

Regular and irregular modulation of frequencies in limit cycle oscillator networks

Masashi Tachikawa*

ERATO Complex Systems Biology Project, JST,
3-8-1, Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan.

(Dated: February 12, 2022)

Frequency modulation by perturbation is the essential trait that differentiates limit cycle oscillators from phase oscillators. We studied networks of identical limit cycle oscillators whose frequencies are modulated sensitively by the change of their amplitudes, and demonstrated that the frequencies sustainably take distributed values. We observed two complex phenomena in the networks: stationarily distributed frequencies at a regular interval, and continuous irregular modulation of frequencies. In the analysis we reveal the mechanisms by which the frequencies are distributed, and show how the sensitive modulation of frequencies produces these complex phenomena. We also illustrate the topology of networks regulating the behaviors of the systems.

PACS numbers: 05.45.Xt, 64.60.aq, 89.75.Fb,

Oscillator networks are widely accepted as a standard model for understanding dynamical systems with many degree of freedom, because of the accumulation of knowledge about them [1, 2, 3, 4] and the large number of their applications [5]. The statistical synchrony for simple phase oscillator networks has been well investigated since the celebrated works by Winfree [1] and Kuramoto [2]. Recently this field has been developed by incorporating statistical knowledge about complex networks [6]. At the same time, detailed dynamic behaviors are also studied for oscillators showing high dimensional properties. Various types of coherent motions are classified, and concepts such as phase synchronization [3], clustering, and chaotic itinerancy [4] have been proposed. However, a large number of complex phenomena still remain unrevealed, and the integrated understanding about them is still lacking compared with that about simple phase oscillator systems.

Which property of a high-dimensional oscillator is essential for generating complex phenomena, and how does that differ from the functioning of a phase oscillator? Among others, the change of *frequency* (phase evolution speed) should be emphasized. While any perturbation on a phase oscillator produces only a phase shift, the frequency in a high-dimensional oscillator can be modulated [15]. When such oscillators are assembled to form a network, the resulting system can generate distributed frequencies states and lead to the temporal formation and breakdown of synchrony of the system. These behaviors are observed in many complex systems [4, 7, 8, 9, 10], and in fact variable frequency effects have been noted in some them. Several theoretical studies have pointed to the variable frequency effect on complex systems [10, 11, 12, 13].

In the present paper, we introduce networks of interacting limit cycle oscillators, whose frequencies are modulated by changes in their amplitudes, and demonstrate that amplitudes of oscillators spontaneously take distributed values; i.e. the frequencies are distributed.

Additionally, we observe that there are two types of behaviors depending on network topologies: arrangement of frequencies at a regular interval and continuous irregular modulation of frequencies. The analysis reveals the mechanism that generates distributed frequencies states. We also show how the topology of the networks regulates the behaviors of the system.

Let us consider a limit cycle oscillator that is weakly stable in one direction transverse to the rotation direction. If one produces perturbations of intensity comparable to the attraction of the limit cycle, the orbit widely deviates from the limit cycle, introducing considerable modulation into the frequency. In order to represent this effect in a simple model, we introduce a two-variable oscillator by assuming that the deviations in transverse directions are projected in a one-dimensional variable r called *amplitude*. Using θ as the phase variable defined along with the limit cycle, and taking the first order of r into account, we get the model equations,

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\theta} &= \omega_0 + \Omega(\theta)r + (\text{perturbation}). \\ \dot{r} &= -\Gamma(\theta)r\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

$\Omega(\theta)$ represents the modulation of the frequency by the amplitude change, and $\Gamma(\theta)$ indicates the decay rate of r which is assumed to be small. If the phase evolution is sufficiently faster than the change in the amplitude (weak stability assumption), the phase dependence of $\Gamma(\theta)$ is normalized and replaced with the parameter γ . We adopt $\omega_0 = 1$, $\Omega(\theta) = \omega \cdot (1 + \varepsilon \sin(2\pi\theta))$ in this study.

Next, we introduce the oscillator networks. Oscillators are supposed to interact in a bidirectional way with an interaction matrix $k_{ij} = k_{ji} \in \{0, 1\}$. Note that the phase differences between interacting oscillators are not always small, and large differences in phases produce considerable perturbations in the amplitudes. We select the interaction function to agree with the diffusive coupling at the leading order, which satisfies $\partial\dot{\theta}/\partial\Delta\theta|_{\Delta r=0} \neq 0$, $\partial\dot{r}/\partial\Delta\theta|_{\Delta r=0} = 0$, and $\partial^2\dot{r}/\partial\Delta\theta^2|_{\Delta r=0} \neq 0$, where $\Delta\theta$ and Δr are phase differences and amplitude differences




FIG. 1: (color online) Behaviors of coupled oscillator networks indicated by Fig. A and D are shown at Fig. B, C and E, F, respectively. $\varepsilon = 0.5$, in B, C, E and F, and $\omega = 1$ in C and F. B and E show the variances of amplitudes of oscillators in network A and D as functions of ω . Dashed lines indicate the slope of $1/\omega^2$. C and F show the time series of amplitudes of oscillators in network A and D.

between the oscillators. Thus, the models of the oscillator networks are given by

$$\dot{\theta}_\alpha = 1 + \omega (1 + \varepsilon \sin(2\pi\theta_\alpha)) r_\alpha + D_\theta \sum_\beta k_{\alpha\beta} \sin(2\pi(\theta_\beta - \theta_\alpha)), \quad (2)$$

$$\dot{r}_\alpha = -\gamma r_\alpha + D_r \sum_\beta k_{\alpha\beta} \{1 - \cos(2\pi(\theta_\beta - \theta_\alpha))\}, \quad (3)$$

where α, β are oscillator indexes. In this study, we set $D_\theta = D_r = 0.01, \gamma = 0.1, \varepsilon = 0, 0.5$ and changed the control parameter $\omega = 0.2 \sim 2$, which indicates the magnitude of the modulation of the frequency by the amplitude change. All simulations run from uniformly distributed random initial conditions in $r_\alpha \in (0, 1], \theta_\alpha \in (0, 1]$.

Now we take up two examples of networks indicated by Fig. 1-A and Fig. 1-D and demonstrate two distinct behaviors of the oscillator-networks.

Figure 1-C shows the time evolution of amplitudes of oscillators in network A (Fig. 1-A) after they reach the stationary states. The case with $\omega = 1, \varepsilon = 0.5$ is shown. In the figure, amplitudes are distributed and remain around the discrete stationary points which are arranged at regular intervals of 0.1. The fluctuations of amplitudes around the stationary points are small and seem to be periodic or quasi-periodic. In other words, we clearly observe the layers of amplitudes. The variances of the amplitudes are plotted against ω in Fig. 1-B. With $\omega \leq 0.38$, all oscillators achieve complete synchronization ($r_\alpha = 0, \theta_\alpha = \theta_\beta$ for all α, β), and no fluctuation appears [16]. With $\omega > 0.38$, amplitudes are distributed and the averaged values of amplitudes are independent from ω (data not shown). In the region, the variances of amplitudes decay with $1/\omega^2$.

On the other hand, network D (Fig. 1-D) exhibits a different behavior as shown in Fig. 1-E and -F. At the

steady state, the layers of amplitudes are partially broken and the amplitudes of oscillators c, f, g and h show large fluctuations. The widths of their fluctuations are greater than the range between layers, and the fluctuations decay slowly with the increase of ω . Other oscillators (a, b, d and e) still stay around the stationary points. We emphasize that network D is constructed by changing only one interaction from network A: $c-d$ to $c-g$. Thus, behaviors are quite sensitive to the topology of networks.

Summarizing the results, the amplitudes of oscillators in networks are widely distributed when the frequency modulation effect (ω) is large. We also found two distinct behaviors in amplitudes depending on the topologies of networks: (i) amplitudes of all oscillators in network form layers, and (ii) amplitudes of a part of oscillators show large fluctuations across the layers. Type (i) behavior is less frequently observed in larger networks. When 1000 networks were generated with 10 and 50 oscillators, respectively, 468 networks with 10 oscillators showed type (i) behavior and only 25 networks with 50 oscillators showed type (i) behavior[17]. Meanwhile, both widely fluctuated and less fluctuated oscillators always coexist in large networks. Figure 2 shows scatter plot distributions of the averages of amplitudes and the variances of amplitudes for two random networks which have 100 and 1000 oscillators. The variances are widely distributed. For less variant oscillators, the averaged amplitudes show the order in regular intervals as seen in Fig. 1-C.

In the following, we illustrate the mechanisms of generating both behaviors. In the analysis $\varepsilon = 0$ is used for simplicity.

We begin with investigating the mechanism of forming layers. In order for the amplitudes to take stationary values, interaction terms should be approximately constant. There are two possible mechanisms; one is phase




FIG. 2: (color online) Scatter plot distributions of averages and variances of amplitudes of all oscillators in two large networks with 100 and 1000 oscillators. The networks are generated randomly with connection probabilities $2/(\text{number of oscillators})$. $\varepsilon = 0.5$, $\omega = 1$. Data of the 1000-oscillator network are plotted with red open circles, and data of the 100-oscillator network are plotted with blue filled squares.

locking and the other is averaging. If the phase difference between two interacting oscillators takes a constant value (a phase-locked state), the interaction term also becomes constant. However, it is unlikely that the phase differences between all interacting oscillators take constant values except in complete synchronization, where all oscillators assume an identical state ($r_\alpha = 0, \theta_\alpha = \theta_\beta$ for all α, β). On the other hand, the averaging assumption for an interaction holds when the two oscillators have considerably different frequencies so that the time evolution of amplitudes can not follow the alternation of the interaction term. Since the difference in amplitudes produces a difference in frequencies, the averaging assumption is expected to hold.

Assume that the speeds of the phase differences between all coupled oscillators are sufficiently fast that interaction functions in eq. (3) are approximately replaced with the averaged values ($\cos(2\pi(\theta_\beta - \theta_\alpha)) \rightarrow 0$). Then, eq. (3) is solved and the approximate amplitude takes $N_\alpha D_r / \gamma$, where N_α is the number of interactions for oscillator α . Note that the approximate amplitudes are proportional to N_α , and hence they take discrete values. With the parameters used in Fig. 1-C, $D_r / \gamma = 0.1$ which agrees with the observed interval in the figure.

Here we examine under which conditions the averaging assumption holds. The following equation expresses the phase difference between two interacting oscillators in which amplitudes are replaced with approximate values [18]:

$$\dot{\bar{\Delta}}_{\alpha\beta} = (N_\alpha - N_\beta) \frac{D_r \omega}{\gamma} - D_\theta \sin(2\pi \bar{\Delta}_{\alpha\beta}). \quad (4)$$

We also assume that the interaction effects from other oscillators are replaced by averaged values. If $|N_\alpha - N_\beta| > 0$ and $D_r \omega / (\gamma D_\theta) \gg 1$ hold, the interaction has little effect and a uniform oscillation with frequency $F_{\alpha\beta} =$

$D_r(N_\alpha - N_\beta)\omega/\gamma$ is an approximate solution of eq. (4). Putting the solution in eq (3), we get the equation for the amplitude

$$\dot{\bar{r}}_\alpha = -\gamma \bar{r}_\alpha + D_r(N_\alpha - 1) + D_r \{1 - \cos(2\pi \bar{\Delta}_{\alpha\beta})\}, \quad (5)$$

where the effects from other interactions are again replaced by averaged values. The solution is

$$\bar{r}_\alpha = \frac{D_r N_\alpha}{\gamma} + \frac{D_r}{\sqrt{(2\pi F_{\alpha\beta})^2 + \gamma^2}} \sin(2\pi F_{\alpha\beta} t + \theta_0), \quad (6)$$

where θ_0 is the initial phase. The second term denotes that the variance of the amplitude decreases along with the increase of ω/γ . This is also consistent with the decrease of fluctuation in Fig. 1-B, since $1/\sqrt{\text{variance}} \propto F_{\alpha\beta} \propto \omega$. Thus, the averaging assumption is fulfilled.

When $N_\alpha = N_\beta$ holds, the averaging assumption does not hold. The synchronous state ($\bar{\Delta}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$) becomes the attractor for eq. (4). Thus, we get $\bar{r}_\alpha = \bar{r}_\beta = (N_\alpha - 1)D_r/\gamma$ from eq. (5). Although this means that the assumed relation for amplitudes ($\bar{r}_\alpha = \bar{r}_\beta = N_\alpha D_r/\gamma$) in eq. (4) is violated, both amplitudes change simultaneously and the relation $r_\alpha = r_\beta$ still holds. Hence, the synchrony of oscillators α and β is sustained as a special phase-locked case.

To sum them up, two interacting oscillators with different N_α have sufficient difference in frequency to be averaged, and the interaction is approximately replaced by the averaged value. On the other hand, two oscillators with the same N_α have the same frequency on average, and they synchronize with each other, an interaction that produces little effect on the amplitudes. Let us apply the analysis to network A and check the relation between the topology of the network and the observed layers in Fig. 1-C. In network A, $d-e$ and $g-h$ pairs have the same numbers of interactions ($N_d = N_e = 2$, $N_g = N_h = 3$); thus, they are supposed to be synchronizing pairs. Therefore, the averaged amplitudes of oscillators are given by

$$\bar{r}_\alpha = \frac{N'_\alpha D_r}{\gamma}, \quad \alpha = a, \dots, h \quad (7)$$

where N'_α denotes the number of effective interactions after eliminating the interaction of synchronizing pairs. They show good agreement with the order of amplitudes in regular intervals as in Fig. 1-C. Besides, the phase difference between oscillators d and e is always less than 0.013 and oscillators g and h have exactly the same phase in the simulations.

Now we investigate the continuous irregular motion of amplitudes observed in the network D. In short, it is caused by the indeterminacy of a consistent set of synchronizing pairs. This leads to continuous changes of the synchronizing pairs, and irregular motion arises. Here we illustrate these processes in detail using network D as an example.

Following the above rules, oscillators f and g in network D synchronize ($N_f = N_g = 4$), and their amplitudes converge to $3D_r/\gamma$. Additionally, oscillator c and h , which interact with g , have the same frequency, since $N_c = N_h = N_g - 1 = 3$. Thus, g and either of two oscillators start to synchronize, which brings about another change in amplitudes of the synchronizing pair (c - g or g - h). Their amplitudes converge to $2D_r/\gamma$. However, this introduces a difference in amplitude between oscillator f and g , i.e. a difference in frequencies, and hence their synchrony is disrupted. This effect also destroys the second synchrony (c - g or g - h). Thus, the system returns to the original no-synchrony state. In this way, the pairs of synchronization in the network D are never settled and the amplitudes of oscillators c , f , g and h continue to change spontaneously. For larger networks, it becomes more difficult to determine the pairs of synchronizing oscillators in a consistent manner. Thus, complete layered behaviors becomes rare in larger networks.

In summary, we have investigated networks of limit cycle oscillators the frequencies of which change widely along with the amplitude changes, and report novel complex behaviors: the layering and the continuous large fluctuation of amplitudes. In the analysis, we explained a mechanism that determines the behaviors of amplitudes from the local structure of the network. The behavior of amplitude primarily depends on the number of connections the oscillator has, but also depends on the states of the connecting oscillators which are determined by their numbers of connections. Therefore, the global structure of the network topology affects the behavior of each oscillator.

The dependence of the frequency on amplitude changes is key for a variety of phenomena. In layered states, the differences in amplitudes originate from the differences in frequencies, and this assures the decoupling of oscillator interactions by averaging. Thus, the differences in amplitudes are sustained. The same effect enables the globally coupled oscillators to form stable multi-cluster states [11, 13]. By contrast, in fluctuating states, amplitude changes result in switching between decoupled and influential interactions. This emergence and annihilation of effective interactions sustainably drives the fluctuation of amplitudes.

In this analysis, we also show that the topology of networks determines the behaviors of the oscillator networks, and reveal how a small difference in topology brings about qualitative change in behaviors. This indicates that exploring the detailed topology of oscillator networks [14] is as important as analyzing them statistically [6].

This change in effective frequencies (time scales) and the associated change of effective interactions are important properties of complex systems. Such behaviors are frequently observed in biological systems as adaptations

of time scales. For example, nerve systems are thought to code information by changing the firing frequencies of neurons as well as their phase relations [7]. The complex dynamics of both properties are expected to work as unified systems [8]. These relations are also observed in adaptive behaviors of single cell organisms which contains a variety of time scales [9, 10]. Our study extracts the mechanism of changing time scales from a general limit cycle system, and reveals the origin of these complex phenomena.

The author is grateful to K. Kaneko, S. Ishihara, and K. Fujimoto for helpful suggestions.

* Electronic address: mtach@complex.c.u-tokyo.ac.jp

- [1] A. T. Winfree, *The Geometry of Biological Time*, (Springer, New York, 1980).
- [2] Y. Kuramoto, *Chemical Oscillations, Waves, and Turbulence*, (Springer, Berlin, 1984).
- [3] A. Pikovsky, M. Rosenblum, and J. Kurths *Synchronization: A Universal Concept in Nonlinear Science*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003).
- [4] K. Kaneko and I. Tsuda, *Complex Systems : Chaos and Beyond* (Springer, Tokyo, 2001).
- [5] K. Wiesenfeld, P. Colet, and S. H. Strogatz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** 404 (1996); G. B. Ermentrout, and C. C. Chow, Physiol. Behav. **77**, 629 (2002); J. Garcia-Ojalvo, M. B. Elowitz, and S. H. Strogatz, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **101**, 10955 (2004).
- [6] M. Timme, F. Wolf, and T. Geisel, PRL **92** 074101 (2004); T. Ichinomiya, PRE **70** 026116 (2004); H. Kori and A. S. Mikhailov, PRL **93** 254101 (2004).
- [7] G. Buzsaki and A. Draguhn, Science, **304**, 1926 (2004).
- [8] L. G. Kay, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **102**, 2863 (2005).
- [9] T. Shinjo, Y. Nakagawa & T. Ueda, Physica D, **84**, 212 (1995).
- [10] A. Takamatsu, K. Takahashi, M. Nagao, & Y. Tsuchiya J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., **66**, 1638 (1997).
- [11] H. Daido & K. Nakanishi PRL, **96**, 54101 (2006).
- [12] J. Rougemont & F. Naef PRE, **73**, 11104 (2006).
- [13] M. Tachikawa & K. Fujimoto Europhys. Lett., **78**, 20004 (2007).
- [14] M. Golubitsky and I. Stewart *The Symmetry Perspective* (Birkhauser, Verlag, 2002).
- [15] In other words, if effects of perturbations on a limit cycle oscillator are described by phase shifts, the system (oscillator + perturbations) is described by a phase oscillator system [2].
- [16] In this model, the complete synchronization state is always stable. However, with large ω values, this state is not reached from most initial conditions.
- [17] 1000 networks for each size were generated randomly with connection probabilities $2/(\text{number of oscillators})$. $\varepsilon = 0.5$, and $\omega = 1$ were used to test the behaviors.
- [18] Here, the amplitudes are replaced with approximate values and the interaction in phases is taken into account. This is because the amplitudes are supposed to be *slow* variables.