

# Unstable Attractors: Existence and Robustness in Networks of Oscillators With Delayed Pulse Coupling

Peter Ashwin<sup>1\*</sup> and Marc Timme<sup>2†</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Mathematical Sciences,

Laver Building, University of Exeter, Exeter EX4 4QE, UK

<sup>2</sup> Max-Planck-Institut für Dynamik und Selbstorganisation,  
(formerly: MPI für Strömungsforschung),  
37073 Göttingen, Germany.

March 23, 2022

## Abstract

We consider unstable attractors; Milnor attractors  $A$  such that, for some neighbourhood  $U$  of  $A$ , almost all initial conditions leave  $U$ . Previous research strongly suggests that unstable attractors exist and even occur robustly (i.e. for open sets of parameter values) in a system modelling biological phenomena, namely in globally coupled oscillators with delayed pulse interactions.

In the first part of this paper we give a rigorous definition of unstable attractors for general dynamical systems. We classify unstable attractors into two types, depending on whether or not there is a neighbourhood of the attractor that intersects the basin in a set of positive measure. We give examples of both types of unstable attractor; these examples have non-invertible dynamics that collapse certain open sets onto stable manifolds of saddle orbits.

In the second part we give the first rigorous demonstration of existence and robust occurrence of unstable attractors in a network of oscillators with delayed pulse coupling. Although such systems are technically hybrid systems of delay differential equations with discontinuous ‘firing’ events, we show that their dynamics reduces to a finite dimensional hybrid system after a finite time and hence we can discuss Milnor attractors for this reduced finite dimensional system. We prove that for an open set of phase resetting functions there are saddle periodic orbits that are unstable attractors.

**Keywords** Pulse-coupled oscillator, Heteroclinic cycle, Global coupling, Hybrid system, Delay, Neural network.

**PACS** 05.45.-a; 87.10.+e

## 1 Background

Attractors for dynamical systems are traditionally viewed as being asymptotically stable invariant sets which have a neighbourhood that absorbs all sufficiently close initial conditions. As a consequence the basins of such attractors contain open sets. Whereas this concept works very well for

---

\*P.Ashwin@ex.ac.uk

†timme@chaos.gwdg.de

simple attractors of ordinary differential equations, for more complicated attractors the smallest asymptotically stable attractor may contain much more than the asymptotic dynamics of ‘typical’ initial conditions.

Partly in response to this problem, Milnor introduced a concept of measure attractor (now usually called *Milnor attractor*) [11]. This is a compact invariant set whose basins of attraction has positive measure in phase space. Examples of riddled basins [2, 13] show that, even for smooth invertible dynamics, one can find Milnor attractors with riddled basins; i.e. such that any open set that intersects the basin has positive measure in the basin of a different attractor; see [3] for a recent review of riddled basins.

In the absence of smoothness or invertibility, it is clear that more exotic attractors may appear. Recent work [14, 15, 16] on globally coupled networks of oscillator with delayed pulse interactions [4, 5] indicates that extreme cases of riddled basin attractors, *unstable attractors*, can appear, where there is a neighbourhood  $U$  of the attractor such that almost all points exit from  $U$  under the dynamics. Even more surprisingly, numerical simulations [14, 15, 16] seem to indicate that these attractors can appear in a robust way as long as there are sufficiently many oscillators in the system. The main aim of this paper is to give a rigorous explanation for the appearance and robustness of unstable attractors in such systems.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 examines the general problem of unstable attractors in a systematic way. We give some necessary conditions for the appearance of unstable attractors and some motivating examples. Subsequently, we address the relationship between networks of unstable attractors and robust heteroclinic cycles, and present a simple recipe of how to perturb a smooth flow with a robust heteroclinic cycle to a smooth semiflow with a network of unstable attractors.

In Section 3 we consider the system of globally pulse coupled oscillators with delayed interactions studied in [14], including a generalization of the set of possible response functions. Because the system combines continuous time evolution with discrete time events, it is strictly speaking a hybrid system [1] with delay. The main result of this section is Theorem 1 which shows that the dynamics reduces, after a finite time, to a finite dimensional hybrid system. It gives an explicit upper bound on the number of remaining dimensions in the system.

In Section 4 we prove that the system discussed in Section 3 exhibits unstable attractors (Theorem 2) and that these persist for an open set of parameter values (Theorem 3). The proof has two parts; firstly we show (by following an appropriate open set of initial conditions) that a certain periodic orbit is a Milnor attractor; secondly we show that this orbit is a saddle. We discuss this mechanism as being an effect of ‘dimension jump’ in the system.

Section 5 discusses obstacles to proving the existence and robustness of unstable attractors in a more general setting. For convenience some of the details of the proofs have been placed in appendices: Appendix A describes the system in the case that the delay is short enough that only one delayed pulse can influence the future dynamics of the system. Appendix B derives the return map on a section transverse to the unstable attracting periodic orbit.

## 2 Unstable attractors

### 2.1 Milnor attractors and unstable attractors

Consider a dynamical system defined by a semiflow  $F_t : M \rightarrow M$  on a finite dimensional manifold  $M$  for  $t \geq 0$  (recall that a semiflow is a family of maps such that  $F_{s+t} = F_s \circ F_t$  whenever  $s \geq 0$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , and such that  $F_0(x) = x$ ). In what follows we will consider continuous ( $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ) or discrete ( $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ ) dynamics.

Our examples arise from cases where  $F_t$  is not invertible for all  $t > 0$ : one cannot extend the semiflow to a flow. For convenience we will assume that  $M$  is compact and let  $\ell(\cdot)$  denote Lebesgue/Riemann measure on  $M$ . Recall that the  $\omega$ -limit set of  $x$  is defined by

$$\omega(x) = \bigcap_{t>0} \overline{\{F_s(x) : s \geq t\}}. \quad (1)$$

A *Milnor attractor* for  $F_t$  is a compact invariant subset  $A \subset M$  such that (i) the basin of attraction

$$\mathcal{B}(A) = \{x \in M : \omega(x) \subset A\} \quad (2)$$

has positive measure in  $M$ , i.e.  $\ell(\mathcal{B}(A)) > 0$ , and (ii) any compact invariant proper subset of  $A$  has a basin with strictly smaller measure [11]. It is a *minimal Milnor attractor* if any compact invariant proper subset of  $A$  has a basin with zero measure. All explicit examples of Milnor attractors given in this paper are fixed points or periodic orbits and thus they are minimal Milnor attractors because they do not contain any compact invariant proper subset. However, we will not explicitly discuss minimality in these cases.

**Definition 1 (Lingering set)** *Given any subset  $U \subset M$  we define the lingering subset of  $U$  to be*

$$\mathcal{A}(U) = \{x \in U : F_t(x) \in U \text{ for all } t \geq 0\}. \quad (3)$$

The lingering set is a (forward) invariant set consisting of points in  $U$  which do not leave  $U$  in the future; note that if  $A$  is an invariant set within  $U$  then  $\mathcal{A}(U)$  is non-empty as it contains  $A$ .

**Definition 2 (Unstable Attractor)** *We say a Milnor attractor  $A$  is an unstable attractor if there is a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $A$  with*

$$\ell(\mathcal{A}(U)) = 0. \quad (4)$$

Requirement (4) means that almost all trajectories in a neighbourhood of the attractor must leave this neighbourhood. We distinguish between two classes of unstable attractors.

**Definition 3 (Unstable Attractor With a Positive (Measure) Local Basin)** *An unstable attractor  $A$  is an unstable attractor with positive measure local basin<sup>1</sup> if*

$$\ell(\mathcal{B}(A) \cap U) > 0 \quad (5)$$

*for all neighbourhoods  $U$  of  $A$ .*

---

<sup>1</sup>For convenience of notation we refer to *positive local basin* (resp. *zero local basin*) for Def. 3 (resp. Def. 4).

**Definition 4 (Unstable Attractor With a Zero (Measure) Local Basin)** *An unstable attractor  $A$  is an unstable attractor with zero measure local basin if there is a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $A$  with*

$$\ell(\mathcal{B}(A) \cap U) = 0. \quad (6)$$

For an unstable attractor with positive local basin, (4) means that almost all trajectories starting in a sufficiently small neighborhood  $U$  will first leave  $U$ . A positive measure will eventually return and be asymptotic to  $A$  (contrasting with [9, 10] where there is a positive measure that remains in  $U$  and is asymptotic to  $A$ ).

For an unstable attractor  $A$  with zero local basin almost all initial conditions in a sufficiently small neighbourhood  $U$  of  $A$  will leave  $U$  and never limit to  $A$ .<sup>2</sup>

Clearly, linearly stable fixed points or periodic orbit attractors for a smooth invertible system cannot be unstable attractors; in such cases one can construct a neighbourhood that by the Hartman-Grobman Theorem is contained within the basin of attraction. If  $A$  is asymptotically stable then trivially it cannot be an unstable attractor. A more general observation is the following proposition characterizing a class of attractors that cannot be unstable with zero local basin.

**Proposition 1** *Suppose that  $A$  is a Milnor attractor whose basin  $\mathcal{B}(A)$  contains an open set, and suppose that  $F_t$  is almost everywhere a local homeomorphism. Then  $A$  cannot be an unstable attractor with zero local basin.*

**Proof:** Consider a point  $y$  in the interior of the basin of  $A$  such that  $F_t$  is a local homeomorphism in a neighbourhood of  $y$ , and choose an open neighbourhood  $U$  of  $A$ . There is a finite time  $T$  after which  $F_T(y) \in U$ . Pick a small neighbourhood  $V$  of  $F_T(y)$  in  $U$ ; continuity of  $F_T$  means that there is a neighbourhood  $W$  of  $y$  within the basin of attraction such that  $F_T(W) \subset V$ . Continuity of the local inverse means that  $F_T(W)$  is also a neighbourhood of  $F_T(y)$ . However all points in  $W$  are in the basin of  $A$  and so  $F_T(W)$  is an open set in the basin of  $A$  that is within  $U$ . Hence  $\ell(\mathcal{B}(A) \cap U) > 0$  for any  $U$  that is a neighbourhood of  $A$ .  $\square$

In particular, this proposition ensures that continuous invertible flows with continuous inverse (homeomorphisms) do not exhibit unstable attractors with zero local basin. We have so far been unable to determine whether the assumptions of Proposition 1 exclude the possibility that  $A$  is an unstable attractor with positive measure local basin, though clearly under additional assumptions (such as linear stability of  $A$ ) we can exclude this case.

As we will see below, unstable attractors occur robustly for certain classes of noninvertible dynamical systems. Suppose  $X$  is a space of dynamical systems under some suitable topology, such that one can obtain an unstable attractor for some  $f \in X$ . If there are unstable attractors for all  $g$  in a neighbourhood of  $f$  then we say the unstable attractors for  $f$  are *robust*; this means that they are stable to perturbations of the system within this  $X$ . In Section 4 we show robustness of unstable attractors with respect to perturbations of a pulse response function defining a class of pulse coupled oscillator systems.

---

<sup>2</sup>A set  $B$  has positive measure if  $\ell(B) > 0$ ; it has full measure (in  $U$ ) if  $\ell(B \cap U) > 0$  and  $\ell(U \setminus B) = 0$ .

## 2.2 Unstable attractors and riddled basin attractors

There is no simple relationship between the lingering set for a given neighbourhood of an attractor and the basin of attraction; in particular there may be points that are in the lingering set and not in the basin, and vice-versa. For example, near a centre in a planar system the lingering set can be an open set but the basin just one point. Similarly the flow of  $\dot{x} = 1 - \cos(2\pi x)$  on the unit circle  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  has a fixed point  $x = 0$ . The basin of the attractor  $A = 0$  is the whole of phase space, but the lingering sets of small open neighbourhoods of  $x = 0$  will not contain nearby points to the right of  $x = 0$ .

Unstable attractors are a related but different phenomena to riddled basin attractors  $A$  [2]. Recall that an attractor  $A$  has *riddled basin* if  $\mathcal{B}(A)$  is such that

$$\ell(\mathcal{B}(A) \cap U) \ell(\mathcal{B}(A)^c \cap U) > 0 \quad (7)$$

for all open sets  $U$  that intersect  $\mathcal{B}(A)$ . In particular, any neighbourhood  $U$  that contains  $A$  will intersect  $\mathcal{B}(A)$  in a set of positive measure; this means that a positive measure set in the basin leaves  $U$ . For unstable attractors almost all points in a small enough  $U$  will leave  $U$ ; by the comment above, this does not have any direct implication for the basin of attraction of  $A$ , though it does imply that any ‘local basin of attraction’ relative to  $U$  will have zero measure. Examples of riddled basin attractors so far all possess irregular or chaotic dynamics to provide attraction local to some points and repulsion local to others. By contrast the dynamics observed on unstable attractors can be very simple, even equilibrium.

## 2.3 Simple examples of unstable attractors

To illustrate the possible types of unstable attractors we consider the dynamical systems defined by the piecewise continuous mapping  $f : [0, 1] \mapsto [0, 1]$  according to

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq x < \frac{1}{3} \\ 3(x - \frac{1}{3}) & \text{if } \frac{1}{3} \leq x < \frac{2}{3} \\ -3(x - \frac{2}{3}) & \text{if } \frac{2}{3} \leq x < 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } \frac{2}{3} \leq x \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

and  $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  where  $g(x) = f(x)$  except on  $\frac{1}{2} \leq x < \frac{2}{3}$  in which case  $g(x) = 3(x - \frac{1}{3})$ . These two maps are illustrated in Figure 1. One can verify that the only invariant sets for  $f$  and  $g$  are the two fixed points  $x = 0$  and  $x = \frac{1}{2}$ . These are both minimal Milnor attractors; for  $f$  their basins of attraction are respectively

$$\mathcal{B}(\{0\}) = [0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3}), \quad \mathcal{B}(\{\frac{1}{2}\}) = \{\frac{1}{2}\} \cup [\frac{2}{3}, 1]. \quad (9)$$

whereas for  $g$  they are

$$\mathcal{B}(\{0\}) = [0, \frac{1}{2}), \quad \mathcal{B}(\{\frac{1}{2}\}) = [\frac{1}{2}, 1]. \quad (10)$$

In both cases the disjoint union of the two basins is the interval  $[0, 1]$ . On the other hand, any open set  $U \subset (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$  that contains  $\frac{1}{2}$  has lingering set  $\mathcal{A}(U)$  that is just the point  $\{\frac{1}{2}\}$ . Hence in both cases this point is an unstable attractor. Considering the definitions (5) and (6) above, we see that the attractor  $A = \{\frac{1}{2}\}$  is an unstable attractor with zero local basin for  $f$  and an unstable attractor with positive local basin for  $g$ .




Figure 1: Dynamical systems defined by piecewise smooth maps  $f$  and  $g$  exhibit an unstable attractor  $A = \frac{1}{2}$  with (a) zero and (b) positive local basin.

## 2.4 Networks of unstable attractors

As noted in [15], unstable attractors can form networks such that a positive measure of sufficiently small perturbations from the unstable attractor  $A_i$  are in the basin of attraction of some other unstable attractor  $A_j$ . We show that this is analogous to robust heteroclinic networks.

**Definition 5** *A set of unstable attractors  $A_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  forms a network given by the directed graph with vertices  $A_i$ . There are directed edges from  $A_i$  to  $A_j$  if and only if for any neighbourhood  $U_i$  of  $A_i$  we have*

$$\ell(\mathcal{B}(A_j) \cap U_i) > 0. \quad (11)$$

If in addition

$$U_i = \bigcup_k \mathcal{B}(A_k) \cap U_i. \quad (12)$$

we say the network is *closed*. All trajectories near a closed network cannot leave a neighbourhood of the network. In such a case the dynamics of the system is well described by the network even in the presence of small perturbations to the system. We illustrate such a network schematically in Figure 2.

If a network is not closed, we only have

$$\ell(U_i) \geq \sum_j \ell(\mathcal{B}(A_j) \cap U_i) \quad (13)$$

and such a network of unstable attractors  $A_i$  may still manifest itself in transients. If there is a proper inequality in (13) then a positive measure of initial conditions starting near the network are not asymptotic to states that are in the network.

A network is called *transitive* if there is a directed path between any two attractors. An arbitrary closed network will contain subnetworks that are transitive networks of unstable attractors.

## 2.5 Unstable attractors from saddles

We briefly demonstrate that one can obtain unstable attractors from smooth semiflows with saddles by including small perturbations that induce collapse onto their stable manifolds.

Consider a hyperbolic saddle equilibrium  $x_0 \in M$  for a (non-invertible) semiflow  $F_t : M \rightarrow M$  on a compact  $M$  with stable manifold  $W^s(x_0)$ . We say  $F_t$  exhibits *collapse onto the stable manifold*




Figure 2: A closed network of unstable attractors. The unstable attractors  $A_i$  may form a network where a link from  $A_i$  to  $A_j$  implies that the basin  $\mathcal{B}(A_j)$  intersects every neighbourhood of  $A_i$  in a set of positive measure. In the example sketched above, there is a transitive subnetwork  $\{A_2, A_3, A_4\}$ .

of  $x_0$  if there is an open set  $U \in M$  and a  $T > 0$  such that  $F_T(U) \subset W^s(x_0)$ . Since  $x_0$  is a saddle, and has thus an unstable manifold, such an  $U$  cannot contain  $x_0$ . Similarly, one can define *collapse onto the unstable manifold* of a saddle  $x_0$ . This can occur on a neighbourhood that includes  $x_0$  and in this case  $U$  may contain  $x_0$ .

An example of an unstable attractor constructed by using a pair of saddle equilibria is shown in Figure 3; this is essentially the mechanism that causes the appearance of unstable attractors in the system we discuss in Section 3. If there is a connecting orbit from  $x_1$  to  $x_0$  then collapse onto the unstable manifold of  $x_1$  is simultaneously a collapse onto the stable manifold of  $x_0$ ; the points in the open set  $V$  intersecting the unstable manifold of  $x_1$  tend to  $x_0$ . Unstable attractors in this sort of scheme can be robust to perturbations of the system if the connecting orbits are in invariant subspaces.

## 2.6 Networks of unstable attractors and heteroclinic networks

Smooth dynamical systems with symmetries can exhibit heteroclinic cycles or homoclinic cycles as robust Milnor attractors, if the connecting orbits lie within symmetry-forced invariant subspaces; see for example [7, 8]. We indicate briefly how one can use these to construct a large class of systems that have networks of unstable attractors.

Consider a smooth semiflow  $F_t : M \rightarrow M$  on  $M$  with an absorbing open region  $R \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that the only Milnor attractor in  $R$  consists of the set

$$\Sigma = \bigcup_i \{x_i\} \cup W^u(\{x_i\}). \quad (14)$$

For hyperbolic saddle equilibria  $x_i$  and the unstable manifolds  $W^u(x_i)$ . We assume that the unstable manifolds are one dimensional and write the connecting orbits from  $x_i$  to  $x_j$  by

$$C_{ji} = W^u(x_i) \cap W^s(x_j). \quad (15)$$

Given such an attractor  $\Sigma$ , we can construct piecewise smooth semiflows  $\tilde{F}_t : M \rightarrow M$  such that the set of  $x_i$  forms a network of unstable attractors, and such that  $F_t$  and  $\tilde{F}_t$  are identical except on a set of arbitrarily small measure.




Figure 3: A semiflow on the plane with two saddles;  $x_0$  is an unstable attractor. The set  $C_{01} = W^u(x_1) \cap W^s(x_0)$  is a heteroclinic connection from  $x_1$  to  $x_0$ . We assume that the open set  $V$  in the neighbourhood  $U_1$  of another equilibrium  $x_1$  collapses in finite time onto the stable manifold  $W^s(x_0) = \mathcal{B}(x_0)$  of  $x_0$ . Hence  $\ell(\mathcal{B}(x_0)) > 0$ ; moreover, almost all perturbations to  $x_0$  within  $U_0$  will leave  $U_0$  and so  $x_0$  is an unstable attractor.

To do this, pick a section  $S_{ij}$  to each connection  $C_{ji} \neq \emptyset$  and a neighbourhood  $U_{ij}$  of  $S_{ij}$  of arbitrarily small measure. Define  $\tilde{F}_t$  to be a semiflow that is equal to  $F_t$  when the trajectories are outside of the  $U_{ij}$ . On entering the  $U_i$  we require that the semiflow collapses onto the connecting orbit in finite time, as illustrated in Figure 4. The illustration depicts this for one-dimensional connections but there can clearly be higher-dimensional connections with qualitatively the same features.

Note that robust networks of unstable attractors can appear under the same conditions as for robust heteroclinic attractors [7] by adding collapse onto *unstable* manifolds because in this case unstable manifolds are contained within stable manifolds of other saddles. This can arise in cases where there is a discontinuity in the semiflow, but we note that it is not necessary; one could construct an unstable attractor similarly to Figure 3 for a smooth semiflow, as long as this maps some open set onto a zero measure subset of the stable manifold of  $x_1$ .

### 3 Oscillators with delayed pulse-coupling: a rigorous reduction to a finite dimensional system

In this section we consider the system of oscillators with delayed pulse interactions investigated in [14]. First we will show that this system, although formally infinite dimensional, can be reduced under general assumptions to a finite dimensional system. The number of dimensions remaining depends on the system parameters.






Figure 4: From heteroclinic networks to networks of unstable attractors. (a) An attracting heteroclinic cycle between three hyperbolic equilibria  $x_i$  can be locally perturbed in sets of arbitrarily small measure to obtain (b) a network of unstable attractors with the same connection topology. Here, trajectories entering the balls hit one of the connecting orbits after a finite time and continue out after a uniformly bounded time.

### 3.1 From phase history functions to phases and firing times

The system of oscillators we consider is technically a hybrid dynamical system. A hybrid dynamical system is defined by a smooth flow in some regions of phase space with boundaries; when the flow hits one of the boundaries it is then mapped instantaneously by a deterministic mapping to some other point on the boundary. A trajectory from a hybrid dynamical system hence consists of intervals of continuous evolution interrupted by events that may be discontinuous. An evolution of the system is a *Zeno State* [6] (also referred to as a *chattering state*) if there can be an infinite number of applications of the map in some finite time interval; in such cases one needs to have extra rules to permit evolution beyond the first accumulation point in time of an infinite number of applications of the map. We will show that there are no Zeno states in the system considered below.

**Definition 6 (Phase History Functions)** We define  $\mathcal{P}$  to be the set of piecewise smooth ‘phase history’ functions  $\tilde{\phi} : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow [0, 1)$ ,  $s \mapsto \tilde{\phi}(s)$  such that:

- (i) Well defined limit from below. For some discrete (possibly finite), monotone increasing set of  $s_k \geq 0$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $\tilde{\phi}(s)$  is smooth for  $s \in [-s_{k+1}, -s_k]$ .
- (ii) No Zeno states. If there are infinitely many discontinuities  $s_k$  then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s_k = \infty$ .

Note that (i) means that the limit from below  $\tilde{\phi}(s'_-) := \lim_{s \rightarrow s'} \tilde{\phi}(s)$  is defined for all  $s' \leq 0$ . Condition (ii) means that we allow no Zeno states in the past. The system [14] of  $N$  pulse-coupled oscillators with delay  $\tau$ , where the phase histories are  $\tilde{\phi} = (\tilde{\phi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\phi}_N)$ , is defined in terms of a semiflow on  $\mathcal{P}^N \ni \tilde{\phi}$  for all  $t \geq 0$

$$\Phi_t : \mathcal{P}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^N \quad (16)$$

such that  $\Phi_t(\tilde{\phi})(s) = \tilde{\phi}(s+t)$  for all  $s \leq -t$ . On the interval  $s \in (-t, 0]$  the function  $\Phi_t(\tilde{\phi})(s)$  is defined below. The boundaries of the intervals on which the phase history function  $[\Phi_t(\tilde{\phi})]_i$  of oscillator  $i$  is smooth are now denoted by  $-s_{i,k}(t) < 0$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

If  $\lim_{s \rightarrow s'-} \tilde{\phi}_i(s) \geq 1$  we say oscillator  $i$  *fires* at time  $s'$ . Given that the system has evolved a time  $t$  from some initial condition  $\tilde{\phi} \in \mathcal{P}^N$  at time 0, we list the past firings  $-\sigma_{i,k} \leq 0$  of oscillator  $i$  as

$$\dots < -\sigma_{i,3}(t) < -\sigma_{i,2}(t) < -\sigma_{i,1}(t) \leq 0 \quad (17)$$

such that the  $\sigma_{i,k}(t)$  are the times since the  $j$ th last firing of the  $i$ th oscillator before or at time  $t$ . Note that the  $\sigma_{i,k}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  count the firing events whereas the  $s_{i,k}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  count all discontinuities that may occur. We write the phase of the oscillator  $i$  as  $\phi_i = \tilde{\phi}_i(0)$ , namely as the most recent point in the phase history of that oscillator, and the previous firing times as  $\sigma_{i,k}$ .

The future dynamics will be determined only by the present phases and the times of the past firings; formally there is a map  $\Pi : \mathcal{P}^N \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\mathbb{N}}$  such that

$$\Pi(\tilde{\phi}) = (\phi_i, (\sigma_{i,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}})_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}}. \quad (18)$$

Thus the map  $\Pi \circ \Phi_t(\tilde{\phi})(0)$  directly gives the current phases  $\phi_i(t)$  and the past firing times  $\sigma_{i,k}(t)$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , of the oscillators  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . Similarly, it will be useful to define a map onto the phases and the  $k$  past firing times:

$$\Pi_k(\tilde{\phi}) = (\phi_i, (\sigma_{i,k'})_{k' \in \{1, \dots, k\}})_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}}. \quad (19)$$

### 3.2 Definition of the semiflow $\Phi_t$

The semiflow  $\Phi_t$  in (16) is given as a hybrid system with continuous time evolution

$$\frac{d\phi_i}{dt} = 1, \quad \frac{d\sigma_{i,k}}{dt} = 1 \quad (20)$$

for all  $i$  and  $k$ , except when one of a number of possible discrete events occur.

These events are determined by a constant delay  $\tau > 0$  between one oscillator being reset and ‘sending’ a pulse (‘firing’) and its ‘reception’ by another oscillator. These events ‘firing’ and ‘reception’ are the only types of discrete events interrupting the continuous time evolution. We say that at a time  $T$

- *oscillator  $i$  fires*,  
denoted  $S_i$ , if  $\phi_i(T-) = 1$ .
- *oscillator  $i$  receives a pulse from oscillator  $j$* ,  
denoted  $R_{ij}$ , if  $\sigma_{j,k}(T-) = \tau$  for some  $k$  and  $\phi_i(T-) < 1$ .
- *oscillator  $i$  fires induced by reception of a pulse from oscillator  $j$* ,  
denoted  $S'_i$ , if  $R_{ij}$  and this results in an immediate firing of oscillator  $i$  (see below).

Observe that for any  $i$  it is not possible that  $S_i$  and  $R_{ij}$  (for any  $j$ ) occur simultaneously, whereas if  $R_{ij}$  occurs it is possible that  $R_{ij'}$ ,  $j' \neq j$  also occurs at the same time. The phases  $\phi(t) = (\phi_i(t))_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}}$  and firing times  $\sigma(t) = (\sigma_{i,k})_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, k \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and thus the evolution  $\Phi_t(\tilde{\phi})$  occurs as (20) until one of  $S_i$ ,  $R_{ij}$  or  $S'_i$  occur at time  $T \geq t$ . By Definition 6, we take  $\phi_i(t) \in [0, 1)$  and  $\sigma_{i,k}(t) \geq 0$  for all  $i, k$  and all  $t$ . At such an event we define the new phases using the list below. One can verify that all variables stay in their respective ranges if they are started in that range and evolving in this way.

- *For each  $i$  such that  $S_i$  occurs*  
we set

$$\phi_i(T) := 0, \quad \sigma_{i,1}(T) := 0 \text{ and renumber } \sigma_{i,k}(T) := \sigma_{i,k-1}(T-) \text{ for all } k \geq 2. \quad (21)$$

- For each  $i$  such that  $R_{ij}$  occurs we set

$$\phi_i(T) := \phi_i(T-) + V(\phi_i(T-), \hat{\varepsilon}_i) \quad (22)$$

where  $V(\phi, \varepsilon)$  is defined below,  $\hat{\varepsilon}_i = \frac{\varepsilon K_i}{N-1}$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and

$$K_i = \#\{l \in \{1, \dots, N\} : \sigma_{l,m}(T-) = \tau \text{ for } l \neq i \text{ and some } m\} \quad (23)$$

is the number of ‘input pulses’ that arrive at time  $t = 0$ .

- Once all the  $R_{ij}$  have been checked, we say there is *firing  $S'_i$  induced by pulse reception* if  $R_{ij}$  occurs for some  $j \neq i$  and results in  $\phi_i(T) \geq 1$ . In this case we set  $\phi_i(T) := 0$ ,  $\sigma_{i,1}(T) = 0$  and renumber  $\sigma_{i,k}(T) = \sigma_{i,k-1}(T-)$  for all  $k \geq 2$ , as if  $S_i$  occurred.

One can verify that the order of ‘processing’ simultaneous events with different  $i$  does not affect the final outcome; hence the map is well-defined. The condition  $l \neq i$  in (23) excludes self-interaction as in [14, 15, 16] which we will consider exclusively in the following. The response function  $V(\phi, \hat{\varepsilon})$  expresses the response of an oscillator at phase  $\phi$  to an input  $\hat{\varepsilon}$ .

The model is specified once the delay  $\tau > 0$ , the coupling strength  $\varepsilon > 0$  and the function  $V$  are known. Observe that given an initial  $\tilde{\phi}$  and  $\phi(t)$  for  $0 < t \leq T$  we can define  $\Phi_T(\tilde{\phi})$  the phase history at time  $T > 0$ . This way we complete the definition of  $\phi_t(\tilde{\phi})(s)$  (16) for times  $s \in (-t, 0]$ .

For continuous functions  $V : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we define their *difference increments*

$$\Delta_V(\phi, \varepsilon) := \min_{0 \leq \phi' \leq 1-\phi} (V(\phi' + \phi, \varepsilon) - V(\phi', \varepsilon)). \quad (24)$$

We say  $V$  is *uniformly strictly monotonic increasing* on  $[0, 1]$  if  $\Delta_V(\phi, \varepsilon) > 0$  for all  $0 < \phi \leq 1$  (note that this implies that  $V(\phi, \varepsilon)$  is strictly monotonic increasing in  $\phi$ ).

**Definition 7 (Response Functions with Increasing Response)** We define  $\mathcal{V}$  be the set of response functions  $V : [0, 1] \times [0, c] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  for some  $c > 0$  with  $V(\phi, \varepsilon)$  satisfying

- (i) Continuity:  $V(\phi, \varepsilon)$  is jointly continuous in  $\phi$  and  $\varepsilon$ .
- (ii) Zero response to zero input:  $V(\phi, 0) = 0$  for all  $\phi$ .
- (iii) Uniform strict monotonicity: For any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$  the function  $V(\phi, \varepsilon) > 0$  is uniformly strictly monotonic increasing in  $\phi$  on  $[0, 1]$ .
- (iv) Upper bound linear in  $\varepsilon$ : For any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , monotonicity of  $V$  means there is a unique  $\phi_m$  that solves

$$V(\phi_m, \varepsilon) + \phi_m = 1 \quad (25)$$

which gives the maximum response; we assume this is bounded above by a linear function of  $\varepsilon$ . More precisely we assume there is a  $V_1$  such that

$$V(\phi_m, \varepsilon) \leq V_1 \varepsilon \leq 1 \quad (26)$$

for all  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq c$ .

Condition (iv) allows one to obtain a bound on the total change in phase over one period. Note that  $V(\phi, \varepsilon) \leq V_1 \varepsilon < 1$  for all  $\phi \leq \phi_m$  and that for  $\phi > \phi_m$ , the response  $V(\phi, \varepsilon)$  is such that the updated phase (22) is supra-threshold, resulting in an induced firing; hence  $V_{\max}(\varepsilon) = V(\phi_m, \varepsilon)$  is the largest response to an input of magnitude  $\varepsilon$ .

We say that response functions  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  give *increasing response* because the response increases with  $\phi$ . In particular, concave (down) potential functions give rise to this form of response (see Lemma 2 below). We give this space the structure of a metric space with norm

$$\|V - \tilde{V}\| = \max_{(\phi, \varepsilon) \in [0, 1] \times [0, c]} |V(\phi, \varepsilon) - \tilde{V}(\phi, \varepsilon)| \quad (27)$$

for  $V, \tilde{V} \in \mathcal{V}$ . Closeness of  $V$  and  $\tilde{V}$  in this norm imply that both the functions and their differences increments are close, by the following Lemma.

**Lemma 1** *Suppose that  $\|V - \tilde{V}\| < \delta$ ; then  $\|\Delta_V - \Delta_{\tilde{V}}\| < 2\delta$ .*

**Proof:** Suppose that  $\|V - \tilde{V}\| < \delta$ , fix  $\varepsilon$  and drop the second argument of  $V(\phi, \varepsilon)$  for convenience. Then  $|V(\phi) - \tilde{V}(\phi)| < \delta$  for all  $\phi$ . The triangle inequality implies that

$$\left| (V(\phi' + \phi) - V(\phi')) - (\tilde{V}(\phi' + \phi) - \tilde{V}(\phi')) \right| < 2\delta \quad (28)$$

for all  $\phi'$  and  $\phi \leq 1 - \phi'$ . For a given value of  $\phi$  there is a sequence  $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $V(s_n + \phi) - V(s_n) \rightarrow \Delta_V(\phi)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . By considering  $\phi' = s_n$  in (28) we can conclude that  $\Delta_{\tilde{V}}(\phi) < \Delta_V(\phi) + 2\delta$ . Similarly by considering  $(\tilde{s}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\tilde{V}(\tilde{s}_n + \phi) - \tilde{V}(\tilde{s}_n) \rightarrow \Delta_{\tilde{V}}(\phi)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  we have using (28) that  $\Delta_V(\phi) < \Delta_{\tilde{V}}(\phi) + 2\delta$ . This implies  $|\Delta_V(\phi) - \Delta_{\tilde{V}}(\phi)| < 2\delta$  for all  $\phi$  and  $\varepsilon$ .  $\square$

The resetting rule

$$\phi \mapsto U^{-1}(U(\phi) + \varepsilon) \quad (29)$$

with a twice continuously differentiable 'potential' function  $U$  was considered previously [12, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16] to describe a phase jump induced by a reception  $(R_{ij})$  of a pulse of strength  $\varepsilon$ . This 'Mirollo-Strogatz' case is a special case of the more general reception rule we use here, if we substitute

$$V(\phi, \varepsilon) = V_{MS}(\phi, \varepsilon) = U^{-1}(U(\phi) + \varepsilon) - \phi. \quad (30)$$

We now show that, if  $U$  is increasing concave downwards, this fits into the more general reception scheme of Definition 7. In Figure 5 we illustrate a typical choice of  $U$  and its consequence for  $V$  for given  $\phi$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

**Lemma 2** *Consider a response defined by  $V_{MS}$  in (29,30) where  $0 < \varepsilon < c$  and  $U$  is an unbounded twice continuously differentiable function  $U : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  that satisfies  $U(0) = 0$ ,  $U(1) = 1$ ,  $0 < c_1 < U'(\phi) < C_1$  and  $-C_2 < U''(\phi) < -c_2 < 0$  for  $\phi \in [0, 1]$  where  $c_k, C_k$  ( $k = 1, 2$ ) are positive constants. Then  $V_{MS} \in \mathcal{V}$  for small enough  $c$ .*

Note that the details of the definition of  $U$  are only critical in the range  $[0, 1]$ . This is because any time that  $U > 1$  we will get resetting; the definition on  $(1, \infty)$  is simply for expositional convenience.

**Proof:** One can directly verify that the conditions (i)–(ii) in the definition of  $\mathcal{V}$  are satisfied. To show (iii), note that  $U$  monotonic increasing and surjective on its range means it has a unique inverse  $U^{-1}$  that is also monotonic increasing. To see that (iii) also holds, first observe that

$$\partial_\phi V(\phi, \varepsilon) = \frac{U'(\phi)}{U'(U^{-1}(U(\phi) + \varepsilon))} - 1. \quad (31)$$

The condition  $U' > 0$  means that  $U$  is strictly monotonic increasing. The condition  $U' < C_1$  means that  $U(\phi + x) < U(\phi) + C_1 x$  for all  $x$  satisfying  $0 < x \leq 1 - \phi$ . Together with the monotonicity of  $U^{-1}$  we obtain, substituting  $x = \varepsilon/C_1$ ,

$$U^{-1}(U(\phi) + \varepsilon) > \phi + \frac{\varepsilon}{C_1}. \quad (32)$$

Similarly,  $U'' < 0$  means that  $U'$  is monotonic decreasing;  $U'' < -c_2$  implies  $U'(\phi) > c_2 \varepsilon / C_1 + U'(\phi + \varepsilon / C_1)$  for all  $\phi$  and thus, using (32),

$$U'(\phi) > U'(U^{-1}(U(\phi) + \varepsilon)) + \frac{c_2}{C_1} \varepsilon. \quad (33)$$

Substituting into (31) this leads to

$$\partial_\phi V(\phi, \varepsilon) = \frac{U'(\phi) - U'(U^{-1}(U(\phi) + \varepsilon))}{U'(U^{-1}(U(\phi) + \varepsilon))} > \frac{c_2}{C_1^2} \varepsilon > 0. \quad (34)$$

Hence for fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$  we have

$$|V(\phi' + \phi, \varepsilon) - V(\phi', \varepsilon)| = \left| \int_{\phi'}^{\phi' + \phi} (\partial_\phi V)(s, \varepsilon) ds \right| > \varepsilon \frac{c_2}{C_1^2} \phi > 0 \quad (35)$$

for all  $\phi > 0$ , and so (iii) holds. Finally, to show (iv), note that for  $V = V_{\text{MS}}$  Eq. (25), which determines  $\phi_{\text{m}}$ , becomes  $U(\phi_{\text{m}}) + \varepsilon = 1$  so that by definition (25), the maximum change at a reset is

$$V_{\text{max}}(\varepsilon) = 1 - U^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon). \quad (36)$$

Clearly,  $V_{\text{MS}}(\phi, \varepsilon) > 0$  for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Moreover,  $V_{\text{max}}(\varepsilon) < 1$  by definition (Eq. (36)),

$$\partial_\varepsilon V_{\text{max}}(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{U'(U^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon))} > 0 \quad (37)$$

and

$$\partial_{\varepsilon\varepsilon} V_{\text{max}}(\varepsilon) = \frac{U''(U^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon))}{[U'(U^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon))]^3} < 0 \quad (38)$$

because  $U' > 0$  and  $U'' < 0$  in the relevant range. Thus  $V_{\text{max}}(\varepsilon)$  is increasing and concave and so we have the linear upper bound  $V_{\text{max}}(\varepsilon) \leq V_1 \varepsilon$  where  $V_1 = \partial_\varepsilon V_{\text{max}}(0)$ .  $\square$




Figure 5: Plot showing  $U(\phi)$  satisfying the conditions for Lemma 2 that hence giving a resetting function  $V(\phi, \varepsilon)$  with increasing response.  $U(\phi)$  in this case is defined in (50) with  $b = 3$ .

### 3.3 Finite dimensional dynamics in finite time

We proceed to show that the system of pulse coupled oscillators with increasing response will reduce to a finite dimensional system for an open set of parameter values. Theorem 1 gives an estimate  $k$  for the largest number of ‘past firings’ one needs to consider in the limit of large time. We can effectively reduce to a system of dimension at most  $N(k + 1)$  after a finite time. The proof works by considering the maximum number of resets that can occur to an oscillator in any time interval  $[0, \tau]$ . This depends on the number of firings that occurred in the previous time interval of the same length, giving the recurrence inequality in Lemma 4.

We reduce the dynamics from a hybrid delay differential equation with infinite dimensional phase space to a finite dimensional system by restricting to phase histories of the form:

$$\mathcal{P}_k^N = \{\tilde{\phi} \in \mathcal{P}^N : \sigma_{j,k+1} > \tau \text{ for all } j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \text{ for which a } \sigma_{i,k+1} \text{ exists}\} \quad (39)$$

namely, those that have at most  $k$  firings within the delay time  $\tau$ .

**Lemma 3** *Suppose that  $\tilde{\phi}$  and  $\tilde{\psi}$  are in  $\mathcal{P}_k^N$  and  $\Pi_k \tilde{\phi} = \Pi_k \tilde{\psi}$ . Then*

$$\Pi_k \Phi_t(\tilde{\phi}) = \Pi_k \Phi_t(\tilde{\psi}) \quad (40)$$

for all  $t \geq 0$ .

**Proof:** This result states that any two initial states in  $\mathcal{P}_k^N$  whose past  $k$  firings and phases are the same will have precisely the same phases (and hence firings) at all times in the future. This is because by definition all firings beyond the  $k$ th in the past will not affect the future phases.  $\square$

The previous Lemma does not necessarily imply that  $\Phi_t(\tilde{\phi}) \in \mathcal{P}_k^N$ .

**Theorem 1** *Suppose that  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ . Then there is a  $k \geq 1$  (depending on  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\tau$  and  $V$ ) such that for any  $\tilde{\phi} \in \mathcal{P}^N$  there is a finite  $T > 0$  (depending on  $\tilde{\phi}$ ,  $\varepsilon$  and  $V$ ) such that  $\Phi_t(\tilde{\phi}) \in \mathcal{P}_k^N$  for all  $t > T$ .*

Moreover, after time  $T$  the number of firings of an oscillator that can appear in any time interval of length  $\tau$  is at most

$$k = \left\lfloor \frac{1 + \tau}{1 - V_1 \varepsilon} \right\rfloor \quad (41)$$

where  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  is the smallest integer less than or equal to  $x$ .

For any  $k$  such that the conclusion of Theorem 1 holds we say the dynamics *reduces* to  $\mathcal{P}_k^N$ . We prove Theorem 1 using the following Lemma. For any initial condition  $\tilde{\phi} \in \mathcal{P}^N$  let  $\tilde{\phi}^{(m)} = \Phi_{m\tau}(\tilde{\phi})$  ( $m \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ ) and suppose that the number of firings of  $\tilde{\phi}^{(m)}$  in the interval  $[-\tau, 0)$  is  $k_m$ .

**Lemma 4** *For all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $k_m \leq \lfloor 1 + \tau + k_{m-1} V_1 \varepsilon \rfloor$*

**Proof:** Suppose that there have been at most  $k_0$  firing events of each of the  $N$  oscillators during the time interval  $[-\tau, 0)$ . Consider the events that affect the phase  $\phi_i$  of an arbitrary oscillator  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  in the future time interval  $[0, \tau)$ ; there will be  $n_0(i)$  events in  $[0, \tau)$  where at each event  $N_n$ ,  $N - 1 \geq N_n \geq 1$  pulses of the oscillators  $\phi_j$ ,  $j \neq i$  are simultaneously received by  $i$ . The total number of received pulses is  $\sum_{n=1}^{n_0(i)} N_n \leq k_0(N - 1)$ . The total change  $\Delta\phi_i$  in phase of oscillator  $i$  up to time  $\tau$  is hence at most

$$\Delta\phi_i \leq \tau + V_1 \sum_{n=1}^{n_0} \frac{N_n}{N-1} \varepsilon \leq \tau + k_0 V_1 \varepsilon. \quad (42)$$

Hence oscillator  $i$  will have fired at most

$$k_1 = \lfloor 1 + \tau + k_0 V_1 \varepsilon \rfloor \quad (43)$$

times in the interval  $[0, \tau)$ . Since  $i$  is arbitrary, we have in general at most  $k_m \leq \lfloor 1 + \tau + k_{m-1} V_1 \varepsilon \rfloor$  firing events of each oscillator in the interval  $[\tau, 0]$  and the Lemma follows.  $\square$

**Proof: (of Theorem 1)** Since  $V_1 \varepsilon < 1$  applying Lemma 4 inductively we have

$$k_m \leq k_0 (V_1 \varepsilon)^m + (1 + \tau) ((V_1 \varepsilon)^{m-1} + (V_1 \varepsilon)^{m-2} + \dots + (V_1 \varepsilon) + 1) \quad (44)$$

$$\leq k_0 (V_1 \varepsilon)^m + \frac{1 + \tau}{1 - V_1 \varepsilon} \quad (45)$$

and so because  $(V_1 \varepsilon)^m \rightarrow 0$ , after some finite time  $T = m\tau$  (which can be estimated from (45) given  $k_0$ ) we have

$$k_m \leq k = \left\lfloor \frac{1 + \tau}{1 - V_1 \varepsilon} \right\rfloor. \quad (46)$$

The remainder of the theorem is a consequence of applying Lemma 3.  $\square$

The estimate of  $k$  will typically be a very poor upper bound. If the number of oscillators  $N$  is small one can improve on these bounds by noting that the pulses are ‘quantized’ into multiples of

$\varepsilon/(N-1)$ . In particular, one can replace the upper bound (26) by requiring only that there is a  $V_1$  such that

$$V\left(\phi_m, \frac{k\varepsilon}{N-1}\right) \leq V_1 \frac{k\varepsilon}{N-1} \leq 1 \quad (47)$$

for all  $1 \leq k \neq (N-1)$ . For larger  $N$  this approaches (26).

As a consequence of Lemma 4 we can now justify defining the dynamics as a semiflow on  $\mathcal{P}^N$ .

**Corollary 1** *A system with  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  that satisfies  $V_1\varepsilon < 1$  will remain free of Zeno states for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\tau > 0$ .*

This is because, although the number of firings in an interval  $[0, \tau]$  can increase if  $V_1\varepsilon$  is large, the maximum rate is given in Lemma 4 and there cannot be infinitely many firings in any time interval of finite length. Another consequence of the proof of Theorem 1 is that the semiflow on  $\mathcal{P}^N$  has a restriction to  $\mathcal{P}_k^N$  that is a well-defined semiflow.

### 3.4 $2N$ dimensional state space in finite time ( $k = 1$ )

In the case that

$$1 + \tau < 2 - 2V_1\varepsilon, \quad (48)$$

we can apply Theorem 1 to see that  $1 \leq (1 + \tau)/(1 - V_1\varepsilon) < 2$ , and so  $k = 1$ . In fact, this is not a very tight estimate, and in many cases where (48) does not hold the dynamics still reduces to  $k = 1$ . For a particular initial condition  $\tilde{\phi}$  one can practically check the dimension it reduces to by finding the limsup of the number of firings of one oscillator in any time interval of length  $\tau$  for a neighbourhood of that initial condition.

If at most one previous firing is needed to determine the phases uniquely in the future, the dynamics reduces to a semiflow on a  $2N$  dimensional space

$$\Pi_1(\mathcal{P}_1^N) = \{(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N) : \phi_i \in [0, 1), \sigma_i \in [0, \infty)\}$$

where we write  $\sigma_i = \sigma_{i,1}$  in shorthand. For the oscillators we consider, the semiflow

$$\Phi_t : \mathcal{P}_1^N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1^N \quad (49)$$

for  $t \geq 0$  is well defined for  $\varepsilon$  and  $\tau$  small enough; Appendix A gives an explicit form on this reduced space.

## 4 Unstable attractors for pulse-coupled oscillators

The main result in this section is a proof that unstable attractors exist and are robust in the system of delay pulse coupled oscillators discussed in Section 3.

### 4.1 Unstable Attractors: Existence and Robustness

For this section we consider the potential function

$$U(\phi) = U_b(\phi) \text{ where } U_b(\phi) = \frac{1}{b} \ln(1 + (e^b - 1)\phi) \quad (50)$$



used in [14]. Computing the associated response function  $V$  defined by (30) we find an affine relationship between  $\phi$  and  $V$ :

$$V(\phi, \hat{\varepsilon}) = \frac{e^{\hat{\varepsilon}b} - 1}{e^b - 1} + (e^{\hat{\varepsilon}b} - 1) \phi \quad (51)$$

and one can check that  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ ; this is a particular case of Lemma 2; the relationship between  $U$  and  $V$  is illustrated in Figure 5.

**Theorem 2** *Consider the system of oscillators defined in Section 3.2 with  $U$  defined by (50) with  $N = 4$ ,  $\tau = 0.14$  and  $\varepsilon = 0.24$  and  $b = 3$ . This system has a periodic orbit that is an unstable attractor with zero measure local basin.*

**Proof:** By applying Theorem 1 one can directly verify that any initial condition  $\tilde{\phi} \in \mathcal{P}^4$  will reduce to the  $4(1 + 4) = 20$  dimensional space  $\Pi_4(\mathcal{P}_4^4)$  after a finite time, i.e. such that only the phase and last four firings of each oscillator contribute to the dynamics at any point in the future. Now consider the open set of initial conditions defined by

$$(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_4, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_4) \in C_0 \quad (52)$$

where

$$C_0 = (0.7, 0.7, 0.3, 0.95, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5) + [0, 0.001]^8 \subset \Pi_1(\mathcal{P}^4). \quad (53)$$

As a slight abuse of notation, we will also write  $C_0$  as meaning  $\Pi_1^{-1}(C_0)$  if the context is clear. Note that all the  $\sigma_i > \tau = 0.14$ , meaning that  $C_0 \subset \mathcal{P}_1^4$ . Theorem 1 means that at points in the future we may in principle arrive at states that are in  $\mathcal{P}_k^4$  for  $k = 4$  but not for  $k \leq 3$ . However, we will verify below that  $\Phi_t(C_0) \subset \mathcal{P}_1^4$  for all  $t > 0$ .

Note that  $\Pi_1^{-1}C_0$  is an open set, as is its image under  $\Pi_k$  is open for any  $k \geq 0$ ; we will show that it is in the basin of attraction of a saddle periodic orbit. In what follows we write  $C_k$  to denote the  $k$ th intersection of the trajectories in  $C_0$  with one or more of the ‘events’  $S_i$  or  $R_{ij}$ . Since the information about the original initial condition of the  $\sigma_i$  has been lost we list only the first four components. We compute that

$$C_1 = [0.749, 0.751] \times [0.749, 0.751] \times [0.349, 0.351] \times \{0\} \quad (54)$$

due to the first event being  $S_4$ . The next event is  $R_4$  which will give

$$C_2 \subset \{(0, 0, \phi_3, 0.14) : \phi_3 \in [0.63, 0.64]\} \quad (55)$$

and so we have reduced to a one dimensional subspace of phase space at this point. A very tedious direct numerical verification listed in Table 1 shows that *all* of the points starting in  $C_2$  after a further 32 events reach a single point

$$C_{34} = \{P\} \quad \text{with} \quad P := (0, 0, a, a, 0, 0, b, b) \quad (56)$$

where  $a \approx 0.62307$  and  $b \approx 0.57088$  can be computed exactly (see Appendix B). We present in Figure 6 the values of the coordinates depending on choice of  $\phi_3$  over a larger range than in  $C_2$ ; observe that a one dimensional set of possible initial values converges to exactly the same point. The point  $P$  (56) is a cross section to a periodic orbit where two pairs of oscillators remain synchronized.

$k$	$\phi_1$	$\phi_2$	$\phi_3$	$\phi_4$	$\sigma_1$	$\sigma_2$	$\sigma_3$	$\sigma_4$
0	0.70000	0.70000	0.30000	0.95000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000
1	0.75000	0.75000	0.35000	0.00000	1.05000	1.05000	1.05000	0.00000
2	0.00000	0.00000	0.63712	0.14000	0.00000	0.00000	1.19000	0.14000
3	0.19219	0.19219	0.00000	0.48478	0.14000	0.14000	0.00000	0.28000
4	0.43650	0.43650	0.14000	0.80846	0.28000	0.28000	0.14000	0.42000
5	0.62804	0.62804	0.33154	0.00000	0.47154	0.47154	0.33154	0.00000
6	0.99058	0.99058	0.61365	0.14000	0.61154	0.61154	0.47154	0.14000
7	0.00000	0.00000	0.62307	0.14942	0.00000	0.00000	0.48095	0.14942
8	0.19219	0.19219	0.00000	0.50000	0.14000	0.14000	0.00000	0.28942
9	0.43650	0.43650	0.14000	0.82781	0.28000	0.28000	0.14000	0.42942
10	0.60870	0.60870	0.31219	0.00000	0.45219	0.45219	0.31219	0.00000
11	0.96599	0.96599	0.58906	0.14000	0.59219	0.59219	0.45219	0.14000
12	0.00000	0.00000	0.62307	0.17401	0.00000	0.00000	0.48620	0.17401
13	0.19219	0.19219	0.00000	0.53974	0.14000	0.14000	0.00000	0.31401
14	0.43650	0.43650	0.14000	0.87833	0.28000	0.28000	0.14000	0.45401
15	0.55817	0.55817	0.26167	0.00000	0.40167	0.40167	0.26167	0.00000
16	0.90176	0.90176	0.52483	0.14000	0.54167	0.54167	0.40167	0.14000
17	0.00000	0.00000	0.62307	0.23824	0.00000	0.00000	0.49990	0.23824
18	0.19219	0.19219	0.00000	0.64354	0.14000	0.14000	0.00000	0.37824
19	0.43650	0.43650	0.14000	0.00000	0.28000	0.28000	0.14000	0.00000
20	0.74709	0.74709	0.37016	0.14000	0.42000	0.42000	0.28000	0.14000
21	0.00000	0.00000	0.62307	0.39291	0.00000	0.00000	0.53291	0.39291
22	0.19219	0.19219	0.00000	0.89350	0.14000	0.14000	0.00000	0.53291
23	0.29869	0.29869	0.10650	0.00000	0.24650	0.24650	0.10650	0.00000
24	0.43650	0.43650	0.14000	0.05679	0.28000	0.28000	0.14000	0.03350
25	0.70451	0.70451	0.32758	0.16330	0.38650	0.38650	0.24650	0.14000
26	0.00000	0.00000	0.62307	0.45879	0.00000	0.00000	0.54199	0.43549
27	0.19219	0.19219	0.00000	0.99996	0.14000	0.14000	0.00000	0.57549
28	0.19222	0.19222	0.00004	0.00000	0.14004	0.14004	0.00004	0.00000
29	0.43650	0.43650	0.14000	0.19214	0.28000	0.28000	0.14000	0.13996
30	0.56917	0.56917	0.19224	0.19218	0.28004	0.28004	0.14004	0.14000
31	0.00000	0.00000	0.62307	0.62301	0.00000	0.00000	0.57087	0.57083
32	0.19219	0.19219	0.00000	0.00000	0.14000	0.14000	0.00000	0.00000
33	0.56912	0.56912	0.19219	0.19219	0.28000	0.28000	0.14000	0.14000
34	0.00000	0.00000	0.62307	0.62307	0.00000	0.00000	0.57088	0.57088

Table 1: The state of the system at times of the  $k$ th event on a trajectory starting with an initial condition in  $C_0$  (see equation (53) in the proof of Theorem 2) the phases  $\phi_i$  and firing times  $\sigma_i$  defining the state at the event times are shown to five decimal places. All initial conditions in  $C_0$  finally arrive at the same point in  $C_{34}$  because of the firing-induced resetting at stages  $k = 2$  and  $k = 32$ .




Figure 6: Dependence of dynamics on the initial phases  $(0, 0, \phi_3, 0.14) \in C_2$ . Panel (a) shows the phases  $(\phi_1(\circ), \phi_2(\times), \phi_3(\square), \phi_4(+))$  after 32 further intersections with discontinuities of the semiflow ('events') in dependence of  $\phi_3$ . Observe that there is a large range of  $\phi_3$  for which the dynamics arrives at precisely the same point. Panel (b) shows the actual attractor reached from the above initial conditions (shown after the 52<sup>nd</sup> reset of oscillator  $i = 1$ ). Surprisingly, the same attractor is reached by several initial conditions whose trajectory after 34 events differs substantially.

Since the periodic orbit through  $P$  contains the open set  $C_0$  in its basin it is a Milnor attractor for any reduction of the system to finite dimensions, for example to  $\mathcal{P}_4^4$ .

Now we show that the orbit through  $P$  is unstable. In order to do this we show that almost all perturbations of the first two coordinates grow to finite size under the action of the local return map. A complete stability analysis is presented in the Appendix B. In particular, as is shown below, this proves instability in general, not only linear instability.

In this analysis we consider the return map from the plane  $\phi_2 \equiv 0$  to itself. The pulses  $\sigma_i$  are kept locked to the phases  $\phi_i$  such that the nonlinear return map (81)

$$\delta' = \mathbf{F}(\delta) \quad (57)$$

is three-dimensional and maps a perturbation  $\delta := (\delta_1, \delta_3, \delta_4) := \phi(0) - \phi^*(0)$  to the periodic orbit started at (56).

$$\phi^*(0) = (0, 0, a, a) \quad (58)$$

to the perturbation  $\delta'$  when the plane  $\phi_2 = 0$  is reached the next time.

If we take a general perturbation (satisfying  $\delta_1 \neq \delta_2$ ) just before arriving at  $(0, 0, a, a)$ , observe that the  $\sigma_i$  are all larger than  $\tau$  and hence will not affect the future of the phases. Starting with such a perturbation, when it hits the next event we can arrive at an arbitrary perturbation satisfying  $\delta_1 > \delta_2 = 0$  such that immediately after the perturbation, events occur in the order  $S_1, S_2, (S'_3, S'_4)$ . Note that the order of the events  $S_3$  and  $S_4$  does not play a role as they become synchronized at their first firing.

As demonstrated explicitly in Appendix B, there is a small  $\Delta^* > 0$  such that the return map (57) defined in the three-dimensional region

$$\mathcal{R} = \{\delta : \delta_1 > \delta_2 = 0 \text{ and } |\delta_i| < \Delta^* \text{ for all } i \in \{1, 3, 4\}\} \quad (59)$$

is given by a smooth map with  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$  (and such that  $\mathbf{F}(\mathcal{R})$  is a line that intersects  $\mathcal{R}$ ). In particular, given the map  $\mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$  in terms of an arbitrary function  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  (see Appendix B) we analyse of the fully nonlinear local dynamics of a sufficiently small perturbation  $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta_1, 0, 0)$ ,  $0 < \delta_1 < \Delta^*$ , to the periodic orbit. For the following estimate, we write  $\Delta_\varepsilon(\phi)$  for  $\Delta_V(\phi, \varepsilon)$  in shorthand notation. First note that requirement (iii) in Def. 7 implies that there is a  $\Delta_\varepsilon(\delta)$  such that for all  $\delta > 0$ ,  $H_\varepsilon(\phi + \delta) - H_\varepsilon(\phi) \geq \delta + \Delta_\varepsilon(\delta)$  for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , in particular,  $H_\varepsilon$  is monotonic increasing in  $\phi$ . This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(\boldsymbol{\delta}) &= H_{2\varepsilon}(H_\varepsilon(\tau + \delta_1) + \tau) && - H_{2\varepsilon}(H_\varepsilon(\tau - \delta_1) + \tau + \delta_1) \\ &\geq H_{2\varepsilon}(H_\varepsilon(\tau) + \delta_1 + \Delta_\varepsilon(\delta_1) + \tau) && - H_{2\varepsilon}(H_\varepsilon(\tau) - \Delta_\varepsilon(\delta_1) + \tau) \\ &\geq \delta_1 + \Delta_\varepsilon(\delta_1) + \Delta_{2\varepsilon}(\delta_1 + \Delta_\varepsilon(\delta_1)) && + \Delta_\varepsilon(\delta_1) + \Delta_{2\varepsilon}(\Delta_\varepsilon(\delta_1)) \\ &> \delta_1 + 2\Delta_\varepsilon(\delta_1). \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Hence we find that  $F_1(\boldsymbol{\delta}) > \delta_1 + 2\Delta_\varepsilon(\delta_1)$  implies that any perturbation  $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta_1, 0, 0)$  satisfying  $\delta_1 > 0$  increases (e.g. in maximum norm). Because the function  $\Delta_\varepsilon(\delta)$  is non-decreasing in  $\delta$ , we see that there is a  $\Delta^* > 0$  for which any sufficiently small perturbations (satisfying  $|\delta_i| < \Delta^*$ ) leave the region  $\mathcal{R}$  in finite time  $t_{\mathcal{R}}$ , bounded by

$$t_{\mathcal{R}} \leq \frac{\Delta^* - \delta_1}{2\Delta_\varepsilon(\delta_1)}. \tag{61}$$

By the permutation symmetry of the system, the analysis in the case  $\delta_1 < \delta_2 = 0$  is analogous. This means that almost all sufficiently small perturbations  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$  leave a neighbourhood of the attractor in finite time, proving that the attracting periodic orbit considered is also unstable. The case  $\delta_2 < \delta_1$  can be treated analogously by the symmetry of the globally coupled network. Taken together there is a neighbourhood  $\mathcal{R}'$  of  $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \mathbf{0}$  such that all points starting in  $\mathcal{R}'$  with  $\delta_1 \neq 0 = \delta_2$  will iterate away until they leave this neighbourhood. This proves instability of the orbit through  $P$  (56).  $\square$

Figure 7 shows the dynamics starting from one initial condition (53) used in the proof of the theorem. The convergence in finite time to the attractor is seen. A small random perturbation to the phases of all oscillators is expanded by the instability, yielding convergence towards another attractor.

**Theorem 3** *The unstable attractors of Theorem 2 are robust in the sense that there is an open neighbourhood in  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $V(x, \hat{\varepsilon}) = H_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(x) - x$  given by (30,50) and an open neighbourhood of  $(\tau, \varepsilon)$  such that a system defined by any  $\tilde{V}$ ,  $\tilde{\tau}$ , and  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$  in these neighbourhoods, has an unstable attracting periodic orbit that remains close to that of Theorem 2.*

**Proof:** We refer to the return map  $\mathbf{F}$  (81) derived in the Appendix B and already discussed in the proof of Theorem 2. Note that in the derivation of the return map  $\mathbf{F}$ , the form of the transfer function  $H$  and the precise values of the parameters  $\tau$  and  $\varepsilon$  are not important, because  $\mathbf{F}$  continuously depends on  $H$ ,  $\tau$ , and  $\varepsilon$  and changes its form only if the sequence of events occurring along the trajectory on or near the periodic orbit is altered. Thus, an equivalent periodic orbit exists if the dynamical system is slightly perturbed, i.e. if  $H$ ,  $\tau$ , and  $\varepsilon$ , are slightly changed from their original values. In particular, one can choose  $H_\varepsilon(\phi) = \phi + V(\phi, \varepsilon)$ , where  $V$  is sufficiently close to the original. Since the mechanism of dimensional reduction and attractivity depends only on




Figure 7: A four oscillator network ( $N = 4$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.24$ ,  $\tau = 0.14$ ,  $U = U_b$ ,  $b = 3$ ) exhibiting an unstable attractor. At time zero, initial phases in  $C_0$  are shown. The time axis is discrete and shows the phase when oscillator  $i = 2$  fires. Just after the firing event  $S_2$  of oscillator  $i = 2$  at times  $t_n$ , all phases  $\phi_i(t_n)$  are plotted ( $\phi_1(\circ)$ ,  $\phi_2(\times)$ ,  $\phi_3(\square)$ ,  $\phi_4(+)$ ). There is convergence of the trajectory in state space in finite time towards the periodic orbit passing through (56). An instantaneous small random perturbation ( $|\delta_i| < 10^{-3}$ ) to the phases at time  $n = 20$  leads to a switching to another attractor, demonstrating instability of the original periodic orbit.

the supra-threshold synchronization mechanism given by the induced firing events  $S'_i$ , the slightly perturbed periodic orbit will also be an attractor. Moreover, for a sufficiently small perturbation to  $V$ ,  $\tau$ , and  $\varepsilon$  we still obtain

$$F_1(\delta) \geq 2\Delta_\varepsilon(\delta_1) + \delta_1 \text{ if } \Delta^* > \delta_1 > 0, \quad (62)$$

which implies instability. (cf. the proof of the previous theorem). Again, since the return map  $\mathbf{F}$  does not change form if the parameters  $H$ ,  $\tau$ , and  $\varepsilon$  are slightly perturbed, also the proof of instability is independent of these parameters of the system. This completes the proof.  $\square$

This result implies that qualitatively the same dynamics is obtained by any flow defined by a  $\tilde{V}$  nearby the original  $V$  (30); in particular it does not have to be defined in terms of a any potential function  $U$  by (30).

## 4.2 Interpretation in terms of dimension jump

Since the proof of Theorem 2 is rather involved, we discuss some intuition in terms of what we term a dimension jump of the semiflow. Given a semiflow  $\Phi_t : M \rightarrow M$  that is not invertible, one can nevertheless define, for all  $x \in M$ , a set-valued inverse for any  $t > 0$  by

$$\Phi_{-t}(x) = \{y \in M : \Phi_t(y) = x\} \quad (63)$$

and the semiflow can be extended uniquely to an invertible flow precisely when  $\Phi_{-t}(x)$  is a single point for all  $x$  and  $t > 0$ . Given sufficient regularity on  $\Phi$ , for example sufficient to ensure that  $\Phi_{-t}(x)$  is a union of manifolds, we can compute its dimension. If all  $\Phi_{-t}(x)$  are non-empty then  $\dim(\Phi_{-t}(x))$  will be a non-decreasing function of  $t$ . The *dimension jump*

$$j(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0-} (\dim(\Phi_t(x))) \quad (64)$$




Figure 8: Schematic showing a point  $x$  that has a unique inverse  $\Phi_{-u}(x)$  for  $0 < u \leq t$ . If we define  $y = \Phi_{-t}(x)$  then  $y$  is in  $J$  the jump set (in this case  $j(y) = 1$ ) and for any  $t < s$  the dimension of the set  $\Phi_{-s}$  is greater than zero.

at  $x$  is of particular interest and we refer to

$$J = \{x \in M : j(x) > 0\} \quad (65)$$

as the *dimension jump set*, shown schematically in Figure 8. Such behaviour can be found in systems exhibiting sliding modes [18], and we suggest that such systems may display unstable attractors.

Observe that trajectories converging to an invariant set that pass through  $J$  may cause locally unstable invariant sets to be unstable attractors. For the system of delay coupled oscillators with  $k = 1$  there are two events on which dimension jump can occur:

1. For one of the firing events  $S_i$  or  $S'_i$  we lose dependence on the delayed phase  $\sigma_i$ .
2. At a resetting  $R_j$  that induces firing in two oscillators  $S'_{i_1}$  and  $S'_{i_2}$  we synchronize the oscillators  $i_1$  and  $i_2$  beyond that point; this also causes a dimension jump.

In our system, these events have ‘jump sets’ that are codimension one and typically they cause a loss of one dimension; however when the oscillators become synchronized, several such events can occur at once resulting in a loss of more dimensions.

The proof of Theorem 2 works by choosing an open set of initial conditions that reduces dimension down to one dimension after two further discrete events. The final loss of dimension that reduces the open set down to one point in the section occurs only a while later, and this is because there is a global connection in phase space that we need to follow.

## 5 Discussion

In this paper we give a rigorous definition for a novel type of Milnor attractor, the *unstable attractor*, introduced in [14, 16]. We classify these attractors in terms of presence or absence of local basin. These attractors are surprising in many ways; notably they have ‘local repelling’ properties in that they have neighbourhoods such that almost all points leave the neighbourhood after a finite time.

We show that unstable attractors not only exist, but even appear robustly in certain classes of hybrid dynamical systems of interest as physical and biological models; namely in networks of pulse-coupled oscillators. The robustness that we have demonstrated is limited in the sense that we only consider perturbations that keep the time delay identical for all connections and

the coupling function identical for all oscillators. We do not consider perturbations that break the identical nature of the oscillators or the symmetry of the system. On introduction of such general perturbations we expect no robustness for such unstable attractors, although one may obtain attractors that remain ‘nearby’ to where a network of unstable attractors used to exist, i.e. close to a collection of unstable periodic orbits and their heteroclinic connections.

For perturbations that break only part of the symmetry, unstable attractors may still persist. For instance there is numerical evidence that unstable attractors can still exist even the network is not coupled all-to-all, cf. [17]. The exact consequences of non-identical oscillators and more general broken symmetry remains to be studied.

If we perturb the system in such a way that it becomes smooth and invertible, the unstable attractors will disappear; any saddle periodic orbit will have a zero measure basin simply by existence of a global stable manifold of dimension less than that of phase space; however as indicated in Section 2 one should be able to make the system arbitrarily differentiable and still obtain unstable attractors, as long as non-invertibility is retained.

In Proposition 1 we have shown that certain conditions on a general dynamical system exclude the possibility of unstable attractors with zero local basin. To generalize this finding to also exclude unstable attractors with positive local basin, we believe it will be necessary to strengthen these conditions. Generalization of our result is not straightforward because a (local) basin may be highly irregularly, as for riddled basin attractors.

Our proofs of the main results are not very elegant; this is because they rely on global features of the hybrid dynamical system, and we have not found them easily reducible to simpler arguments. We believe however that it should be possible for exact numerical methods [15] to identify when unstable attractors are present in such systems.

The numerical results in [16] suggest that networks of unstable attractors exist in a wide range of systems of pulse-coupled oscillators. Preliminary studies have shown that the networks of unstable attractor may often be transitive for a wide range of parameters and system sizes. Revealing the mechanisms underlying the existence, structure and prevalence of such networks of unstable attractors is a challenging task for future research.

**Acknowledgements:** PA thanks the Max-Planck-Institut für Dynamik und Selbstorganisation (formerly: MPI für Strömungsforschung) for their hospitality and financial support, as well as a grant from the Leverhulme Foundation for partial support. MT thanks Leonid Bunimovich, Stefan Großkinsky and Raoul-Martin Memmesheimer for useful and interesting conversations relating to this work as well as the Department of Mathematical Science, University of Exeter for their hospitality and financial support.

## A Explicit form of the semiflow for $k = 1$

We give the semiflow of globally coupled oscillator networks explicitly for the case  $k = 1$  by the following algorithm. Consider  $(\phi, \sigma) = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N) \in \Pi_1(\mathcal{P}_1^N)$  where the  $i$ th component represent the  $i$ th phases and the  $n + i$ th component represents the time since the  $i$ th oscillator fired. Suppose that  $\Phi_t(\mathcal{P}_1^N) \subset \mathcal{P}_1^N$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . We note that we can represent the flow on  $\Pi_1(\mathcal{P}_1^N)$  by

$$\Phi_t(\phi, \sigma) = (\phi, \sigma) + t(1, \dots, 1) \quad (66)$$

for all  $0 < t$  such that  $\phi_i < 1$  and  $\sigma_i < \tau$ . After time

$$T(\phi, \sigma) = \text{smallest positive value in } (1 - \phi_i, \tau - \sigma_i : i \in \{1, \dots, N\}) \quad (67)$$

we hit the first event and apply a mapping according to the following algorithm:

- Set  $(\phi, \sigma) \mapsto (\phi, \sigma) + T(\phi, \sigma)(1, \dots, 1)$ .
- For each  $i$  such that  $\sigma_i = \tau$  we say  $R_j$  occurs for all  $j \neq i$  and set  $\phi_j(T) = \phi_j(T^-) + V(\phi_j, \hat{\varepsilon})$  for  $\hat{\varepsilon}$  defined as in (22).
- If there is an  $i$  such that  $\phi_i(T) \geq 1$  then we say  $S_i$  occurs and set  $\phi_i(T) := 0$  and  $\sigma_i(T) := 0$ .

After applying this algorithm we are assured that  $T(\phi, \sigma) > 0$ , as  $\phi_i(T) \in [0, 1]$  and  $\sigma_i(T) \neq \tau$  for  $i = 1..n$ . Thus we can take this state as a new initial condition and rerun the algorithm sequentially from event to event.

## B Return map near unstable attracting periodic orbit

For the main results of this paper (Theorems 2 and 3) we use a nonlinear return map  $\mathbf{F}(\delta)$  of perturbations  $\delta$  to the unstable attracting periodic orbits in a network of  $N = 4$  oscillators using the semiflow detailed in Appendix A. We detail the derivation of this return map and analyze the periodic orbit that is the unstable attractor.

We choose  $\phi_2(t_0) = 0$  where  $t_0 = 0$ , and consider cases where the initial  $\sigma_{ij} > \tau$ . First we analyse the dynamics on the periodic orbit. To establish instability we then consider, without loss of generality, perturbations to the periodic orbit phases at a point on the orbit where the time since last pulse is greater than  $\tau$  for all oscillators. This means that the future depends only on the current phases and we can effectively consider  $\phi_i(t) - \sigma_{i,k}(t) = \text{const}$  for all  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  and all  $t$  satisfying  $t_1 \leq \sigma_{i,k}(t) \leq t_2$  where  $t_1$  defines the time of the last event such that  $\sigma_{i,k}(t_1) = 0$  and  $t_2 > t_1$  the time of the next event analogous to (67). Within this convention, we consider the return map from the three-dimensional plane defined by  $\phi_2 = 0$  to itself and establish instability for this return map to prove instability of the periodic orbit.

The following analysis applies for the parameters  $\varepsilon = 0.24$ ,  $\tau = 0.14$ , and the function  $U = U_b$  (50) where  $b = 3$ . It will turn out that it also applies for a neighbourhood thereof, showing robustness of the instability of the periodic orbit. For compact notation, we introduce the *transfer function*

$$H_\varepsilon(\phi) = V(\phi, \varepsilon) + \phi. \quad (68)$$

This transfer function mediates the action of an incoming pulse of strength  $\varepsilon$  on the phase  $\phi$ . We obtained the sequence of discrete events and the numerical values in the following analysis for the specific choice (30,50).

### B.1 Periodic orbit dynamics

First we determine the dynamics of the unperturbed orbit (Table 2). Throughout the table, the phases after each event are labelled  $p_{i,k}$  where the first index labels the oscillator  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  and the second index counts the events  $k$  occurring for a *perturbed* trajectory (see Table 3 below) starting with  $k = 0$  for the initial condition (first row of Table 2). Since the second oscillators  $i = 2$  and  $i = 4$  in the two synchronous groups have the same phases as the oscillators  $i = 1$  and  $i = 3$ , respectively, we define  $p_{2,k} := p_{1,k}$  and  $p_{4,k} := p_{3,k}$  for all  $k$ . We show that the unperturbed orbit indeed is periodic with period

$$T = 2\tau + 1 - p_{1,3} \quad (69)$$



Event	$t$	$\phi_1(t) \equiv \phi_2(t)$	$\phi_3(t) \equiv \phi_4(t)$
$S_1, S_2$	0	0 $=: p_{1,0}$	$a$ $=: p_{3,0} \approx 0.62307$
$R_1, R_2, S'_3, S'_4$	$\tau$	$H_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(\tau)$ $=: p_{1,2}$	$U(p_{3,0} + \tau) + 2\hat{\varepsilon} > 1$ $1 \rightarrow 0$ $=: p_{3,2}$
$R_3, R_4$	$2\tau$	$H_{2\hat{\varepsilon}}(p_{1,2} + \tau)$ $=: p_{1,3}$	$H_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(\tau)$ $=: p_{3,3}$
$S_1, S_2$	$2\tau + 1 - p_{1,3}$	$1 \rightarrow 0$ $0 =: p_{1,5}$	$p_{3,3} + 1 - p_{1,3}$ $=: p_{3,5}$ $\downarrow$ $= a$

Table 2: Events occurring during one period of one of the unstable attracting periodic orbits in the system of four coupled oscillators (see text for explanation).

given by the time  $t$  in the last row of Table 2 where

$$p_{1,3} = H_{2\hat{\varepsilon}}(H_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(\tau) + \tau) \quad (70)$$

is also read off the table. Here we use the abbreviation  $\hat{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon/(N - 1)$  for the strength of an individual pulse.

Table 2 displays the time evolution on the periodic orbit event by event. The left column gives the sequence of events, labelled  $S_i$  if oscillator  $i$  sends a signal and  $R_i$  if the signal from oscillator  $i$  is received by all other oscillators  $j \neq i$  (for conciseness we write  $R_i$  here instead of  $\{R_{i,j} | j \neq i\}$ ). The second left column gives the time of occurrence of these events. The right two columns give the phases  $\phi_i$  of oscillators  $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$  just after the events have occurred, where the synchronized oscillators have identical phases,  $\phi_1(t) \equiv \phi_2(t)$  and  $\phi_3(t) \equiv \phi_4(t)$ . The first row gives the initial condition at  $t = 0$ , just after the signals of oscillators  $i = 1$  and  $i = 2$  have been sent,  $S_1, S_2$ . The initial phases

$$\phi(0) = (0, 0, a, a) \quad (71)$$

are given in the first column with constant  $a \approx 0.62307$  used in Section 4, equation (56) and defined below, Eq.(79).

In general, at time  $t$  the time interval to the next event is given by the minimal distance of any phase to threshold,

$$\Delta t_1 = \min\{1 - \phi_i(t) | i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}\}, \quad (72)$$

or by the time

$$\Delta t_2 = \min\{\tau - \sigma_{i,k}(t) | i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \text{ and } k \text{ such that } \sigma_{i,j}(t) \leq \tau\} \quad (73)$$

until the next signal arrives, depending on which  $\Delta t_i$  is smallest at any given time  $t$  (cf. App. A).

As an example of the event-based dynamics, consider the event  $k = 2$  at time  $t = \tau$ . This event contains the reception of signals sent by oscillators  $i = 1$  and  $i = 2$  at time  $t = 0$ ,  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ . Since there are no self-connections, these oscillators receive only one signal each such that their phases are shifted according to

$$p_{i,2} = H_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(\tau) \quad (74)$$

for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . At the same time  $t = \tau$  the other oscillators  $i = 3$  and  $i = 4$  receive two signals of total strength  $2\hat{\varepsilon}$  making them superthreshold,  $U(p_{i,0} + \tau) + 2\hat{\varepsilon} > 1$  for  $i \in \{3, 4\}$ , such that they experience a reset, denoted  $1 \rightarrow 0$ , and

$$p_{3,2} = p_{4,2} = 0. \quad (75)$$

Here, one incoming signal would not have been sufficient to reach the threshold,

$$U(p_{i,0} + \tau) + \hat{\varepsilon} < 1, \quad (76)$$

for  $i \in \{3, 4\}$ . This ensures that the return map (81) for perturbations to the periodic orbit is continuous.

Going through the table row by row, the phases proceed (with time) from event to event. The last row gives the phases just after oscillator  $i = 2$  has been reset again,

$$\phi_2(T) = p_{2,5} = 0, \quad (77)$$

after period  $T = 2\tau - 1 + p_{1,3}$ . The actual parameter dependence of the constant  $a$  is then determined self-consistently from the condition

$$p_{3,5}(a) \stackrel{!}{=} a \quad (78)$$

for the orbit to be closed. This leads to

$$a = H_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(\tau) + 1 - H_{2\hat{\varepsilon}}(H_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(\tau) + \tau). \quad (79)$$

## B.2 Dynamics of a general perturbation to the periodic orbit

Here we consider the dynamics of a general perturbation applied to the periodic orbit studied above. By general perturbation we mean that the initial phases

$$\phi(0) = (0, 0, a, a) + (\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4) \quad (80)$$

satisfy  $\phi_1(0) \neq \phi_2(0)$ . To be specific we assume  $\delta_1 > \delta_2 = 0$ . Whether or not  $\phi_3(0) = \phi_4(0)$  does not play a role. Pulses are then sent by the network in the cyclic order  $S_1, S_2, (S'_3, S'_4)$ . This assumption is made without loss of generality because of the permutation symmetry; the case  $\delta_2 > \delta_1 = 0$  can be treated analogously. We consider only perturbations of firing events that are locked to the phases such that the firing time variables  $\sigma_{i,k}(t)$  are unimportant as discussed previously. The changes of the phases due to single events are obtained from Table 3. If we denote  $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta_1, \delta_3, \delta_4)$ , the return map

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}' = \mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \quad (81)$$

from the three-dimensional plane defined by  $\phi_2 = 0$  to itself is obtained after all oscillators have fired exactly once (last row of Table 3).

Table 3 displays the time evolution of a general perturbation event by event. As for the unperturbed orbit described above, the left column gives the sequence of events and the second left column gives the time of these events. The right four columns give the phases of oscillators  $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$  right after an event has occurred. The first row gives the initial condition at  $t = 0$ , just after the signal has been sent,  $S_2$ , by oscillator  $i = 2$ . Before, at time  $t = -\delta_1 < 0$ , the signal of oscillator

Event	$t$	$\phi_1(t)$	$\phi_2(t)$	$\phi_3(t)$	$\phi_4(t)$
$(S_1), S_2$	0	$\delta_1$ $=: \varphi_{1,0}$	$\delta_2 = 0$ $=: \varphi_{2,0}$	$a + \delta_3$ $=: \varphi_{3,0}$	$a + \delta_4$ $=: \varphi_{4,0}$
$R_1$	$\tau - \delta_1$	$\tau$ $=: \varphi_{1,1}$	$H_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(\varphi_{2,0} + \tau - \delta_1)$ $=: \varphi_{2,1}$	$H_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(\varphi_{3,0} + \tau - \delta_1)$ $=: \varphi_{3,1} \approx 0.9843 < 1$	$H_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(\varphi_{4,0} + \tau - \delta_1)$ $=: \varphi_{4,1} \approx 0.9843 < 1$
$R_2, S'_3, S'_4$	$\tau$	$H_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(\tau + \delta_1)$ $=: \varphi_{1,2}$	$\varphi_{2,1} + \delta_1$ $=: \varphi_{2,2}$	$U(\varphi_{3,1} + \delta_1) + \hat{\varepsilon} > 1$ $1 \rightarrow 0$ $=: \varphi_{3,2}$	$U(\varphi_{4,1} + \delta_1) + \hat{\varepsilon} > 1$ $1 \rightarrow 0$ $=: \varphi_{4,2}$
$R_3, R_4$	$2\tau$	$H_{2\hat{\varepsilon}}(\varphi_{1,2} + \tau)$ $=: \varphi_{1,3}$	$H_{2\hat{\varepsilon}}(\varphi_{2,2} + \tau)$ $=: \varphi_{2,3}$	$H_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(\tau)$ $=: \varphi_{3,3}$	$H_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(\tau)$ $=: \varphi_{4,3}$
$S_1$	$2\tau - 1 - \varphi_{1,3}$	$1 \rightarrow 0$ $=: \varphi_{1,4}$	$\varphi_{2,3} + 1 - \varphi_{1,3}$ $=: \varphi_{2,4}$	$\varphi_{3,3} + 1 - \varphi_{1,3}$ $=: \varphi_{3,4}$	$\varphi_{4,3} + 1 - \varphi_{1,3}$ $=: \varphi_{4,4}$
$S_2$	$2\tau + 1 - \varphi_{2,3}$	$\varphi_{1,3} - \varphi_{2,3}$ $=: \varphi_{1,5}$ $=: \delta_1$	$1 \rightarrow 0$ $=: \varphi_{2,5}$	$\varphi_{3,3} + 1 - \varphi_{2,3}$ $=: \varphi_{3,5}$ $=: a + \delta'_3$	$\varphi_{4,3} + 1 - \varphi_{2,3}$ $=: \varphi_{4,5}$ $=: a + \delta'_4$

Table 3: Time evolution of a small perturbation to the unstable periodic orbit as it progresses around one period. A general perturbation splits up the first synchronized group,  $\delta_1 > \delta_2 \equiv 0$ , while any splitting of the second group is lost due to the event  $R_2, S'_3$ , and  $S'_4$ , i.e. before the first return to the initial section. This sequence of events will occur for all sufficiently close perturbations to the orbit.

$i = 1$  has been sent, denoted  $(S_1)$ ; this signal will travel until time  $t = \tau - \delta_1$ . The initial phases (80) are displayed in the first column. Here  $\delta_2 = 0$  by definition. Throughout the table, the phases after each event are labelled  $\varphi_{i,k}$  where the first index labels the oscillator  $i$  and the second index counts the events  $k$  starting with  $k = 0$  for the initial condition as was also used in Table 2 above.

For instance, the first event (after the initial condition),  $k = 1$ , at time  $t = \tau - \delta_1$  is the reception  $R_1$  of the signal sent by oscillator  $i = 1$ . Since there are no self-interactions, the phase of oscillator  $i = 1$  is only shifted in time,

$$\varphi_{1,1} = \delta_1 + (\tau - \delta_1) = \tau. \quad (82)$$

The phases of all other oscillators  $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$  additionally jump because of the incoming sub-threshold signal,

$$\varphi_{i,1} = H_{\varepsilon}(\varphi_{i,0} + (\tau - \delta_1)). \quad (83)$$

Again, as for the unperturbed dynamics, going through the table row by row, the phases are calculated event by event. The phases  $\varphi_{i,k}$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$  right after the events are approximated by the unperturbed phases  $p_{i,k}$  defined in Table 2,

$$\varphi_{i,k} = p_{i,k} + \mathcal{O}(\delta) \quad (84)$$

for all  $k$  for which the  $p_{i,k}$  are defined,  $k \in \{0, 2, 3, 5\}$ . Here  $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$  denotes a function of all  $\delta_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, 3, 4\}$ , that approaches zero at least linearly if all  $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{O}(\delta) := \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{O}(\delta_i)$ .

We thus obtain the return map

$$\mathbf{F}(\delta) = \delta' \quad (85)$$

$$= (\delta'_1, \delta'_3, \delta'_4) \quad (86)$$

$$= (\varphi_{1,5}, \varphi_{3,5} - a, \varphi_{4,5} - a) \quad (87)$$

from the last row of Table 3. Here the  $\varphi_{i,5}$  again depend on the original perturbation vector  $\delta$ . From this identification we obtain the components

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(\delta) &= H_{2\varepsilon}(H_{\varepsilon}(\tau + \delta_1) + \tau) - H_{2\varepsilon}(H_{\varepsilon}(\tau - \delta_1) + \tau + \delta_1) \\ F_3(\delta) = F_4(\delta) &= H_{2\varepsilon}(H_{\varepsilon}(\tau) + \tau) - H_{2\varepsilon}(H_{\varepsilon}(\tau - \delta_1) + \tau + \delta_1) \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

Note that the component functions  $F_i(\delta)$  in (88) are of order  $F_i(\delta) = \mathcal{O}(\delta)$ ; moreover the dynamics clearly depends only on the initial perturbation  $\delta_1$  to this orbit. It is important to note that although  $\delta_3 \neq 0$  and  $\delta_4 \neq 0$  in general, this group is resynchronized at the next return,  $\delta'_3 = \delta'_4$ .

## References

- [1] P. Antsaklis, W. Kohn, A. Nerode and S. Sastry (Eds) *Hybrid systems. II*. Papers from the 3<sup>rd</sup> workshop held at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York (1994). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 999. Springer, Berlin, (1995).
- [2] J.C Alexander, I. Kan, J.A. Yorke and Z. You. Riddled Basins. *Int. J. Bif. Chaos*, **2**:795–813 (1992).
- [3] P. Ashwin, Riddled basins and coupled dynamical systems. To appear in "Dynamics of Coupled Map Lattices and of Related Spatially Extended Systems", Eds: J.-R. Chazottes and B. Fernandez, Springer Lecture Notes in Physics (2005).

- [4] U. Ernst, K. Pawelzik, and T. Geisel. Synchronization induced by temporal delays in pulse-coupled oscillators. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**:1570–1573 (1995).
- [5] U. Ernst, K. Pawelzik, and T. Geisel. Delay-induced multistable synchronization of biological oscillators. *Phys. Rev. E* **57** 2150–2162 (1998).
- [6] M. Heymann, F. Lin, G. Meyer and S. Resmerita. Analysis of Zeno behaviours in Hybrid Systems, *Proceedings of the 41st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Las Vegas (2002).
- [7] M. Krupa. Robust heteroclinic cycles, *J. Nonlin. Sci.* **7**, 129–176 (1997).
- [8] M. Krupa and I. Melbourne. Asymptotic stability of heteroclinic cycles in systems with symmetry, *Ergodic Theor. Dynam. Sys.* **15**, 121–147 (1995).
- [9] P. Mendelson, On unstable attractors, *Bol. Soc. Mat. Mex* **5**, 270–276 (1960).
- [10] I. Melbourne, An example of a non-asymptotically stable attractor, *Nonlinearity* **4**, 835–844 (1991).
- [11] J. Milnor, On the concept of attractor. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **99**:177–195 (1985); Comments *Commun. Math. Phys.* **102**:517–519 (1985).
- [12] R. Mirollo, and S. H. Strogatz, Synchronization in Networks of Biological Oscillators, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **50**, 1645 (1990).
- [13] J. C. Sommerer and E. Ott, A Physical System with Qualitatively Uncertain Dynamics, *Nature* **365**, 138–140 (1993).
- [14] M. Timme, F. Wolf, and T. Geisel. Prevalence of Unstable Attractors in Networks of Pulse-Coupled Oscillators, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**:154105, (2002).
- [15] M. Timme, F. Wolf, and T. Geisel, Unstable attractors induce perpetual synchronization and desynchronization, *Chaos* **13**:377–387 (2003).
- [16] M. Timme. *Collective dynamics in networks of pulse-coupled oscillators*, Doctoral thesis, University of Göttingen (2002).
- [17] A. Zumdick, M. Timme, T. Geisel, and F. Wolf. Long Chaotic Transients in Complex Networks, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**:244103, (2004).
- [18] F. Pfeiffer. (Ed) Special issue volume **359**, number 1789 of *Phil Trans Roy Soc Lond A* (2001).