

# Periodic orbits of delay equations with monotone feedback and even-odd symmetry

Alejandro López Nieto

Institut für Mathematik, Freie Universität Berlin

version of February 18, 2022

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Basic theory and main results</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The zero number and the spectral property</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Proof of lemma 2.1</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Proof of theorem A</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Proof of theorem B</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Examples and conclusion</b>	<b>24</b>

## Abstract

We study the periodic solutions of the scalar delay equation

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), x(t-1)),$$

where  $f$ , regular enough, satisfies even-odd symmetries and is strictly monotone in the delayed component. Our results fully characterize the set of periodic solutions and their stability in terms of a time map defined for a planar ordinary differential equation. The presentation is the uniqueness counterpart of existence results developed by Kaplan and Yorke in 1974.

# 1 Introduction

Time maps are a standard tool in the treatment of two point boundary value problems, see [BC84, Sch90], and play a fundamental role in the study of global dynamics in reaction diffusion systems [FR91, FRW04]. In this work we deal with their periodic counterpart: the period map. Our main results, theorems A and B, are the delay equations analogues of the ones in [FRW04] for rotating waves of scalar reaction diffusion systems on the circle.

Theorem A associates a period map  $T_f$  to the delay differential equation (DDE)

$$(1.1) \quad \dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), x(t-1)),$$

where  $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$  has even-odd symmetry and satisfies a monotone feedback assumption. The associated period map is then used to characterize the branches of periodic solutions in (1.1) and gives an insight of the mechanisms generating these patterns, in infinite dimensions. Theorem B is a refinement of the spectral theory developed in [MPN13], in the setting of theorem A. More specifically, we develop a way to read the hyperbolicity of the periodic solutions and their unstable dimension from the local growth of the period map  $T_f$ .

The note is structured as follows, in section 2 we introduce basic concepts concerning periodic solutions and their stability, immediately after, we present previous results by Kaplan and Yorke [KY74] on existence of periodic orbits. Then we define our symmetry and monotone feedback assumptions for the nonlinearity  $f$  in the DDE (1.1). After defining an associated, planar, ordinary differential equation (ODE) (2.7), the introduction of the period map  $T_f$  is justified by elementary phase plane analysis in lemma 2.1. Once this is all set we introduce the main results; theorem A can then be viewed as a converse to the existence results by Kaplan and Yorke. Theorem B, on the other hand, provides a stability criterion for the periodic solutions obtained in theorem A.

Section 3 constitutes a summary of the techniques required in proving both theorems A and B and follows the results in [MPS96b, MPS96a, MPN13]. The main tool is the *zero number* for DDE with monotone feedback. As a consequence, periodic orbits of equation (1.1) can not intersect when projected onto the  $(x(t), x(t-1))$  plane, this is the main argument in proving theorem A. Additionally, the zero number induces a spectral property, which is fundamental in the proof of theorem B. To be more precise, the spectral property reduces the possible values of the unstable dimension of a periodic orbit to two, out of which the derivative of the period map  $T_f$  tells us how to choose one.

Sections 4, 5 and 6 contain the proofs of lemma 2.1 and theorems A and B, respectively.

Finally, section 7 is a discussion on the immediate consequences of our findings, illustrated with examples.

**Acknowledgement:** I am deeply grateful to Bernold Fiedler and the group for Nonlinear Dynamics at the Free University of Berlin for their constant encouragement and for many fruitful discussions. In particular I would like to thank Babette de Wolff for reading and commenting the manuscript. This work was supported by DFG/Germany through SFB910 project A4.

## 2 Basic theory and main results

Let  $C$  denote the Banach space  $C^0([-1, 0], \mathbb{R})$ , equipped with the supremum norm. A curve  $x : [-1, t^*) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $t^* > 0$  is a *solution* of the delay differential equation (DDE) (1.1) with *initial condition*  $\phi \in C$ , if  $x(\theta) = \phi(\theta)$  for  $\theta \in [-1, 0]$  and  $x(t)$  satisfies the differential equality (1.1) for  $t \in [0, t^*)$  where  $\dot{x}(0)$  refers to the right-side derivative at 0. Following [HVL93, DvGVLW95] the solutions of (1.1) are described by a *local solution semiflow*

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} S(t) : C &\rightarrow C \\ x(\theta) =: x_0(\theta) &\mapsto x_t(\theta) := x(t + \theta) \quad \text{for } \theta \in [-1, 0]. \end{aligned}$$

The *orbit* of a solution  $x(t)$  to the DDE (1.1), with a maximal interval of existence  $I$ , is the set

$$(2.2) \quad \Gamma := \{x_t \mid t \in I\} \subset C.$$

A nonconstant solution  $x^*(t)$  of the DDE (1.1) is called *periodic* if there exists a number  $p > 0$  such that

$$(2.3) \quad x^*(t + p) = x^*(t).$$

We call any such  $p$  a *period* of  $x^*(t)$ , the smallest  $p > 0$  satisfying the equality (2.3) is called the *minimal period* of  $x^*(t)$ .

Denote the orbit of  $x^*(t)$  by  $\Gamma$ , the stability of the invariant set  $\Gamma$  is determined by the spectrum of the linearization of the *time- $p$*  map,  $S(p)$ , along the orbit  $\Gamma$ .

The *monodromy operator*  $M$  of  $\Gamma$  is defined as

$$(2.4) \quad M := D_{x_0^*} S(p) : C \rightarrow C.$$

Here  $D_{x_0^*}$  denotes the Fréchet derivative at  $x_0^*(\theta) = x^*(\theta)$  for  $\theta \in [-1, 0]$ . By elementary functional analysis, there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $M^n$  is a compact operator. As a consequence the spectrum  $\text{spec}(M)$  can consist solely of eigenvalues, called *Floquet multipliers*, with finite algebraic multiplicity, and 0.

Denote by  $\partial_j$ , the partial derivative in the  $j$ -th component. Note that  $M$  coincides with the time- $p$  solution operator of the linear, non-autonomous equation

$$(2.5) \quad \dot{y}(t) = \partial_1 f(x^*(t), x^*(t-1))y(t) + \partial_2 f(x^*(t), x^*(t-1))y(t-1).$$

In particular,  $x^*(t)$  is a solution with period  $p$  of (2.5), which implies that  $1 \in \text{spec}(M)$ . The periodic orbit  $\Gamma$  is called *hyperbolic* if the *trivial Floquet multiplier*  $1 \in \text{spec}(M)$  has geometric multiplicity 1.

We characterize the local stability of the periodic orbit  $\Gamma$  in terms of its Floquet multipliers. More precisely,  $\Gamma$  is called *asymptotically stable* if it is hyperbolic and all of its Floquet multipliers, except the trivial eigenvalue 1, lie inside the closed complex unit ball.  $\Gamma$  is called *unstable* if any of its Floquet multipliers lies outside the closed complex unit ball. The *unstable dimension* or *Morse index* of the periodic orbit  $\Gamma$ , denoted  $i(\Gamma)$ , is the number of Floquet multipliers lying outside the closed complex unit ball. By definition,  $i(\Gamma) > 0$  if, and only if,  $\Gamma$  is unstable, conversely, if  $\Gamma$  is hyperbolic then it is asymptotically stable if, and only if,  $i(\Gamma) = 0$ .

Periodic solutions are usually hard to spot and the methods used for equation (1.1) often involve topological arguments or a functional analytical approach [MP88, Nus74] that, although powerful, often incur a loss of information.

In contrast, Kaplan and Yorke [KY74] took a planar approach and gave sufficient conditions for the existence of periodic solutions with symmetries in the DDE (1.1). They studied the special case

$$(2.6) \quad \dot{x}(t) = g(x(t-1)),$$

where  $g \in C^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  is odd and satisfies  $\xi g(\xi) < 0$  for  $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ .

Indeed, assuming that  $x^*(t)$  is a periodic solution of (2.6) with period 4 and satisfying the odd symmetry assumption  $x^*(t-2) = -x^*(t)$ , the curve  $(x^*(t), x^*(t-1))$  has period 4 and solves the planar Hamiltonian ODE

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{\xi} &= g(\eta), \\ \dot{\eta} &= -g(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, given a periodic solution  $(\xi^*(t), \eta^*(t))$  of the ODE (2.7) such that  $\xi^*(t-2) = -\xi^*(t)$ ,  $x^*(t) := \xi^*(t)$  solves the DDE (2.6).

In this way, at the expense of requiring symmetry, it is possible to show the existence of periodic solutions in (2.6), by solving a low dimensional ODE. Moreover, we can extract valuable information like the minimal period, amplitude, shape or frequency of oscillation around 0. However, the method in [KY74] doesn't address the question

$$(Q) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{Do all of the periodic solutions of the DDE (2.6)} \\ \text{solve the planar ODE (2.7)?} \end{array}$$

In general, the statement is false. For instance, the period doubling bifurcations found in [DILW02] immediately discard any planar origin of the periodic solutions. However, under additional assumptions we find an affirmative answer to the question. We consider the problem for the family of DDE (1.1) whose nonlinearity  $f$  has even-odd symmetry and, additionally, monotone feedback, in the following sense.

The set of nonlinearities with *positive monotone feedback* and *even-odd symmetry*  $\mathfrak{X}^+$  is

$$(2.8) \quad \mathfrak{X}^+ := \left\{ f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}) \mid \begin{array}{l} f(\xi, \eta) = f(-\xi, \eta) = -f(\xi, -\eta) \text{ and} \\ \partial_2 f(\xi, \eta) > 0, \text{ for all } (\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \end{array} \right\}.$$

Analogously, the set of nonlinearities with *negative monotone feedback* and *even-odd symmetry*  $\mathfrak{X}^-$  is

$$(2.9) \quad \mathfrak{X}^- := \left\{ f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}) \mid \begin{array}{l} f(\xi, \eta) = f(-\xi, \eta) = -f(\xi, -\eta) \text{ and} \\ \partial_2 f(\xi, \eta) < 0, \text{ for all } (\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \end{array} \right\}.$$

Finally, the set of nonlinearities with *monotone feedback* and *even-odd symmetry*  $\mathfrak{X}$  is the disjoint union

$$(2.10) \quad \mathfrak{X} := \mathfrak{X}^+ \cup \mathfrak{X}^-.$$

Given  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$  we define the associated planar ordinary differential equation (ODE)

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\xi} \\ \dot{\eta} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f(\xi, \eta) \\ -f(\eta, \xi) \end{pmatrix} := F(\xi, \eta).$$

Analogously to the DDE case, given  $(\xi(t), \eta(t))$  solving an ODE for  $t \in I$ , I the maximal interval of existence; we define the *orbit* to be the set

$$(2.12) \quad O := \{(\xi(t), \eta(t)) \mid t \in I\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Due to the even-odd symmetry of  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$ , the ODE (2.11) is *equivariant* with respect to the rotation by  $\pi/2$  given by

$$(2.13) \quad \rho := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \rho^{-1} \circ F \circ \rho = F.$$

And *reversible* with respect to the reflections by  $\sigma$  and  $-\sigma$  defined by

$$(2.14) \quad \pm \sigma := \pm \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \pm \sigma^{-1} \circ F \circ \pm \sigma = -F.$$

This, together with the monotone feedback condition  $\partial_2 f(\xi, \eta) \neq 0$ , restricts the qualitative behavior of the dynamics in the planar ODE (2.11).

**Lemma 2.1.** *Consider the planar ODE (2.11) with  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$ , we denote by  $(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t))$  the solution with initial condition  $(a, 0)$ ,  $a > 0$ . Then the following holds:*

- (i) *The only equilibrium of the ODE (2.26) is  $(0, 0)$ .*
- (ii)  *$(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t))$  is periodic and winds once around  $(0, 0)$  in a finite time  $T_f(a)$ .*
- (iii) *If  $f \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$  ( $f$  is analytic), then the map*

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{aligned} T_f : (0, \infty) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \\ a &\mapsto T_f(a), \end{aligned}$$

*taking the amplitude to the minimal period  $T_f(a)$  of  $(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t))$  is  $C^k$  (is analytic).*

- (iv)  *$(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t))$  satisfies*

$$(2.16) \quad \eta(a, t) = \xi(a, t - 3T_f(a)/4), \quad \text{if } f \in \mathfrak{X}^+,$$

$$(2.17) \quad \eta(a, t) = \xi(a, t - T_f(a)/4), \quad \text{if } f \in \mathfrak{X}^-.$$

- (v)  *$(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t))$  satisfies*

$$(2.18) \quad \xi(a, t) = \xi(a, -t),$$

$$(2.19) \quad \eta(a, t) = -\eta(a, -t).$$

Motivated by lemma 2.1, the *period map* of a function  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$  is the map  $T_f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  taking  $a > 0$  to  $T_f(a)$ , the minimal period of the periodic solution of the associated ODE (2.11) with initial condition  $(a, 0)$ . The value at 0 is determined by continuous extension and comes given by

$$(2.20) \quad T_f(0) = \left| \frac{2\pi}{\partial_\eta f(\xi, \eta)|_{(\xi, \eta)=(0,0)}} \right|.$$

*Remark 2.2.* In lemma 2.1 we showed that the planar ODE (2.11) is an integrable, not necessarily Hamiltonian, equation. The orbits of the non-equilibrium solutions foliate  $\mathbb{R}^2$  by a family of curves, diffeomorphic to circles, and centered around the only equilibrium  $(0, 0)$ . Moreover, the representation of the group of symmetries of the square,  $\mathcal{D}_4$ , generated by  $\{\rho, \sigma\}$  leaves the orbits of the ODE (2.11) invariant, as sets.

This justifies the definition of the period map (2.15) in part (iii).

Part (iv) shows that the periodic solutions have spatio-temporal symmetry and, in particular, solve a delay differential equation for an appropriately chosen delay. The special case when  $f(\xi, \eta) \equiv f(\eta)$  corresponds to Kaplan and Yorke's result in [KY74], for which the ODE (2.11) is actually Hamiltonian. Part (v) shows that the reversibilities (2.14) translate into reversible periodic orbits.

A period map  $T_f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called *locally non-constant at*  $a \in [0, \infty)$  if  $T_f$  is not constant on any subinterval  $I$  such that  $a \in I \subset [0, \infty)$ .  $T_f$  is called *locally non-constant* if it is locally non-constant at  $a$  for all  $a \in [0, \infty)$ .

**Theorem A** (Converse of Kaplan and Yorke). *Consider the delay differential equation (1.1) with nonlinearity  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$  such that its period map  $T_f$  is locally non-constant. Then any periodic solution  $x^*(t)$  of the delay differential equation (1.1) has (not necessarily minimal) period 4. More precisely, let  $\bar{x} := \max_{t \in [0, 4]} x^*(t)$  be the amplitude of the periodic solution. Then the minimal period of  $x^*(t)$  is  $T_f(\bar{x})$  and*

$$(2.21) \quad T_f(\bar{x}) \in J^+ := \{4/(4n - 1) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \text{ if } f \in \mathfrak{X}^+,$$

$$(2.22) \quad T_f(\bar{x}) \in J^- := \{4/(4n - 3) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \text{ if } f \in \mathfrak{X}^-.$$

Moreover, the planar curve  $(x^*(t), x^*(t - 1))$  solves the ordinary differential equation (2.11).

The set  $J^+$  (resp.  $J^-$ ) defined in equation (2.21) (resp. (2.22)) is called set of *realizable periods* for  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$  (resp.  $\mathfrak{X}^-$ ).

The next corollary follows immediately by combining lemma 2.1 and theorem A and is a full characterization of the set of periodic solutions to the delay equation (1.1) when  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$  and  $T_f$  is locally non-constant.

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let  $x^*(t)$  be a periodic solution of the delay equation (1.1) with  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$  and a locally non-constant period map  $T_f$ , let  $\bar{x} := \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} x^*(t)$ . Then  $(x^*(t), x^*(t - 1))$  solves the ordinary differential equation (2.11) and has minimal period  $T_f(\bar{x}) \in J^+$  (resp.  $J^-$ ) for  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$  (resp.  $\mathfrak{X}^-$ ).*

The converse is also true, let  $(\xi^*(t), \eta^*(t))$  be a periodic solution of the associated ODE (2.11), let  $a := \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \xi(t)$  and  $T_f(a) \in J^+$  (resp.  $J^-$ ) for  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$  (resp.  $\mathfrak{X}^-$ ). Then  $\xi^*(t)$  is a periodic solution of the delay differential equation (1.1).

Therefore the existence, amplitude and period of all the periodic solutions to the DDE (1.1) with  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$  comes determined by the period map  $T_f$  of  $f$ . Notice that even though  $f$  and  $-f$  share the same period map  $T_f$ , their respective sets of realizable periods have an empty intersection.

Additionally, we present results on the local stability of the periodic solutions to the DDE (1.1) with  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$ . The  $\mathcal{D}_4$  symmetries (2.13), (2.14), of the periodic solutions in theorem A allow us to refine previous results on the spectral structure of the monodromy operator  $M$ , see [MPN13]. More precisely, it is possible to read the unstable dimension of the periodic orbits obtained in theorem A from the direction in which the period map  $T_f$  crosses the realizable periods  $J^\pm$ .

**Theorem B.** *Consider a periodic solution  $x^*(t)$ , of the DDE (1.1) with non-linearity  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$ . Let  $x^*(t)$  have amplitude  $\bar{x} := \max_{t \in [0,4]} x^*(t)$  and minimal period*

$$(2.23) \quad T_f(\bar{x}) = \frac{4}{4n-1} \text{ if } f \in \mathfrak{X}^+, \text{ and}$$

$$(2.24) \quad T_f(\bar{x}) = \frac{4}{4n-3} \text{ if } f \in \mathfrak{X}^-.$$

Then  $\Gamma$  is hyperbolic if, and only if,

$$(2.25) \quad T'_f(\bar{x}) \neq 0.$$

Moreover, the strong unstable dimension  $i(\Gamma)$  comes given by:

$$(2.26) \quad \begin{aligned} i(\Gamma) &= 2n-1 & \text{if } T'_f(\bar{x}) \geq 0, \\ i(\Gamma) &= 2n & \text{if } T'_f(\bar{x}) < 0, \end{aligned} \quad \text{for } f \in \mathfrak{X}^+.$$

$$(2.27) \quad \begin{aligned} i(\Gamma) &= 2n-2 & \text{if } T'_f(\bar{x}) \geq 0, \\ i(\Gamma) &= 2n-1 & \text{if } T'_f(\bar{x}) < 0, \end{aligned} \quad \text{for } f \in \mathfrak{X}^-.$$

### 3 The zero number and the spectral property

In this section we present the main tools needed to prove our results. In the first part we introduce the *zero number*, a discrete valued function that



measures the frequency of oscillation. For solutions to the DDE (1.1), with monotone feedback  $\partial_2 f(\xi, \eta) \neq 0$ , the relative frequency of the solutions is a monotonically non-increasing function in time. This property, first reported in [Mys55], justifies referring to the zero number as a discrete Lyapunov function and endows the global dynamics of the equation (1.1) with an explicit *Morse decomposition* [MP88]. Strikingly, the zero number has an analogue in scalar partial differential equations [Mat82][Ang88], where it plays a fundamental role in the description of the global dynamics [FR91, FRW04]. Our presentation of the zero number for delay equations, follows [MPS96a, MPS96b]; in the second part of the section we will discuss the spectral property that the zero number induces at the linear level, following [MPN13].

Given a function  $\phi \in C \setminus \{0\}$ , the *sign changes of  $\phi$*  are given by

$$(3.1) \quad \text{sc}(\phi) := \sup\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \phi(\tau_i)\phi(\tau_{i+1}) < 0, \ -1 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_{k+1} < 0\}.$$

For  $\phi \in C \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\text{sc}(\phi) < \infty$ , we define the *zero number* functions

$$(3.2) \quad z^+(\phi) := \begin{cases} \text{sc}(\phi) & \text{if } \text{sc}(y_t) \text{ is even,} \\ \text{sc}(\phi) + 1 & \text{if } \text{sc}(y_t) \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

$$(3.3) \quad z^-(\phi) := \begin{cases} \text{sc}(\phi) & \text{if } \text{sc}(y_t) \text{ is odd,} \\ \text{sc}(\phi) + 1 & \text{if } \text{sc}(y_t) \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

*Remark 3.1.* The sign changes of a continuous function can indeed be infinitely many, however, one can prove that under our assumptions that is not the case for periodic solutions of the DDE (1.1).

Consider  $x^*(t)$  and  $\hat{x}(t)$ , two periodic solutions of the DDE (1.1) with  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$  (resp.  $\mathfrak{X}^-$ ) with minimal periods  $p > 0$  and  $\hat{p} > 0$ , and orbits  $\Gamma$  and  $\hat{\Gamma}$ , respectively. Then theorem 2.2 in [MPS96b] asserts that

$$(3.4) \quad z^+(x_t^* - \hat{x}_t), \ z^+(\dot{x}_t^*), \ z^+(\dot{\hat{x}}_t), \quad (\text{resp. } z^-(x_t^* - \hat{x}_t), \ z^+(\dot{x}_t^*), \ z^+(\dot{\hat{x}}_t))$$

are monotonically non-increasing functions of  $t$ . From this point we drop the sign superscript in the notation of the zero number, our statements should then be read by picking  $z^\pm$  when  $f$  belongs to the corresponding subset  $\mathfrak{X}^\pm$  of  $\mathfrak{X}$ .

The Poincaré-Bendixson property, see theorem 2.1 in [MPS96a], implies that the projections onto pseudo-phase space  $P\Gamma$  and  $P\hat{\Gamma}$  intersect if, and only if the orbits themselves coincide, i.e.

$$(3.5) \quad P\Gamma \cap P\hat{\Gamma} \neq \emptyset \iff \Gamma = \hat{\Gamma}.$$

Moreover, again following [MPS96a], the planar curve  $P\Gamma$  is an immersion of the circle and its inside region contains the projection of at least one

equilibrium solution of the DDE (1.1). In our case, since  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$  has monotone feedback and even-odd symmetry, the only equilibrium of the DDE (1.1) is 0. Therefore the projection  $P\Gamma$  always contains  $(0, 0)$  in the inside region. Additionally,  $x^*(t)$  is sinusoidal in the sense that it moves monotonically in between its (positive) maximum and (negative) minimum values, and it reaches them exactly once over every minimal period. By even-odd symmetry of  $f$ , we also obtain that  $x^*(t)$  has the odd symmetry

$$(3.6) \quad x^*(t) = -x^*(t - p/2).$$

These planar properties are, however, far from implying that the dynamics of the DDE (1.1) are planar, all sorts of crossings can be expected from general solutions.

We now turn our attention to the stability of the periodic solutions. Our presentation from this point follows section 5 in [MPN13]. Recall (2.5), the linearized equation around the periodic solution  $x^*(t)$ . As we mentioned section 2, the stability of the orbit of  $x^*(t)$ ,  $\Gamma$ , comes characterized by the eigenvalues of the monodromy operator  $M$ , which coincides with the time- $p$  solution operator of the linearization (2.5). Notice that the coefficients

$$(3.7) \quad \partial_1 f(x^*(t), x^*(t-1)), \text{ and } \partial_2 f(x^*(t), x^*(t-1)),$$

have period  $p/2$  rather than  $p$  due to the odd symmetry (3.6) and the even-odd symmetry of  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$ . This motivates the study of the *half-period Floquet multipliers*, i.e. the eigenvalues of the time- $p/2$  solution operator, that we denote  $N$ , of the linearized equation (2.5).

The zero number (3.2),(3.3), induces a spectral ordering that relates  $\nu \in (0, \infty)$ , the norm of the Floquet multipliers, to the zero number of the associated eigenfunctions  $\phi^\mu \in C$  such that  $|\mu| = \nu$ .

Notice that  $\dot{x}^*(t)$  is a periodic solution of the linearization (2.5) and that by the odd symmetry (3.6), trivially,  $-1 \in \text{spec}(N)$ . Furthermore, since  $x^*(t)$  is sinusoidal,  $\dot{x}^*(t)$  changes signs exactly twice over a time interval of length  $p$ . By the monotonicity of the zero number (3.4) (in either positive or negative feedback case) we have that

$$(3.8) \quad z(\dot{x}_0) = z(\dot{x}_t) \equiv \text{const.} > 0, \text{ where } \dot{x}_t(\theta) := \dot{x}(t + \theta), \theta \in [-1, 0].$$

Given  $\nu \in (0, \infty)$ , we denote by  $G_\nu$  the direct sum of the real generalized eigenspaces associated to eigenvalues of the half-period monodromy operator,  $N$ , that have absolute values  $\nu$ , i.e.

$$(3.9) \quad G_\nu := \bigoplus_{|\mu|=\nu} \text{Re} \left( \bigcup_{1 \leq m < \infty} \text{Ker}(\mu I - N)^m \right).$$

In virtue of theorem 5.1 in [MPN13], if  $G_\nu \neq 0$  then it satisfies

$$(3.10) \quad 1 \leq \dim G_\nu \leq 2.$$

The case when  $\dim G_1 = 1$  corresponds to the periodic orbit  $\Gamma$  being hyperbolic with  $G_1 = \text{span}\{\dot{x}_0^*\}$ . Additionally, there exists a real Floquet multiplier,  $-\zeta$ , where  $\zeta > 0$ . Associated to  $\zeta$  there exists a real eigenfunction  $\Psi$  such that  $G_\zeta = \text{span}\{\Psi\}$  and that satisfies

$$(3.11) \quad z(\Psi) = z(\dot{x}_0^*).$$

If  $\dim G_1 = 2$ , then  $\zeta = 1$  and  $G_1 = \text{span}\{\dot{x}_0^*, \Psi\}$ , where

$$(3.12) \quad \text{either } \Psi \in \text{Ker}(Id + N) \text{ or } \Psi \in \text{Ker}(Id + N)^2 \setminus \text{Ker}(Id + N),$$

depending on the geometric multiplicity of  $-1 \in \text{spec}(N)$ . In either case, we have that

$$(3.13) \quad z(\Psi) \equiv z(\dot{x}_0^*).$$

Consider now a half-period Floquet multiplier  $\mu \in \text{spec}(N)$ , such that  $\mu \notin \{-1, -\zeta\}$ . Then one of the following cases holds:

$$(3.14) \quad \text{Either } |\mu| > \max\{1, \zeta\} \quad \text{and } z(\phi^\mu) < z(\dot{x}_0^*) \text{ for all } \phi^\mu \in G_{|\mu|},$$

$$(3.15) \quad \text{or } |\mu| < \min\{1, \zeta\} \quad \text{and } z(\phi^\mu) > z(\dot{x}_0^*) \text{ for all } \phi^\mu \in G_{|\mu|}.$$

Furthermore, the half-period monodromy operator  $N$  possesses, exactly,  $z(\dot{x}_0^*) - 1$  eigenvalues satisfying the case (3.14). Therefore, the unstable dimension  $i(\Gamma)$  comes given by the inclusion

$$(3.16) \quad i(\Gamma) \in \{z(\dot{x}_0^*), z(\dot{x}_0^*) - 1\}.$$

The case  $i(\Gamma) = z(\dot{x}_0^*)$  corresponds to the situation in which  $\Gamma$  is hyperbolic and the multiplier  $-\zeta$  satisfies  $\zeta > 1$ . The case  $i(\Gamma) = z(\dot{x}_0^*) - 1$  corresponds to either the non-hyperbolic situation in which  $\zeta = 1$  and  $\dim G_1 = 2$ , or the situation when  $\zeta < 1$ .

We finish the section with a small lemma that relates the unstable dimension to the minimal period of the periodic solution  $x^*(t)$  via the zero number.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $x^*(t)$  be a periodic solution of the delay equation (1.1) with  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$ ,  $\Gamma$  denotes the orbit.*

*If  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$  and  $x^*(t)$  has minimal period  $p := 4/(4n - 1)$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then*

$$(3.17) \quad z^+(\dot{x}_0^*) = 2n, \text{ in particular}$$

$$(3.18) \quad i(\Gamma) \in \{2n, 2n - 1\}$$

*If  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^-$  and  $x^*(t)$  has minimal period  $p := 4/(4n - 3)$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then*

$$(3.19) \quad z^-(\dot{x}_0^*) = 2n - 1, \text{ in particular}$$

$$(3.20) \quad i(\Gamma) \in \{2n - 1, 2n - 2\}.$$

**Proof.** We know from the beginning of the section,  $x^*(t)$  acquires its maximum  $\bar{x}$  (resp. its minimum  $\underline{x}$ ) once over every minimal period and moves monotonically between the maximum and the minimum. We already remarked in (3.8) that  $z(x_t^*)$  is constant. Without loss of generality we normalize to  $x^*(0) = \bar{x}$ ;  $\dot{x}^*(t)$  changes signs exactly once on  $[(k - 1)p/2, kp/2]$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . By the odd symmetry (3.6) any two neighboring sign changes of  $\dot{x}^*(t)$  are separated, exactly, by half a minimal period. Therefore, if  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$

$$(3.21) \quad 2n - 1 = \left\lfloor \frac{4n - 1}{2} \right\rfloor \leq z^+(\dot{x}_0^*) \leq \left\lceil \frac{4n - 1}{2} \right\rceil = 2n,$$

and if  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^-$

$$(3.22) \quad 2n - 2 = \left\lfloor \frac{4n - 3}{2} \right\rfloor \leq z^-(\dot{x}_0^*) \leq \left\lceil \frac{4n - 3}{2} \right\rceil = 2n - 1.$$

Here we used the usual notation for the floor and ceiling functions. The parity choice in the definition of the zero number (3.2) and (3.3) finishes the proof of equations (3.17) and (3.19). Plugging (3.17) and (3.19) into (3.16) completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Note that if  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$ , the unstable dimension always satisfies  $i(\Gamma) \geq 1$  and no periodic orbits of the DDE (1.1) with  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$  are stable. This is not surprising since the DDE (1.1) with  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$  defines a monotone semiflow and instability of every periodic orbit is expected, see [HS08]. However, the case  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^-$  does allow the existence of attracting periodic orbits, which in our setting, necessarily, have minimal period 4 [KY75][MPS96a].

## 4 Proof of lemma 2.1

**Proof.** We will assume without loss of generality that  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$ . The case of negative feedback  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^-$  corresponds to a change in the time direction of the ODE (2.11) and will not play a role until part (iv).

To prove part (i) it is enough to notice that since  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$ , the map  $f(\xi, \cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an odd diffeomorphism of the real line for any fixed  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ . Hence  $f(\xi, \eta) = f(\xi, \eta) = 0 \iff (\xi, \eta) = (0, 0)$ , and  $(0, 0)$  is the only equilibrium of equation (2.11).

To prove part (ii) take the function  $(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t))$  solving the ODE (2.11) with  $(\xi(a, 0), \eta(a, 0)) = (a, 0)$ , we will show that it is periodic. Using the reversibility of the vector field  $F$  under the action of the reflections  $\sigma$  and  $-\sigma$  in (2.14). As we previously observed,  $\sigma$  and  $-\sigma$  map orbits of (2.11) to orbits of (2.11), as sets. It is then enough to see that the curve  $(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t))$  intersects both set of fixed points  $\text{Fix}(\sigma)$  and  $\text{Fix}(-\sigma)$ , given by

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Fix}(\sigma) &:= \{(\xi, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \xi \in \mathbb{R}\}, \\ \text{Fix}(-\sigma) &:= \{(\xi, -\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \xi \in \mathbb{R}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $I(a)$  be the maximal interval of existence of  $(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t))$  and denote the orbit by

$$(4.2) \quad O_a := \{(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t)) \mid t \in I(a)\}.$$

Indeed, if

$$(4.3) \quad O_a \cap \text{Fix}(\sigma) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } O_a \cap \text{Fix}(-\sigma) \neq \emptyset,$$

it is then clear that

$$(4.4) \quad O_a = \sigma O_a = -O_a = -\sigma O_a.$$

Since  $O_a$  contains at least an arc connecting  $\text{Fix}(\sigma)$  to  $\text{Fix}(-\sigma)$  and passing through  $(a, 0)$ , necessarily,  $O_a$  is a closed loop around  $(0, 0)$ ,  $I(a) = \mathbb{R}$  and the time it takes for  $(\eta(t), \xi(t))$  to go around zero once is finite.

We will just show that  $O_a \cap \text{Fix}(-\sigma) \neq \emptyset$ , the analogue for the points fixed by  $\sigma$ ,  $\text{Fix}(-\sigma)$ , follows the same argument in backwards time direction. Notice that since  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$ ,  $(\dot{\xi}(a, 0), \dot{\eta}(a, 0)) = (0, -f(0, a))$ , where  $-f(0, a) < 0$ . Therefore after a small time  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t))$  wanders into the lower-right region  $Q := \{(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid 0 < \xi \text{ and } \eta < 0\}$ . Inside of  $Q$  it holds that  $\dot{\xi}(a, t) < 0$  and  $\dot{\eta}(a, t) < 0$  and for  $t > \varepsilon > 0$  both derivatives remain uniformly bounded away from 0 as long as the trajectory is confined in  $Q$ . Therefore the solution must cross the lower diagonal,  $\text{Fix}(-\sigma)$ , at a

time  $t_1 > 0$ , i.e.  $(\xi(a, t_1), \eta(a, t_1)) \in \text{Fix}(\sigma)$ . By the previous discussion, we call  $T_f(a)$  to the finite, minimal time that  $(\xi(t), \eta(t))$  needs to loop around  $(0, 0)$  once. This finishes the proof of part (ii).

The regularity of  $T_f$  in part (iii) follows immediately by the implicit function theorem. Indeed,  $T_f(a)$  is a curve solving

$$(4.5) \quad \eta(a, T_f(a)) - \eta(a, 0) = 0,$$

since  $\dot{\eta}(a, T_f(a)) = -f(0, a) \neq 0$  for  $a \neq 0$ , the regularity of  $T_f$  is immediately inherited from  $f$ .

To show part (iv), we apply the invariance of  $O_a$  under  $\rho^k$ , for  $\rho$  defined in (2.13) and  $k \pmod{4}$ . Indeed, we have seen in the proof of parts (i) and (ii) that  $O_a$  is a closed loop around  $(0, 0)$  and  $\rho$  is a rotation by  $\pi/2$  centered at  $(0, 0)$ , which implies that

$$(4.6) \quad O_a = \rho O_a.$$

Since  $\rho(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t)) = (\eta(a, t), -\xi(a, t))$  solves the ODE (2.11) and shares orbits with  $(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t))$ , they must be time translates of one another. An analysis of the sense of rotation of the solutions around  $(0, 0)$  yields the values for the time shifts in the expressions (2.16) and (2.17), depending on the feedback type of the nonlinearity  $f$ .

It is then only left to prove (v). By the invariance (4.4) it follows, analogously to part (iv), that  $\xi(a, -t) = \eta(a, t + \tau)$ ,  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ . Setting  $\xi(a, 0) = \eta(a, \tau) = a$  yields the expression (2.18). The same argument with  $\eta(a, 0) = \xi(a, \tau) = 0$  provides equation (2.19). This finishes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

## 5 Proof of theorem A

In this section we present the proof of the converse to Kaplan and Yorke's theorem. The argument is geometrical and relies on symmetry properties of the periodic solutions with (not necessarily minimal) period 4 in the DDE (1.1), when  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$ . First we introduce an auxiliary lemma that characterizes the shape of the pseudo-phase space projection of periodic orbits in the DDE (1.1), immediately after we proceed to proving theorem A.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $x^*(t)$  have minimal period  $p > 0$  and solve the DDE (1.1) with nonlinearity  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$ , let  $\Gamma$  denote the orbit of  $x^*(t)$ . Then  $mp = 4$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  if, and only if, the pseudo-phase space projection of the orbit,  $P\Gamma := \{(x^*(t), x^*(t-1)) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ , intersects the vertical axis orthogonally.*

**Proof.** Let  $x^*(t)$  have period 4, i.e.  $mp = 4$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Notice that then  $m$  is necessarily odd since otherwise the planar vector field

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{\xi} &= f(\xi, \eta), \\ \dot{\eta} &= f(\eta, \xi), \end{aligned}$$

would have periodic solutions. Then  $x^*(t-2) = -x^*(t)$  by odd symmetry (3.6) and  $(x^*(t), x^*(t-1))$  is a solution of the planar ODE (2.11).  $P\Gamma$  is an orbit of the planar ODE (2.11) and by the discussion in section 1  $P\Gamma$  is left invariant by the rotation  $\rho$  defined in (2.13). In particular  $P\Gamma$  intersects the vertical axis orthogonally.

To see the converse implication, assume that the pseudo-phase space projection  $P\Gamma$  intersects the vertical axis orthogonally. We set without loss of generality  $x^*(0) = \bar{x} := \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} x^*(t)$  and will show that  $x^*(-2) = -x^*(0) = -\bar{x}$ . Notice that since  $x^*(0) = \bar{x}$  is a maximum, then  $\dot{x}^*(0) = 0$  and for  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$  this implies that  $x^*(-1) = 0$ . We saw in section 2 that  $x^*(t)$  moves monotonically between extrema. Therefore the point  $(x^*(-1), x^*(-2)) = (0, x^*(-2))$  corresponds to one of the two intersections that  $P\Gamma$  has with the vertical axis, which we assumed to be orthogonal. As a result  $\dot{x}^*(-2) = f(x^*(-2), x^*(-3)) = 0$  and by monotone feedback  $x^*(-3) = 0$ . Taking into account the odd symmetry (3.6),  $P\Gamma$  only intersects the horizontal axis at  $(\bar{x}, 0)$  and  $(-\bar{x}, 0)$ . We already discussed that 2 was not a valid period for the delay equation (1.1), thus the only possibility is  $x^*(-2) = -\bar{x} = -x^*(0)$ . Repeating the procedure once more shows that  $x^*(-4) = x^*(0)$  and finishes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Motivated by lemma 5.1, a periodic solution  $x^*(t)$  of the differential delay equation (1.1) with  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$  is called *Kaplan-Yorke (KY)* if its projection onto pseudo-phase space  $\Gamma := \{(x^*(t), x^*(t-1)) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\}$  intersects the vertical axis orthogonally. Equivalently, we just showed that  $x^*(t)$  is KY if, and only if,  $x^*(t+4) = x^*(t)$ .

**Proof of theorem A.** The main argument will be to show that if  $x^*(t)$ , a periodic solution of the DDE (1.1) satisfying that  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$ , and  $T_f$  is locally non-constant. Then  $x^*(t)$  must be a KY solution.

We proceed by contradiction. Suppose that  $x^*(t)$  with minimal period  $p$  and orbit denoted by  $\Gamma$  is not KY. Then, by lemma 5.1, the projection  $P\Gamma := \{(x^*(t), x^*(t-1)) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\}$  intersects the vertical axis at an angle different from  $\pi/2$ . Without loss of generality, we denote the intersection point

$$(5.2) \quad (0, \hat{x}) = P\Gamma \cap \{(0, \eta) \mid \eta \in \mathbb{R}^+\}.$$

Let us denote  $(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t))$  to the periodic solution of the ODE (2.11) with initial condition  $(0, a)$ . We recall that the ODE orbits

$$(5.3) \quad O_a := \{(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t)) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}, a > 0\}$$

are invariant under rotations by  $\pi/2$ ,  $O_a = \rho O_a$ , in particular  $O_a$  intersect the vertical axis orthogonally. Therefore we can find  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$(5.4) \quad O_a \cap P\Gamma \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } a \in (\hat{x} - \varepsilon, \hat{x} + \varepsilon).$$

At the same time, by part (iv) in lemma 2.1 we know that  $\xi(a, t)$  satisfy the DDE

$$(5.5) \quad \dot{\xi}(a, t) = f(\xi(a, t), \xi(a, t - 3T_f(a)/4)) \quad \text{if } f \in \mathfrak{X}^+, \text{ and}$$

$$(5.6) \quad \dot{\xi}(a, t) = f(\xi(a, t), \xi(a, t - T_f(a)/4)) \quad \text{if } f \in \mathfrak{X}^-.$$

Let us restrict our attention now to the case  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$ .

If  $3T_f(a_0)/4 = 1$  for some  $a_0 \in (\hat{x} - \varepsilon, \hat{x} + \varepsilon)$ , the proof is finished because  $O_{a_0}$  corresponds to the pseudo-phase space projection of the periodic solution  $\xi(a_0, t)$  of the DDE (1.1) and  $O_{a_0}$  intersects  $P\Gamma$ , which is a contradiction to the Poincaré-Bendixson property discussed in section 3.

Notice that  $\xi(a, t)$ , additionally, solves the family of delay differential equations

$$(5.7) \quad \dot{\xi}(a, t) = f(\xi(a, t), \xi(a, t - 3T_f(a)/4 - nT_f(a))), \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Analogously,  $x^*(t)$  satisfies

$$(5.8) \quad \dot{x}^*(t) = f(x^*(t), x^*(t - 1 - mp)), \text{ for all } m \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Recall that the period map  $T_f(a)$  is locally non-constant by assumption, therefore one can always find  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $\delta > 0$  arbitrarily small such that

$$(5.9) \quad (n + 3/4)(T_f(\hat{x}) + \delta) = mp + 1.$$

If  $\delta$  is small enough, then  $T_f$  non-constant implies that there exists  $a_0 \in (\hat{x} - \varepsilon, \hat{x} + \varepsilon)$  such that  $T_f(a_0) = T_f(\hat{x}) + \delta$ . Therefore we have two periodic functions  $x^*(t)$  and  $\xi(a_0, t)$ , both of which solve the delay equation

$$(5.10) \quad \dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), x(t - 1 - mp)), \text{ for a suitably chosen } m \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

The projections onto pseudo-phase space come given by

$$(5.11) \quad \{(x^*(t), x^*(t - 1 - mp)) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\} = \{(x^*(t), x^*(t - 1)) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\} = P\Gamma$$



and for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.12) \quad & \{(\xi(a_0, t), \xi(a_0, t - 1 - mp) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}) = \\
& = \{(\xi(a_0, t), \xi(t - 3T_f(a_0)/4 - nT_f(a_0)) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}) \\
& = \{(\xi(a_0, t), \xi(t - 3T_f(a_0)/4) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}) = O_{a_0}
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $P\Gamma$  and  $O_{a_0}$  intersect by (5.4), we have reached again a contradiction to the Poincaré-Bendixson property in section 3 and  $x^*(t)$  must be a KY solution, i.e. it must have period 4.

The statement on the minimal periods (3.18) follows then immediately. Notice that  $x^*(t)$  being KY implies that  $(\xi^*(t), \eta^*(t)) := (x^*(t), x^*(t - 1))$  solves the ODE (2.11) with minimal period  $T_f(\bar{x})$ .

The negative feedback case  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^-$  follows immediately from changing the time direction and choosing a negative delay by using the trick (5.8).

This, together with part (iv) in lemma 2.1 finishes the proof of theorem A.  $\square$

*Remark 5.2.* Note that in proving theorem A we actually proved a more refined local version. Indeed, we proved that if the period map  $T_f$  is locally non-constant at amplitude  $a \in (0, \infty)$ , then there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that any periodic solution  $x^*(t)$  with amplitude  $\max x^*(t) \in (a - \delta, a + \delta)$  of the DDE (1.1) with  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$  has period 4 and satisfies the conclusions of theorem A.

## 6 Proof of theorem B

By the Floquet theory in section 3 and the inclusion (3.16), we just have to discuss the sign of  $(\zeta - 1)$ , where  $-\zeta$  is the Floquet multiplier associated to  $\Psi$  in equations (3.11), (3.12), depending on the sign of  $T'_f$ . First of all we characterize hyperbolicity of the periodic solutions, once this case has been settled, we immediately proceed to the proof of theorem B.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $x^*(t)$  be a periodic solution with period  $T = 4/(2m - 1)$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , of the delay equation (1.1) with  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$  and denote  $\bar{x} := \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} x^*(t)$ . Then the orbit  $\Gamma$  of  $x^*(t)$  is hyperbolic if, and only if,  $T'_f(\bar{x}) = 0$ .*

**Proof.** The plan of the proof is as follows. To see how  $T'_f(\bar{x}) = 0$  implies that  $\Gamma$  is not hyperbolic we explicitly construct a periodic solution of the linearized equation (2.5), linearly independent from  $\dot{x}^*(t)$ . In order to show the converse we first prove that if  $\Gamma$  is not hyperbolic, then any generalized eigenfunction is genuinely an eigenfunction, i.e. the monodromy operator has a geometrically double eigenvalue 1. In particular this implies that the

period map must have a critical point, by examining a two-point boundary value problem.

Denoting  $T := T_f(\bar{x})$ ,  $T' := T'_f(\bar{x})$ , we first suppose that  $T' = 0$ . Let us denote by  $x^*(a, t)$ , the solution of the delay differential equation

$$(6.1) \quad \dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), x(t - (2m - 1)T_f(a)/4)),$$

with minimal period  $T_f(a)$ , amplitude  $a := \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} x^*(a, t)$  and initial condition normalized so that

$$(6.2) \quad x^*(a, 0) = a.$$

Then the amplitude derivative  $y^*(a, t) := D_a x^*(a, t)$  solves the, in general non-homogeneous, linear, non-autonomous DDE

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{y}(t) = & \partial_1 f(x^*(a, t), x^*(a, t - mT_f(a)/4))y(t) + \\ & + \partial_2 f(x^*(a, t), x^*(a, t - mT_f(a)/4))y(t - mT_f(a)/4) - \\ & - \dot{x}^*(a, t - mT'_f(a)/4)mT'_f(a)/4. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that since  $T' = 0$ ,  $y^*(t) := y^*(\bar{x}, t)$  satisfies the linearized equation (2.5) around  $x^*(t)$ . Furthermore,  $y^*(t)$  is periodic since

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{aligned} y^*(t + T) &= \partial_1 x^*(\bar{x}, t + T) + T' \partial_2 x^*(\bar{x}, t + T) \\ &= \partial_1 x^*(\bar{x}, t + T) = y^*(t). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,  $y^*(t)$  satisfies  $y^*(0) = 1$ , in contrast to the trivial solution of the linearized equation  $\dot{x}^*(t)$  for which  $\dot{x}^*(0) = 0$  due to the normalization (6.2). Therefore  $\dot{x}_0^*$  and  $y_0^*$  are linearly independent. In other words, by the discussion in section 3, the Floquet multiplier 1 has geometric multiplicity 2 and  $\Gamma$  is not hyperbolic.

Suppose now that  $\Gamma$  is not hyperbolic, equivalently, again by the discussion in section 3, assume that the half-period Floquet multiplier  $-1 \in \text{spec}(N)$  has algebraic multiplicity 2. Here  $N$  is the time- $T/2$  solution operator of the linearization (2.5).

By standard Floquet theory [HVL93, DvGVLW95], the linearization (2.5) has a solution  $\Psi(t)$  of the form

$$(6.5) \quad \Psi(t) = v^*(t) + \kappa t \dot{x}^*(t),$$

where  $v^*(t)$  has period  $T$  and satisfies  $v^*(t - T/2) = -v^*(t)$ , for  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$  a constant. Note that, additionally,  $(2m - 1)T/2 = 2$  and, therefore,  $v^*(t - 2) = -v^*(t)$ . In the following we denote

$$(6.6) \quad A(t) := \partial_1 f(x^*(t), x^*(t - 1)), \quad B(t) := \partial_2 f(x^*(t), x^*(t - 1)).$$

In particular,  $(v^*(t), v^*(t-1))$  solves the non-homogeneous ODE

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{v}(t) &= A(t)v(t) + B(t)w(t) - \\ &\quad -\kappa B(t)\dot{x}^*(t-1) - \kappa \dot{x}^*(t), \\ \dot{w}(t) &= -B(t-1)v(t) + A(t-1)w(t) + \\ &\quad +\kappa B(t-1)\dot{x}^*(t) - \kappa \dot{x}^*(t-1). \end{aligned}$$

By a Fredholm alternative argument, see [Hal69], the non-homogeneous ODE (6.7) has solutions with period  $T$  if, and only if,

$$(6.8) \quad \kappa \int_0^T (\hat{v}^*(t), \hat{w}^*(t)) \begin{pmatrix} -B(t)\dot{x}^*(t-1) - \dot{x}^*(t) \\ B(t-1)\dot{x}^*(t) - \dot{x}^*(t-1) \end{pmatrix} dt = 0.$$

For all  $(\hat{v}^*(t), \hat{w}^*(t))$  with period  $T$  solving the homogeneous adjoint equation

$$(6.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{v}}(t) &= -A(t)\hat{v}(t) + B(t-1)\hat{w}(t), \\ \dot{\hat{w}}(t) &= -B(t)\hat{v}(t) - A(t-1)\hat{w}(t). \end{aligned}$$

At this point we invoke part (v) in lemma 2.1, then the normalized form (6.2) implies

$$(6.10) \quad x^*(t) = x^*(-t), \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Notice that then  $A(t) = A(-t)$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and the integral

$$(6.11) \quad \int_0^t A(s)ds, \text{ is periodic with period } T.$$

Therefore the curve

$$(6.12) \quad \exp \left( - \int_0^t A(s)ds - \int_0^{t-1} A(s)ds \right) \begin{pmatrix} -\dot{x}^*(t-1) \\ \dot{x}^*(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

provides, explicitly, a period  $T$  solution of the adjoint equation (6.9). Since  $B(t)$  never crosses 0 by the monotone feedback of  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$ , a necessary condition for the equality (6.8) to hold is that

$$(6.13) \quad \kappa = 0.$$

Then the generalized eigenfunction  $\Psi(t) = v^*(t)$  is a periodic solution of the linearized equation (2.5) and  $\Psi_0$  is linearly independent from  $\dot{x}_0^*$ , by construction. Moreover,  $\Psi(t+2) = -\Psi(t)$ , this implies that the linear, non-autonomous ODE

$$(6.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{v}(t) &= A(t)v(t) + B(t)w(t), \\ \dot{w}(t) &= -B(t-1)v(t) + A(t-1)w(t), \end{aligned}$$

has two linearly independent solutions with period 4, namely  $(\dot{x}^*(t), \dot{x}^*(t-1))$  and  $(\Psi(t), \Psi(t-1))$ .

For  $a \geq 0$  we denote  $(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t))$  to the solution of the ODE (2.11) with initial condition  $(a, 0)$ , i.e.

$$(6.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{\xi}(a, t) &= f(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t)), \\ \dot{\eta}(a, t) &= -f(\eta(a, t), \xi(a, t)), \end{aligned}$$

with the boundary condition

$$(6.16) \quad \begin{pmatrix} a \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \xi(a, 0) \\ \eta(a, 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \xi(a, T_f(a)) \\ \eta(a, T_f(a)) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The amplitude derivative

$$(6.17) \quad \begin{pmatrix} D_a \xi(\bar{x}, t) \\ D_a \eta(\bar{x}, t) \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} D_a \xi(a, t) \\ D_a \eta(a, t) \end{pmatrix} \Big|_{a=\bar{x}},$$

solves the linear ODE (6.14) by oddness of the periodic solution (3.6) and even-oddness of  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$ . Moreover, it takes the *boundary values*

$$(6.18) \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} D_a \xi(\bar{x}, 0) \\ D_a \eta(\bar{x}, 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} D_a \xi(\bar{x}, 4) \\ D_a \eta(\bar{x}, 4) \end{pmatrix} + (2m-1)T' \begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}^*(0) \\ \dot{x}^*(-1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

However,  $(D_a \xi(\bar{x}, t), D_a \eta(\bar{x}, t))$  can be written as a linear combination of the eigenfunctions  $(\dot{x}^*(t), \dot{x}^*(t-1))$  and  $(\Psi(t), \Psi(t-1))$  of the linear ODE (6.14), both periodic with period  $T$ , and in particular also period 4. Since  $\dot{x}^*(-1) \neq 0$ , again by the normalized form (6.2), it follows that  $T' = 0$ .  $\square$

**Proof of theorem B.** We use again the notation  $T := T_f(\bar{x})$ ,  $T' := T'_f(\bar{x})$ . We first deal with the result in the positive feedback case, i.e. let  $x^*(t)$  be a periodic solution of the delay equation (1.1) with nonlinearity  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$  and period 4. In particular  $(x^*(t), x^*(t-1))$  solves the ODE (2.11) and has minimal period  $T = 4/(4n-1)$  for a natural number  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Without loss of generality we normalize  $x^*(t)$  so that  $x^*(0) = \bar{x}$ .

By the observations on Floquet theory in section 3 and lemma 6.1, if  $T' = 0$  the time- $T/2$  solution operator,  $N$ , has an eigenvalue  $-1$  with geometric multiplicity 2. By lemma 3.2, the Morse index of the periodic orbit  $\Gamma$  is

$$(6.19) \quad i(\Gamma) = 2n - 1.$$

If  $T' \neq 0$ , following again section 3, there exists a half-period Floquet multiplier  $-\zeta \in \text{spec}(N)$  with geometric multiplicity 1,  $\zeta > 0$ . Furthermore, the associated eigenfunction  $\Psi$  satisfies  $z(\Psi_t) \equiv z(\dot{x}_0^*)$ .

In virtue of lemma 3.2, if  $\zeta > 1$  the Morse index of the periodic orbit  $\Gamma$  is  $i(\Gamma) = 2n$ . In case  $\zeta < 1$ , then  $i(\Gamma) = 2n - 1$ . We will show by a comparison argument that

$$(6.20) \quad T' > 0 \Rightarrow \zeta < 1, \text{ and}$$

$$(6.21) \quad T' < 0 \Rightarrow \zeta > 1.$$

The eigenfunction  $\Psi$  satisfies

$$(6.22) \quad \Psi(t - T/2) = -\zeta^{-1}\Psi(t),$$

since  $\zeta > 0$  and  $2 = (4n - 1)T/2$

$$(6.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \zeta > 1 &\iff \mu := \zeta^{(4n-1)T/2} > 1, \\ \zeta < 1 &\iff \mu < 1 \text{ and } \Psi(t - 2) = -\mu^{-1}\Psi(t). \end{aligned}$$

in particular,  $(\Psi(t), \Psi(t - 1))$  solves the ODE

$$(6.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{v}(t) &= A(t)v(t) + B(t)w(t), \\ \dot{w}(t) &= -\alpha^{-1}B(t - 1)v(t) + A(t - 1)w(t), \end{aligned}$$

for  $\alpha = \mu$ , here we used again the notation (6.6).

Just like in the proof of lemma 6.1, for  $a \geq 0$  we denote  $(\xi(a, t), \eta(a, t))$  to the solution of the ODE (2.11) with initial condition  $(a, 0)$ . Then we consider the amplitude derivative

$$(6.25) \quad (D_a\xi(\bar{x}, t), D_a\eta(\bar{x}, t)),$$

which solves the linear equation (6.24) with the parameter  $\alpha = 1$  and takes the values

$$(6.26) \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} D_a\xi(\bar{x}, 0) \\ D_a\eta(\bar{x}, 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} D_a\xi(\bar{x}, T) \\ D_a\eta(\bar{x}, T) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ T'\dot{x}^*(-1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Notice that  $\Psi(t)$ ,  $\dot{x}^*(t)$  and  $D_a\xi(\bar{x}, t)$  are all solutions of the second order ODE

$$(6.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \ddot{v}(t) &= [A(t) + \dot{B}(t)/B(t) + A(t - 1)]\dot{v}(t) + \\ &\quad + [\dot{A}(t) - A(t) - A(t)A(t - 1) - \alpha^{-1}B(t)B(t - 1)]v(t), \end{aligned}$$

for parameter values  $\alpha = \mu$  in the case of  $\Psi$ , and  $\alpha = 1$  for  $\dot{x}^*(t)$  and  $D_a \xi(\bar{x}, t)$ . Let  $v^1(t)$  and  $v^2(t)$  be solutions of (6.27) with parameters  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  respectively. We introduce the angle variables

$$(6.28) \quad \omega^j(t) := \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{v^j(t)}{\dot{v}^j(t)} \right), \quad j = 1, 2.$$

A comparison theorem, see [CL55], guarantees that

$$(6.29) \quad \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \text{ and } \omega^1(0) \geq \omega^2(0) \Rightarrow \omega^1(t) < \omega^2(t) \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

We will first prove that the initial condition  $(\Psi(0), \dot{\Psi}(0))$ , for the second order ODE (6.27), satisfies

$$(6.30) \quad \Psi(0) \neq 0.$$

By contradiction, suppose  $\Psi(0) = 0$ , then we compare the angles

$$(6.31) \quad \omega^\zeta(t) := \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\Psi(t)}{\dot{\Psi}(t)} \right) \text{ and } \omega^*(t) := \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\dot{x}^*(t)}{\ddot{x}^*(t)} \right).$$

By assumption we can set  $\omega^\zeta(0) = \omega^*(0) = \pi/2$ . Since we are in the hyperbolic setting,  $\mu \neq 1$ , the comparison principle (6.29) yields that

$$(6.32) \quad \text{either } \omega^\zeta(t) > \omega^*(t) \text{ or } \omega^\zeta(t) < \omega^*(t) \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

At this point we recall the nodal property (3.13) and the identity (6.22), as a result, the normalized curves

$$(6.33) \quad \mathbf{\Psi}(t) := \frac{(\Psi(t), \dot{\Psi}(t))}{\|(\Psi(t), \dot{\Psi}(t))\|} \text{ and } \mathbf{\dot{x}}(t) := \frac{(\dot{x}^*(t), \ddot{x}^*(t))}{\|(\dot{x}^*(t), \ddot{x}^*(t))\|},$$

are both periodic with minimal period  $T$ . However, the comparison (6.32) and the fact that  $\mathbf{\dot{x}}$  and  $\mathbf{\Psi}(t)$  wind clockwise, by the positive feedback assumption  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$ , implies that  $\omega^*(T) \neq \omega^\zeta(T) = -3\pi/2$ . Hence we have reached a contradiction.

Multiplying  $\Psi(t)$  by a scalar, if necessary, we assume without loss of generality  $(\Psi(0), \dot{\Psi}(0)) = (1, r)$ . Now we compare the angle variable  $\omega^\zeta(t)$  to  $\omega^r(t)$  given by

$$(6.34) \quad \omega^r(t) := \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{y^r(t)}{\dot{y}^r(t)} \right),$$

where we  $y^r(t) := D_a \xi(\bar{x}, t) + r\dot{x}(t)/\ddot{x}(0)$  solves the second order ODE (6.27) for  $\alpha = 1$  and has initial condition  $(y^r(0), \dot{y}^r(0)) = (\Psi(0), r)$ . By construction, we have  $\omega^\zeta(0) = \omega^r(0)$ .

Once again, we proceed by contradiction. Let  $T' > 0$  and suppose that  $\zeta > 1$ , then by the inequality (6.29) it follows that

$$(6.35) \quad \omega^r(t) < \omega^\zeta(t) \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

The normalized curve  $\Psi(t)$  winds, clockwise, around  $(0,0)$  once in time  $T$ . At the same time, by (6.26) we have that  $y^r(t)$  satisfies

$$(6.36) \quad \begin{pmatrix} y^r(T) \\ \dot{y}^r(T) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y^r(0) \\ \dot{y}^r(0) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -B(0)T'\dot{x}^*(-1) \end{pmatrix}$$

Now we just have to assemble together a series of facts. First of all both normalized curves  $\Psi$  and

$$(6.37) \quad \mathbf{y}^r := \frac{(y^r(t), \dot{y}^r(t))}{\|(y^r(t), \dot{y}^r(t))\|},$$

wind around zero, clockwise. Therefore (6.29) implies that  $\mathbf{y}^r$  rotates around zero *faster* than  $\Psi$ . At the same time we can compare the values after time  $T$  by (6.36) and since  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$  and we assumed  $T' > 0$ , it follows that  $-B(0)T'\dot{x}^*(-1) > 0$ . Therefore,  $y^r(t)$  changes signs at least twice more than  $\Psi(t)$  over the interval  $[0, T]$ . However,  $\Psi(t)$  changes signs exactly twice in that interval, therefore  $y^r(t) > 0$  changes signs at least 4 times for  $t \in [0, T]$ .

Again, by a comparison argument [CL55], there must be a sign change of  $\dot{x}^*(t)$  inserted between every two zeros of  $y^r(t)$ . It follows that  $\dot{x}^*(t)$  must change signs at least 4 times for  $t \in [0, T]$ . This is a contradiction to  $T$  being the minimal period of  $\dot{x}^*(t)$ , by the arguments in section 3. In this way we have proved the implication (6.20) and

$$(6.38) \quad T' > 0 \Rightarrow \zeta < 1 \Rightarrow i(\Gamma) = 2n - 1.$$

The proof of the implication (6.21) follows a completely analogous argument by contradiction. In this case, however,  $y^r$  has two fewer sign changes than  $\Psi$  over the same time interval. Again, this is a contradiction when one considers the sign changes of the trivial eigenfunction  $\dot{x}^*(t)$ . Therefore

$$(6.39) \quad T' < 0 \Rightarrow \zeta > 1 \Rightarrow i(\Gamma) = 2n.$$

Let us now go over the details of the proof in case  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^-$ . Notice that the term  $B(t)B(t-1)$  multiplying the parameter  $\alpha$  in the second order ODE (6.27) is always positive, therefore the comparison principle (6.29) remain unchanged. The quantity  $-B(0)T'\dot{x}^*(-1)$ , however, changes signs and is now negative. At the same time, both normalized solutions  $\Psi$  and  $\mathbf{y}^r$  rotate now

counterclockwise, rather than clockwise. This compensates for the change in signs and yields an analogous characterization to the positive feedback case  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$ . Namely, that if  $T' < 0$ ,  $\Gamma$  is *more unstable* than when  $T' \geq 0$ . Once again, plugging this detailed study in the inclusion (3.20) yields the implications (2.27) and finishes the proof.  $\square$

## 7 Examples and conclusion

In theorem A we have completely characterized the set of periodic solutions of the delay differential equation (1.1) with a nonlinearity  $f \in \mathfrak{X}$  satisfying even-odd symmetries and a monotone feedback assumption. However, our results required the (rather technical) additional assumption that the associated period map  $T_f$  is nowhere constant.

The apparent degeneracy of the case  $T_f$  locally constant has dramatic consequences in the analytic category. We will briefly address the problem for  $f = f(\eta) \in \mathfrak{X}^+$ ,  $f$  analytic. In virtue of 2.1, the period map  $T_f$  will also be analytic and, if a plateau ever exists,  $T_f$  will be (globally) constant. By expanding the implicit equation for the period map near  $a = 0$ , see [KY74], we obtain

$$(7.1) \quad \int_0^{T_f} \frac{\xi(a, t)f(\xi(a, t)) + \eta(a, t)f(\eta(a, t))}{\xi(a, t)^2 + \eta(a, t)^2} dt =$$

$$(7.2) = T_f f'(0) + f^{(n)}(0) \int_0^{T_f} \left( \frac{\xi(a, t)^{n+1} + \eta(a, t)^{n+1}}{\xi(a, t)^2 + \eta(a, t)^2} + \mathcal{O}(a^{n+1}) \right) dt =$$

$$(7.3) = 2\pi + f^{(n)}(0) \int_0^{T_f} \left( \frac{\xi(a, t)^{n+1} + \eta(a, t)^{n+1}}{\xi(a, t)^2 + \eta(a, t)^2} + \mathcal{O}(a^{n+1}) \right) dt = 2\pi.$$

Here  $f^{(n)}(0)$ , is the first nonvanishing derivative of  $f$  and, due to oddness,  $n + 1$  is even. Therefore, for  $a$  small enough,

$$(7.4) \quad f^{(n)}(0) \int_0^{T_f} \left( \frac{\xi(a, t)^{n+1} + \eta(a, t)^{n+1}}{\xi(a, t)^2 + \eta(a, t)^2} + \mathcal{O}(a^{n+1}) \right) dt$$

remains nonzero, unless  $f^{(n)}(0) = 0$ . In other words, we just proved

$$(7.5) \quad f = f(\eta) \in \mathfrak{X} \text{ analytic such that } T_f \equiv \text{const.} \iff f(\eta) = f'(0)\eta.$$

It is well-known that the delayed harmonic oscillator

$$(7.6) \quad \dot{x} = \alpha x(t - 1), \quad \alpha \neq 0,$$

satisfies the conclusions of theorem A [HVL93, DvGVLW95]. Therefore the assumption on the period map can be lifted in this case.






Figure 1: Plots of nonlinearities  $f(\xi, \eta)$  and their associated period maps  $T_f$ .  $\triangle$  and  $\square$  mark the intersection with the  $J^-$  and  $J^+$ , respectively. The unstable dimensions are circled. From left to right: soft-spring, hard-spring and neither soft- nor hard-spring.

Going beyond the analytic category, there exists a number of classical results concerning the growth of the period map  $T_f$ . Following [Nus75], the traditional division into *soft-spring* nonlinearities such that

$$(7.7) \quad \eta^{-1}f(\eta) \text{ strictly monotonically decreasing,}$$

and *hard-spring* nonlinearities such that

$$(7.8) \quad \eta^{-1}f(\eta) \text{ strictly monotonically increasing,}$$

yields strictly monotonically increasing and decreasing period maps that limit to  $\infty$  and 0, respectively.

The case in which the period map  $T_f$  is strictly monotone, except at isolated points, does not have a trivial macroscopic characterization. However, it is this case that yields the most interesting results. Indeed, consider the delay differential equation with a parameter  $\alpha > 0$  and  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^+$

$$(7.9) \quad \dot{x} = \alpha f(x(t-1)).$$

Here we can always regard  $\alpha$  as a time rescaling and trivially obtain the equality

$$(7.10) \quad T_{\alpha f} = \alpha^{-1} T_f.$$

As the value of  $\alpha$  increases, the period map  $T_{\alpha f}$  decreases, at a uniform rate. Moreover, the critical points of  $T_{\alpha f}$  remain unchanged along the homotopy in  $\alpha$ . Suppose now that the assumptions of theorem A are fulfilled, in light of theorem B, whenever

$$(7.11) \quad \alpha^{-1} T_f(0) \in J^+,$$

0 undergoes Hopf bifurcation. Most remarkably, intersections of the extrema of  $T_{\alpha f}$  with the set of realizable periods  $J^+$  correspond to secondary saddle-node bifurcations of periodic orbits.

Therefore, the soft- and hard-spring cases (7.7), (7.8), correspond to delay differential equations for which the bifurcation in  $\alpha$  can only produce periodic orbits via Hopf bifurcation of the single equilibrium, 0, resembling the Chafee-Infante bifurcation problem [CI74]. Note, additionally, that if  $f \in \mathfrak{X}^-$ , then (7.9) has a unique stable limit cycle for all  $\alpha$  above a certain threshold, recovering well-known results [Nus75, KY75].

## References

- [Ang88] S. Angenent. The zero set of a solution of a parabolic equation. *J. re. und ang. Math.*, 1988.
- [BC84] P. Brunovsky and S.-N. Chow. Generic properties of stationary state solutions of reaction-diffusion equations. *J. Diff. Eqs.*, 1984.
- [CI74] N. Chafee and E. F. Infante. Bifurcation and stability for a nonlinear parabolic partial differential equation. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 1974.
- [CL55] E. A. Coddington and N. Levinson. *Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations*. McGraw-Hill, 1955.
- [DILW02] P. Dormayer, A.F. Ivanov, and B. Lani-Wayda. Floquet multipliers of symmetric rapidly oscillating solutions of differential delay equations. *Tohoku Math. J.*, 2002.

- [DvGVLW95] O. Diekmann, S. A. van Gils, S.M. Verduyn-Lunel, and H.-O. Walther. *Delay Equations Functional-, Complex-, and Non-linear Analysis*. Springer, 1995.
- [FR91] G. Fusco and C. Rocha. A permutation related to the dynamics of a scalar parabolic PDE. *J. Diff. Eqs.*, 1991.
- [FRW04] B. Fiedler, C. Rocha, and M. Wolfrum. Heteroclinic orbits between rotating waves of semilinear parabolic equations on the circle. *J. Diff. Eqs.*, 2004.
- [Hal69] J. K. Hale. *Ordinary Differential Equations*. Krieger, 1969.
- [HS08] M. Hirsch and H. Smith. Monotone dynamical systems. In *Handbook of Differential Equations: Ordinary Differential Equations*. North-Holland, 2008.
- [HVL93] J. K. Hale and S. M. Verduyn-Lunel. *Introduction to Functional Differential Equations*. Springer, 1993.
- [KY74] J. Kaplan and J. Yorke. Ordinary differential equations which yield periodic solutions of differential delay equations. *J. Math. An. and App.*, 1974.
- [KY75] J. Kaplan and J. Yorke. On the stability of a periodic solution of a differential delay equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 1975.
- [Mat82] H. Matano. Nonincrease of the lap-number of a solution for a one-dimensional semilinear parabolic equation. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo*, 1982.
- [MP88] J. Mallet-Paret. Morse decompositions for delay-differential equations. *J. Diff. Eqs.*, 1988.
- [MPN13] J. Mallet-Paret and R. D. Nussbaum. Tensor products, positive linear operators, and delay-differential equations. *J. Dyn. Diff. Eqs.*, 2013.
- [MPS96a] J. Mallet-Paret and G. R. Sell. The Poincaré-Bendixson theorem for monotone cyclic feedback systems with delay. *J. Diff. Eqs.*, 1996.
- [MPS96b] J. Mallet-Paret and G. R. Sell. Systems of differential delay equations: Floquet multipliers and discrete lyapunov functions. *J. Diff. Eqs.*, 1996.

- [Mys55] A.D. Myshkis. *Lineare Differentialgleichungen mit nachfolgendem Argument*. Dt. Verl. der Wiss., 1955.
- [Nus74] R. D. Nussbaum. Periodic solutions of some nonlinear autonomous functional differential equations. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, 1974.
- [Nus75] R. Nussbaum. Uniqueness and nonuniqueness for periodic solutions of  $\dot{x}(t) = -g(x(t-1))$ . *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 1975.
- [Sch90] R. Schaaf. *Global Solution Branches of Two Point Boundary Value Problems*. Springer, 1990.