Jason A. Platt,^{*} Adrian Wong,[†] and Randall Clark[‡]

Department of Physics, University of California San Diego 9500 Gilman Drive La Jolla, CA 92093

Stephen G. Penny[§]

Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences at the University of Colorado Boulder, and NOAA Physical Sciences Laboratory Boulder, CO, 80305-3328, USA

Henry D. I. Abarbanel[¶]

Department of Physics,

and

Marine Physical Laboratory, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California San Diego 9500 Gilman Drive La Jolla, CA 92093

Abstract

Reservoir computers (RC) are a form of recurrent neural network (RNN) used for forecasting time series data. As with all RNNs, selecting the hyperparameters presents a challenge when training on new inputs. We present a method based on generalized synchronization (GS) that gives direction in designing and evaluating the architecture and hyperparameters of an RC. The 'auxiliary method' for detecting GS provides a computationally efficient pre-training test that guides hyperparameter selection. Furthermore, we provide a metric for RC using the reproduction of the input system's *Lyapunov exponents* that demonstrates robustness in prediction.

I. INTRODUCTION

Machine learning (ML) is a computing paradigm for data-driven prediction in which an ML "device" accepts input data in a training phase, which is then used in a predict/forecast phase that is used to extrapolate to new data. When the data is in the form of a time series, such a "device" is denoted a "recurrent neural network" (RNN) [1]. This is in contrast to other ML network architectures, such as feed forward neural networks, that assume the statistical independence of inputs [2, 3].

RNNs have feedback in the connection topology of the network, enabling self excitation as a dynamical system and distinguishing them from feed forward networks that only represent functions [4]. This feature identifies RNNs as an attractive choice for data driven forecasting [5].

A kind of RNN architecture with demonstrated capability for dynamical systems forecasting is reservoir computing (RC) [4, 6–14], where a large random network is constructed and only the final layer is trained. This method is much simpler to train due to the fixed weights in the reservoir layer, avoiding the vanishing/exploding gradients that plague other forms of RNNs [15–17]. The *D*-dimensional training input signal to the network, denoted $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{D}$, may be generated from a known dynamical system [18, 19], or from observations where the underlying dynamical rules are undetermined. RC's simplicity, ease of training

^{*} jplatt@ucsd.edu

[†] asw012@ucsd.edu

[‡] r2clark@ucsd.edu

[§] steve.penny@noaa.gov

[¶] habarbanel@gmail.com

and demonstrated prediction capabilities make them a clear choice for time series prediction tasks [5].

The ability to develop a data-driven model using a method such as RC is attractive for a number of practical reasons. RC allows us to construct predictive models of unknown or poorly understood dynamics. Should the input signal $\mathbf{u}(t)$ arise from measurements of high dimensional geophysical or laboratory flows [20, 21], the speedup in computing with a reservoir network realized in hardware [22, 23] may permit the exploration of detailed statistical questions about the observations that might be difficult or impossible otherwise. RC has the potential to provide significant computational cost savings in prediction applications, since the RC dynamics typically comprises a network with computationally simple active dynamics at its nodes.



FIG. 1. Flow of operations for utilizing a Reservoir Computation (RC) to perform forecasting/prediction of a D-dimensional input $\mathbf{u}(t)$ presented to an RC with N-dimensional dynamical degrees-of-freedom $\mathbf{r}(t)$. When the input and the reservoir exhibit generalized synchronization, $u_a = \varphi_a(\mathbf{r}); a = 1, 2, ...D$, training consists of estimating any parameters in a representation of $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$.

The success of RNNs and their increased adoption in research applications has rapidly outpaced the understanding of these data driven processes. It is not known how best to design a network for a particular problem, nor how much or what kind of data is most useful for training. General guidelines are well established [7], but tend to be justified with empirical rather than theoretical considerations. In probing this question, the idea arose [18, 24–26] that the explanation might be a form of synchronization known as 'generalized synchronization' (GS) [27–29].

We use this insight to move from an *ad hoc* training approach to a systematic strategy where we ensure that the input $\mathbf{u}(t)$ and the reservoir degrees-of freedom $\mathbf{r}(t)$ show generalized synchronization $u_a(t) = \varphi_a(\mathbf{r}(t))$; a = 1, 2, ..., D, and point out that it is parameters in the function $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$ that we need to estimate. We show a **computationally efficient** way to choose a region of RC hyperparameters—including the spectral radius (SR) of the adjacency matrix $A_{\alpha,\beta}$ and the probability of non-zero connections among the N active units (ρ_A) —where generalized synchronization occurs and skillful forecasting of the training input data $\mathbf{u}(t)$ is to be expected, given an accurate enough approximation to $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$. We argue that the vague references in the literature to the "edge of chaos" [6] are not particularly informative.

A related issue is that the traditional method of evaluating the effectiveness of an RNN, with training and testing data sets, is not sufficient when performing dynamical systems forecasting, as the former method gives no indication of the stability of the forecast. A simple approach to evaluation, showing a prediction of a single time series, also gives no indication of the stability of the predictions over the entire range of inputs. In this paper we attempt to rectify these deficiencies by using dynamical properties of the reservoir to design and evaluate a trained network.

The goals of this paper are as follows:

- Introduce a computationally efficient numerical test, based on GS and using the 'auxiliary method', that can guide hyperparameter selection in RNNs.
- Provide a metric for a "well trained"—*i.e.*, robust to perturbations—network using the reproduction of the input system's Lyapunov exponent spectrum.

II. SYNCHRONIZATION IN RESERVOIR COMPUTING

RCs are applied to forecasting problems where the task is to predict a *D*-dimensional input sequence $\mathbf{u}(t)$ generated from a dynamical system

$$\frac{d\mathbf{u}(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{F}_u(\mathbf{u}(t)),$$

 $\mathbf{F}_u(\mathbf{u}(t))$ is the vector field of the **u** dynamics.

An RC consists of three layers: an input layer, the reservoir itself, and an output layer. The reservoir, described as a dynamical system \mathbf{F}_r , is composed of N nodes at which we locate nonlinear models, in ML called 'activation functions', [13, 30–34]. The nodes in the network are connected through an $N \times N$ adjacency matrix $A_{\alpha\beta}$, chosen randomly to have a connection density ρ_A and non-zero elements chosen from a uniform distribution in [-1, 1]. This is then normalized by the largest eigenvalue of $A_{\alpha\beta}$: the spectral radius (SR).

The input layer maps the signal $\mathbf{u}(t)$ from D dimensions into the N dimensional reservoir space. The output layer $\varphi(\mathbf{r}(t))$ is a function such that $\varphi_a(\mathbf{r}) = u_a(t)$, chosen during the **training phase** during which we estimate any parameters in $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$. This is the only part of the reservoir computer that is trained. It is common practice to choose $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$ as a linear function of \mathbf{r} , but this is by no means the only choice of output function—see appendix.

The structure of a RC is shown in Fig.(1). $\mathbf{r}(t)$ can be viewed as representing the information in the input time series $\{\mathbf{u}(0), \mathbf{u}(1), \dots, \mathbf{u}(t_{final})\}$ in N > D dimensional space consistent with Takens' embedding theorem [37].

The reservoir dynamics act at the nodes of the network $\mathbf{r}(t)$. In the 'training phase' and 'prediction/forecast phase' the equations governing the dynamics of the reservoir are these:

$$\underbrace{\frac{d\mathbf{r}(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{F}_r[\mathbf{r}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)]}_{\text{training}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{u}(t) = \varphi(\mathbf{r}(t))}_{\text{forecast}} \underbrace{\frac{d\mathbf{r}(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{F}_r[\mathbf{r}(t), \varphi(\mathbf{r}(t))]}_{\text{forecast}}.$$
(1)

The forecast phase in Eq.(1) is an autonomous dynamical system, enabling prediction. Fig.(2) contains an example of an RC in the training and forecast phases.

A. The Hyperbolic Tangent Model

We use linear operator $\mathbf{A}_{\alpha\beta}$ and nonlinear activation function tanh() [24]. We also use a scaling constant γ to adjust the timescale of the reservoir dynamics, and a scaling constant



FIG. 2.

Top Synchronization and prediction between an N = 2000 tanh reservoir output (red) and the Lorenz63 input (black) [35, 36]. In $A_{\alpha\beta} : SR = 0.9$ and $\rho_A = 0.02$. The black vertical line at t = 0 is the end of the "training period."

Bottom When one selects the hyperparameters **outside** the region of GS, for example using N = 2000, SR = 1.6 and $\rho_A = 0.02$ for the tanh reservoir, the function $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$ does not exist. We may expect the reservoir to operate poorly in producing a replica of the input $\mathbf{u}(t)$.

 σ to weight the influence of the input signal $\mathbf{u}(t)$

$$\frac{d\mathbf{r}_{\alpha}(t)}{dt} = \gamma \{-r_{\alpha}(t) + \tanh(A_{\alpha\beta}r_{\beta}(t) + \sigma W_{\alpha a}u_{a}(t))\}.$$

Repeated indices are summed over. This is not the only formulation that is possible for \mathbf{F}_r , see the appendix for other kinds of reservoirs including those based on nonlinear neuron models.

Parameter	Description
SR	Largest eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix $A_{\alpha\beta}$
ρ_A	Density of the adjacency matrix $A_{\alpha\beta}$
Ν	Degrees-of-Freedom of the reservoir
γ	Time constant of the reservoir computer
σ	Strength of input signal

TABLE I. Hyperparameters of the tanh reservoir computer that need to be selected for individual problems. Other reservoirs also have various hyperparameters that depend on the active units at their nodes.



FIG. 3. The average forecast time of the reservoir depends strongly on the RC hyperparameters. Here we show the average forecast time variation (in units of $\lambda_1 t$) as a function of SR and ρ_A (labeled pnz for probability of a non-zero connection) for the Lorenz63 system. This kind of grid search is very computationally intensive due to the high sensitivity of the RC to changes in the parameters and the necessity of testing at multiple points to ensure stability of the prediction.

B. Synchronization and Training

GS refers to the synchronization of two **nonidentical** dynamical systems. These cannot exhibit identical oscillations [27, 29, 38]. For an input time series $\mathbf{u}(t)$ and response system $\mathbf{r}(t)$ GS means there is a function $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$ connecting them so we have $u_a(t) = \varphi_a(\mathbf{r}(t))$. We do not have an explicit form for φ , but if there is GS then we infer it exists [28, 39]. When $\mathbf{u}(t)$ and $\mathbf{r}(t)$ are synchronized, the combined system in \mathbb{R}^{N+D} will lie on a, generally complicated, synchronization manifold [40]. During the training phase when the reservoir evolves according to Eq.(1), $\mathbf{u}(t)$ drives the reservoir system towards the synchronization manifold.

GS gives us some advantage in the analysis of RC networks. GS assures us that the dynamical properties of the stimulus $\mathbf{u}(t)$ and the reservoir $\mathbf{r}(t)$ are now essentially the same. They share global Lyapunov exponents [41], attractor dimensions, and other quantities classifying nonlinear systems [27]. The principal power of GS in RC is that we may replace the initial non-autonomous reservoir dynamical system with an autonomous system operating on the synchronization manifold. (See Eq.(1))

The function $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$ is approximated in some manner, through training, and then this is substituted for **u** in the reservoir dynamics. In previous work on this [18, 19, 24] the authors approximated $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$ via a polynomial expansion in the components \mathbf{r}_{α} and used a regression method to find the coefficients of the powers of \mathbf{r}_{α} . We follow their example in this paper but note that there is a more general formulation of the problem—see the appendix.

C. The Auxiliary Method for GS

There are a variety of approaches for determining whether $\mathbf{r}(t)$ and $\mathbf{u}(t)$ exhibit GS. Perhaps the easiest approach is to establish **two identical** reservoirs [28] driven by the same $\mathbf{u}(t)$,

$$\frac{d\mathbf{r}_A(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{F}_r(\mathbf{r}_A(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) \& \frac{d\mathbf{r}_B(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{F}_r(\mathbf{r}_B(t), \mathbf{u}(t)).$$

Then we compare some function, $\chi(\mathbf{r})$ of $\mathbf{r}_A(t)$ against the same function of $\mathbf{r}_B(t)$. This should yield a straight line in the $\{\chi(\mathbf{r}_A), \chi(\mathbf{r}_B)\}$ plane. The two states $\mathbf{r}_A(t)$ and $\mathbf{r}_B(t)$ should be identical after a short transient period, even though the initial conditions of the reservoirs are typically different. This test does not tell us what the function $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$ is or what any of its properties may be; it only establishes the existence of $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$.

D. Synchronization Test

GS provides us with a test of whether a particular reservoir—with choice of architecture, dynamics and hyperparameters—has the capability to learn the dynamics implied by the data. Following the previous section, without training, one can simply evolve $\mathbf{F}_r(\mathbf{r}(t), \mathbf{u}(t))$ with the input $\mathbf{u}(t)$ present for two different initial conditions, and then test if GS occurs. If GS **does not occur** between the reservoir and the data then the reservoir is almost certainly untrainable and the choice of hyperparameters needs to be changed—see Fig.(2).

Looking for GS can greatly reduce the number of RCs with different hyperparameters that must be trained and tested in a traditional grid search—Fig.(3) shows such a grid search. The advantage of searching first for GS comes from the fact that the auxiliary test is fast and efficient, unlike computing the conditional Lyapunov exponents directly. The conditional Lyapunov exponents [42, 43] between the drive and response systems being negative mean that the two reservoir states should converge exponentially towards each other. In practice this property means that one can look at a much smaller segment of time than is required for accurate training. In addition, the training step does not need to be completed, so searching for GS is computationally much more efficient than training a reservoir and then evaluating it by predicting at multiple points.

Testing for GS only tells us that the function $\varphi(\mathbf{r}(t))$ exists, not whether our approximation to it is sufficient for prediction. One would expect a linear approximation to $\varphi(\mathbf{r}(t))$ would predict well only for a small subset of the parameters for which GS is shown to occur; indeed this is exactly what we find empirically. We hypothesise that more complex approximations might expand this subset of good predictions to include most of the region indicated by the GS test.

The authors in [24, 26] claim that in addition to the synchronization condition $u_a(t) = \varphi_a(\mathbf{r}(t))$, there is an invertibility condition that they call "invertible generalized synchronization." We do not find the invertibility condition to be a useful framework for analyzing the predictability of the RC, and the authors in the aforementioned papers assert the condition as a conjecture. Furthermore, many papers [29, 39, 44, 45] make the general assumptions that ϕ is a smooth, **invertible**, time independent function with [46] proving some of these properties hold locally. In our experience building and training these networks, the most likely explanation for the gap between the parameter space exibiting GS and the space that actually gives good predictions is that we are approximating a nonlinear function ϕ with a linear readout matrix. While not ruling out the issue of invertibility, the linear approximation argument is the cleaner explanation if for no other reasoning than Occam's razor.

An example of using GS to find hyperparameters to predict a geophysical system is shown



FIG. 4.

Top Contour plot of GS and no GS regions. Blue/Purple indicates a region of parameters in a localized tanh reservoir model (N = 5000) which shows GS with a driving signal from the 8 × 8 Shallow Water Equations (SWE) [47] as $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{192}$. The red region shows no GS.

Bottom Forecast for the normalized vorticity at a particular point on the 192 dimensional $8 \times 8 \times 3$ grid. Localized reservoir scheme and details of the SWE are found in the appendix.

in Fig. (4). Here we predict the evolution of the shallow water equations [47] on an 8×8 grid using a localized reservoir scheme. Using the auxiliary method to test for GS, we found a set of parameters for this high dimensional model quite efficiently. See appendix for the detailed implementation details including the localized reservoir scheme.

III. EVALUATION OF RESERVOIR PROPERTIES

After running the test for GS and performing a hyperparameter search, the question arises of how to guarantee stable forecasting. One often encounters the two situations in RC:

- The forecast starts out close to the data but then quickly diverges and becomes nonphysical
- The forecast is "good" for certain initial starting conditions but not for others.



FIG. 5. Left Panel Gaussian fit to the prediction times for 10 N=2000 tanh RCs trained on Lorenz63 data with the same hyperparameters but different random seeds and training data. Each reservoir predicts 4000 randomly selected training points. These points are different for each reservoir. The 10 RC's prediction times overlap closely; the (mean(10 reservoirs)) = 5.92 and the (RMS deviation(10 reservoirs)) = 0.24. This shows the robustness of this set of hyperparameters to training data and randomization of the reservoir layers. **Right Panel** A histogram and the Gaussian fit to it from the **Left Panel** better displays the variation shown in one hyperparameter setting of the reservoir computer.

The problem of finding a set of hyperparameters that will give robust predictions is one of the main challenges in reservoir computing and RNNs in general. The definition of a robust set of hyperparameters is one in which neither the randomness of the adjacency matrix $A_{\alpha\beta}$ or the training data set causes the reservoir to fail in prediction. An example of robustness is shown in Fig. (5) for a Lorenz63 input system. Many sets of parameters work well for a particular example or point on the attractor. It is more challenging to find a set of parameters that predict well for many initial conditions and for different instantiations of the RC.

The typical approach for evaluating machine learning predictions with the mean squared error over a test set does not capture a key feature of RC. A well trained RC should be able to give good short term predictions for **all** initial starting points **and** be stable in the



FIG. 6. Top Left Average prediction time of a N=2000 tanh reservoir as a function of SR for D = 5Lorenz96 Driver [48]. The time units are in $\lambda_1 t$. The error bars indicate variation in prediction depending on the stability of the input stimulus. Middle Left Largest Lyapunov exponent, λ_1 of the forecast reservoir and the input system (black line) as a function of the spectral radius. Bottom Left $\lambda_2, ..., \lambda_5$ Smaller Lyapunov exponents for the predicting reservoir. The method for computing the Lyapunov Exponents of an RC is discussed in [6, 24, 49, 50]. Right The fractal dimension [51, 52] (Olive Green) of the forecasting reservoir (tanh, N=2000) driven by a Lorenz96 system as a function of the SR plotted along with the prediction time (Red). The predicting reservoir KY dimension is an estimate of the dimensionality of the synchronization manifold where the RC resides. As the SR crosses ≈ 1.1 , corresponding to the largest CLE of the reservoir crossing 0, the dimension of the reservoir increases rapidly. This corresponds to the reservoir moving off the low dimensional generalized synchronization manifold.

medium to long term. This feature is called attractor reconstruction [24]. Instead of a test set, we propose an additional criterion for RC evaluation; a well trained RC reproduces the spectrum of Lyapunov exponents of the input system F_u —see Fig. (6) for an example. Lyapunov exponents (LEs) characterize the average global error growth rate of a dynamical system [42] along directions in phase space. One can calculate the N LEs of the forecast reservoir Eq.(1) and compare them to the D exponents of the input system. If the D largest LEs match and the smaller N - D exponents of the RC are negative, then the two systems will have the same global behavior, increasing the likelihood of robust, stable predictions.

We show this calculation for the Lorenz96 system [48] in Fig.(6). Our results show that when more of the spectrum of LE's are matched by the RC, the better the average predictions. If the Lyapunov spectrum of the RC does not match that of the input then the two situations above are more likely to occur. In situations where it is difficult to exhaustively test the RC, perhaps because the model is expensive to run or there is limited data, evaluating the Lyapunov exponents of the reservoir will guarantee that the global error growth of the RC is the same as the data. A similar calculation is performed in [24] but without systematically tying the results to the average prediction time.

The results presented in Fig.(6) match the suggestion that the reservoir operates best at "the edge of chaos" [6, 53–55], that is, the maximal prediction time of the reservoir corresponds to a SR just less than 1. We make the case that the "edge" corresponds to the state where the reservoir LEs approximately match all the non-negative exponents of the input system. Given the computational time and the LEs of the input data, one could use the match of the LEs as a cost function to search for the most robust implementation of an RC for a given system.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Recurrent neural networks are the method of choice when it comes to time series prediction tasks due to their natural self excitation. While much intuition and knowledge for practical applications have been built up for specific tasks over the years, understanding the tradeoffs when designing a particular network is of the utmost importance.

Generalized synchronization both provides a perspective when designing these networks, but also gives practical tools for testing and evaluation. The auxiliary test narrows down the hyperparameter search space when applying RC to a new problem. Once the network is trained, the LEs of the synchronization manifold give a rigorous evaluation criterion that can guarantee the robustness of the networks predictions. We have explored the role of GS, where the input $\mathbf{u}(t)$ driving the reservoir and the reservoir coordinates $\mathbf{r}(t)$ satisfy $u_a(t) = \varphi_a(\mathbf{r}(t))$. We have elaborated on the notion that the only training required to provide accurate estimations/forecasts by the trained reservoir involves the estimation of parameters in representations of $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We had many thoughtful discussions on the material presented here with Brian Hunt. Three of us (SGP, J. Platt, and HDIA) acknowledge support from the Office of Naval Research (ONR) grants N00014-19-1-2522 and N00014-20-1-2580. SGP acknowledges further support from the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) grants NA18NWS4680048, NA19NES4320002, and NA20OAR4600277. We also thank Lawson Fuller for many fruitful discussions and for paper editing.

- I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville, *Deep Learning* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA; London, UK, 2016).
- [2] Z. C. Lipton, A critical review of recurrent neural networks for sequence learning, CoRR abs/1506.00019 (2015), arXiv:1506.00019.
- [3] A. J. A. Ty, Z. Fang, R. A. Gonzalez, P. J. Rozdeba, and H. D. I. Abarbanel, Machine learning of time series using time-delay embedding and precision annealing, Neural Computation 31, 2004 (2019), pMID: 31393828.
- [4] M. Lukovsevivcius and H. Jaeger, Jaeger, h.: Reservoir computing approaches to recurrent neural network training. computer science review 3, 127-149, Computer Science Review 3, 127 (2009).
- [5] P. Vlachas, J. Pathak, B. Hunt, T. Sapsis, M. Girvan, E. Ott, and P. Koumoutsakos, Backpropagation algorithms and reservoir computing in recurrent neural networks for the forecasting of complex spatiotemporal dynamics, Neural Networks 126, 191 (2020).
- [6] D. Verstraeten and B. Schrauwen, On the quantification of dynamics in reservoir computing, in Artificial Neural Networks – ICANN 2009, edited by C. Alippi, M. Polycarpou, C. Panayiotou, and G. Ellinas (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009) pp. 985–994.

- [7] M. Lukovsevivcius, A practical guide to applying echo state networks, in *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade: Second Edition*, edited by G. Montavon, G. B. Orr, and K.-R. Müller (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012) pp. 659–686.
- [8] H. Jaeger, The "echo state" approach to analysing and training recurrent neural networkswith an erratum note, Bonn, Germany: German National Research Center for Information Technology GMD Technical Report 148, 1 (2010).
- [9] H. Jaeger, Long short-term memory in echo state networks: Details of a simulation study (2012).
- [10] H. Jaeger and H. Haas, Harnessing nonlinearity: Predicting chaotic systems and saving energy in wireless communication, Science 304, 78 (2004).
- [11] B. Schrauwen, D. Verstraeten, and J. Van Campenhout, An overview of reservoir computing: Theory, applications and implementations, in ESANN'2007 proceedings - European Symposium on Artificial Neural Networks Bruges (Belgium), 25-27 April 2007 (2007) pp. 471–482.
- [12] W. Maass, T. Natschläger, and H. Markram, Real-time computing without stable states: A new framework for neural computation based on perturbations, Neural Computation 14, 2531 (2002).
- [13] G. M. Wojcik and W. A. Kaminski, Liquid state machine built of hodgkin-huxley neurons and pattern recognition, Neurocomputing 58-60, 245 (2004), computational Neuroscience: Trends in Research 2004.
- [14] J. Pathak, B. Hunt, M. Girvan, Z. Lu, and E. Ott, Model-free prediction of large spatiotemporally chaotic systems from data: A reservoir computing approach, Phys. Rev. Lett. 120, 024102 (2018).
- [15] S. Hochreiter, Y. Bengio, P. Frasconi, and J. Schmidhuber, Gradient flow in recurrent nets: the difficulty of learning long-term dependencies, in *A Field Guide to Dynamical Recurrent Neural Networks*, edited by S. C. Kremer and J. F. Kolen (IEEE Press, 2001).
- [16] Y. Bengio, P. Frasconi, and P. Simard, The problem of learning long-term dependencies in recurrent networks, in *IEEE International Conference on Neural Networks* (1993) pp. 1183– 1188 vol.3.
- [17] R. Pascanu, T. Mikolov, and Y. Bengio, On the difficulty of training recurrent neural networks (PMLR, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 2013) pp. 1310–1318.

- [18] B. Hunt, Machine learning for forecasting and data assimilation, in Talk at NOAA Center for Satellite Applications and Research (STAR); November 7, 2019 (2019).
- [19] E. Ott, Using machine learning for prediction of large complex, spatially extended systems (2019), workshop on Dynamical Methods in Data-based Exploration of Complex Systems; Max-Planck Institute for the Physics of Complex Systems; Dresden, Germany.
- [20] N. Sharan, G. Matheou, and P. Dimotakis, Turbulent shear-layer mixing: initial conditions, and direct-numerical and large-eddy simulations, J. Fluid Mech. 877, 35 (2019).
- [21] G. Matheou, Turbulence structure in a stratocumulus cloud, Atmosphere 9, 392 (2018).
- [22] G. Tanaka, T. Yamane, J. B. Héroux, R. Nakane, N. Kanazawa, S. Takeda, H. Numata, D. Nakano, and A. Hirose, Recent advances in physical reservoir computing: A review, Neural Networks 115, 100–123 (2019).
- [23] D. Canaday, A. Griffith, and D. J. Gauthier, Rapid time series prediction with a hardwarebased reservoir computer, Chaos 28, 123119 (2018).
- [24] Z. Lu, B. R. Hunt, and E. Ott, Attractor reconstruction by machine learning, Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science 28, 061104 (2018).
- [25] T. Lymburn, D. M. Walker, M. Small, and J[']ungling, The reservoir's perspective on generalized synchronization, Chaos 29, 093133 (2019).
- [26] Z. Lu and D. S. Bassett, Invertible generalized synchronization: A putative mechanism for implicit learning in neural systems, Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science 30, 063133 (2020).
- [27] N. F. Rulkov, M. M. Sushchik, L. S. Tsimring, and H. D. I. Abarbanel, Generalized synchronization of chaos in directionally coupled chaotic systems, Phys. Rev. E 51, 980 (1995).
- [28] H. D. I. Abarbanel, N. F. Rulkov, and M. M. Sushchik, Generalized synchronization of chaos: The auxiliary system approach, Phys. Rev. E 53, 4528 (1996).
- [29] L. Kocarev and U. Parlitz, Generalized synchronization, predictability, and equivalence of unidirectionally coupled dynamical systems, Physical Review Letters 76 (1996).
- [30] D. Brunner, S. Reitzenstein, and I. Fischer, All-optical neuromorphic computing in optical networks of semiconductor lasers, in 2016 IEEE International Conference on Rebooting Computing (ICRC) (2016) pp. 1–2.
- [31] C. Fernando and S. Sojakka, Pattern recognition in a bucket, in Advances in Artificial Life, edited by W. Banzhaf, J. Ziegler, T. Christaller, P. Dittrich, and J. T. Kim (Springer Berlin

Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003) pp. 588–597.

- [32] N. Haynes, M. Soriano, I. Fischer, and D. Gauthier, Reservoir computing with a single timedelay autonomous boolean node, Physical review. E, Statistical, nonlinear, and soft matter physics 91, 10.1103/PhysRevE.91.020801 (2014).
- [33] L. Larger, A. Baylón-Fuentes, R. Martinenghi, V. S. Udaltsov, Y. K. Chembo, and M. Jacquot, High-speed photonic reservoir computing using a time-delay-based architecture: Million words per second classification, Phys. Rev. X 7, 011015 (2017).
- [34] Y. Paquot, F. Duport, A. Smerieri, J. Dambre, B. Schrauwen, M. Haelterman, and S. Massar, Optoelectronic reservoir computing, Scientific Reports 2, 10.1038/srep00287 (2011).
- [35] E. N. Lorenz, Deterministic Nonperiodic Flow, Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences 20, 130 (1963).
- [36] J. A. Platt, L. Fuller, A. Wong, R. Clark, S. G. Penny, and H. D. I. Abarbanel, Forecasting using reservoir computing: The role of generalized synchronization (2021), unpublished.
- [37] F. Takens, Detecting strange attractors in turbulence, in *Dynamical Systems and Turbulence*, Warwick 1980, edited by D. Rand and L.-S. Young (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1981) pp. 366–381.
- [38] K. Pyragas, Properties of generalized synchronization of chaos, Nonlinear Analysis. Modelling and Control 3 (1998).
- [39] B. R. Hunt, E. Ott, and J. A. Yorke, Differentiable generalized synchronization of chaos, Phys. Rev. E 55, 4029 (1997).
- [40] L. M. Pecora, T. L. Carroll, G. A. Johnson, D. J. Mar, and J. F. Heagy, Fundamentals of synchronization in chaotic systems, concepts, and applications, Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science 7, 520 (1997).
- [41] V. I. Oseledec, A multiplicative ergodic theorem. lyapunov characteristic numbers for dynamical systems, Trudy Mosk. Mat. Obsc. 19, 179 (1968).
- [42] A. M. LYAPUNOV, The general problem of the stability of motion, International Journal of Control 55, 531 (1992).
- [43] L. M. Pecora and T. L. Carroll, Synchronization in chaotic systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 821 (1990).
- [44] U. Parlitz, L. Junge, and L. Kocarev, Subharmonic entrainment of unstable period orbits and generalized synchronization, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 3158 (1997).

- [45] R. Brown, Approximating the mapping between systems exhibiting generalized synchronization, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 4835 (1998).
- [46] K. Josic, Synchronization of chaotic systems and invariant manifolds, Nonlinearity 13, 1321 (2000).
- [47] R. Sadourny, The dynamics of finite-difference models of the shallow water equations, Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences 32, 680 (1975).
- [48] E. N. Lorenz, Predictability: A problem partly solved, in *Predictability of weather and climate*, edited by T. Palmer and R. Hagedorn (Cambridge, 2006).
- [49] H. D. I. Abarbanel, The Analysis of Observed Chaotic Data (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996).
- [50] J. P. Eckmann and D. Ruelle, Ergodic theory of chaos and strange attractors, Rev. Mod. Phys. 57, 617 (1985).
- [51] J. L. Kaplan and J. A. Yorke, Chaotic behavior of multidimensional difference equations, in Functional Differential Equations and Approximation of Fixed Points, edited by H.-O. Peitgen and H.-O. Walther (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1979) pp. 204–227.
- [52] P. Frederickson, J. L. Kaplan, E. D. Yorke, and J. A. Yorke, The liapunov dimension of strange attractors, Journal of Differential Equations 49, 185 (1983).
- [53] J. Boedecker, O. Obst, J. T. Lizier, N. M. Mayer, and M. Asada, Information processing in echo state networks at the edge of chaos, Theory in biosciences = Theorie in den Biowissenschaften 131, 205—213 (2012).
- [54] J. Jiang and Y.-C. Lai, Model-free prediction of spatiotemporal dynamical systems with recurrent neural networks: Role of network spectral radius, Phys. Rev. Research 1, 033056 (2019).
- [55] T. L. Carroll, Do reservoir computers work best at the edge of chaos?, Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science 30, 121109 (2020).
- [56] M. Kostuk, Synchronization and Statistical Methods for the Data Assimilation of HVC Neuron Models, Ph.D. thesis, University of California San Diego (2012).
- [57] D. Johnston and S. M.-S. Wu, Foundations of Cellular Neurophysiology (Bradford Books, MIT Press, 1995).
- [58] D. Sterratt, B. Graham, A. Gillies, and D. Willshaw, Principles of Computational Modelling in Neuroscience (Cambridge University Press, 2011) p. 390.

- [59] A. L. Hodgkin and A. F. Huxley, A quantitative description of membrane current and its application to conduction and excitation in nerve, The Journal of physiology 117, 500 (1952).
- [60] R. FitzHugh, Impulses and physiological states in theoretical models of nerve membrane, Biophysical Journal 1, 445 (1961).
- [61] J. Nagumo, S. Arimoto, and S. Yoshizawa, An active pulse transmission line simulating nerve axon, Proceedings of the IRE 50, 2061 (1962).
- [62] A. N. Tikhonov, On the stability of inverse problems, Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR 39, 195–198 (1943).
- [63] D. L. Phillips, A technique for the numerical solution of certain integral equations of the first kind, Journal of the ACM. 9, 84–97 (1962).
- [64] K. Miller, Least squares methods for ill-posed problems with a prescribed bound, SIAM Journal on Mathaematical Analysis 1, 52 (1970).
- [65] A. N. Tikhonov and V. Y. Arsenin, Solutions of Ill-Posed Problems (Wiley:New York, 1977).

Appendix A: Data used for Driving Signals

Data are generated from a variety of simple dynamical systems to act as a nonlinear driving signal for the RC. Each model is described in detail below.

1. Lorenz 1963 Model

The Lorenz63 [35] equations form a deterministic nonlinear dynamical system that exhibits chaos for certain ranges of parameters. It was originally found as a three dimensional, reduced, approximation to the partial differential equations for the heating of the lower atmosphere of the earth by sunlight. The dynamical equations of motion are

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = \sigma[y(t) - x(t)]$$

$$\frac{dy(t)}{dt} = x(t)[\rho - z(t)] - y(t)$$

$$\frac{dz(t)}{dt} = x(t)y(t) - \beta z(t)$$
(A1)
(A2)

with time independent parameters $\sigma = 10, \rho = 28, \beta = 8/3.$

The Lyapunov exponents are $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3\} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.9, 0, -14.7 \end{bmatrix}$ calculated via the QR decomposition algorithm given by Eckmann and Ruelle [50].

2. Lorenz96 Model

The dynamical equations introduced by [48]:

$$\frac{dx_a(t)}{dt} = x_{a-1}(t)(x_{a+1}(t) - x_{a-2}(t)) - x_a(t) + f$$
(A3)

and a = 1, 2, ..., D; $x_{-1}(t) = x_{D-1}(t)$; $x_0(t) = x_D(t)$; $x_{D+1}(t) = x_1(t)$. f is a fixed parameter which we take to be in the range 8.0 to 8.2 where the solutions to these dynamical equations are chaotic [56]. The equations for the states $x_a(t)$; a = 1, 2, ..., D are meant to describe 'stations' on a periodic spatial lattice. We use D = 5.

The Lyapunov exponents are $\{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_5\} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6, 0, -0.4, -1.4, -3.8 \end{bmatrix}$ calculated via the QR decomposition algorithm given by Eckmann and Ruelle [50].

3. The Shallow Water Equations

The shallow water equations (SWE) describe fluid dynamics in a domain in which the horizontal length scales greatly exceed the vertical length scales. The SWEs often serve as a basic model for geophysical fluid dynamics due to the thickness of the atmosphere or ocean in relation to the size of the Earth. The troposphere, where most weather phenomena occur, varies from 6-20 km, while the ocean has an average depth of 3.7 km. These fluids constitute a thin film in relation to the size of flows over the surface of the Earth, which has a radius between 6357 km to 6378 km, depending on latitude.

Accurate numerical solutions to the SWEs on a grid have been investigated in detail by Sadourny [47] who concluded that a potential-enstrophy conserving scheme is effective. The details of this scheme can be found in Section 2 of [47]. We use a form of the SWEs with three dynamical variables: surface height $\mathbf{h}(x, y, t)$, and the $\mathbf{u}(x, y, t)$ and $\mathbf{v}(x, y, t)$ components of velocity. We solve the SWEs numerically on a discretized grid of size $N_{\Delta} = 8$ in two horizontal directions, resulting in an 8×8 grid. Including the three dynamical variables, this yields a D = 192-dimensional dynamical system.

Inspired by the scheme used in [14] on a 1 dimensional grid, we use this discretized numerical integration of the SWEs to drive a set of localized reservoirs arranged in 16 overlapping local "patches" on a 2 dimensional grid. Each patch receives input from a subset of 48 local variables of the total 192-dimensional input vector. The 48 variables input to each local reservoir consist of 16 u(t), 16 v(t) and 16 h(t) that are located at the 16 points on a local patch of the grid. Each local reservoir is used to predict 12 (4 u(t), 4 v(t), 4 h(t)) of these after training, thus creating the overlapping scheme.

From the dynamical variables $\{u(x, y, t), v(x, y, t), h(x, y, t)\}$ we compare the reservoir output for normalized height and for the normalized vorticity $\omega_z(x, y, t)$ with their counterparts in the data. We recall

$$\omega_z(x, y, t) = \frac{\partial v(x, y, t)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial u(x, y, t)}{\partial y}.$$

Even in this complicated set of overlapping localized RCs, it is straightforward and computationally efficient to apply our GS test to the data. Applying the auxiliary test we see—Fig. (4)—that there is a broad region where our 16 reservoir scheme synchronizes with the data. This test is much more computationally efficient than evaluating the reservoir by training, thus giving us guidance as to where to focus our search. Then, after a traditional search over this smaller grid of hyperparameters, a set of hyperparameters were found that produce reasonable and robust predictions over a short time scale. The test enables us to significantly reduce the number of hyperparameters searched.

Appendix B: Dynamical Systems Used at the Nodes of the Reservoir Network

Any nonlinear dynamical system can be used for the reservoir dynamics. We use a uniform notation to include the adjacency/connectivity matrix $A_{\alpha\beta}\alpha, \beta = 1, 2, ...N$ and a reservoir vector $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha}(N, D, t)$ which specifies the connections within the reservoir $A_{\alpha\beta}$ and the manner in which the driving data stream $\zeta_{\alpha,b} \mathbf{u}_b$; b = 1, 2, ..., D is distributed among the active elements at the nodes of the reservoir network:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\alpha}(N, D, t) = \sum_{\beta=1}^{N} A_{\alpha\beta} r_{\beta}(t) + \sum_{b=1}^{D} \zeta_{\alpha, b} u_{b}(t)$$
(B1)

1. Hodgkin-Huxley Model

The connection $\mathcal{R}_{\gamma}(N, D, t)$ for this input model uses

$$\zeta_{\alpha,b} = \chi_{\alpha,b} I_0(V_\alpha(t)) \tag{B2}$$

The Hodgkin-Huxley equations [57–59] for the neurons with Na, K, and Leak Channels operating at reservoir sites $\alpha = 1, 2, ...N$ are given by:

$$C_m \frac{dV_{\gamma}(t)}{dt} = g_{Na} m(V_{\gamma}(t))^3 h(V_{\gamma}(t))(E_{Na} - V_{\gamma}(t)) + g_K (n(V_{\gamma}(t))^4 (E_K - V_{\gamma}(t) + g_L (E_L - V_{\gamma}(t)) + \mathcal{R}_{\gamma}(N, 4, t))$$

$$\frac{dm_{\gamma}(t)}{dt} = \alpha_m(V_{\gamma}(t))(1 - m_{\gamma}(V_{\gamma}(t)) - \beta_m(V_{\gamma}(t))m_{\gamma}(V_{\gamma}(t)))$$

$$\frac{dh_{\gamma}(t)}{dt} = \alpha_h(V_{\gamma}(t))(1 - h_{\gamma}(V_{\gamma}(t)) - \beta_h(V_{\gamma}(t))h_{\gamma}(V_{\gamma}(t)))$$

$$\frac{dn_{\gamma}(t)}{dt} = \alpha_n(V_{\gamma}(t))(1 - n_{\gamma}(V_{\gamma}(t)) - \beta_n(V_{\gamma}(t))n_{\gamma}(V_{\gamma}(t)))$$
(B3)

in which:

$$\alpha_m(V) = \frac{0.1(V+40)}{1-\exp[-(V+40)/10]}; \quad \beta_m(V) = 4\exp[-(V+65)/18]$$

$$\alpha_h(V) = 0.07\exp[-(V+65)/20]; \quad \beta_h(V) = \frac{1}{1+\exp[-(V+35)/10]}$$

$$\alpha_n(V) = \frac{0.01(V+55)}{1-\exp[-(V+55)/10]}; \quad \beta_n(V) = 1.125\exp[-(V+65)/80]$$

(B4)

and

$$I_0(V) = \frac{1}{2} [1 + \tanh(K(V - V_p)/2)].$$
(B5)

The values of the constants are chosen as: $C_m = 1\mu F/cm^2$; $g_{Na} = 120mS/cm^2$; $E_{Na} = 50mV$; $g_K = 36mS/cm^2$; $E_K = -77mV$; $g_L = 0.3mS/cm^2$; $E_L = -54mV$; K = 10/mV; $V_p = 0 mV$.

2. Fitzhugh-Nagumo Model

The connection $\mathcal{R}_{\gamma}(N, D, t)$ for this input model uses

$$\zeta_{\alpha,b} = \chi_{\alpha,b} I_0(V_\alpha(t)) \tag{B6}$$

The equations for the Fitzhugh-Nagumo Model (FHN) [60, 61] operating at reservoir sites $\gamma = 1, 2, .., N$ are

$$\frac{dV_{\gamma}(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{\tau} [V_{\gamma}(t) - \frac{1}{3} V_{\gamma}(t)^{3} - w_{\gamma}(t) + \left[\mathcal{R}_{\gamma}(N, 2, t) \right]$$
$$\frac{dw_{\gamma}(t)}{dt} = V_{\gamma}(t) - \eta w_{\gamma}(t) + \xi$$

The constants here are $\xi = 0.7$, $\eta = 0.8$, $\tau = 0.08$ ms, and we choose $I_0(V) = \frac{1}{2}[1 + \tanh(K(V - V_p))]$. K = 3/2, $V_p = 1$.

A is the $N \times N$ adjacency matrix, $A_{\alpha\beta}$, where entries are selected with (probability of non-zero connections (**pnz**)) in the range from $\{-1, 1\}$ and then rescaled by the largest singular value of **A**, namely the spectral radius (**SR**).



FIG. 7. We display two ways of computing regions of GS for a reservoir (N = 100) with Fitzhugh-Nagumo neurons at the nodes. Both methods give approximately the same result. Left The largest CLE calculated for Lorenz63 input and a Fitzhugh-Nagumo based ML device for variation in hyperparameters. Here Blue shows regions with *positive* CLEs. This means the hyperparameters in this region do not show GS. Red shows regions of *negative* CLE. This means GS exists in this region. Right The error between the response system and the *auxiliary* response system. A cutoff was picked for the error, determined by the criterion: $\|\mathbf{r}_A - \mathbf{r}_B\|/T <$ Threshold. $\mathbf{r}_A/\mathbf{r}_B$ are the two systems and T is the number of time points, and tell us that the two systems do not show GS, with one another. Choices for hyperparameters in the Blue regions indicate the absence of GS, while choices in the Red regions show GS.

3. The Hyperbolic Tangent Model

Here the input to reservoir connection $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha}(N, D, t)$

$$\zeta_{\alpha,b} = \sigma \mathbf{W}_{in-\alpha,b} \mathbf{u}_b \tag{B7}$$

We use the differential equation version of the combined linear operator in $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha}(N, D, t)$. We also use a scaling constant μ to adjust the timescale of the reservoir dynamics.

$$\frac{d\mathbf{r}(t)}{dt} = \mu \left[-\mathbf{r}(t) + \tanh\left(\sum_{b=1}^{D} \mathcal{R}_{\alpha b}(N, D, t)u_{b}(t)\right) \right].$$
(B8)

Appendix C: General Formulation of Polynomial Expansion

GS assures us that the dynamical properties of the stimulus $\mathbf{u}(t)$ and the reservoir $\mathbf{r}(t)$ are now essentially the same. They share global Lyapunov exponents [41], attractor dimensions, and other classifying nonlinear system quantities [27].

The principal power of GS in RC is that we may replace the initial non-autonomous reservoir dynamical system

$$\frac{d\mathbf{r}_{\alpha}(t)}{dt} = F_{\alpha}[\mathbf{r}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)], \qquad (C1)$$

with an autonomous system operating on the synchronization manifold [40]

$$\frac{d\mathbf{r}_{\alpha}(t)}{dt} = F_{\alpha}[\mathbf{r}(t), \varphi(\mathbf{r}(t))].$$
(C2)

In practice, the function $\mathbf{u} = \varphi(\mathbf{r})$ is approximated in some manner, through training, and then this is substituted for \mathbf{u} in the reservoir dynamics. In previous work on this [18, 19, 24] the authors approximated $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$ via a polynomial expansion in the components \mathbf{r}_{α} ; $\alpha =$ 1, 2, ..., N, and used a regression method to find the coefficients of the powers of \mathbf{r}_{α} .

This means we write $u_a(t) = \varphi_a(\mathbf{r}(t)) = \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^N J_{a\alpha} r_\alpha(t) + Z_{a\alpha\beta} r_\alpha(t)r_\beta(t) + \dots$, and we evaluate the coefficients $\{\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{Z}, \dots\}$ by minimizing with respect to the constant matrices $J_{a\alpha}$ and $Z_{a\alpha\beta}$

$$\sum_{t} \left[u_{a}(t) - \left\{ \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{N} J_{a\alpha} r_{\alpha}(t) + Z_{a\alpha\beta} r_{\alpha}(t) r_{\beta}(t) + \dots \right\} \right]^{2} + \text{regularization term, if required}$$
(C3)

[62–65]. The dimension of $J_{a\alpha}$ is D by N. The dimension of $Z_{a\alpha\beta}$ is D by $\frac{N(N+1)}{2}$ as it is symmetric in $\{\alpha, \beta\}$. If one simplifies to keeping only 'diagonal' terms in $\{\alpha\beta\}$, then the second term in Eq. (C3) is $\mathbf{Z}_{a\alpha}[r_{\alpha}]^2$ and this has dimension D by N.

We use this polynomial representation for $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$, noting there are many ways of approximating multivariate functions of \mathbf{r} . Another, perhaps useful, expression is this:

$$\frac{du_a(t)}{dt} = \frac{\partial \varphi_a(\mathbf{r}(t))}{\partial r_\beta(t)} \frac{dr_\beta(t)}{dt}.$$
(C4)

We have expressions for $\frac{du_a(t)}{dt}$ and $\frac{dr_{\beta}(t)}{dt}$ from the vector fields of the equations of motion for the driver and the reservoir, respectively.