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We study localized patterns in an exact mean-field description of a spatially-extended network of quadratic integrate-and-fire (QIF) neurons. We investigate conditions for the existence and stability of localized solutions, so-called \textit{bumps}, and give an analytic estimate for the parameter range where these solutions exist in parameter space, when one or more microscopic network parameters are varied. We develop Galerkin methods for the model equations, which enable numerical bifurcation analysis of stationary and time-periodic spatially-extended solutions. We study the emergence of patterns composed of multiple bumps, which are arranged in a snake-and-ladder bifurcation structure if a homogeneous or heterogeneous synaptic kernel is suitably chosen. Furthermore, we examine time-periodic, spatially-localized solutions (\textit{oscillons}) in the presence of external forcing, and in autonomous, recurrently coupled excitatory and inhibitory networks. In both cases we observe period doubling cascades leading to chaotic oscillations.

In this paper we study the emergence of spatio-temporal localized structures in networks of QIF neurons. We employ a recently derived mean-field description for networks of QIF neurons, whose structure is amenable to numerical computations. Specifically, we develop an inexpensive Galerkin method which exploits this structure and enables numerical bifurcation analysis of both stationary and time-periodic localized structures (termed \textit{bumps} and \textit{oscillons}, respectively). The landscape of stationary localized solutions in the QIF mean field model is strongly affected by the spatial distribution of synaptic connections, as in ordinary neural fields, but are in direct correspondence to localized solutions in microscopic spiking networks. We use this property to construct spatially uniform and non-uniform stationary solutions in parameter space. For suitable choices of synaptic connections, we find that localized states with multiple bumps coexist and are stable. We then investigate oscillons, and discover that the mean field model supports these structures via two basic mechanisms: if an impinging current is applied, then oscillons appear without bifurcation, as temporal modulations of stationary localized states; in coupled networks of excitatory and inhibitory QIF neurons, oscillons originate at a Hopf bifurcation of localized steady states, as predicted for other nonlinear physical media. In both scenarios, oscillons destabilize to period-doubling bifurcations, leading to chaos which is predicted by the low-dimensional Galerkin model, and confirmed by full-scale time simulations, and microscopic network simulations.

I. INTRODUCTION

Localized states in neuronal networks, so-called bumps, are related to working memory\textsuperscript{[1]} and feature selectivity\textsuperscript{[2]}, whereby neurons encoding similar stimuli or features show an increased firing rate for the duration of the related cognitive task. Neural fields are well-known coarse-grained models of spatio-temporal neuronal activity\textsuperscript{[3-6]}, capable of reproducing dynamic phenomena found experimentally, such as traveling waves, temporal oscillations, and spatially localized states\textsuperscript{[7-9]}. A challenge faced in the derivation of neural field models is to establish an accurate mean-field description of the spiking dynamics of the underlying microscopic neural network. Classical neural field models recover the microscopic dynamics only in the limit of slow synapses\textsuperscript{[10,11]} and the derivation of neural mass or neural field description from network models of spiking neurons is still an active area of research\textsuperscript{[12-14]}. In addition, in neural fields the network firing rate is not an emergent quantity, but rather the result of a modelling choice.

Some limitations can be overcome if the microscopic model description is a heterogeneous network of non-uniformly coupled \( \theta \) or QIF neurons, subject to random, Cauchy-distributed background currents. Recently, it has been shown that heterogeneous networks of \( \theta \)- and QIF neurons admit an exact mean field description\textsuperscript{[15-19]}, which has later been extended to spatially-extended networks\textsuperscript{[20,21]}. In the thermodynamic limit, the network admits an exact mean field description in terms of the network mean rate and voltage\textsuperscript{[10,11]}, or in terms of a complex-valued order parameter\textsuperscript{[22-24]}. Here we study a network of \( n \) quadratic integrate-and-fire neurons:

\[
\dot{V}_i = V_i^2 + \eta_i + Js_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{1}
\]

where \( V_i \) is the membrane potential of the \( i \)th neuron, \( \eta_i \)
an intrinsic current, \( s_i \), the synaptic input and \( J \) a global coupling parameter. The \( i \)th neuron emits a spike when \( V_i \) reaches the firing threshold \( V_f \), and \( V_i \) is reset immediately to \( V_r \). Following Reference\(^{[20]}\), we distribute \( \{ \eta_i : i = 1, \ldots, n \} \) according to a Lorentzian distribution using the formula 
\[
\eta_i = \eta + \Delta \tan \left( \frac{\pi}{2} (2j - n - 1) / (n + 1) \right),
\]
where \( \eta \) is the center and \( \Delta \) is the half-width of the Lorentzian distribution, respectively. An important difference in the model considered in the present paper is that neurons are distributed in space, in a domain \( \Omega = [-L, L] \subset \mathbb{R} \), \( L \gg 1 \), at evenly spaced positions \( \{ x_i : i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \} \), and we associate to each lattice point \( x_i \) a random component of the vector \( \{ \eta_i \} \), without repetitions. The synaptic current received by a neuron is determined by the synaptic footprint as follows
\[
s_i(t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} w(x_i, x_j) \sum_{k : t_k < t} \delta(t - t_k^i),
\]
where \( w(x, y) \) models the synaptic coupling strength between neurons from position \( y \) to position \( x \) in the network. The synaptic currents are regarded as instantaneous for simplicity, but it is straightforward to include synaptic delays via temporal convolutions as well\(^{[21]}\).

A neural field model that describes without approximation the average firing rate \( r(x, t) \) and the average membrane potential \( v(x, t) \) of the spatially-extended networks presented above has been developed recently\(^{[22]}\):
\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t r &= \frac{\Delta}{\pi} + 2rv, \\
\partial_t v &= v^2 + \eta + Jw \otimes r - \pi^2 r^2,
\end{align*}
\]
This neural field model inherits the coupling parameter \( J \) and the parameters \( \eta \) and \( \Delta \) from the microscopic, spiking network. The mean field description is exact in the limit \( n \to \infty \) and \( V_f = -V_r \to \infty \). The spatial coupling, or synaptic footprint, is given by the integral operator
\[
[w \otimes r](x) = \int_\Omega w(x, y) r(y) dy, \quad x \in \Omega.
\]
For the concrete calculations presented below, we will assume \( \Omega = \mathbb{R} \) or \( \Omega = (-L/2, L/2] \cong \mathbb{S} \) with \( L \gg 1 \) (a ring with large width). We will study the model with a variety of kernels but, unless stated otherwise, we assume, with a small abuse of notation, \( w(x, y) = w(|x - y|) \) and
\[
w(x) = e^{-|x|} - \frac{1}{4} e^{-|x|^2/2},
\]
hence our default synaptic kernel will depend on the distance between two points in \( \Omega \), and will have long-range inhibition and short-range excitation. With these choices \( w \otimes r \) is a convolution and \( \int_\Omega w(y) dy = 1 \).

The mean model is related to mean field descriptions of networks of theta neurons\(^{[18,20,23,24]}\) and was obtained using the Ott-Antonsen ansatz\(^{[25]}\). It retains the transient dynamics of the microscopic network including spiking synchrony, and has therefore a richer dynamic repertoire than purely rate-based models\(^{[26]}\). An example of localized solutions in this model is shown in Figure 1a, alongside a numerical simulation of the microscopic system of spiking neurons (Figure 1b).

The main aim of the present paper is to study spatiotemporal localized patterns supported by this model, such as the one presented in Figure 1. Our investigation will be primarily numerical and therefore we will also introduce several numerical schemes for the approximation of the mean field model. The paper is structured as follows: in Section II we discuss analytical methods to study stationary solutions and their bifurcations; in Section III we introduce the numerical methods used to perform numerical bifurcation analysis of stationary and time-periodic localized structures, which are presented in Sections IV and V respectively; we make a few concluding remarks in Section VI.

II. STATIONARY SOLUTIONS

Stationary states of Equation (3) are determined by the conditions \( \partial_t r = \partial_t v = 0 \). Bounded solutions with \( r(x) > 0 \) satisfy
\[
0 = \frac{\Delta^2}{4\pi^2 r^2} + \eta + Jw \otimes r - \pi^2 r^2, \quad v = -\frac{\Delta}{2\pi r}.
\]

The model supports both uniform and non-uniform steady states, which we discuss below in further detail.
A. Spatially uniform states

Solutions to (6) depend in general on \( x \). Spatially-uniform solutions, for which \( Jw \otimes r = Jr \), satisfy the quartic equation

\[
    r^4 - \frac{J}{\pi^2} r^3 - \frac{\eta}{\pi^2} r^2 - \frac{\Delta^2}{4\pi^4} = 0,
\]

which has the following four solutions,

\[
    r_{1,2} = J \frac{4\pi^2}{8} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{S} \pm \sqrt{-2p - S - 2q/\sqrt{S}},
\]

\[
    r_{3,4} = J \frac{4\pi^2}{8} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{S} \pm \sqrt{-2p - S + 2q/\sqrt{S}},
\]

where \( p, q, \) and \( S \) are given by

\[
    p = -\frac{\eta}{\pi^2} - \frac{3}{8} \frac{J^2}{\pi^2}, \quad q = -\frac{J^3}{8\pi^6} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{J \eta}{\pi^2},
\]

\[
    S = -\frac{2}{3} p + \frac{1}{3} (Q + R_0/Q),
\]

with

\[
    Q = \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( R_1 + \sqrt{R_1^2 - 4R_0^3} \right) \right)^{1/3},
\]

\[
    R_0 = \frac{\eta^2}{\pi^4} - \frac{3\Delta^2}{\pi^4},
\]

\[
    R_1 = -\frac{\eta^3}{\pi^6} - \frac{27}{4} \frac{J^2 \Delta^2}{\pi^8} - 18 \frac{\eta \Delta^2}{\pi^6},
\]

respectively. Physically-relevant solutions are positive and real, and an inspection of the equations above reveals that \( r_4 \) must be discarded, and the system admits either 1 or 3 homogeneous steady states. At sufficiently small (large) \( \eta \) only one stable fixed point exists, represented by \( r_3 \) (\( r_1 \)); also, there exists an interval in parameter space where the stable solutions \( r_1, r_3 \) coexist with \( r_2 \), which is unstable. The conclusions presented above justify the bifurcation diagram found in References\textsuperscript{22\textendash}23, and reported in Figure 2.

Loci of saddle-node bifurcations in the \((\eta,J)\)-plane can be found by setting \( dq/dr = 0 \) in the first equation in (6), which, combined with (7) yields a parameterization in \( r \)

\[
    \eta_{sn} = -\frac{\pi^2 \Delta^2}{4\eta^2 r^2},
\]

\[
    J_{sn} = 2\pi^2 r + \frac{\Delta^2}{2\eta^2 r^3},
\]

or, more explicitly,

\[
    J_{sn} = \sqrt{2\pi^2} \sqrt{-\eta_{sn} \pm \sqrt{\eta_{sn}^2 - 3\Delta^2}}
    + \frac{-\eta_{sn} \pm \sqrt{\eta_{sn}^2 - 3\Delta^2}}{3/2} \text{3/2},
\]

where \( \pm \) denote two bifurcation branches of saddle-node bifurcation which collide at a cusp

\[
    (\eta_c,J_c) = \left( -\frac{\sqrt{3} \Delta}{3}, \frac{4\pi \sqrt{2\sqrt{3} \Delta}}{3} \right).
\]

B. Turing bifurcations

A first step towards the construction of heterogeneous steady states is the determination of Turing bifurcations, which mark points in parameter space where a spatially uniform solution becomes unstable to spatially periodic patterns. We remark that it is known that spatially-extended networks of QIF or \( \theta \) neurons display this instability\textsuperscript{22\textendash}23, and here we present an analytic determination of the loci of such bifurcation in parameter space. Turing bifurcations of a homogeneous steady state \((r,v)\) can be identified by linear stability analysis of the model equations in Fourier space, which results in the following eigenvalue problem:

\[
    \lambda(k) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{r} \\ \hat{v} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2v \\ J \hat{w}(k) - 2\pi^2 r - 2v \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{r} \\ \hat{v} \end{pmatrix} := A(k) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{r} \\ \hat{v} \end{pmatrix},
\]

where \( \hat{w}(k) \) is the Fourier transform of the connectivity kernel. A sufficient condition for a Turing bifurcation is the existence of a critical wavenumber \( k_c > 0 \) for which \( \det A(k_c) = 0 \), which yields

\[
    r_T = \frac{1}{\pi} \sqrt{-\frac{q}{2(2-w(k_c))} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\eta^2 \hat{w}(k_c)}{(2-w(k_c))^2} - \frac{(2+\hat{w}(k_c))\Delta^2}{2-w(k_c)}}},
\]

and

\[
    J_T = \frac{1}{\hat{w}(k_c)} \left( \frac{\Delta^2}{2\pi^2 r^2_T} + 2\pi^2 r_T \right).
\]

Combining (15) and (16) results in an equation for the loci of the Turing bifurcation in the \((\eta,J)\)-plane. As \( k_c \rightarrow 0 \) the resulting equation recovers (13), since \( \hat{w}(k_c) \rightarrow 1 \). This analytic result agrees well with the numerical calculations of these loci, which will be presented further below.

C. Spatial dynamical system

After studying uniform and spatially-periodic steady states, we move to the construction of localized steady states supported by the models. One strategy to study localized stationary states in nonlinear models posed on \( \mathbb{R} \) is to construct solutions to boundary-value problems derived from the model’s steady state equation\textsuperscript{22\textendash}23. With this approach, localized steady states correspond to homoclinic orbits of a dynamical system in which \( x \) plays the role of time (hence the term spatial dynamics).

In this section we make some preliminary considerations on the spatial dynamics of steady states solutions to (3), although we do not explicitly study the associated spatial-dynamical system, as we will construct our solutions numerically in the following sections. Using the
localized steady state solutions allow us to use spatial dynamics to characterize we regard as the Green’s function of a differential operator.

The steady state equation (6) is recast as

\[ \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} \]

We note that Eq. (19) is formally equivalent to the Amari steady state equation \[\frac{\partial u}{\partial r} = F(u)\] in Amari’s theory \(u\) represents the voltage, whereas in this case \(u\) combines the steady state’s voltage and rate, and scales as \(u \sim v^2 - \eta\) for small \(r\) and \(u \sim \pi^2 r^2 - \eta\) for large \(r\), respectively.

Importantly, the identification with the Amari equation allows us to use spatial dynamics to characterize localized steady state solutions.\[\frac{\partial u}{\partial r} = F(u)\]

The Fourier transform of \(u\) is of the form \(\hat{u}(k) = \frac{P(k^2)}{Q(k^2)}\), with \(P\) and \(Q\) being polynomials, hence the integral kernel can be regarded as the Green’s function of a differential operator. In particular, the bi-exponential kernel \([6]\) leads to the differential equation

\[ u''' = \frac{5}{4} u'' + \frac{1}{4} u - \frac{1}{4} f(u) + \frac{7}{4} [f(u)]'' = 0, \]

where a prime denotes differentiation with respect to \(x\). The equation above can be cast as a 4D, first-order spatial dynamical system in the vector \((u, u', u'', u''')\), which we omit here for brevity. To construct localized solutions to \[\frac{\partial u}{\partial r} = F(u)\] we proceed in the same spirit as \[\frac{\partial u}{\partial r} = F(u)\] to each homogeneous steady state of \([3]\) corresponds one value \(r_j\) in \([8]\), and hence one value \(u_j\) in \([17]\), and one constant solution \((u_j, 0, 0, 0)\) to \([20]\); in addition, there exists a region in parameter space where \(r_1\) and \(r_3\) coexist and are stable (see also Figure \([2a]\)). A localized steady state of \([3]\) is identified with a bounded, sufficiently regular function \(u: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\) which satisfies \([20]\) with boundary conditions

\[ \lim_{x \to -\infty} (u(x), u'(x), u''(x), u'''(x)) = (u_1, 0, 0, 0), \]

\[ \lim_{x \to +\infty} (u(x), u'(x), u''(x), u'''(x)) = (u_3, 0, 0, 0). \]

Furthermore, we note that the quantity

\[ H(u, u', u'', u''', x) = u''' u'' - \frac{1}{2} (u''')^2 - \frac{5}{8} (u')^2 + \frac{1}{8} u^2 \]

is conserved in the sense that, if \([20]\) holds, then

\[ \frac{d}{dx} H(u(x), u'(x), u''(x), u'''(x), x) = 0. \]

Therefore, we expect to construct a localized stationary state in a region of parameter space where \(H(u_1, 0, 0, 0, 0) = H(u_3, 0, 0, 0, 0)\). With a slight abuse of notation, we write this condition in terms of the variable \(r\), as \(H(r_1) = H(r_3)\), where \(H\) is given by

\[ H(r) = -2\eta r - \frac{3}{2} J r^2 + \frac{4}{3} J^3. \]

In analogy with the literature mentioned above, we called Maxwell points the values on the \((\eta, J)\)-plane where the condition \(H(r_1) = H(r_3)\) is met. We display the Maxwell point for our standard parameter set in Figure \([2b]\), and we plot the locus of Maxwell points and the bistability region in Figure \([2c]\).

III. NUMERICAL SCHEMES

As anticipated in the previous sections, stationary states beyond onset are computed numerically, hence we present in this section several numerical schemes used in the upcoming computations. In preparation for presenting the schemes, we rewrite the model as an ODE on a function space. To simplify the notation we apply in this section the scaling \(r \to r/\pi, J \to \pi J\) to \([3]\), and obtain

\[ \dot{r} = \Delta + 2 r v, \]

\[ \dot{v} = \eta + v^2 - r^2 + W r, \]

\[ r \to r/\pi, J \to \pi J. \]
where $W$ is the integral operator defined as $(W r)(x) = J(w \otimes r)(x) = \int_{\Omega} w(x, y) r(y) dy$. In the system above we assume $r, v : \mathbb{R} \to L^2_p(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$ (also denoted by $L^2_p(\Omega)$), that is, at each time $t$, $r(t)$ and $v(t)$ belong to a weighted Lebesgue space of complex-valued functions defined on $\Omega$, with inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \int_{\Omega} f(x) g^*(x) \rho(x) dx,$$

and norm $\|f\|_\rho = \langle f, f \rangle^{1/2}$. Note that the subscript $\rho$ will be omitted when $\rho(x) \equiv 1$. We assume that, once complemented with initial conditions, system \cite{22} defines a well-posed Cauchy problem on $L^2_p(\Omega) \times L^2_p(\Omega)$.

A. Galerkin Schemes

Galerkin schemes are derived by introducing a complete orthogonal basis $\{\varphi_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ for the weighted space $L^2_p(\Omega)$, and seeking an approximation in the $n$-dimensional subspace spanned by $\{\varphi_i : i \in \Lambda_n\}$, where $\Lambda_n$ is an index set with $n$ elements, as follows

$$r_n(x, t) = \sum_{i \in \Lambda_n} R_i(t) \varphi_i(x), \quad v_n(x, t) = \sum_{i \in \Lambda_n} V_i(t) \varphi_i(x).$$

A Galerkin scheme for \cite{22} is then given by

$$\langle \varphi_i, -\dot{r}_n + \Delta + 2 r_n v_n \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \varphi_i, -\dot{v}_n + \eta + v_n^2 - r_n + W r_n \rangle = 0, \quad i \in \Lambda_n,$$

that is,

$$\dot{R}_i = \alpha_i \Delta + 2 \sum_{j, k \in \Lambda_n} \gamma_{ijk} R_j V_k,$$

$$\dot{V}_i = \alpha_i \eta + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_n} \beta_{ij} R_j + 2 \sum_{j, k \in \Lambda_n} \gamma_{ijk} (V_j V_k - R_j R_k),$$

for $i \in \Lambda_n$, with coefficients given by

$$\alpha_i = \langle \varphi_i, 1 \rangle, \quad \beta_{ij} = \langle \varphi_i, W \varphi_j \rangle, \quad \gamma_{ijk} = \langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \varphi_k \rangle.$$

1. Fourier-Galerkin Scheme

When $\Omega = (-L/2, L/2) \cong \mathbb{S}$, the functions $r(t)$ and $v(t)$ are $L$-periodic. Therefore we choose the Fourier basis $\varphi_j(x) = \exp(i j 2\pi x / L)$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, which is a complete orthogonal basis for $L^2(\Omega)$. The index set for this case is $\Lambda_n = \{ -n/2, \ldots, n/2 - 1 \}$ with $n$ even. Exploiting the trigonometric properties of the Fourier basis, we obtain

$$\alpha_i = \begin{cases} L & \text{if } i = 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \quad \gamma_{ijk} = \begin{cases} L & \text{if } i + j + k = 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

In passing we note that $\beta_{ij}$ can also be expressed compactly, in terms of the Fourier coefficients of the kernel $w$, if the operator $W$ is convolutional. In addition, requiring $r$ and $v$ to be real-valued implies $(R_i, V_i) = (R^*_{-i}, V^*_{-i})$. We call this method the Fourier-Galerkin scheme.

2. Hermite-Galerkin Scheme

When $\Omega = \mathbb{R}$, a natural basis for the Galerkin scheme is given by the Hermite polynomials

$$\varphi_j(x) = H_j(x) = (-1)^j \exp(x^2) \frac{d^j}{dx^j} \exp(-x^2),$$

which are a complete orthogonal set for $L^2_p(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ with weight $\rho(x) = \exp(-x^2)$. For this scheme $\Lambda_n = \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$. To avoid problems with the numerical evaluations of $\varphi_j$ for large $|x|$, we derive an alternative scheme, which uses inner products with weight $\rho(x) \equiv 1$, as the Fourier Galerkin scheme. We seek a solution to \cite{22} in the form

$$r = R_0 + \tilde{r}, \quad v = V_0 + \tilde{v},$$

with $R_0$, $V_0$ constant in $x$, and $\tilde{r}, \tilde{v} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$. This leads to the system

$$\dot{R}_0 = \Delta + 2 R_0 V_0,$$

$$\dot{V}_0 = \eta + V_0^2 - R_0^2 + J R_0,$$

$$\dot{\tilde{r}} = 2 R_0 \tilde{v} + 2 V_0 \tilde{r} + 2 \tilde{v} \tilde{r},$$

$$\dot{\tilde{v}} = 2 V_0 \tilde{v} - 2 R_0 \tilde{r} + \tilde{v} \tilde{r}^2 + W \tilde{r},$$

in which the homogeneous background dynamics for $(R_0, V_0)$ is decoupled from $(\tilde{r}, \tilde{v})$, and follows the spatially-clamped QIF mean field. Since the Hermite functions

$$\varphi_j(x) = \exp(-x^2/2) H_{j-1}(x), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0},$$

are an orthogonal set for $L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$, an approximation to $\tilde{r}, \tilde{v}$ is sought in the space spanned by $\varphi_j$, with $j \in \Lambda_n = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, giving the scheme

$$\dot{R}_0 = \Delta + 2 R_0 V_0,$$

$$\dot{V}_0 = \eta + V_0^2 - R_0^2 + J R_0,$$

$$\dot{R}_i = 2 \sum_{j \in \Lambda_n} (R_0 V_j + V_0 R_j) + 2 \sum_{j, k \in \Lambda_n} \gamma_{ijk} R_j V_k,$$

$$\dot{V}_i = \sum_{j \in \Lambda_n} [2 V_0 V_j + (\beta_{ij} - 2 R_0) R_j]$$

$$+ \sum_{j, k \in \Lambda_n} \gamma_{ijk} (V_j V_k - R_j R_k),$$

for $i \in \Lambda_n$. We call this method the Hermite–Galerkin scheme.

B. Fourier Collocation Scheme

A Fourier collocation scheme can be derived in the case $\Omega = (-L/2, L/2) \cong \mathbb{S}$. This method, which has been used in the past for neural field models, \cite{21} and
the QIF model represents \((r_n, v_n)\) by its values at the gridpoints \(x_j = -L + 2Lj/n, j \in \Lambda_n = \{1, \ldots, n\}\),
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{R}_i &= \Delta + 2R_iV_i, \\
\dot{V}_i &= \eta + V_i^2 + R_i^2 + (W r_n)_i,
\end{align*}
\]
and evaluates \((W r_n)_i\), either with a quadrature rule or, more efficiently, with a pseudospectral evaluation if \(W\) is convolutional.

C. Numerical considerations

To the best of our knowledge, the methods presented above are novel, and we leave the analysis of the numerical properties of these schemes to a separate publication. The calculations presented here have been tested against event-driven simulations of large network of spiking neurons. We employ our schemes as follows: the Fourier collocation scheme with \(n = 5000\) is generally used for time simulations, to obtain accurate initial guesses for the continuation. However, we observed that time-periodic orbits are reproduced with a similar accuracy by the Hermite–Galerkin scheme with just \(n = 50\) modes, hence we select this scheme to continue periodic orbits. Finally, we use the Fourier–Galerkin scheme with \(n = 200\) for bifurcation analysis of steady states on large domains, when solutions are non-localized.

IV. STATIONARY LOCALIZED SOLUTIONS

We use the numerical schemes presented in the previous section to study the bifurcation structure of stationary localized solution to the mean field model. We initially study the model with our default excitatory-inhibitory kernel \([5]\), and then show that a snaking bifurcation scenario is supported when the kernel is switched to a homogeneous oscillatory kernel, or to a kernel with harmonic heterogeneities, similarly to what is found for Amari neural field models.

A. Local excitation, lateral inhibition kernel

We set \(w\) as in \([5]\), generate a stationary localized solution by numerically integrating the model equations in time, and then implement the Fourier–Galerkin scheme to continue the localized solutions in \(\eta\), using AUTO.

In Figure 3 we show the bifurcation diagram of localized solutions. Across a range of parameters, these occur as a pair of one wide, stable solution and one narrow, unstable solution. Using the Fourier basis, it can be shown that the stable solution branch approaches the Maxwell point asymptotically, and solutions grow wider, which resemble two (stationary) interacting wave fronts. Because of the periodic boundary conditions, the solution branch grows larger again and forms another stable/unstable solution pair of locally low activity (not shown). The latter could be regarded as stationary versions of traveling anti-pulses reported in refs.\([7,13]\).

Because stable solutions are of particular interest, we present a two-parameter bifurcation diagram (Figure 4) of the saddle-node bifurcations that delimit the branch of stable solutions. As expected, the saddle nodes of localized states enclose the Maxwell point. In addition, saddle nodes of localized and uniform steady states meet at two separate cusps, as shown in Figure 4b.

The bifurcation behavior of localized solutions described above is robust to changes in coupling parameters but, as we shall see below, it is strongly affected by changes in the kernel.

B. Snaking with homogeneous kernel

Homoclinic snaking is a phenomenon that describes the formation of multiple, coexisting localized solutions

FIG. 3. (a) Bifurcation diagram in \(\eta\) of localized solutions (black), periodic solutions (green), and uniform solutions (blue). (b) Exemplary profiles of unstable narrow (1), stable narrow (2), and unstable wide (3) localized solutions, close to the Maxwell point (vertical line). Parameters: \(\Delta = 2, J = 15\sqrt{\Delta}\).

FIG. 4. (a) The parameter space in which stable localized solutions exist is delimited by loci of saddle-node bifurcations. They can be approximated by the saddle-node bifurcations of spatially uniform solutions, and the Maxwell point. (b) Inset of the left panel, showing additionally the loci of Turing bifurcations and saddle-node bifurcations of periodic solutions. The saddle-nodes of the bump solutions form a cusp where the Turing bifurcation changes from supercritical to subcritical. Parameters: \(\Delta = 2\).
in spatially-extended models. Steady states are arranged in branches of intertwined snaking bifurcation diagrams, connected via ladders.\(^{28,30,31}\) Adopting the spatial-dynamics approach outlined above, localized solutions are interpreted as homoclinic orbits to a fixed point. Snaking solution branches correspond to symmetries of the problems, which are broken along the ladder branches.\(^{32,33,35,36,43–45}\) This scenario is not limited to PDEs, but have also been studied in the non-local Swift–Hohenberg equation\(^{22}\), as well as in neural field models.\(^{22,24,26,28,29,30,32,34,35,39–41}\)

In the simplest setting, localized snaking solutions are found in regions of parameter space where there is bistability between a stationary homogeneous state and a periodic state. In nonlocal neural fields, homoclinic snaking has been observed with the following homogeneous damped-oscillatory kernel\(^{41}\)

\[
w(x) = \frac{1 + b^2}{4b} e^{-b|x|} (b \sin |x| + \cos x),
\]

which we now adopt also for the QIF neural field. This kernel leads to a sub-critical Turing bifurcation of the lower stable branch of uniform solutions, from which an unstable branch of spatially-periodic solutions emerges. This branch undergoes a saddle-node bifurcation, where spatially-periodic solutions become stable. Eventually, the branch connects to the upper stable branch of uniform solutions, see Figure 5.

As anticipated, spatially localized snaking solutions are found in this region of parameter space, and they are arranged in a typical snakes-and-ladders bifurcation structure, which is displayed in Figure 6.

C. Snaking with heterogeneous kernel

It is known that snaking bifurcation scenarios can be triggered by heterogeneities in the underlying evolution equations. Examples discussed in the literature include the Swift–Hohenberg\(^{10}\), Amari\(^{13}\) and Ginzburg-Landau\(^{17}\) equations. In neuroscience models, heterogeneities are naturally introduced via harmonic perturbations of a homogeneous (distance-dependent) kernel, which break the translational invariance of the problem. In Reference\(^{33}\) we have shown that the following kernel leads to snaking in the Amari model

\[
w(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-|x-y|} (1 + a \cos(ky)),
\]

and we therefore investigate the effect of this kernel on the QIF mean field model.

In the absence of spatial forcing \((a = 0)\), a system with exponential connectivity does not yield stable localized solutions (see Figure 7). In the presence of modulation, we find snaking branches that oscillate around the branch obtained for \(a = 0\) (see Figure 8). Furthermore, for small values of \(a\), the snaking width increases proportionally to the value of \(a\) (not shown). These findings indicate that the snaking phenomenon in the QIF mean field are entirely determined by the kernel choice, as in the Amari case.
field model with $A = 0$, upon imposing a small-amplitude forcing, $A \ll 1$. We therefore select the default kernel [3], set $\eta = -10$, for which the model with $A = 0$ supports one stable (wide) and one unstable (narrow) bump (see Figure 3), and continue time-periodic solutions to (25) in $A > 0$ for $\omega = 4$, close to the network’s resonant frequency [25]:

One stable and one unstable branch of oscillons emerge from $A = 0$, as shown in Figure 9 and connect at a saddle-node bifurcation. The stable branch undergoes a sequence of period-doubling bifurcations leading to chaos, and examples of a period-doubled solution and a chaotic solution are shown in Figure 9, demonstrating the correspondence between the mean field model and the spiking network model.

In a recent study we have investigated the effect of periodic forcing on a population of excitatory spiking neurons without spatial interaction [26], whose solutions correspond to the spatially-homogeneous states of the present model. In that context it was shown that a sufficiently large forcing amplitude is able to suppress homogeneous oscillations. Here we report that the same statement holds true for forced oscillons: no localized time-periodic solution is found to the right of the saddle-node bifurcation in Figure 9. We therefore select the default kernel (5), whose solutions correspond to the formation of oscillons in the QIF mean-field model.

As mentioned above, a necessary ingredient for oscillons is the presence of oscillatory bifurcations. These bifurcations are typically been observed as large-amplitude structures, hence they are conjectured to form via a subcritical Hopf bifurcation of a heterogeneous, spatially-localized steady state. This conjecture, however, has not yet been confirmed by numerical bifurcation analysis which, in contrast to direct numerical simulations, allows to track both stable and unstable states.

Here we employ the Hermite–Galerkin scheme to study the formation of oscillons in the QIF mean-field model. As mentioned above, a necessary ingredient for oscillons is the presence of oscillatory bifurcations. These bifurcations are precluded in one-populations networks of QIF neurons but, as we shall see, are possible in two-population models, therefore we turn our attention to the following network of coupled excitatory and inhibitory neurons.

### V. Oscillons

Various nonlinear models including chemical, fluid-dynamical, and particle systems, support time-periodic, spatially-localized states termed oscillons (see Reference [54] and references therein). A comprehensive theory for the existence and bifurcation structure of such solutions is the subject of experimental, numerical, and analytical investigations. We study oscillons in spatially-extended QIF mean-fields in the two main settings where they are observed in other media: (i) a non-autonomous setting, whereby oscillons emerge as the medium is subject to a homogeneous, exogenous, time-periodic forcing; (ii) an autonomous setting, whereby oscillons emerge spontaneously as one of the model parameters is varied.

#### A. Oscillons induced by harmonic forcing

We setup a QIF neural field subject to a time-dependent, homogeneous, sinusoidal forcing with frequency $\omega$,

$$\partial_t r = \frac{\Delta}{\pi} + 2rv,$$

$$\partial_t v = v^2 + Jw \otimes r - \pi^2 r^2 + \eta + A \sin(\omega t),$$

and cast it in the following, equivalent autonomous model formulation to perform numerical bifurcation analysis

$$\partial_t r = \frac{\Delta}{\pi} + 2rv,$$

$$\partial_t v = v^2 + Jw \otimes r - \pi^2 r^2 + \eta + A \xi,$$

$$\dot{\xi} = \xi + \omega \xi - (\xi^2 + \zeta^2)\xi,$$

$$\dot{\zeta} = \zeta - \omega \xi - (\xi^2 + \zeta^2)\zeta.$$  

(25)

Note that the numerical framework proposed here is applicable also if the forcing is heterogeneous.

In this setting we expect oscillons to emerge without bifurcation from a localised steady state of the QIF mean field model with $A = 0$, upon imposing a small-amplitude forcing, $A \ll 1$. We therefore select the default kernel [3], set $\eta = -10$, for which the model with $A = 0$ supports one stable (wide) and one unstable (narrow) bump (see Figure 3), and continue time-periodic solutions to (25) in $A > 0$ for $\omega = 4$, close to the network’s resonant frequency [25].

One stable and one unstable branch of oscillons emerge from $A = 0$, as shown in Figure 9 and connect at a saddle-node bifurcation. The stable branch undergoes a sequence of period-doubling bifurcations leading to chaos, and examples of a period-doubled solution and a chaotic solution are shown in Figure 9, demonstrating the correspondence between the mean field model and the spiking network model.

In a recent study we have investigated the effect of periodic forcing on a population of excitatory spiking neurons without spatial interaction [26], whose solutions correspond to the spatially-homogeneous states of the present model. In that context it was shown that a sufficiently large forcing amplitude is able to suppress homogeneous oscillations. Here we report that the same statement holds true for forced oscillons: no localized time-periodic solution is found to the right of the saddle-node bifurcation in Figure 9, where the attractor is a spatially-homogeneous, time-periodic state, which can be found by continuing in $A$ the low-activity uniform steady state (not shown).

#### B. Spontaneous oscillons in coupled networks of excitatory and inhibitory neurons

In the second scenario, oscillons occur in autonomous systems. Direct numerical simulations of reaction diffusion systems display oscillons in the proximity of codimension-two Turing–Hopf bifurcation of the homogeneous steady state. Oscillons in these systems have typically been observed as large-amplitude structures, hence they are conjectured to form via a subcritical Hopf bifurcation of a heterogeneous, spatially-localized steady state. This conjecture, however, has not yet been confirmed by numerical bifurcation analysis which, in contrast to direct numerical simulations, allows to track both stable and unstable states.

Here we employ the Hermite–Galerkin scheme to study the formation of oscillons in the QIF mean-field model. As mentioned above, a necessary ingredient for oscillons is the presence of oscillatory bifurcations. These bifurcations are precluded in one-populations networks of QIF neurons but, as we shall see, are possible in two-population models, therefore we turn our attention to the following network of coupled excitatory and inhibitory neurons.
populations

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{r}_e &= \frac{\Delta}{\pi} + 2r_e v_e, \\
\dot{v}_e &= v_e^2 + \eta_e + J_e w_e \otimes r_e - J_i r_i w_i \otimes r_i - \pi^2 r_e^2, \\
\tau_i^2 \dot{r}_i &= \frac{\Delta}{\pi} + 2\tau_i r_i v_i, \\
\tau_i \dot{v}_i &= v_i^2 + \eta_i + J_e w_e \otimes r_e - J_i r_i w_i \otimes r_i - \pi^2 r_i v_i^2.
\end{align*}
\]

The subscripts \(e, i\) indicate whether a variable or parameter refers to the excitatory or inhibitory population, respectively; the two populations have, for simplicity, the same heterogeneity parameter \(\Delta\), but they have possibly different membrane time constants and average background currents. In single-population mean fields, excitation and inhibition are artificially lumped into a single excitatory-inhibitory kernel (see for instance [5], [23], and [24]), whereas in the new, more realistic model the kernels are separate

\[
w_e(x) = e^{-|x|}, \quad w_i(x) = \frac{1}{4} e^{-|x|/2}. \tag{26}
\]

The connectivity parameters are chosen to be \(J_e = J_i = J\) to recover a similar setting used in the lumped model. In Figure 10 we show the bifurcation diagram of localized solutions using \(\eta_e\) as bifurcation parameter. The bifurcation structure is similar to the lumped model, with the exception that the range of parameters for which stable solutions exist is narrower. This computation confirms that a stationary bump is supported by the two-population network. In order to hunt for oscillons, we continue the solution for \(\eta_e = -10\) in the parameter \(\tau_i\): the bump becomes unstable at a subcritical Hopf bifurcation at \(\tau_i \approx 1.14\), restabilizes at a saddle-node bifurcation, and undergoes a sequence of saddle-node bifurcations leading to a torus bifurcation. The branch eventually restabilizes at a further saddle-node, leading to a period-doubling cascade which initiates around \(\tau_i \approx 1.26\), and to chaos at \(\tau_i > 1.29\) (Figure 10).

In Figure 10 we also show numerical examples of a stable period-doubled solution at \(\tau_i = 1.28\) and a chaotic solution at \(\tau_i = 1.295\). We do not observe oscillons beyond \(\tau_i = 1.3\). Chaotic solutions can also be reproduced in the spiking network model, see Figure 11.

VI. DISCUSSION

We introduced a framework to study localized solutions in a neural field model that was recently derived as an exact representation of the mean field dynamics of networks of spiking neurons. Although this model does not permit closed-form solutions such as the Amari model with Heaviside firing rates, we show that it is possible to give an analytical estimate for the range of model parameters for which stable localized solutions exist. The structure of the model equations permit the straightforward use of Galerkin methods, which unlike the Amari model has a linear nonlocal term.

We have demonstrated that stationary equations can be transformed into a formulation that is equivalent to the stationary Amari model, provided an effective firing-rate function is defined. The significance of such a firing rate is chiefly mathematical: the mean field possesses a rate variable, which is combined with the voltage variable in the effective firing rate; however, this transformation allows to map out patterned steady states of the mean field model using the same toolkit available for the Amari formulation. In both models localized solutions emerge subcritically from a branch of homogeneous steady states, which then restabilize at a saddle node bifurcation. In the Amari model, this behavior is parametrized by a firing threshold, whereas here we use the average excitability
FIG. 10. (a) Bifurcation diagram of bump solutions in the E-I network (black), and spatially uniform solutions (blue) for $\tau_i = 1$. (b) Bifurcation diagram of emerging limit cycles (showing maxima of $R_1(t)$) using $\tau_i$ as bifurcation parameter. H: Hopf bifurcation, S: saddle node bifurcation, T: torus bifurcation, P: period doubling bifurcation. Parameters: $\eta_e = \eta_i = -10$, $J_e = J_i = 15 \sqrt{\Delta}$, $\Delta = 2$.

of the network to map out solutions. However, there is a correspondence between the excitability of the model used here and the firing threshold in the Amari model, in the sense that an increase in the firing threshold in the latter corresponds to a decrease in the excitability in the former. In addition, techniques developed for piecewise-linear firing rate functions in the Amari model could be adapted to work for steady states in the QIF mean field model, using the correspondence described above. Furthermore, all branches of stationary solutions computed in this paper, including the snaking branches, also occur in standard rate-based models. The crucial difference lies in the transient dynamics of the two models, which makes the model considered here dynamically richer and more realistic.

The development of a Galerkin method opened up the possibility to study oscillons using numerical bifurcation analysis. We focused here on sinusoidal forcing of bump solutions, which is a proxy of oscillations ubiquitous in neuronal systems. In previous work, the neural mass version of this model was studied in terms of its response to oscillatory forcing in various frequency bands, and the present paper makes this exploration feasible also in the spatially-extended model. We leave this exploration to a future publication.

In coupled networks of excitatory and inhibitory populations, a small change in the inhibitory membrane time scale can have a significant effect on the existence and dynamics of bump solutions, and can elicit oscillons. This was demonstrated for instantaneous synapses, and it remains to be seen how the dynamics changes when synaptic delays are introduced to the model. Another natural extension would be to examine coupled multi-layer neural field models, which are known to give rise to localized bump solutions when neither layer does in isolation.

The Galerkin numerical methods derived in this paper can be applied directly to more general spatially-extended models of QIF networks, such as the ones mentioned above. For instance, adding a synaptic variable can be accounted for with an additional Galerkin expansion, and $n$ scalar variables per additional evolution equation.

Single population, neural mass QIF models with chemical as well as electrical synapses have recently been developed, and it was found that oscillations originate at Hopf bifurcations. Spatially-extended versions of this model would then have the possibility of forming oscillons with a single population, although it is not clear whether Hopf bifurcations of bumps will occur near Hopf bifurcations of homogeneous states, which are the ones mapped in Reference.

Understanding how slow-fast temporal scales are generated by the discrete network is an open question, which has recently been addressed in networks of sparsely-coupled networks of QIF neurons. Employing our numerical methodology to these macroscopic mean fields is also possible, and would enable to study how such slow-fast phenomena occur in more realistic, spatially-
FIG. 11. Chaotic solution in spiking network. (a) Rastergram of excitatory population. (b) Rastergram of inhibitory population. (c) Excitatory and inhibitory spike rates averaged on interval $-1 < x < 1$ and sliding window in $t$ (width $10^{-3}$). (d) Phase portrait of spike rates in (c). Parameters: $\tau_e = \tau_i = -10$, $J_e = J_i = 15\sqrt{\Delta}$, $\Delta = 2$, $\tau_i = 1.295$.

extended networks.
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