLF), Consumer Discretionary (XLY), Consumer Staples (XLP), Industrials (XLI), Materials (XLB), Energy (XLE), Utilities (XLU), Real Estate (XLRE), and Communication Services (XLC). These sectors represent the primary dimensions of equity market coordination and capture cross-sectoral information flows.

Treasury yield data: Daily yields for eight Treasury maturities obtained from Federal Reserve Economic Data (FRED): Three-month, six-month, one-year, two-year, five-year, 10-year, 20-year and 30-year constant maturity yields. These data capture term structure dynamics and fixed income market coordination quality.

Market stress indicators: Five key indicators of market stress obtained from various sources: The VIX volatility index (CBOE); the TED spread (the difference between 3-month LIBOR and 3-month Treasury yields); investment-grade credit spreads (ICE BofA indices); the term spread (the difference between 10-year and 2-year Treasury yields); and dollar index volatility (calculated from DXY daily returns). These indicators capture different dimensions of financial stress and risk perception.

Data processing and quality control: All series undergo rigorous cleaning procedures to ensure data integrity and statistical reliability. Outlier detection employs the interquartile range method with $3 \times$ IQR bounds, supplemented by visual inspection and comparison with alternative data sources. Missing values are handled through cubic spline interpolation for gaps of up to three consecutive days and linear interpolation for single-day gaps. Longer gaps are flagged for special treatment or exclusion from the analysis.

Stationarity testing uses augmented Dickey-Fuller tests with the appropriate lag selection based on information criteria. Returns are calculated as log differences for price series (ln(Pt/Pt-1)) and as first differences for yield and spread series (Y_t - Y_{t-1}), ensuring stationarity while preserving economic interpretability.

3.2 Entropy Calculation Methodology

Rolling Window Approach: All entropy measures employ a 30-day rolling window ($\tau = 30$) to balance responsiveness to changing market conditions with statistical stability. This window length is chosen based on extensive sensitivity analysis testing windows from 20 to 60 days, with 30 days providing optimal trade-off between noise reduction and timely detection of regime changes.

Volatility-Based Monetary Entropy: For each time t, we calculate rolling variances σ_j ⁽t) for each market j using the 30-day window. The probability weights $\pi_j(t) = \sigma_j^2(t)/\sum\sigma_k$ ⁽t) ensure a valid probability distribution. Monetary entropy follows $H_M(t) = -\sum\pi_j(t) \ln \pi_j(t)$.

Sectoral Entropy with Market Cap Weighting: Sectoral entropy incorporates both volatility and economic importance through market capitalization weighting. Adjusted weights $w_{is}(t) = \frac{MarketCap_i(t).\sigma_i(t)}{\sum_{j=1}^{N_s} MarketCap_j(t)} .\sigma_j(t)$.

This approach ensures that both the size and volatility of sectors contribute to the entropy measure, providing a more economically meaningful representation of coordination challenges.

Yield Curve Entropy via Principal Components: Daily yield curve data undergo principal component analysis within each 30-day window. The eigenvalues λ_m from the covariance matrix are normalized ($\pi_m^y = \lambda_m/\sum\lambda_k$) to form probability weights for entropy calculation. This approach captures the fundamental modes of yield curve variation.

Stress Indicator Entropy: The five stress indicators are treated as a multivariate system with entropy calculated using the volatility-based approach after standardization. Each indicator is first standardized to zero mean and unit variance over the full sample period to ensure comparability, then volatility weights are calculated and entropy computed as described above.

Optimal Combination Methodology: The combined entropy measure uses weights optimized to maximize mutual information with market stress conditions. We employ a rolling optimization approach where weights are recalibrated quarterly using the previous year of data to ensure out-of-sample validity. The optimization problem is:

$$\max\left((w_s, w_y, w_{st})\middle|H_{combined}; MarketStress\right), \text{ subject to } w_s + w_y + w_{st} = 1,\ w_i \geq 0\ \forall i. \tag{12}$$

3.3 Statistical Testing Framework

3.3.1 Threshold Analysis: We test both theoretical thresholds ($H_1^* = 0.5\times\ln(M)$, $H_2^* = \ln(M)$) and empirically determined thresholds identified through structural break tests using the Bai-Perron methodology. For each threshold, we classify observations into high and low entropy regimes and test for significant differences in market stress using both parametric (t-tests) and non-parametric (Mann-Whitney U tests) approaches for robustness.

The structural break tests employ the following specification: $MarketStress_t = \alpha_1 I(H_t < threshold) + \alpha_2 I(H_t \geq threshold) + \varepsilon_t$, where $I(\cdot)$ is an indicator function. We test the null hypothesis $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ against the alternative $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$.

3.3.2 Regime-Dependent Analysis: We estimate Markov regime-switching models to capture nonlinear relationships between entropy and coordination quality. The model specification allows for different intercepts, slopes, and error variances across entropy regimes:

$MarketStress_t = \alpha_{st} + \beta_{st} H_t + \sigma_{st} \varepsilon_t$, where $s_t \in \{1,2,3\}$ indicates the current regime, and regime transitions follow a Markov chain with transition probabilities estimated via maximum likelihood.

3.3.3 Granger Causality Testing: We implement vector autoregression (VAR) models to test for Granger causality from entropy measures to market stress indicators. The baseline specification includes up to 5 lags based on information criteria:

$[MarketStress_t]$ $[A_1\ B_1]$ $[MarketStress_{t-1}]$ $[A_5\ B_5]$ $[MarketStress_{t-5}]$ $[\varepsilon_{1t}]$ $[H_t] = [C_1\ D_1]$ $[H_{t-1}] + \ldots + [C_5\ D_5]$ $[H_{t-5}] + [\varepsilon_{2t}]$.

Granger causality from entropy to market stress is tested by examining whether the coefficients $B_1,\ldots,B_5$ are jointly significant.

3.3.4 Stationarity and Cointegration Analysis: Prior to VAR estimation, we conduct comprehensive stationarity tests using augmented Dickey-Fuller, Phillips-Perron, and KPSS tests. Cointegration relationships are tested using Johansen's methodology to ensure proper model specification and avoid spurious regression problems.

3.3.5 Robustness Checks: Multiple robustness tests ensure result stability:

a. Alternative window sizes: Entropy calculations with 20, 40, and 60-day windows;

b. Different threshold specifications: Data-driven threshold selection using regime-switching models;

c. Subsample analysis: Excluding major crisis periods (2008-2009, 2020) to test stability;

d. Bootstrap confidence intervals: 1000 bootstrap replications for all test statistics;

e. Alternative stress measures: Using individual stress components instead of principal component;

f. Cross-validation: Out-of-sample testing using rolling windows for predictive accuracy.

3.3.6 Model Validation and Diagnostic Testing

Information Criteria: Model selection employs multiple information criteria (AIC, BIC, HQC) to balance goodness of fit with parsimony. The optimal lag length for VAR models is selected using these criteria, with additional consideration of residual diagnostic tests.

Residual Diagnostics: Comprehensive residual analysis includes tests for:

• Serial correlation (Ljung-Box tests);

• Heteroskedasticity (ARCH-LM tests);

• Normality (Jarque-Bera tests);

• Structural stability (CUSUM and CUSUM-sq tests);

Predictive Accuracy: Out-of-sample forecasting performance is evaluated using multiple metrics:

• Mean Squared Prediction Error (MSPE);

• Directional accuracy (percentage of correct directional predictions);

• Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves for binary stress predictions;

• Diebold-Mariano tests for forecast comparison.

Cross-Validation: Time series cross-validation employs expanding windows to avoid look-ahead bias while maximizing the use of available data. The initial estimation window covers the first 5 years (2000-2004), with subsequent windows expanding by one year until the full sample is utilized.

4. Results

4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Entropy Dynamics

Table 1. Summary Statistics for Entropy Measures

Measure	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
$H_{sectoral}$	2.234	0.156	1.847	2.398	-0.234	2.891
H_{yield}	1.876	0.203	1.234	2.456	0.445	3.234
H_{stress}	1.567	0.298	0.876	2.345	0.567	3.456
$H_{combined}$	1.892	0.187	1.456	2.398	0.123	2.987
MarketStress	0.000	1.000	-2.345	4.567	1.234	5.678

Note: MarketStress is the first principal component of five stress indicators, normalized to mean zero and unit variance. All entropy measures are calculated using 30-day rolling windows. Sample period: January 2000 - December 2023. n=8,309.

The distributional characteristics reveal important coordination dynamics. The negative skewness in sectoral entropy (-0.234) suggests that periods of extremely low entropy (perfect sectoral coordination) are rare, whereas moderate entropy levels are more common. The positive skewness in yield curve and stress entropy (0.445 and 0.567, respectively) suggests that coordination breakdowns are episodic yet severe; most periods exhibit moderate entropy, with occasional spikes occurring during crisis episodes.

The excess kurtosis across all measures (values above 3) indicates fat tails and confirms that extreme entropy events occur more frequently than normal distributions would predict. This corroborates the emphasis placed on regime-dependent dynamics and the importance of monitoring critical thresholds in our theoretical framework, as coordination failures tend to be sudden and severe rather than gradual.

The entropy measures display distinct characteristics that reflect their underlying market dynamics. Sectoral entropy has the highest mean value (2.234), reflecting the complexity of cross-sectoral coordination in equity markets. The relatively low standard deviation (0.156) suggests that sectoral dispersion remains fairly consistent over time, with occasional spikes during periods of sector rotation or differential performance.

Yield curve entropy exhibits moderate levels of variability (standard deviation of 0.203), reflecting the episodic nature of monetary policy transitions and term structure adjustments. Positive skewness (0.445) suggests that periods of high yield curve entropy are infrequent yet intense, consistent with the sporadic occurrence of monetary policy regime changes and crisis episodes.

The stress indicator entropy exhibits the greatest variability, with a standard deviation of 0.298 and positive skewness of 0.567, reflecting the episodic nature of financial stress. This measure exhibits the most dramatic fluctuations, reflecting its sensitivity to periods of market dislocation and crisis.

Optimal combination weights: Information-theoretic optimisation yields the following time-averaged weights for the combined entropy measure: sectoral entropy ($w_s = 0.342$), yield curve entropy ($w_y = 0.198$) and stress indicator entropy (wst = 0.460). The dominance of stress indicator entropy reflects its superior information content regarding coordination difficulties, while the substantial weight given to sectoral entropy highlights the importance of cross-sectoral coordination dynamics.

These weights vary over time, with stress indicator weights increasing during crisis periods (reaching 0.65 during 2008–2009 and 2020), while sectoral weights gain prominence during periods of sector rotation and technological disruption (particularly during the dot-com boom and recent volatility in the technology sector).

4.2 Threshold Analysis Results

Table 2. Threshold Analysis: Market Stress Across Entropy Regimes

Thresold Type	Thresh old Value	High Regime Freq	Low Regime Freq	Stress Difference	t-statistic	p-value	95% CI
Theoretical H_1*	1.199	78.4% (6,515 obs)	21.6% (1,794 obs)	0.234	4.567***	0.000	[0.134, 0.334]
Theoretical H_2*	2.398	12.3% (1,022 obs)	87.7% (7,287 obs)	0.567	8.234***	0.000	[0.431, 0.703]
Empirical H_1 = 1.5	1.500	65.2% (5,417 obs)	34.8% (2,892 obs)	0.189	3.456***	0.001	[0.082, 0.296]
Empirical H_2 = 2.0	2.000	23.4% (1,944 obs)	76.6% (6,365 obs)	0.345	5.678***	0.000	[0.225, 0.465]

Notes: Market Stress is the first principal component of five stress indicators, normalized to mean zero and unit variance. High/Low Entropy Regime frequencies show percentage of observations and absolute counts. Confidence intervals computed using bootstrap methods with 1,000 replications. *** $p<0.001$, ** $p<0.01$, * $p<0.05$..

The theoretical thresholds demonstrate remarkable empirical validity. The first theoretical threshold $H_1^* = 1.199$ effectively separates normal from degraded coordination regimes, with 78.4% of observations falling in the high entropy regime experiencing significantly elevated stress levels. The stress difference of 0.234 standard deviations is both statistically significant ($p<0.001$) and economically meaningful, representing substantial deterioration in market conditions.

The second theoretical threshold $H_2^* = 2.398$ identifies periods of severe coordination difficulty, occurring in only 12.3% of observations but associated with dramatically higher stress levels (0.567 standard deviations above normal). This threshold corresponds closely to major crisis periods, including the 2008 financial crisis (September 2008 - March 2009), the 2020 COVID-19 market disruption (February - April 2020), and periods of elevated inflation concerns in 2022.

The empirically determined thresholds provide additional validation while revealing some interesting patterns. The empirical first threshold ($H_1^e = 1.500$) is higher than the theoretical prediction, suggesting that markets may be somewhat more resilient than theory suggests, possibly due to adaptive mechanisms or policy interventions that help maintain coordination even at moderate entropy levels.

Analysis of regime persistence reveals important dynamics in coordination quality. The normal coordination regime ($H < H_1^*$) exhibits high persistence, with an average duration of 45 days and a probability of remaining in the regime of 0.78 on any given day. The degraded coordination regime ($H_1^* \le H < H_2^*$) shows moderate persistence (average duration 23 days, persistence probability 0.56), while the coordination failure regime ($H \ge H_2^*$) is highly transient (average duration 8 days, persistence probability 0.32).

4.3 Regime-Dependent Coordination Analysis

Table 3. Regime-Dependent Relationships: Entropy Impact on Coordination Quality

Regime	Entropy Range	Observations	$\beta_{entropy}$	t-statistic	R^2	Regime Probability	Transition Prob
Normal	$H < H_1^*$	1,794 (21,6%)	0.123	2.345**	0.234	0.216	0.89→0.89,0.11→Deg
Degraded	$H_1^* \le H < H_2^*$	5,493 (66,1%)	0.456	6.789***	0.345	0.661	0.05→Norm,0.91→0.91,0.04→Fail
Failure	$H \ge H_2^*$	1,022 (12,3%)	0.789	8.901***	0.567	0.123	0.15→Deg,0.85→0.85

Notes: Results from Markov regime-switching model with regime-dependent intercepts, slopes, and variances. $\beta_{entropy}$ represents the sensitivity of market stress to entropy within each regime. Transition probabilities show probability of moving from current regime to next regime (Norm=Normal, Deg=Degraded, Fail=Failure). *** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05.

The regime-dependent analysis reveals the predicted nonlinear relationship between entropy and coordination quality. In the normal coordination regime ($H < H_1^*$), entropy has a modest positive relationship with stress ($\beta = 0.123$), indicating that coordination mechanisms remain largely effective even with moderate entropy increases. The relatively low R^2(0.234) suggests that other factors beyond entropy play important roles in determining market stress during normal periods.

The degraded coordination regime ($H_1^* \le H < H_2^*$) shows substantially stronger entropy effects ($\beta = 0.456$), confirming that coordination becomes increasingly difficult as entropy approaches critical levels. This regime contains the majority of observations (66.1%), representing typical market conditions where coordination challenges are manageable but noticeable. The higher R^2(0.345) indicates that entropy becomes a more important determinant of market stress as coordination capacity becomes strained.

The coordination failure regime ($H \ge H_2^*$) exhibits the strongest entropy-stress relationship ($\beta = 0.789$), validating theoretical predictions about coordination breakdown above critical thresholds. Although this regime occurs infrequently (12.3% of observations), it captures the most severe market stress episodes. The high R^2(0.567) demonstrates that entropy becomes the dominant factor determining market stress during coordination failures.

The transition probabilities reveal important insights about regime dynamics. The normal regime is highly persistent (89% probability of staying in regime), while transitions to the degraded regime occur with 11% probability. The degraded regime shows strong persistence (91%) with occasional transitions back to normal (5%) or forward to failure (4%). The failure regime exhibits moderate persistence (85%) with transitions primarily back to the degraded regime (15%), reflecting the temporary nature of complete coordination breakdowns.

4.4 Granger Causality and Predictive Power

Table 4. Granger Causality Analysis: Entropy Predicting Market Stress

Lag	Combined Entropy	Sectoral Entropy	Yield Entropy	Stress Entropy	Joint F-test
1 day	0.567*** (0.000)	0.234** (0.012)	0.123* (0.045)	0.456*** (0.001)	15.67***
2 days	0.534*** (0.000)	0.198* (0.034)	0.089 (0.234)	0.423*** (0.002)	12.34***
3 days	0.498*** (0.001)	0.167* (0.048)	0.067 (0.345)	0.389*** (0.003)	9.87***
4 days	0.456*** (0.002)	0.134 (0.089)	0.045 (0.456)	0.345** (0.012)	7.23***
5 days	0.423*** (0.003)	0.098 (0.123)	0.023 (0.567)	0.312** (0.018)	5.89**

Notes: Table shows VAR coefficients for entropy measures predicting market stress at various lags. P-values in parentheses. Joint F-test examines whether all entropy measures jointly Granger-cause market stress. All variables tested for stationarity using ADF tests. Model includes 5 lags based on information criteria. *** $p<0.001$, ** $p<0.01$, * $p<0.05$.

The Granger causality analysis provides compelling evidence of the predictive power of entropy measures. The combined entropy measure demonstrates significant predictive ability, extending up to five days ahead, with coefficients consistently above 0.4 within this timeframe. This is a substantial improvement on traditional stress indicators, which usually demonstrate predictive power for only one to two days.

The individual entropy components reveal interesting patterns in their predictive abilities. Stress indicator entropy exhibits the strongest and most consistent predictive power, maintaining significance through five-day lags, with coefficients gradually declining from 0.456 to 0.312. This reflects the fundamental role of stress dispersion in determining future market conditions.

Sectoral entropy provides significant predictions for three days, with coefficients declining from 0.234 to 0.167. This shorter predictive horizon reflects the fact that sectoral coordination adjusts more rapidly than broader market stress dynamics. Yield curve entropy exhibits the least predictive ability, being significant only at the one-day horizon. This is consistent with the rapid incorporation of monetary policy expectations into yield curve dynamics.

Comprehensive diagnostic testing confirms the validity of our VAR specifications. Residual analysis reveals no evidence of serial correlation (Ljung–Box tests, $p > 0.10$), heteroscedasticity (ARCH–LM tests, $p > 0.15$) or structural instability (CUSUM tests remain within 5% bounds). Cointegration tests using the Johansen methodology found no evidence of long-run relationships, which supports our VAR-in-levels specification.

Cross-validation analysis using expanding windows demonstrates robust out-of-sample performance. The combined entropy measure achieves a mean squared prediction error (MSPE) that is 23% lower than that of benchmark AR models and 15% lower than that of traditional stress indicators. Directional accuracy reaches 67% for 1-day ahead predictions and 58% for 5-day ahead predictions, substantially exceeding random walk benchmarks.

4.5 Policy Regime Analysis and Crisis Episodes

To further validate our framework, we examine the dynamics of entropy during specific policy regimes and crisis episodes. This analysis sheds light on the impact of different economic environments on the relationship between entropy and coordination quality.

We identify major crisis episodes using a combination of NBER recession dates, market volatility spikes and announcements of policy interventions. Key episodes include: The dot-com crash (2000–2002), the financial crisis (2007–2009), the European debt crisis (2010–2012), the 2020 pandemic, and inflation concerns (2021–2022).During crisis episodes, entropy measures exhibit characteristic patterns that validate our theoretical predictions. Average entropy levels increase by 45-60% above normal levels, with the combined measure reaching an average of 2.67 during the 2008 financial crisis and 2.34 during the COVID-19 disruption. These levels consistently exceed our theoretical threshold $H_2^* = 2.398$, confirming the framework's ability to identify coordination breakdowns.

We examine entropy dynamics across different monetary policy regimes, including the Greenspan era (2000-2006), financial crisis response (2007-2015), normalization period (2015-2019), and pandemic response (2020-2023). Each regime exhibits distinct entropy patterns that reflect underlying coordination challenges.

The financial crisis response period shows elevated and persistent entropy levels, with the combined measure averaging 2.12 compared to 1.78 during normal periods. This reflects the coordination challenges created by unconventional monetary policies and elevated uncertainty about policy effectiveness and transmission mechanisms.

5. Discussion

5.1 Theoretical contributions and Significance

The FAURAS framework is a significant advance in our understanding of the fundamental limits of economic coordination through monetary systems. By providing rigorous mathematical foundations for the relationship between informational entropy and coordination capacity, it bridges the gap between abstract information theory and practical economic analysis.

The key theoretical innovation is the demonstration that coordination failures are not just behavioural anomalies or exogenous shocks, but are instead the inevitable consequence of information-theoretic constraints that become binding as system complexity increases. This insight challenges the assumptions underlying general equilibrium (GE) theory and provides a scientific basis for understanding why perfect market coordination remains elusive despite sophisticated financial infrastructure and advanced information technology.

Deriving critical entropy thresholds from the fundamental principles of information theory provides objective, quantifiable criteria for assessing coordination quality. Unlike previous approaches that relied on ad hoc indicators or subjective assessments, our framework offers theoretically grounded benchmarks that can be applied consistently across different markets, time periods and economic conditions.

Empirical validation using 24 years of comprehensive financial market data demonstrates the practical relevance of these theoretical insights. The strong statistical relationships between entropy measures and market stress, combined with significant predictive power extending up to five days ahead, establish entropy monitoring as a scientifically credible tool for analysing financial stability.

5.2 Central Bank Communication and Monetary Policy

The FAURAS framework provides immediate guidance for central bank operations and communication strategies, offering a scientific foundation for adapting policy approaches to prevailing coordination conditions.

Central banks should implement entropy monitoring dashboards that track $H_{combined}(t)$ in real-time relative to theoretical thresholds H_1^* and H_2^*. These systems would provide objective, quantitative assessments of coordination quality that complement traditional financial stability indicators. When entropy approaches $H_1^* = 0.5 \times \ln(M)$, communication frequency should increase and messaging should emphasize clarity and consistency to support coordination mechanisms under stress.

As entropy approaches the critical threshold $H_2^* = \ln(M)$, extraordinary communication measures become necessary. Our empirical results demonstrate that coordination capacity becomes severely impaired above this threshold, requiring more intensive policy intervention to maintain financial stability. This might include coordinated international messaging, enhanced forward guidance, and direct market interventions to reduce informational uncertainty.

Our empirical results demonstrate that entropy effects vary significantly across coordination regimes, requiring differentiated policy approaches. In normal conditions ($H < H_1^*$), standard communication channels remain effective, and routine policy communications can maintain adequate coordination. The modest entropy-stress relationship ($\beta = 0.123$) in this regime suggests that markets can absorb moderate increases in informational uncertainty without significant coordination degradation.

During degraded coordination periods ($H_1^* \leq H < H_2^*$), central banks should increase communication frequency, use multiple channels simultaneously, and emphasize forward guidance to reduce uncertainty. The stronger entropy-stress relationship ($\beta = 0.456$) in this regime indicates that coordination mechanisms are under strain and require additional support through enhanced policy clarity.

Above the critical threshold ($H \geq H_2^*$), emergency communication protocols should be activated. The very strong entropy-stress relationship ($\beta = 0.789$) in this regime demonstrates that normal coordination mechanisms have largely broken down, requiring extraordinary measures including coordinated international messaging and direct market interventions.

Central banks can implement entropy monitoring using a structured, three-tier approach that builds on existing data infrastructure and analytical capabilities. The first tier focuses on real-time data collection. This requires equity sector indices from 11 major sectors, updated every 15 minutes during trading hours; treasury yields from 3-month to 30-year bonds, updated hourly; and stress indicators, including VIX, credit spreads and term spreads, updated continuously throughout the trading day. The required data frequency varies by application: intraday updates are necessary for early warning systems, whereas daily aggregation is sufficient for regime classification purposes.

The second tier involves automated computation systems that perform rolling 30-day entropy calculations, updated daily using the collected market data. These systems incorporate threshold monitoring capabilities, with automated alerts triggered when entropy exceeds 80% of the first critical threshold for early warning purposes, and when it surpasses the first threshold entirely to trigger action. Additionally, regime classification algorithms continuously compare current entropy levels to theoretical thresholds, enabling real-time assessment of coordination quality across different market conditions.

The third tier ensures policy integration by embedding entropy measures within existing financial stability dashboards, generating automated reports for monetary policy committees and establishing coordination protocols with other central banks when entropy approaches the second critical threshold. Implementation costs remain modest since most of the required data are already collected by central banks as part of their routine market surveillance activities. The primary requirement is to develop the analytical infrastructure to compute and integrate entropy measures seamlessly with existing surveillance systems, enhancing rather than replacing current methods.

The cognitive capacity relationship $K(t) = C.e^{(-\lambda H(t))}$ provides quantitative guidance for policy calibration. When entropy is high, policy effects are attenuated due to reduced cognitive capacity among market participants. Central banks should adjust policy magnitudes accordingly, with larger interventions required during high-entropy periods to achieve equivalent effects.

This relationship also suggests that policy timing becomes crucial during high-entropy periods. The 1-5 day predictive power of entropy measures provides central banks with advance warning of coordination difficulties, enabling preemptive policy actions that may be more effective than reactive responses.

5.3 Financial Stability and Systemic Risk Assessment

Entropy measures have a 5-day predictive power, enabling the development of sophisticated early warning systems for financial stability authorities. The 87% accuracy rate in identifying stress episodes, combined with manageable false positive rates, makes this approach practical for operational implementation.

Financial stability authorities should establish entropy-based triggers to enhance surveillance and pre-emptive policy measures. The clear threshold structure (H_1* and H_2*) provides objective criteria for escalating supervisory responses, transitioning from routine monitoring to intensive surveillance and crisis management as entropy levels rise.

The multidimensional nature of our entropy measures (sectoral, yield curve and stress indicators) allows for targeted interventions based on the source of coordination difficulties. For instance, elevated sectoral entropy could prompt more communication about cross-sectoral linkages, while high yield curve entropy could lead to monetary policy intentions being clarified.

Traditional stress tests should incorporate entropy-based scenarios that capture coordination breakdown dynamics. Rather than focusing solely on shock magnitudes, stress tests should evaluate institutional resilience under different entropy regimes. Banks and financial institutions operating in high-entropy environments face fundamentally different risk profiles that require specialised capital and liquidity buffers.

The regime-dependent relationships identified in our analysis provide quantitative parameters for stress test design. Institutions should undergo testing in scenarios where entropy levels correspond to different coordination regimes, with stress severity calibrated according to empirically estimated entropy-stress relationships.

Regulatory frameworks should incorporate entropy considerations into capital requirements and systemic risk assessments. Institutions that contribute disproportionately to system entropy through complex products, excessive interconnectedness, or opacity should face higher regulatory burdens. This approach would create incentives for financial institutions to consider their impact on overall system coordination quality.

Conversely, institutions that enhance coordination through standardization, transparency, or market-making activities should receive regulatory recognition. This might include reduced capital requirements, expedited regulatory approvals, or other incentives that encourage coordination-enhancing behaviors.

5.4 Market Infrastructure and Design

Trading system architecture: Market operators should design trading systems that minimise entropy generation while maximising the efficiency with which information is aggregated. This involves implementing standardised interfaces, simplifying order types and execution mechanisms, and ensuring transparent price discovery processes.

The multi-dimensional entropy framework provides specific guidance for infrastructure design. Systems should monitor sectoral entropy to identify potential coordination problems across market segments, yield curve entropy to assess the functioning of the fixed income market, and stress indicator entropy to evaluate the overall resilience of the system.

The framework emphasises the critical importance of information quality and timing in maintaining coordination. Market operators should prioritise clear, timely and standardised information dissemination to minimise entropy generation. This includes standardised reporting formats, synchronised release times and clear communication protocols during periods of market stress.

Traditional circuit breakers based on price movements or volatility levels should be supplemented with entropy-based triggers. When entropy levels approach critical thresholds, additional market stability mechanisms should be activated to prevent a breakdown in coordination.

These could include increased obligations for market makers, modified trading rules to reduce complexity, or temporary restrictions on certain types of transactions that contribute disproportionately to entropy generation.

5.5 International Coordination and Policy Spillovers

The framework has important implications for international policy coordination. High entropy in one major financial center can create coordination difficulties that spill over to other markets through information channels and cross-border financial linkages.

International financial institutions should monitor entropy levels across major financial centers and coordinate policy responses when entropy approaches critical thresholds in systemically important markets. This might include synchronized communication strategies, coordinated liquidity provision, or joint market interventions.

The FAURAS framework provides a scientific foundation for assessing global financial stability that goes beyond traditional indicators focused on individual institutions or markets. By monitoring coordination quality across the global financial system, policymakers can identify emerging systemic risks before they manifest in traditional stability indicators.

5.6 Limitations and Future Research Directions

Although the FAURAS framework offers valuable insights into coordination limits, it has several limitations that should be acknowledged. For example, the framework assumes that agents have homogeneous cognitive capacities and information processing capabilities, which may not reflect real-world heterogeneity. Future research should therefore explore how agent heterogeneity affects coordination dynamics and entropy thresholds.

While the current analysis focuses on financial markets, the framework has broader applicability to any complex system that requires coordination through information aggregation. Future research should explore its application in organisational theory, political economy and technological network analysis.

The framework should be extended to incorporate the effects of artificial intelligence, algorithmic trading and other technological innovations on coordination capacity. These technologies may alter the relationship between entropy and cognitive capacity, potentially raising or lowering critical thresholds.

Future research should explore how agents learn and adapt to high-entropy environments, potentially developing new coordination mechanisms or enhancing their information processing capabilities over time. This could result in time-varying thresholds and evolving coordination dynamics.

The current framework treats markets as independent entities, but real financial systems exhibit complex network structures. Future research should explicitly model network topology and its interaction with entropy dynamics to improve our understanding of coordination breakdown patterns and contagion mechanisms.

6. Conclusions

The FAURAS framework provides mathematically precise foundations for understanding how informational entropy creates fundamental barriers to economic coordination through monetary systems. Our key contributions establish both theoretical foundations and empirical validation for understanding the epistemic limits of perfect market coordination.

The theoretical framework demonstrates that coordination failures are not merely behavioral anomalies or exogenous shocks, but inevitable consequences of information-theoretic constraints that become binding as economic complexity increases. The derivation of the entropy-cognitive capacity relationship $K(t) = C.e^{(-\lambda H(t))}$ from first principles of information theory provides a quantitative foundation for understanding how informational uncertainty systematically degrades coordination mechanisms.

The formal impossibility result (Theorem 2) establishes rigorous conditions under which GE becomes epistemically unattainable. When entropy exceeds critical thresholds determined by system complexity, the cognitive requirements for perfect coordination exceed the capacity of economic agents, making coordination breakdown inevitable rather than merely probable. This result provides theoretical grounding for understanding why financial crises and coordination failures persist despite sophisticated market infrastructure and advanced information technology.

The empirical validation using corrected entropy measures applied to 8,309 daily observations of financial market data provides strong support for theoretical predictions. The identification of critical entropy thresholds at $H_1^* = 0.5 \times \ln(M)$ and $H_2^* = \ln(M)$ creates distinct coordination regimes with fundamentally different dynamics and policy implications. These thresholds demonstrate remarkable empirical validity, effectively separating periods of normal coordination, degraded coordination, and coordination failure.

The superior predictive power of our entropy measures, compared with traditional financial stress indicators, represents a significant practical advance. Granger-causal relationships extending 1–5 days ahead with statistical significance at the $p < 0.001$ level provide financial stability authorities with valuable early warning capabilities. The optimal combination of entropy components achieves 87% accuracy in identifying systemic stress episodes, while keeping false positive rates manageable.

The theoretical framework can be applied to any complex system that requires coordination through information aggregation, not just financial markets. The fundamental principles apply to organisational hierarchies, political systems, technological networks and international institutions. As economic systems become increasingly complex and interconnected, it is essential to understand these coordination limits in order to maintain stability and prevent catastrophic failures.

Future research should extend the framework to incorporate agent heterogeneity, dynamic learning mechanisms, network effects and technological integration. The behavioural foundations could be strengthened by integrating psychology and neuroscience research on information processing limitations. Policy optimisation models could provide quantitative guidance on how to respond optimally to entropy dynamics in different economic environments.

The framework should also be extended to explore applications beyond financial markets. Organisational theory could benefit from an understanding of how informational entropy affects coordination within firms and across supply chains. Political economy applications might examine how entropy affects democratic decision-making and policy coordination across different levels of government. Technological network analysis could examine the impact of entropy on coordination in distributed systems and digital platforms.

The FAURAS framework provides both rigorous theoretical foundations and practical tools for understanding and managing coordination challenges in complex economic systems. The integration of Shannon's information theory with Hayek's insights about dispersed knowledge creates a powerful analytical framework that addresses fundamental questions about the limits of economic coordination.

The theoretical contributions of this work are significantly strengthened by complete formal verification using the Lean 4 proof assistant, establishing FAURAS with computationally verified mathematical foundations. The formal proofs demonstrate that our key results – including the entropy-capacity relationship $K(t) = C\ e^{(-\lambda H(t))}$, the impossibility theorem for GE under high entropy, and the derivation of critical thresholds – follow rigorously from first principles of information theory without ad hoc assumptions. This level of mathematical rigor represents a significant methodological advance in information-theoretic economics, providing a template for how complex economic theories can be subjected to the highest standards of mathematical verification.

The formal verification process provided valuable insights into the logical structure of coordination constraints, resulting in more precise impossibility condition statements and clearer identification of the minimal assumptions required for our results. The constructive nature of our Lean 4 proofs provides explicit algorithms for computing critical thresholds and capacity relationships, enabling direct implementation in policy applications. This computational approach to the development of economic theory opens up new possibilities for ensuring theoretical consistency, identifying hidden assumptions and building cumulative knowledge in information-theoretic economics.

As global economic complexity continues to increase due to technological innovation, financial integration and regulatory complexity, these insights are becoming increasingly relevant for policymakers, market participants and researchers. The framework provides a scientific foundation for understanding why perfect coordination remains elusive and offers practical guidance for managing coordination challenges in an increasingly complex economic environment.

Acknowledgments

During the preparation of this manuscript the author(s) used Manus.im for the purposes of running statistics (Manu.im have an internal Terminal and emulate R for statistics. The author has reviewed and edited the output and take full responsibility for the content of this publication.)

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Competing interests

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of Sciedu Press.

The journal and publisher adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

References

Acemoglu, D., Ozdaglar, A., & Tahbaz-Salehi, A. (2015). Systemic risk and stability in financial networks. *American Economic Review, 105*, 564-608. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20130456

Allen, F., & Gale, D. (2000). Financial contagion. *Journal of Political Economy, 108*, 1-33. https://doi.org/10.1086/262109

Angeletos, G. M., & La'O, J. (2013). Incomplete information, higher-order beliefs and price inertia. *Journal of Monetary Economics, 60*, 696-707.

Angeletos, G. M., & Pavan, A. (2007). Efficient use of information and social value of information. *Econometrica, 75,* 1103-1142. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0262.2007.00783.x

Angeletos, G. M., & Werning, I. (2006). Crises and prices: Information aggregation, multiplicity, and volatility. *American Economic Review, 96*, 1720-1736. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.96.5.1720

Arrow, K. J., & Debreu, G. (1954). Existence of an equilibrium for a competitive economy. *Econometrica, 22,* 265-290. https://doi.org/10.2307/1907353

Arthur, W. B. (2015). *Complexity and the Economy*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.

Barberis, N., & Shleifer, A. (2003). Style investing. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *68*, 161-199. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-405X(03)00064-3

Battiston, S., Puliga, M., Kaushik, R., Tasca, P., & Caldarelli, G. (2012). DebtRank: Too central to fail? Financial networks, the FED and systemic risk. *Scientific Reports, 2,* 541. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep00541

Billio, M., Getmansky, M., Lo, A. W., & Pelizzon, L. (2012). Econometric measures of connectedness and systemic risk in the finance and insurance sectors. *Journal of Financial Economics, 104*, 535-559. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2011.12.010

Cifuentes, R., Ferrucci, G., & Shin, H. S. (2005). Liquidity risk and contagion. *Journal of the European Economic Association, 3,* 556-566. https://doi.org/10.1162/jeea.2005.3.2-3.556

Cover, T. M., & Thomas, J. A. (2006). *Elements of Information Theory*. Wiley: New York, NY, USA.

Diamond, D. W., & Dybvig, P. H. (1983). Bank runs, deposit insurance, and liquidity. *Journal of Political Economy, 91,* 401-419. https://doi.org/10.1086/261155

Diebold, F. X., & Yılmaz, K. (2014). On the network topology of variance decompositions: Measuring the connectedness of financial firms. *Journal of Econometrics, 182*, 119-134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2014.04.012

Gabaix, X. (2020). Behavioral macroeconomics via sparse dynamic programming. *American Economic Review, 110,* 3319-3355. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20162005

Grossman, S. J., & Stiglitz, J. E. (1980). On the impossibility of informationally efficient markets. *American Economic Review, 70*, 393-408.

Gu, S., Kelly, B., & Xiu, D. (2020). Empirical asset pricing via machine learning. *Review of Financial Studies, 33,* 2223-2273. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhaa009

Hayek, F. A. (1945). The use of knowledge in society. *American Economic Review, 35*, 519-530. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/1809376

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica, 47,* 263-291. https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185

LeBaron, B. (2006). Agent-based computational finance. *Handbook of Computational Economics, 2,* 1187-1233. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0021(05)02024-1

Marschak, J. (1971). Economics of information systems. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 66,* 192-219. https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1971.10482244

Morris, S., & Shin, H. S. (2002). Social value of public information. *American Economic Review, 92*, 1521-1534. https://doi.org/10.1257/000282802762024610

Morris, S., & Shin, H. S. (1998). Unique equilibrium in a model of self-fulfilling currency attacks. *American Economic Review, 88*, 587-597.

Rosser, J. B. (2000). *From Catastrophe to Chaos: A General Theory of Economic Discontinuities*. Springer: Berlin, Germany. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-1613-0

Schreiber, T. (2000). Measuring information transfer. *Physical Review Letters, 85,* 461-464.

Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, *27*, 379-423. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x

Shiller, R. J. (2000). *Irrational Exuberance*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ, USA.

Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *69*, 99-118. https://doi.org/10.2307/1884852

Sims, C. A. (2003). Implications of rational inattention. *Journal of Monetary Economics, 50*, 665-690. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3932(03)00029-1

Thurner, S., Farmer, J. D., & Geanakoplos, J. (2012). Leverage causes fat tails and clustered volatility. *Quantitative Finance, 12*, 695-707. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697688.2012.674301

Tumminello, M., Aste, T., Di Matteo, T., & Mantegna, R. N. (2005). A tool for filtering information in complex systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 102,* 10421-10426. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0500298102

Walras, L. (1954). *Elements of Pure Economics*. Allen and Unwin: London, UK.

Woodford, M. (2003). Imperfect common knowledge and the effects of monetary policy. In *Knowledge, Information, and Expectations in Modern Macroeconomics*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ, USA. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691223933-004

Zunino, L., Zanin, M., Tabak, B. M., Pérez, D. G., & Rosso, O. A. (2010). Complexity-entropy causality plane: A useful approach to quantify the stock market inefficiency. *Physica A, 389*, 1891-1901. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2010.01.007