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Abstract

A generalization of the well-known Wilson-Cowan model of excitatory and inhibitory interactions in localized neuronal populations is presented, by taking into consideration distributed time delays. A stability and bifurcation analysis is undertaken for the generalized model, with respect to two characteristic parameters of the system. The stability region in the characteristic parameter plane is determined and a comparison is given for several types of delay kernels. It is shown that if a weak Gamma delay kernel is considered, as in the original Wilson-Cowan model without time-coarse graining, the resulting stability domain is unbounded, while in the case of a discrete time-delay, the stability domain is bounded. This fact reveals an essential difference between the two scenarios, reflecting the importance of a careful choice of delay kernels in the mathematical model. Numerical simulations are presented to substantiate the theoretical results. Important differences are also highlighted by comparing the generalized model with the original Wilson-Cowan model without time delays.

1 Introduction

1.1 Modeling background

Computational modeling of neuronal behavior covers a large range of spatio-temporal scales, from detailed, membrane potential based models of single spiking neurons, to broad network models of interacting brain regions. At the lower scale, typically associated with electrode recordings from single cell in vitro preparations, modeling difficulties often arise from the inherent complexity and high dimensionality associated with considering detailed molecular mechanisms that govern ionic currents and spiking activity in a cell. The Hodgkin-Huxley model was in its original form limited to the two voltage-dependent currents found in the squid giant axon, but it has to be extended to dozens of equations per neuron if it includes other ion channels involved in neuronal excitability \cite{1,2}. In the context of studying behavior in functional neuronal networks, which may involve thousands of neurons, the dimensionality of a network formed of single cells may become an obstacle to computational feasibility. At the opposite end, often associated with functional imaging data, modeling activity within entire brain regions as a whole lacks specificity, and prevents clear interpretations of what “activity” of a state variable may actually represent \cite{3}.

The middle range between the two ends consists of a rich variety of models. One wide-spread possibility has been creating reduced models as modifications of Hodgkin-Huxley equations, by modeling the behavior of multiple ion channels into one comprehensive variable \cite{4}. Another popular option has been using state variables to characterize the meanfield spiking activity in a population of cells. This type of model is still able to incorporate information on spiking mechanisms, and efficiently illustrates resulting firing patterns by using only one variable per population.

Among meanfield models, the Wilson-Cowan model is perhaps the most popular. The model, derived in 1972 by Wilson and Cowan \cite{5}, describes the localized interactions in a pair of excitatory and inhibitory
neuronal populations. At each time instant \( t \), the proportions of excitatory and inhibitory cells firing per unit of time are captured by the two state variables \( E(t) \) and \( I(t) \). The original model considers the effect that an external input \( P \) has on the E/I system, based not only on the coupling strengths between the two units, but also on the history of firing in each. More specifically, \( E(t + \tau) \) and \( I(t + \tau') \) are considered to be equal to the proportion of cells which are sensitive (i.e. not refractory) and which also receive at least threshold excitation at the moment of time \( t \). This leads to the following system of integral equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
E(t + \tau) &= \left( 1 - \int_{t-r}^{t} E(s)ds \right) \cdot S_e \left[ \int_{-\infty}^{t} h(t - s) \left( c_1 E(s) - c_2 I(s) + P_e(s) \right) ds \right] \\
I(t + \tau') &= \left( 1 - \int_{t-r'}^{t} I(s)ds \right) \cdot S_i \left[ \int_{-\infty}^{t} h(t - s) \left( c_3 E(s) - c_4 I(s) + P_i(s) \right) ds \right]
\end{align*}
\] (1)

In this system, the first factors in the right hand side represent the proportion of sensitive excitatory / inhibitory cells, where \( r \) is the absolute refractory period (msc), the functions \( S_e, S_i \) are sigmoid threshold functions, their arguments denoting the mean field level of excitation / inhibition generated in an excitatory /inhibitory cell at time \( t \) (assuming that individual cells sum their inputs and that the effect of the stimulation decays exponentially with time course \( h(t) \)). Moreover, \( c_i > 0 \) are connectivity coefficients representing the average number of excitatory / inhibitory synapses per cell and \( P_e, P_i \) denote external inputs.

The model historically known as the Wilson-Cowan model [5] was then obtained at this point applying time-coarse graining. This final form, consisting of a system of ordinary differential equations without time delays, is very convenient and was extensively analyzed and used in the modeling literature. However, the coarse-graining procedure obscures potentially vital timing information related to the readiness of a cell in either population to generate a spike. If this information is crucial to the neural function that the model is aiming to address, it would be useful to return to the original equations, prior to coarse graining. In this context, generalizations of the standard model, including discrete time-delays, have been investigated in several papers, often considering refractory periods \( r, r' \) being equal to zero.

### 1.2 Our model

Based on the integral terms appearing in the original model [1] as arguments of the threshold functions, the following model with distributed delays will be analyzed in this paper:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{u}(t) &= -u(t) + f \left[ \theta_u + \int_{-\infty}^{t} h(t - s) (au(s) + bv(s)) ds \right] \\
\dot{v}(t) &= -v(t) + f \left[ \theta_v + \int_{-\infty}^{t} h(t - s) (cu(s) + dv(s)) ds \right]
\end{align*}
\] (2)

where \( u(t) \) and \( v(t) \) represent the synaptic activities of the two neuronal populations, \( a, b, c, d \) are connection weights and \( \theta_u, \theta_v \) are background drives. The activation function \( f \) is considered to be increasing and of class \( C^1 \) on the real line.

In system (2), the delay kernel \( h : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty) \) is a probability density function representing the probability that a particular time delay occurs. It is assumed to be bounded, piecewise continuous and satisfy

\[
\int_{0}^{\infty} h(s)ds = 1, \quad \text{with the average time delay} \quad \tau = \int_{0}^{\infty} sh(s)ds < \infty.
\]

The particular case of discrete time delays (Dirac kernels) has been discussed in [6]. However, there are other important classes of delay kernels often used in the literature, such as Gamma kernels or uniform distribution kernels. It is worth mentioning that in the original Wilson-Cowan model [5], a weak Gamma kernel \( h(t) = \tau^{-1} \exp(-t/\tau) \) has been used, so this case should be the original reference point. Analyzing mathematical models with particular classes of delay kernels (e.g. weak Gamma kernel or strong Gamma kernel \( h(t) = 4\tau^{-2}t \exp(-2t/\tau) \)) may shed a light on how distributed delays affect
the dynamics differently from discrete delays. However, in the modeling of real world phenomena, one usually does not have access to the exact distribution, and approaches using general kernels may be more appropriate [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15].

Initial conditions associated with system (2) are of the form:

\[ u(s) = \varphi(s), \quad v(s) = \psi(s), \quad \forall s \in (-\infty, 0], \]

where \( \varphi, \psi \) are bounded real-valued continuous functions defined on \((-\infty, 0]\).

## 2 Main stability and bifurcation results

The equilibrium states of system (2) are the solutions of the following algebraic system:

\[
\begin{aligned}
  u &= f(\theta_u + au + bv) \\
  v &= f(\theta_v + cu + dv)
\end{aligned}
\]  

(3)

The linearized system at an equilibrium state \((u^*, v^*)\) is

\[
\begin{aligned}
  \dot{u} &= -u + \phi_1 \int_{-\infty}^{t} h(t-s) (au(s) + bv(s)) \, ds \\
  \dot{v} &= -v + \phi_2 \int_{-\infty}^{t} h(t-s) (cu(s) + dv(s)) \, ds
\end{aligned}
\]  

(4)

where \( \phi_1 = \phi_1(u^*, v^*) = f'(\theta_u + au^* + bv^*) > 0 \) and \( \phi_2 = \phi_2(u^*, v^*) = f'(\theta_v + cu^* + dv^*) > 0 \).

Applying the Laplace transform to the linearized system (4), we obtain:

\[
\begin{aligned}
  zU(z) - u(0) &= -U(z) + \phi_1 H(z) (aU(z) + bV(z)) \\
  zV(z) - v(0) &= -V(z) + \phi_2 H(z) (cU(z) + dV(z))
\end{aligned}
\]  

(5)

where \( U(z) \) and \( V(z) \) represent the Laplace transforms of the state variables \( u \) and \( v \) respectively, while \( H(z) \) is the Laplace transform of the delay kernel \( h \).

System (5) is equivalent to:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
  z + 1 - a \phi_1 H(z) \\
  -c \phi_2 H(z)
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
  U(z) \\
  V(z)
\end{pmatrix}
= 
\begin{pmatrix}
  u(0) \\
  v(0)
\end{pmatrix}
\]

(6)

and hence, the characteristic equation associated to the equilibrium state \((u^*, v^*)\) is

\[
\Delta(z) = (z + 1)^2 - a H(z)(z + 1) + \beta H^2(z) = 0
\]

(7)

where

\[
\alpha = a \phi_1(u^*, v^*) + d \phi_2(u^*, v^*) = af'(\theta_u + au^* + bv^*) + df'(\theta_v + cu^* + dv^*);
\]

\[
\beta = (ad - bc) \phi_1(u^*, v^*) \phi_2(u^*, v^*) = (ad - bc)f'(\theta_u + au^* + bv^*)f'(\theta_v + cu^* + dv^*).
\]

### 2.1 Delay-independent stability and instability results

The following delay-independent stability and instability results are easily obtained, based on the properties of the Laplace transform and the particularities of the characteristic equation (7):

**Theorem 2.1** (Delay-independent stability and instability).
1. In the non-delayed case, the equilibrium state \((u^*, v^*)\) of system (2) is locally asymptotically stable if and only if
\[
\alpha < \min\{2, \beta + 1\} \tag{8}
\]

2. If the following inequality holds:
\[
|\alpha| + |\beta| < 1 \tag{9}
\]
then the equilibrium state \((u^*, v^*)\) of system (2) is locally asymptotically stable for any delay kernel \(h(t)\).

3. If the following inequality holds:
\[
\beta < \alpha - 1 \tag{10}
\]
then the equilibrium state \((u^*, v^*)\) of system (2) is unstable for any delay kernel \(h(t)\).

Proof. 1. In the non-delayed case \((H(z) = 1, \text{for any } z \in \mathbb{C})\), the characteristic equation (7) becomes:
\[
\Delta(z) = z^2 + (2 - \alpha)z + \beta - \alpha + 1 = 0
\]
The necessary and sufficient condition \((8)\) for the asymptotic stability of the equilibrium state \((u^*, v^*)\) of system (2) follows from the Routh-Hurwitz stability test.

2. If we assume that the characteristic equation (7) has a root \(z\) in the right half-plane \((\Re(z) \geq 0)\), it follows that
\[
|H(z)| = \left|\int_0^\infty e^{-zt}h(t)dt\right| \leq \int_0^\infty |e^{-zt}h(t)dt = \int_0^\infty e^{-\Re(z)t}h(t)dt \leq \int_0^\infty h(t)dt = 1,
\]
and hence, from (7) we deduce:
\[
|z + 1|^2 = |\alpha H(z)(z + 1) - \beta H^2(z)|
\]
\[
\leq |\alpha||z + 1| + |\beta|
\]
Considering the polynomial \(P(x) = x^2 - |\alpha|x - |\beta|\), from inequality (9) it follows that \(P(1) > 0\) and \(P'(1) > 0\), and hence \(P(x) > 0\) for any \(x \geq 1\). From the above inequality, we have \(P(|z + 1|) \leq 0\), and hence, we deduce \(|z + 1| < 1\), which is absurd, since \(|z + 1|^2 = |z|^2 + 2\Re(z) + 1 \geq 1\).

Therefore, all the roots of the characteristic equation (7) are in the left half-plane and the equilibrium state \((u^*, v^*)\) of system (2) is asymptotically stable, regardless of the delay kernel \(h(t)\).

3. Condition (10) is equivalent to \(\Delta(0) < 0\). We also have that \(\Delta(z) \to \infty\) as \(z \to \infty\), and therefore, the characteristic equation (7) has at least one positive real root. Hence, the equilibrium state \((u^*, v^*)\) of system (2) is unstable, regardless of the delay kernel \(h(t)\).

2.2 Saddle-node bifurcation

**Theorem 2.2** (Saddle-node bifurcation). A saddle-node bifurcation takes place at the equilibrium state \((u^*, v^*)\) of system (2), regardless of the delay kernel \(h(t)\), if and only if \(\alpha \neq 2\) and
\[
\beta = \alpha - 1 \tag{11}
\]

Proof. Condition (11) is equivalent to \(\Delta(0) = 0\) (i.e. the characteristic equation has a zero root). Moreover, \(z = 0\) is a simple root of the characteristic equation if and only if \(\alpha \neq 2\).

Let us denote by \(z(\beta)\) the root of the characteristic equation (7) which satisfies \(z(\alpha - 1) = 0\). Taking the derivative with respect to \(\beta\) in equation (7), we obtain:
\[
2(z + 1)\frac{dz}{d\beta} - \alpha H'(z)(z + 1)\frac{dz}{d\beta} - \alpha H(z)\frac{dz}{d\beta} + 2\beta H'(z)H(z)\frac{dz}{d\beta} + H^2(z) = 0,
\]

and hence:
\[
d\frac{dz}{d\beta} = -\frac{H^2(z)}{2(z + 1) - \alpha H'(z)(z + 1) - \alpha H(z) + 2\beta H'(z)H(z)}.
\]
As \( H(0) = 1 \) and \( H'(0) = -\tau \), it follows that:
\[
\left. \frac{dz}{d\beta} \right|_{\beta = \alpha - 1} = \frac{1}{(\alpha - 2)(\tau + 1)} \neq 0.
\]
This completes the proof. 

2.3 Hopf bifurcation

In the following, we will show that the average time delay \( \tau \) of the delay kernel \( h(t) \) plays an important role in the Hopf bifurcation analysis.

Let \( \hat{h}(t) = \tau h(\tau t) \), for any \( t \geq 0 \). The function \( \hat{h} \) is a probability density function with the mean value:
\[
\int_0^\infty \hat{h}(t)dt = \int_0^\infty t h(\tau t)dt = \tau^{-1} \int_0^\infty uh(u)du = \tau^{-1} \tau = 1.
\]
The Laplace transform \( \hat{H}(z) \) of \( \hat{h}(t) \) is
\[
\hat{H}(z) = \int_0^\infty e^{-zt}\hat{h}(t)dt = \int_0^\infty e^{-zt\tau}h(\tau t)dt = \int_0^\infty e^{-z\tau}h(u)du = H \left( \frac{z}{\tau} \right)
\]
We assume from now on that \( \hat{H}(z) \) does not depend on the average time delay \( \tau \). In fact, for the most important classes of delay kernels we have:

- Dirac kernel: \( \hat{H}(z) = e^{-z} \);
- Gamma kernel: \( \hat{H}(z) = \left( \frac{p}{p+z} \right)^p \);

We write \( \hat{H} \) in the polar form as:
\[
\hat{H}(i\omega) = \rho(\omega)e^{-i\theta(\omega)}
\]
with \( \rho(0) = 1, \theta(0) = 0, \rho'(\omega) < 0, \theta'(\omega) > 0 \), for any \( \omega > 0 \).

With the change of variable \( z \mapsto \frac{z}{\tau} \), the characteristic equation \( \hat{\Delta}(z) \) becomes
\[
\hat{\Delta}(z) = \tau^2 \Delta \left( \frac{z}{\tau} \right) = (z + \tau)^2 - \alpha \tau \hat{H}(z)(z + \tau) + \beta \tau^2 \hat{H}(z) = 0
\]
Denoting \( Q_\tau(z) = \frac{z + \tau}{\tau H(z)} \), it follows that the characteristic equation is equivalent to
\[
Q_\tau^2(z) - \alpha Q_\tau(z) + \beta = 0
\]
The characteristic equation \( \hat{\Delta}(z) \) has a pair of complex conjugated roots on the imaginary axis if and only if there exists \( \omega > 0 \) such that \( Q(i\omega) \) is a root of the polynomial \( P(\lambda) = \lambda^2 - \alpha \lambda + \beta \).

Case 1: \( \alpha^2 - 4\beta < 0 \).
In this case, the polynomial $P(\lambda)$ has complex conjugated roots $Q_\tau(i\omega)$ and $\overline{Q_\tau(i\omega)}$, and hence, Hopf bifurcations may only take place at the equilibrium state $(u^*, v^*)$ of system [2] along the curve $(\gamma_\tau)$ from the $(\alpha, \beta)$-plane, defined by the following parametric equations:

$$
\begin{align*}
(\gamma_\tau) : & \quad \alpha = \alpha_\tau(\omega) = 2\mathcal{R}(Q_\tau(i\omega)) = \frac{2}{\rho(\omega)} \left[ \cos \theta(\omega) - \frac{\omega}{\tau} \sin \theta(\omega) \right], \\
& \quad \beta = \beta_\tau(\omega) = |Q_\tau(i\omega)|^2 = \frac{1}{\rho(\omega)^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\omega^2}{\tau^2} \right), \quad \omega > 0.
\end{align*}
$$

Indeed, we prove the following:

**Lemma 2.3.** If $\alpha^2 - 4\beta < 0$ then the characteristic equation has a pair of complex conjugated roots on the imaginary axis if and only if $(\alpha, \beta)$ belong to the curve $(\gamma_\tau)$ defined by [14].

**Proof.** The characteristic equation has a pair of complex conjugated roots on the imaginary axis if and only if there exists $\omega > 0$ such that the polynomial $P(\lambda)$ has complex conjugated roots $Q_\tau(i\omega)$ and $\overline{Q_\tau(i\omega)}$. As

$$Q_\tau(i\omega) = \frac{i\omega + \tau}{\tau \bar{H}(i\omega)} = \frac{i\omega + \tau}{\tau \rho(\omega) e^{-i\theta(\omega)}} = \frac{(i\omega + \tau)(\cos \theta(\omega) + i \sin \theta(\omega))}{\tau \rho(\omega)} = \frac{\tau \cos \theta(\omega) - \omega \sin \theta(\omega) + i(\omega \cos \theta(\omega) + \tau \sin \theta(\omega))}{\tau \rho(\omega)},$$

from Viete’s formulas, we obtain:

$$\begin{align*}
\alpha = Q_\tau(i\omega) + \overline{Q_\tau(i\omega)} = 2\mathcal{R}(Q_\tau(i\omega)) = 2 \cdot \frac{\tau \cos \theta(\omega) - \omega \sin \theta(\omega)}{\tau \rho(\omega)} &= \frac{2}{\rho(\omega)} \left[ \cos \theta(\omega) - \frac{\omega}{\tau} \sin \theta(\omega) \right]; \\
\beta = Q_\tau(i\omega)\overline{Q_\tau(i\omega)} = |Q_\tau(i\omega)|^2 = \left| \frac{i\omega + \tau}{\tau \rho(\omega) e^{-i\theta(\omega)}} \right|^2 &= \frac{\omega^2 + \tau^2}{\tau^2 \rho(\omega)^2} = \frac{1}{\rho(\omega)^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\omega^2}{\tau^2} \right).
\end{align*}$$

Therefore, we obtain the equivalence from the statement. \(\square\)

It is worth noting that the curve $(\gamma_\tau)$ intersects the saddle-node bifurcation line $\beta = \alpha - 1$ at the point of coordinates $(2, 1)$, corresponding to $\omega = 0$.

**Case 2:** $\alpha^2 - 4\beta \geq 0$.

In this case, the following result holds:

**Lemma 2.4.** If $\alpha^2 - 4\beta \geq 0$ then the characteristic equation has a pair of complex conjugated roots $\pm i\omega \tau^{-1}$ on the imaginary axis if and only if $\omega$ is a root of the equation

$$\omega \cos \theta(\omega) + \tau \sin \theta(\omega) = 0 \tag{15}$$

and $(\alpha, \beta)$ belong to a line

$$\begin{align*}
(l) : & \quad \beta = \frac{\alpha}{\rho(\omega) \cos \theta(\omega)} - \frac{1}{(\rho(\omega) \cos \theta(\omega))^2}, \tag{16}
\end{align*}$$

**Proof.** The characteristic equation has a pair of complex conjugated roots on the imaginary axis if and only if there exists $\omega > 0$ such $Q_\tau(i\omega)$ is a real root of the polynomial $P(\lambda)$. Therefore, $\Im(Q(i\omega)) = 0$ and hence, it follows that $\omega$ is a root of the equation

$$\omega \cos \theta(\omega) + \tau \sin \theta(\omega) = 0.$$
Assuming that such a root exists, let us denote it by \( \omega^* \). Hence:

\[
Q_\tau(i\omega^*) = \Re(Q_\tau(i\omega^*)) = \frac{\tau \cos \theta(\omega^*) - \omega^* \sin \theta(\omega^*)}{\tau \rho(\omega^*)} = \frac{\tau \cos \theta(\omega^*) + (\omega^*)^2 \cos \theta(\omega^*)}{\tau \rho(\omega^*)} = \frac{1}{\rho(\omega^*) \cos \theta(\omega^*)}.
\]

As \( Q_\tau(i\omega^*) \) is a root of \( P(\lambda) \), we obtain:

\[
\beta = [\alpha Q_\tau(i\omega^*) - Q_\tau^2(i\omega^*)] = \frac{\alpha}{\rho(\omega^*) \cos \theta(\omega^*)} - \frac{1}{(\rho(\omega^*) \cos^2 \theta(\omega^*))^2}.
\]

Therefore, the proof is complete.  \( \square \)

The existence of the roots of the equation (15), and hence, of the lines given by the previous Lemma, is a particularity of the delay kernel that is considered, and will be discussed separately.

**Theorem 2.5.** Assuming that the equation (15) has at least one positive real root, let us denote:

\[
\omega_\tau = \min\{\omega > 0 : \tau \sin \theta(\omega) + \omega \cos \theta(\omega) = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_\tau = (\rho(\omega_\tau) \cos \theta(\omega_\tau))^{-1}.
\]

The boundary of the stability region \( S(\alpha, \beta) \) of the equilibrium state \((u^*, v^*)\) of system (2) is given by the union of the line segments and curve given below:

\[
\begin{align*}
(l_0): & \quad \beta = \alpha - 1, \quad \alpha \in [1 + \mu_\tau, 2]; \\
(l_\tau): & \quad \beta = \mu_\tau (\alpha - \mu_\tau), \quad \alpha \in [2\mu_\tau, 1 + \mu_\tau]; \\
(\gamma_\tau): & \quad \begin{cases} 
\alpha = \frac{2}{\rho(\omega)} \left[ \cos \theta(\omega) - \frac{\omega}{\tau} \sin \theta(\omega) \right], \\
\beta = \frac{1}{\rho(\omega)^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\omega^2}{\tau^2} \right), \\
\end{cases} \quad \omega \in (0, \omega_\tau).
\end{align*}
\]

At the boundary of the stability domain \( S(\alpha, \beta) \), the following bifurcation phenomena take place in a neighborhood of the equilibrium \((u^*, v^*)\) of system (2):

a. **Saddle-node bifurcations** take place along the open line segment \((l_0)\);

b. **Hopf bifurcations** take place along the open line segment \((l_\tau)\) and curve \((\gamma_\tau)\);

c. **Bogdanov-Takens bifurcation** at \((\alpha, \beta) = (2, 1)\);

d. **Double-Hopf bifurcation** at \((\alpha, \beta) = (2\mu_\tau, \mu_\tau^2)\);

e. **Zero-Hopf bifurcation** \((\alpha, \beta) = (1 + \mu_\tau, \mu_\tau)\).

**Proof.** It is easy to see that for \( \alpha = \beta = 0 \), the characteristic equation has negative real roots, and therefore, the equilibrium state \((u^*, v^*)\) of system (2) is asymptotically stable. As the roots of the characteristic function \( \Delta(z) \) (or \( \tilde{\Delta}(z) \)) continuously depend on the parameters \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), the number of roots \( z \) such that \( \Re(z) > 0 \) may change if and only if a root \( z = 0 \) or a pair of pure imaginary roots appear, i.e. along the curve \((\gamma_\tau)\) or the lines \((l_0)\) or \((l)\) in the \((\alpha, \beta)\)-plane. A simple analysis shows that the line segments and curve segment given in the statement above enclose a connected region of the \((\alpha, \beta)\)-plane containing the origin, i.e. the stability region \( S(\alpha, \beta) \) of the equilibrium \((u^*, v^*)\) of system (2). Moreover, Theorem 2.2 shows that a saddle-node bifurcation takes place along the line segment \((l_0)\), and hence, statement a. holds.

b. We will first show that Hopf bifurcations take place along the curve segment \((\gamma_\tau)\), with \( \omega \in (0, \omega_\tau)\).
Lemma 2.3 provides that the characteristic equation (13) has a pair of pure imaginary roots \( \pm i\omega \) if \((\alpha, \beta)\) belong to the curve \((\gamma_r)\). Let us consider an arbitrary \( \omega \in (0, \omega_r) \) and denote by \( z(\alpha, \beta) \) the root of the characteristic equation (13) satisfying \( z(\alpha^*, \beta^*) = i\omega \) where \((\alpha^*, \beta^*) = (\alpha_r(\omega), \beta_r(\omega)) \in (\gamma_r)\). Our aim is to prove the transversality condition:

\[
\nabla \Re(z)(\alpha^*, \beta^*) > 0,
\]

for any outward pointing vector \( \mathbf{n} \) from the region \( S(\alpha, \beta) \), i.e. \( \langle \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n} \rangle > 0 \), where \( \mathbf{n} \) denotes the outward pointing normal vector to the curve \((\gamma_r)\).

From (13) it follows that \( z(\alpha, \beta) \) is a solution of the equation

\[
Q_r^2(z) - \alpha Q_r(z) + \beta = 0. \tag{17}
\]

Taking the derivative with respect to \( \alpha \), we obtain:

\[
2Q_r(z)Q_z'(z) \frac{\partial z}{\partial \alpha} - Q_z(z) - \alpha Q_z'(z) \frac{\partial z}{\partial \alpha} = 0,
\]

and we express:

\[
\frac{\partial z}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{Q_z(z)}{Q_z(z)[2Q_z(z) - \alpha]}.
\]

(18)

Therefore, based on the parametric equations of the curve \((\gamma_r)\) given by (14), we deduce:

\[
\frac{\partial z}{\partial \alpha}(\alpha^*, \beta^*) = \frac{Q_r(i\omega)}{Q_r(i\omega)[2Q_r(i\omega) - \alpha^*]} = \frac{Q_r(i\omega)}{2Q_r(i\omega)[2Q_r(i\omega) - 2\Re(Q_r(i\omega))]} = \frac{Q_r(i\omega)}{2\Re(Q_r(i\omega)) \cdot i \cdot \Im(Q_r(i\omega))}.
\]

Applying the real part, we finally obtain:

\[
\frac{\partial \Re(z)}{\partial \alpha}(\alpha^*, \beta^*) = \Re \left[ \frac{i}{2} \frac{Q_r(i\omega)}{Q_r'(i\omega) \Im(Q_r(i\omega))} \right] = \frac{1}{2} \\Im \left[ \frac{Q_r(i\omega)}{Q_r'(i\omega) \Im(Q_r(i\omega))} \right] = \frac{1}{2\Im(Q_r(i\omega))} \cdot \Im \left[ \frac{Q_r(i\omega)}{Q_r'(i\omega)} \right].
\]

Taking the derivative with respect to \( \beta \) in equation (17), we obtain:

\[
2Q_r(z)Q_z'(z) \frac{\partial z}{\partial \beta} - \alpha Q_z'(z) \frac{\partial z}{\partial \beta} + 1 = 0,
\]

and we express:

\[
\frac{\partial z}{\partial \beta} = \frac{1}{Q_z'(z)(\alpha - 2Q_r(z))}.
\]

(19)

Again, using the expressions of the parametric curve \((\gamma_r)\) given by (14), we deduce:

\[
\frac{\partial z}{\partial \beta}(\alpha^*, \beta^*) = \frac{1}{2Q_r(i\omega)[2Q_r(i\omega) - i\Im(Q_r(i\omega))]} = \frac{i}{2Q_r'(i\omega) \Im(Q_r(i\omega))}.
\]

Once again, applying the real part, we arrive at:

\[
\frac{\partial \Re(z)}{\partial \beta}(\alpha^*, \beta^*) = -\frac{1}{2} \cdot \Im \left[ \frac{1}{Q_r'(i\omega) \Im(Q_r(i\omega))} \right] = -\frac{1}{2\Im(Q_r(i\omega))} \cdot \Im \left[ \frac{1}{Q_r'(i\omega)} \right],
\]

and thus, we obtain the gradient vector:

\[
\nabla \Re(z)(\alpha^*, \beta^*) = \left( \frac{\partial \Re(z)}{\partial \alpha}, \frac{\partial \Re(z)}{\partial \beta} \right)(\alpha^*, \beta^*) = \frac{1}{2\Im(Q_r(i\omega))} \left( \Im \left[ \frac{Q_r(i\omega)}{Q_r'(i\omega)} \right], -\Im \left[ \frac{1}{Q_r'(i\omega)} \right] \right) = \frac{1}{2\Im(Q_r(i\omega))Q_r'(i\omega)} \left( \Im \left[ Q_r(i\omega)Q_r'(i\omega) \right], \Im(Q_r'(i\omega)) \right).
\]
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The tangent vector to the curve \((\gamma_\tau)\) at the point \((\alpha^*, \beta^\tau)\) is \((\alpha'(\omega), \beta'(\omega))\), where

\[
\alpha'(\omega) = \frac{d}{d\omega}(2\Re(Q_,(i\omega))) = 2\Re \left[ \frac{d}{d\omega} Q_\tau(i\omega) \right] = 2\Re(i \cdot Q_\tau'(i\omega)) = -23(Q_\tau'(i\omega))
\]

\[
\beta'(\omega) = \frac{d}{d\omega}(Q_\tau(i\omega))^2 = \frac{d}{d\omega} \left[ Q_\tau(i\omega)Q_\tau(i\omega) \right] = i \cdot Q_\tau'(i\omega)Q_\tau(i\omega) + Q_\tau(i\omega)\bar{i} \cdot Q_\tau'(i\omega) =
\]

\[
= i \cdot Q_\tau'(i\omega)Q_\tau(i\omega) - i \cdot Q_\tau'(i\omega)Q_\tau'(i\omega) = i \cdot (Q_\tau'(i\omega)Q_\tau(i\omega) - Q_\tau(i\omega)Q_\tau'(i\omega)) =
\]

\[
= -23 \left[ Q_\tau'(i\omega)Q_\tau(i\omega) \right] = 2\Im \left[ Q_\tau(i\omega)Q_\tau'(i\omega) \right].
\]

Thus, we obtain the following tangent vector to the curve \((\gamma_\tau)\):

\[
(\alpha'(\omega), \beta'(\omega)) = 2 \left( -\Im(Q_\tau'(i\omega)), \Im \left[ Q_\tau(i\omega)Q_\tau'(i\omega) \right] \right).
\]

Therefore, fixing the orientation of the curve \((\gamma_\tau)\) in the direction of increasing \(\omega\), a right-pointing normal vector to the curve \((\gamma_\tau)\) is:

\[
\pi(\omega) = \left( \Im \left[ Q_\tau(i\omega)Q_\tau'(i\omega) \right], \Im(Q_\tau'(i\omega)) \right).
\]

Hence, the directional derivative is:

\[
\nabla_\pi \Re(z)(\alpha^*, \beta^*) = \langle \nabla \Re(z)(\alpha^*, \beta^*), \pi \rangle = \frac{\pi}{2\Im(Q_\tau(i\omega))|Q_\tau'(i\omega)|^2} = \frac{\langle \pi, \overline{\pi} \rangle}{2\Im(Q_\tau(i\omega))|Q_\tau'(i\omega)|^2} > 0,
\]

as \(\langle \pi, \overline{\pi} \rangle > 0\) and \(\Im(Q_\tau(i\omega)) > 0\) for any \(\omega \in (0, \omega_\tau)\). Therefore, the transversality condition holds, and it follows that a Hopf bifurcation takes place along the curve segment \((\gamma_\tau)\) which bounds the stability region \(S(\alpha, \beta)\).

In the following, we will show that Hopf bifurcations take place along the line segment \((l_\tau)\), with \(\alpha \in [2\mu_\tau, 1 + \mu_\tau]\). If \((\alpha, \beta)\) belong to this line segment, Lemma 2.4 shows that the characteristic equation \([13]\) has a pair of pure imaginary roots \(\pm i\omega_\tau\). Let us denote by \(z(\alpha, \beta)\) the root of the characteristic equation \([13]\) with the property \(z(\alpha^*, \beta^\tau) = i\omega_\tau\) where \(\alpha^* \in [2\mu_\tau, 1 + \mu_\tau]\) is arbitrarily fixed and \(\beta^\tau = \mu_\tau(\alpha - \mu_\tau)\). We will prove the transversality condition

\[
\nabla_\pi \Re(z)(\alpha^*, \beta^*) > 0,
\]

for any vector \(\overline{\pi}\) pointing outward from the region \(S(\alpha, \beta)\), i.e. \(\langle \overline{\pi}, \pi \rangle > 0\), where \(\overline{\pi} = (\mu_\tau, -1)\) is an outward pointing normal vector to the line segment \((l_\tau)\).

Similarly as in \([18]\) and \([19]\) we have:

\[
\frac{\partial z}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{Q_\tau(z)}{Q_\tau'(z)[2Q_\tau(z) - \alpha]} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial z}{\partial \beta} = \frac{1}{Q_\tau'(z)[\alpha - 2Q_\tau(z)]}.
\]

Using the fact that, \(Q_\tau(z) = \frac{z + \tau}{\tau H(z)}\), we deduce:

\[
Q_\tau'(z) = \frac{\dot{H}(z) - (z + \tau)\dot{H}'(z)}{\tau H^2(z)} = \frac{1}{\tau \dot{H}(z)} - \frac{z + \tau}{\tau H^2(z)} \cdot \frac{\dot{H}(z)}{\tau} = \frac{1 - \tau Q_\tau(z)\dot{H}'(z)}{\tau \dot{H}(z)}
\]

and therefore, using the fact that \(Q_\tau(i\omega_\tau) = \mu_\tau\) (as in the proof of Lemma 2.4), we obtain

\[
Q_\tau'(i\omega_\tau) = \frac{1 - \tau \mu_\tau e^{-i\theta(\omega_\tau)} [-i \rho'(\omega_\tau) - \rho(\omega_\tau)\theta'(\omega_\tau)]}{\tau \rho(\omega_\tau)e^{-i\theta(\omega_\tau)}} = \frac{e^{i\theta(\omega_\tau)} + \tau \mu_\tau [i \rho'(\omega_\tau) + \rho(\omega_\tau)\theta'(\omega_\tau)]}{\tau \rho(\omega_\tau)}.
\]

Hence, it is easy to see that:

\[
\Re\left[ Q_\tau'(i\omega_\tau) \right] = \frac{\cos \theta(\omega_\tau) + \tau \mu_\tau \rho(\omega_\tau)\theta'(\omega_\tau)}{\tau \rho(\omega_\tau)} = \mu_\tau (\tau^{-1} \cos^2 \theta(\omega_\tau) + \theta'(\omega_\tau)) < 0,
\]
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as $\mu_\tau < 0$. The following gradient vector is obtained:

\[
\nabla \Re(z)(\alpha^*, \beta^*) = \Re \left[ \left( \frac{Q_\tau(i\omega_\tau)}{Q'_\tau(i\omega_\tau)}(2Q_\tau(i\omega_\tau) - \alpha^*), \frac{1}{Q'_\tau(i\omega_\tau)[\alpha^* - 2Q_\tau(i\omega_\tau)]} \right) \right] = 
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{(2\mu_\tau - \alpha^*)} \cdot \Re \left[ \left( \frac{1}{Q'_\tau(i\omega_\tau)} - \frac{1}{Q'_\tau(i\omega_\tau)} \right) \right] = 
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{(2\mu_\tau - \alpha^*)} \cdot \Re \left[ \left( \frac{1}{Q'_\tau(i\omega_\tau)} \right) \cdot (\mu_\tau, -1) = 
\]

\[
= \frac{\Re(Q'_\tau(i\omega_\tau))}{(2\mu_\tau - \alpha^*) |Q'_\tau(i\omega_\tau)|^2} \cdot \pi. 
\]

As the scalar term appearing in front of $\pi$ is positive, it follows that the gradient vector is indeed a normal vector to the line ($l_\tau$) pointing outward from the stability region $S(\alpha, \beta)$. In conclusion, the transversality condition is now deduced as in the case of the curve segment ($\gamma_\tau$), and it follows that a Hopf bifurcation takes place along the line segment ($l_\tau$).

The points c., d. and e. from the statement of the theorem follow easily taking into consideration the intersections between the lines ($l_0$), ($l_\tau$) and the curve ($\gamma_\tau$). □

The following result follows similarly in the case when equation (15) does not admit any positive roots. In this case, the stability domain $S(\alpha, \beta)$ will be unbounded.

**Theorem 2.6.** If the equation (15) does not admit any positive real root, the boundary of the stability region $S(\alpha, \beta)$ of the equilibrium state $(u^*, v^*)$ of system (2) is given by the union of the half-line and curve given below:

\[
(l_0) : \quad \beta = \alpha - 1, \quad \alpha \in (-\infty, 2]; \\
(\gamma_\tau) : \quad \begin{cases} 
\alpha = \frac{2}{\rho(\omega)} \left[ \cos \theta(\omega) - \frac{\omega}{\tau} \sin \theta(\omega) \right] \\
\beta = \frac{1}{\rho^2(\omega)} \left[ 1 + \frac{\omega^2}{\tau^2} \right]
\end{cases}, \quad \omega > 0.
\]

At the boundary of the stability domain $S(\alpha, \beta)$, the following bifurcation phenomena take place in a neighborhood of the equilibrium $(u^*, v^*)$ of system (2):

a. Saddle-node bifurcations take place along the open half-line ($l_0$);

b. Hopf bifurcations take place along the curve ($\gamma_\tau$);

c. Bogdanov-Takens bifurcation at $(\alpha, \beta) = (2, 1)$.

In Fig. 1 the stability domains given by the previous theorems are represented for four different delay kernels with the same average time delay $\tau = 1$. In each subfigure, the blue rhombus represents the delay-independent part of the stability domain given by Theorem 2.1. It is important to note that compared to discrete time-delays, the stability domains in the case of Gamma delay kernels are much larger. Moreover, in the case of a weak Gamma kernel (as it was the one included in the original Wilson-Cowan model [5], and therefore it produces the behavior of the model in its pure form, before the coarse-grain approximation), the stability region is unbounded, as in Theorem 2.6.

## 3 Numerical simulations

The sigmoid activation function is chosen as in [6]: $f(x) = (1 + \exp(-\delta x))^{-1}$. For all numerical simulations, the following values of the system parameters are chosen: $\theta_u = 0.1$, $\theta_v = 0.2$, $a = d = -6$.
Figure 1: Stability domain $S(\alpha, \beta)$ for different types of delay kernels, with a fixed average time delay $\tau = 1$. The stability domains are obtained based on Theorem 2.5 (left and right) and Theorem 2.6 (middle). The blue shaded region represents a delay-kernel-invariant subset of $S(\alpha, \beta)$. Along the blue curves and line segments Hopf bifurcations take place, while the red line corresponds to saddle-node bifurcations.

$b = c = 3$ and $\delta = 40$. The following equilibrium is computed: $(u^*, v^*) = (0.0660694, 0.076733)$, with the characteristic parameters: $\alpha = -31.8118$ and $\beta = 188.846$. Based on Theorem 2.5, the critical value of the average time delay $\tau^*$ responsible for the occurrence of a Hopf bifurcation which causes the loss of asymptotic stability of the equilibrium $(u^*, v^*)$ is determined in the case of a Dirac kernel $\tau^*_0 = 0.0674893$ and a strong Gamma kernel $\tau^*_2 = 0.202917$. The Hopf bifurcations are supercritical, causing the appearance of stable limit cycles, as it can be seen in Figs. 2.

On the other hand, in the case of a weak Gamma kernel, from Theorem 2.6 it follows by numerical computations that for the specific values of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ given above, the equilibrium $(u^*, v^*)$ is asymptotically stable, for any $\tau > 0$. Therefore, no oscillations or bursting behavior is expected to occur in a neighborhood of the equilibrium if a weak Gamma kernel is considered in the mathematical model. This reflects an important difference between the different types of behavior that can be observed for different types of delay kernels. The weak Gamma kernel has a particular importance as it has been included in the original Wilson-Cowan model before applying time-coarse graining.
Numerical simulations also reveal complex bursting and quasi-periodic behavior in the Wilson-Cowan model with a discrete time delay (see Fig. 3), suggesting a series of bifurcations involving limit cycles. Interestingly, these phenomena could not be observed in the case of strong Gamma kernels with the same system parameters.

4 Conclusions

A local stability and bifurcation analysis has been presented for a generalization of the Wilson-Cowan model of excitatory and inhibitory interactions in localized neuronal populations, incorporating general distributed delays. Essential differences have been pointed out for different scenarios involving diverse delay kernels, emphasizing the importance of a careful choice of delay kernels in the mathematical model.
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Figure 3: Periodic, quasi-periodic and chaotic orbits shown in the $(u, v)$-phase-plane for the Wilson-Cowan model with discrete time-delay, obtained for different values of $\tau$. 


