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Perhaps because of the elegance of the central limit theorem, it is often assumed that distributions in nature will approach singly-peaked, unimodal shapes reminiscent of the Gaussian normal distribution. However, many systems behave differently, with variables following apparently bimodal or multimodal distributions. Here we argue that multimodality may emerge naturally as a result of repulsive or inhibitory coupling dynamics, and we show rigorously how it emerges for a broad class of coupling functions in variants of the paradigmatic Kuramoto model.

In this paper we employ oscillators as a test system for understanding how bimodality—the splitting of oscillators into two rather than one cluster—may emerge as a result of coupling between interacting units. We present numerical and analytical results showing that repulsive coupling can lead to bimodality (or multimodality) for a wide range of detailed interaction dynamics.

I. INTRODUCTION

Synchronization is a widespread phenomenon observed in biological [1–3], chemical [4–6], physical [7–10], and social settings [11–14]. A paradigmatic mathematical model that can explain synchronization in many contexts is the Kuramoto Model [15–19]. Much work has been done on understanding the complex and surprising dynamics of the Kuramoto model and its variants, but the vast majority of that research focuses on the case of attractive coupling: here we are interested in the case where the coupling is repulsive.

Repulsive (or inhibitory) coupling is of physical interest as it arises frequently in the context of neuronal networks (e.g., see refs. 2 and 20), chemical interactions (e.g., refs. 4–21 and 22), and many other systems (see refs. 23–27). Some coupled oscillator models have examined repulsive coupling: Giver et al. developed a local variant of the Kuramoto Model with repulsive coupling based on the interaction between water micro-droplets with reactants of the Belousov-Zhabotinsky reaction [28]. Hong and Strogatz have developed two variants of the Kuramoto Model that involve a mix of positive and negative coupling. In ref. [29] they consider the case where oscillators are “listeners” and are separated into two groups. The first group, “conformists” with positive coupling, are attracted to the mean field (thus conforming with it); the second group, “contrarians” with negative coupling, are repulsed by the mean field. They find three kinds of long term behavior: the incoherent state, a partially synchronized state named the “π-state,” and a traveling wave state, where the phase distribution travels at a constant speed about the phase axis, keeping a steady separation between the oscillators of less than π. In ref. 30 oscillators “speak” to other oscillators in a specific way, either trying to attract all the others or trying to repel all of them. Surprisingly, they find that this model shows no new effects and is similar to the standard mean-field behavior of the Kuramoto model [30]. Recently, it has been shown that synchronization can arise in both repulsive and attractive coupling scenarios subject to common noise [31–34]. Gong et al. [35], inspired by the work of Gil et al. [33], studied instances where common noise can lead to clustering in the phase distribution of oscillators for repulsive coupling. They showed that for identical oscillators under repulsive coupling the Kuramoto model cannot form multiple clusters. Furthermore, they showed that, for general limit cycle oscillators (e.g., Van der Pol oscillators), multiple clusters can arise as a result of an anharmonic phase response and dynamics on the amplitude of the signal.

The central limit theorem [45] may influence us to expect that distributions in nature should tend to a singly-peaked, unimodal shape akin to the Gaussian normal distribution. Yet, bimodality can be observed in biological [46–48], social [49–51], and chemical [52–55] contexts and beyond [56–58] (see Fig. 1 for selected examples). In this paper we demonstrate that multimodality may arise as a result of repulsive or inhibitory coupling dynamics and we give an in-depth explanation of how it can arise for a range of coupling functions.

II. MODEL WITH ANTISYMMETRIC REPULSIVE COUPLING

We begin by considering a system of $N$ phase oscillators characterized by natural frequencies $\omega_i$, $i=1\ldots N$. The oscillators are globally coupled with coupling strength $K$ through...
B. Bimodal equilibria

We assume that the number of oscillators is large, $N \gg 1$, and we look for bimodal equilibria by making the ansatz of an oscillator phase distribution $h(\theta) = x\delta(\theta - \theta_1) + (1 - x)\delta(\theta - \theta_2)$, where $0 < x < 1$ describes the fraction in cluster 1. Note that this constitutes an explicit restriction to a bimodal manifold within the broader space of all possible oscillator phase distributions. Then system (3) can be reduced to two coupled ordinary differential equations (ODEs):

$$\begin{align*}
\dot{\theta}_1 &= \omega_0 + K \left( \frac{x}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} f(\theta_j - \theta_1) + \sum_{i=xN+1}^{N} f(\theta_2 - \theta_1) \right) \\
&= \omega_0 + K (1 - x) f(\theta_2 - \theta_1) \\
\dot{\theta}_2 &= \omega_0 + K \left( \frac{x}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} f(\theta_1 - \theta_j) + \sum_{i=xN+1}^{N} f(\theta_2 - \theta_2) \right) \\
&= \omega_0 - K x f(\theta_2 - \theta_1).
\end{align*}$$

We define a new phase-difference variable $\psi = \theta_2 - \theta_1$ and write its dynamical system by subtracting Eq. (4) from Eq. (5):

$$\dot{\psi} = -K f(\psi).$$

We observe that the fixed points of the system for $\psi$ are fully determined by the zeros of $f(\psi)$. From the assumptions above $f(\psi)$ must have zeros at $\psi = 0$ and $\psi = \pi$. Furthermore, if conditions (2a–2e) hold and $f(\psi)$ has no other zeros (as in the case of the red dashed curve from Fig. 2), then it is implied that $f'(\pi) \leq 0$. Hence, within the bimodal manifold, the fixed point at $\psi = \pi$ should be stable with $\psi = 0$ being unstable. $\psi = \pi$ corresponds to a bimodal equilibrium with two clusters of oscillators separated by $180^\circ$ of phase.

If additional roots of $f(\psi)$ exist between 0 and $\pi$, these will also correspond to bimodal fixed points with alternating stability (again restricted to the bimodal manifold). We focus on the cases where there are no other fixed points or there is exactly one other fixed point $\psi_0$ in $(0, \pi)$; other cases are similarly tractable. Figure 2 illustrates the typical general shapes of the interaction functions that we consider.

1. Stability of bimodal equilibrium

To investigate the broader stability of solutions to perturbations outside the bimodal manifold, we consider the perturbation of a single oscillator by a small amount $\varepsilon$. Because $N \gg 1$, we approximate the dynamics of the two clusters as unaffected by this perturbation. We examine the evolution of distance between the perturbed oscillator and the group from which it was perturbed, $\varepsilon(t)$, to evaluate whether the system returns to its initial state.

For convenience, we move into a rotating frame by re-defining $\theta_i \rightarrow \theta_i + \omega_0 t$, which is equivalent to setting $\omega_0 = 0$. Without loss of generality we choose oscillator index $N$ from the $\theta_2$ cluster for the perturbation and assume $\theta_1 = 0$, and thus $\theta_2 = \psi_0 \leq \pi$ (assuming for now that our interaction

\[\text{FIG. 2. Sample interaction functions. Two cases of coupling functions that we consider. Case 1 (red, dashed) is an odd, } 2\pi \text{-periodic function with a continuous derivative, no zeros in between } 0 \text{ and } \pi, \text{ and has a positive slope at 0. Case 2 (blue, solid) is similar to case 1 but has a zero of order 1 in between } 0 \text{ and } \pi.\]
function has only one or zero fixed points in \((0, \pi)\). Then \(\theta_N = \theta_2 - \varepsilon = \psi_0 - \varepsilon\), and
\[
\varepsilon = -\frac{K}{N} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} f(\theta_1 - \psi_0 + \varepsilon) + \sum_{i=N+1}^{N-1} f(\theta_2 - \psi_0 + \varepsilon) \right]
\]
\[
= -Kx f(-\psi_0 + \varepsilon) - K(1-x)f(\varepsilon)
\]
\[
\approx -\varepsilon K \left[ x f'(\psi_0) + (1-x)f'(0) \right].
\]
We expand the functions \(f\) in Taylor series to linear order:
\[
\varepsilon \approx -\varepsilon K \left[ x f'(\psi_0) + (1-x)f'(0) \right].
\]
Assuming that \(K < 0\) (repulsive coupling, our case of interest in this manuscript), this implies stability if and only if
\[
x f'(\psi_0) + (1-x)f'(0) < 0 . \tag{7}
\]
A nearly identical calculation starting with the perturbation of a single oscillator from the \(\theta_1\) (zero phase) cluster leads to a similar equation,
\[
(1-x)f'(\psi_0) + xf'(0) < 0 . \tag{8}
\]
Since Eqs. (7) and (8) must be simultaneously satisfied for stability of the full bimodal distribution, the following inequality must hold:
\[
f'(0) < (1-x)[f'(0) - f'(\psi_0)] < -f'(\psi_0). \tag{9}
\]
Interestingly, this implies that the slope of the interaction function \(f(\psi)\) must be steeper at \(\psi = \psi_0\) compared to \(\psi = 0\) if the bimodal state is to be stable. We can also compute explicit bounds on the proportion of the oscillators in each group by isolating fraction \(x\) in inequality (9):
\[
\frac{f'(0)}{f'(0) - f'(\psi_0)} < x < \frac{-f'(\psi_0)}{f'(0) - f'(\psi_0)}. \tag{10}
\]

### III. CONCRETE EXAMPLE

As a concrete example, we consider a simple class of interaction functions
\[
f(u;a) = \frac{1}{\pi^2 u^2} \left( u \left( \pi^2 - u^2 \right) - a^2 - a^2 \right). \tag{11}
\]
These functions have roots on \((-\pi, \pi)\) at 0, \(\pi\), and \(\pm a\), and satisfy all the conditions set forth earlier in section II. As long as \(0 < |a| \leq \pi\) there are three roots in \(0 \leq u \leq \pi\), and one can check that \(f'(0) = 1\) for all choices of \(a\). For inequality (10) to be satisfiable, we require
\[
\frac{\pi^2}{3\pi^2 - 2a^2} < \frac{2\pi^2 - 2a^2}{3\pi^2 - 2a^2} .
\]
which reduces to
\[
|a| < \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}} \equiv a_{\text{crit}}. \tag{12}
\]

We note that symmetry of the roots allows us to consider positive \(a\) without loss of generality. Figure 3 shows the results of numerical experiments where we test this predicted stability threshold. In each panel, Eq. (3) is implemented with the interaction function from Eq. (11). We initialize \(xN\) oscillators at \(\theta_1 = 0\) and \((1-x)N\) at \(\theta_2 = a\), then add a small random perturbation \(\xi_i\) to each oscillator’s initial phase, where \(\xi_i\) is drawn from the normal distribution \(\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)\). We point out here that we set \(\sigma = \sqrt{\omega/\Gamma}\) for all simulations in figure 3. We numerically integrate the system using a 4th/5th order Runge-Kutta scheme and consider evidence for stability if it approaches the unperturbed state, \(\psi = \theta_2 - \theta_1 \rightarrow a\) with \(x_{\text{final}} = x_{\text{initial}}\). We note that for the rest of the paper we set coupling strength \(K = -1000\).

In panels (a) and (b), we use \(N = 100\) oscillators, \(\omega_0 = 0\), and set \(a = \pi/2\), consistent with the stability threshold from Eq. (12), \(a < a_{\text{crit}} = \pi/\sqrt{2}\). The stable band of fractionation according to inequality (10) is then \(2/5 < x < 3/5\). In panel (a), we set \(x_{\text{initial}} = 0.55\), below the band’s upper bound; in panel (b), we set \(x_{\text{initial}} = 0.65\), above the band’s upper bound. As expected, the bimodal equilibrium appears stable in panel (a), but unstable in panel (b), where eleven oscillators move between clusters to establish a different equilibrium within the stable fractionation band \(2/5 < x_{\text{final}} = 0.54 < 3/5\).

In panels (c) and (d), we again use \(N = 100\) oscillators and \(\omega_0 = 0\), but here we examine the predicted stability threshold \(a_{\text{crit}} = \pi/\sqrt{2}\) from Eq. (12). We expect the bimodal state with \(\psi = a\) to be unstable for all positive \(a > a_{\text{crit}}\) (but note that this state ceases to exist when \(a > \pi\)). We set \(x_{\text{initial}} = 1/2\) since this is within the fractionation stability
band from inequality (10) for all \( a < a_{\text{crit}} \). In panel (c), we set \( a = a_{\text{crit}} - 0.1 \), just below the threshold for stability; in panel (d), we set \( a = a_{\text{crit}} + 0.1 \), just barely in the unstable domain. As expected, the bimodal equilibrium again appears stable in panel (c), but it appears unstable in panel (d). Since no fractionation \( x \) will lead to a stable bimodal equilibrium, the system must move to an entirely different state, and it appears to converge to a trimodal distribution of oscillator phases.

We are able to understand why the system converges to a trimodal state by performing a similar analysis for the stability of three-cluster, or trimodal, oscillator distributions. One can show that a necessary condition for stability is:

\[
f'(0) < -\left[(x + y)f'(\psi_1) + (y + z)f'(\psi_2) + (x + z)f'(\psi_1 + \psi_2)\right]
\]

where \( \psi_i \) is the angle separating clusters at \( \theta_i \) and \( \theta_{i+1} \) (\( \theta_4 \) identified with \( \theta_1 \)), and \( x, y, \) and \( z \) are the fractionations of the three clusters at \( \theta_1, \theta_2, \) and \( \theta_3 \) respectively. With equal spacing between the clusters \( \psi_1 = \psi_2 = 2\pi - \psi_1 - \psi_2 = 2\pi/3 \), the necessary condition simplifies to

\[
f'(0) < -2f'\left(\frac{2\pi}{3}\right).
\]

For the example function shown in Eq. (11) this is

\[
a < \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{\frac{14}{3}} \pi \equiv a_{\text{crit}} \approx 1.44\pi.
\]

This implies that a trimodal state remains stable for all \( a < \pi \). It stably coexists with the bimodal state for \( a < \pi/\sqrt{2} \), and may coexist with other multimodal states for \( \pi/\sqrt{2} < a < \pi \). In general different multimodal states may stably coexist over various parameter ranges. More details of the analysis for trimodality can be found in the appendix.

IV. GENERALIZATION TO ASYMMETRIC INTERACTION FUNCTIONS

We can relax assumption (2c) of an antisymmetric coupling function and still find stability boundaries for multimodal states. In place of Eq. (6) (which used oddness of the coupling function), we find instead

\[
\psi = Kxf(-\psi) - K(1-x)f(\psi).
\]

Clearly \( \psi^* = 0 \) and \( \psi^* = \pi \) both remain fixed points. Other fixed points exist if

\[
x f(-\psi^*) = (1-x) f(\psi^*)
\]

has a solution on \( -\pi < \psi^* < \pi \). Figure 3 shows an example of an asymmetric interaction function. Geometrically this condition can be understood as identifying intersections of \( f(\psi) \) and its reflection \( f(-\psi) \) when \( x = 1/2 \) (or scaled versions when \( x \neq 1/2 \)). Once multimodal fixed points are identified, stability analysis is analogous to that presented earlier.

V. GENERALIZATION TO NON-IDENTICAL OSCILLATORS

We argue that real-world bimodal or multimodal distributions may result from similar dynamics to those presented in this paper. Of course, heterogeneity is inevitable in most real-world systems, yet we have focused thus far on the case of identical oscillators. While we leave the more general analysis for future work, we have conducted numerical experiments that appear to show that the predicted behavior occurs even in the presence of oscillator heterogeneity.

Again using the same example interaction function from Eq. (11), we now draw frequencies, \( \omega_i \), from a normal distribution \( \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \) and set the initial phases of the oscillators to \( \theta_i = \xi_i \) (fraction \( x \)) or \( \theta_i = a + \xi_i \) (fraction \( 1-x \)), where \( \xi_i \) is a small perturbation draw from the distribution \( \mathcal{N}(0, \delta^2) \). Figure 5 shows the results of perturbation experiments analogous to those presented in Fig. 3 with analogous results except that the final phase distributions have phases that cluster about the modes rather than all converging to them precisely (right panels show histograms of final states).

In Fig. 3 panels (a) and (b), we use \( N = 1000 \) oscillators and set \( a = \pi/2 < a_{\text{crit}} \) and \( x_{\text{initial}} = 1/2 \). Even with perturbed initial phases and heterogeneous natural frequencies, the oscillators still remain in the bimodal state as predicted for \( a < a_{\text{crit}} \). Specifically, panel (b) shows that the steady state distribution of oscillators has finite-width clustering about the fixed point positions predicted from the identical-oscillator theory and the system appears to converge to a trimodal equilibrium with three finite-width clusters.
VI. DISCUSSION

Coupled oscillators are an excellent testbed for models of synchronization or clustering. Even though real-world variables (e.g., sediment grain size\cite{59}, salmon body size\cite{38,60}, human communication frequency\cite{61}, dopamine receptor density\cite{62}, neutron star mass\cite{63}, galaxy color\cite{64}, gamma ray burst duration\cite{65}, tree height\cite{66}, animal ornament size\cite{67}) may not be oscillatory or confined to a periodic domain, bimodality may emerge for qualitatively similar reasons. In our model, the coupling of one unit’s dynamical behavior to that of others is key to the phenomenon.

For clarity of presentation we have focused on a single example of interaction function (Eq. (11)), but evaluation of two other classes of interaction functions (triangle waves and antisymmetrized von-Mises kernels) also supports our analytical results (see supplementary material for details).

The analysis we present here focuses exclusively on the case of all-to-all coupling; we leave further investigation of the impact of network structure for future work.

For real-world scenarios where bimodality or multimodality is of interest, the interaction function may not be known exactly. Nevertheless, we expect that it will often be possible to assess whether the conditions expressed in Eqs. (2) hold in a particular case. It also seems plausible that functions describing real-world interactions between coupled systems will have no more than a handful of roots, making bimodality and multimodality likely outcomes when repulsive or inhibitory coupling is imposed.

One particularly important case occurs when the interaction function has only roots at zero and π, with the root at zero having larger or equal magnitude slope. That is the case in the standard Kuramoto model with sinusoidal coupling. In such a case we expect that the incoherent splay state will be stable. In general, the splay state should be stable when the tendency to cluster (due to long-distance interactions) cannot overcome the oscillators’ locally repulsive interactions.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that, when coupling is repulsive, multimodality of the oscillator distribution can be a stable configuration for a wide range of interaction functions. We showed that bimodality can be expected under repulsive coupling when the slope of the interaction function at the origin is shallower than at the other root(s). We performed numerical experiments for both identical and nonidentical oscillators and observed results consistent with theory.

This demonstration that repulsive coupling can produce clustering under reasonable assumptions about the interaction dynamics is important as repulsive coupling is present in many natural systems. Hence, the theory we present in this paper provides an argument as to why one might expect multi-modality instead of unimodality or incoherence in systems known to have repulsive coupling.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

See supplementary material for numerical experiments using a selection of additional interaction functions.

Appendix: Trimodal equilibria

We again consider a function $f(u)$ that satisfies conditions (2a)–(2e). We look for solutions with oscillators distributed according to $h(\theta) = x\delta(\theta - \theta_1) + y\delta(\theta - \theta_2) + (1 - x - y)\delta(\theta - \theta_3)$, where $x, y > 0$, $x + y < 1$ so that the oscillators will be in three clusters at $\theta_1$, $\theta_2$, and $\theta_3$ (we again assume that the natural frequencies are identical):

\begin{align}
\dot{\theta}_1 &= \omega_0 + K(yf(\theta_2 - \theta_1) + zf(\theta_1 - \theta_1)) \\
\dot{\theta}_2 &= \omega_0 + K(-xf(\theta_2 - \theta_1) + zf(\theta_1 - \theta_2)) \\
\dot{\theta}_3 &= \omega_0 - K(xf(\theta_1 - \theta_1) + yf(\theta_1 - \theta_2)) .
\end{align}

Here, $z = 1 - x - y$. We define two variables $\psi_1 = \theta_2 - \theta_1$ and $\psi_2 = \theta_3 - \theta_2$, so that the system reduces to

\begin{align}
\dot{\psi}_1 &= -K(z[f(\psi_2 + \psi_1) - f(\psi_2)] + (x + y)f(\psi_1)) \\
\dot{\psi}_2 &= -K(x[f(\psi_2 + \psi_1) - f(\psi_1)] + (y + z)f(\psi_2)) .
\end{align}

We set $\psi_i = 0$, $i = 1, 2$ and arrive at the following system of equations:

\begin{align}
f(\psi_2) &= \frac{xf(\psi_1)}{z} \\
f(\psi_2 + \psi_1) &= -\frac{yf(\psi_1)}{z} .
\end{align}

To set bounds on the fractionation of the clusters, we assume that there exists points $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in (-\pi, \pi)$ such that Eqs.
and (A.7) are satisfied. Additionally, we put our system of coupled oscillators into a rotating frame so that \( \theta_i \to \theta_i + \alpha \omega t \). In the rotating frame, we set \( \theta_1 = 0 \), \( \theta_2 = \psi_1 \), and \( \theta_3 = \psi_1 + \psi_2 - 2\pi \). As before we perturb an oscillator from one of the three groups. We do this for all three groups and get a system of inequalities

\[
\begin{align*}
x f'(0) + y f'(\psi_1) + z f'(\psi_1 + \psi_2) &< 0 \quad (A.8a) \\
y f'(0) + x f'(\psi_1) + z f'(\psi_2) &< 0 \quad (A.8b) \\
z f'(0) + x f'(\psi_2) + x f'(\psi_1 + \psi_2) &< 0 . \quad (A.8c)
\end{align*}
\]

All these must be simultaneously satisfied for stability of a trimodal state. Adding, we find

\[
f'(0) < -[(x+y)f'(\psi_1) + (y+z)f'(\psi_2) + (x+z)f'(\psi_1 + \psi_2)]. \quad (A.9)
\]

This states that the weighted sum of the slopes of the coupling function at \( \psi = \psi_1 \), where the weights are the proportions for the groups separated by \( \psi_1 \), is greater in magnitude than the slope at the origin. This condition reduces to

\[
f'(0) < -2f'\left(\frac{2\pi}{3}\right) \quad (A.10)
\]

if \( \psi_1 = \psi_2 = 2\pi - \psi_1 - \psi_2 = 2\pi/3 \). As an example, we return to the class of interaction functions that we introduced in Section II. We relax the assumption that \( |a| < \pi \) and consider the case when \( \psi_1 = \psi_2 = 2\pi - \psi_1 - \psi_2 \). To satisfy inequality (A.10), this means that

\[
1 < \frac{56\pi^2 + 54a^2}{81a^2}, \quad (A.11)
\]

which reduces to

\[
|a| < \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{\frac{14}{3}} \pi \equiv a_{\text{tricrit}} \approx 1.44\pi . \quad (A.12)
\]

Figure 6 shows the results of a numerical experiment where we test this threshold. In both panels we have equal fractionation in the three groups, i.e., \( x = y = z = 1/3 \), and equal spacing, \( \psi_1 = 2\pi/3 \). In panel (a) we can see that when \( a = a_{\text{tricrit}} + 0.1 \), the trimodal state breaks down in the bimodal state. In panel (b) we can see that when \( a = a_{\text{tricrit}} - 0.1 \), the system returns to the trimodal state after a perturbation.

FIG. 6. Numerical experiments testing the threshold for trimodality. Using equation (11) as an example, we test the thresholds given by (A.12). In both panels we have equal fractionation in the three groups, i.e., \( x = y = z = 1/3 \) and equal spacing, \( \psi_1 = 2\pi/3 \). In panel (a) we set \( a = a_{\text{tricrit}} + 0.1 \), and perturb the oscillators by amount \( \xi_1 \) from the predicted fixed points, whose values are drawn from the distribution \( \mathcal{N}(0,0.1) \). In panels (a) and (b) we set \( a = 1.43\pi \in (\sqrt{2\pi},a_{\text{crit}}) \). In these cases we expect both the bimodal state and the trimodal state to be stable for this value of \( a \). In panels (a) and (b), we set the fractionation to be equal in all groups, and we set the spacing between groups to be equal. As expected, we see that the trimodal state and the bimodal state are stable under perturbation.

In panel (c) we set \( a = 1.43\pi - 0.1 < \sqrt{2\pi} < a_{\text{crit}} \). As expected, we see that the bimodal state is unstable and the system goes into trimodal state. Given the proximity of the clusters to \( \pm \pi \), we have added black lines that at \( \pm \pi \), so that one can see that the difference between the final state and \( \pm \pi \). In panel (d), we set \( a = 1.43\pi + 0.1 > a_{\text{tricrit}} > \sqrt{2\pi} \). We also observe an expected result, as trimodality appears to be unstable and the system converges to a bimodal equilibrium, which is stable given that \( a > \sqrt{2\pi} \).

In summary, we have necessary condition for the stability of the trimodal equilibrium. Although, this condition is only necessary, numerical experiments seems to point to the necessary condition being an accurate threshold for the stability of the trimodal state. Also, theory and numerical experiments demonstrate that multistability of different multimodal equilibria is possible over parameter space. The theory for the stability of higher modes we leave for future work.

and in panel (d) we set \( \theta = \frac{\pi}{2} \), where \( \alpha_3 \) is given by Eq. (A.12). The top two panels illustrate the multistability of the system within the threshold; the bottom two panels demonstrate instability of one equilibrium outside of this threshold. Here \( N = 300 \) and the oscillators frequencies are identical, \( \omega_1 = \omega_2 = 0 \). Furthermore, for all the initial conditions we have equal spacing and equal fractionation, i.e., \( \alpha_\text{initial} = 1/2 \), \( \theta_2 - \theta_1 = \pi \) for the bimodal initial condition and \( x = y = z = 1/3 \), \( \theta_2 - \theta_1 = 2\pi/3 \), and \( \theta_2 - \theta_1 = 2\pi/3 \). For panels (a) and (b), we set \( a = 1.43\pi \in (\sqrt{2}\pi, \alpha_\text{crit}) \). As expected, system returns from its initial bimodal equilibrium and trimodal equilibrium, for panels (a) and (b) respectively. In panel (c) we set \( a = 1.43\pi - 0.1 \in (\sqrt{2}\pi, \alpha_\text{crit}) \) and in panel (d) we set \( a = 1.43\pi + 0.1 > \alpha_\text{crit} > \sqrt{2}\pi \). As predicted, in panel (c) we see that the bimodal state is unstable and it is driven to another state, which appears to be the trimodal state (we have added black lines so that one can see that the clusters away from the origin are not at \( \pm \pi \)). In panel (d), we see that the trimodal state is unstable and moves to another state, which seems to be the bimodal state.

**FIG. 7. Numerical experiments testing bistability.** Using equation (11) as an example, we test the bistability threshold \( \sqrt{2}\pi < a < \alpha_\text{crit} \) where \( \alpha_\text{crit} \) is given by Eq. (A.12). The top two panels illustrate the multistability of the system within the threshold; the bottom two panels demonstrate instability of one equilibrium outside of this threshold. Here \( N = 300 \) and the oscillators frequencies are identical, \( \omega_1 = \omega_2 = 0 \). Furthermore, for all the initial conditions we have equal spacing and equal fractionation, i.e., \( \alpha_\text{initial} = 1/2 \), \( \theta_2 - \theta_1 = \pi \) for the bimodal initial condition and \( x = y = z = 1/3 \), \( \theta_2 - \theta_1 = 2\pi/3 \), and \( \theta_2 - \theta_1 = 2\pi/3 \). For panels (a) and (b), we set \( a = 1.43\pi \in (\sqrt{2}\pi, \alpha_\text{crit}) \). As expected, system returns from its initial bimodal equilibrium and trimodal equilibrium, for panels (a) and (b) respectively. In panel (c) we set \( a = 1.43\pi - 0.1 \in (\sqrt{2}\pi, \alpha_\text{crit}) \) and in panel (d) we set \( a = 1.43\pi + 0.1 > \alpha_\text{crit} > \sqrt{2}\pi \). As predicted, in panel (c) we see that the bimodal state is unstable and it is driven to another state, which appears to be the trimodal state (we have added black lines so that one can see that the clusters away from the origin are not at \( \pm \pi \)). In panel (d), we see that the trimodal state is unstable and moves to another state, which seems to be the bimodal state.