

Collective dynamical response of coupled oscillators with any network structure

Hiroshi Kori,^{1,2,*} Yoji Kawamura,³ Hiroya Nakao,⁴ Kensuke Arai,⁴ and Yoshiki Kuramoto^{5,6}

¹*Division of Advanced Sciences, Ohtsuka Academic Production, Ochanomizu University, Tokyo 112-8610, Japan*

²*PRESTO, Japan Science and Technology Agency, Kawaguchi 332-0012, Japan*

³*Earth Simulator Center, Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology, Yokohama 236-0001, Japan*

⁴*Department of Physics, Graduate School of Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

⁵*Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

⁶*Institute for Integrated Cell-Material Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan*

(Dated: November 1, 2018)

We formulate a reduction theory that describes the response of an oscillator network as a whole to external forcing applied nonuniformly to its constituent oscillators. The phase description of multiple oscillator networks coupled weakly is also developed. General formulae for the collective phase sensitivity and the effective phase coupling between the oscillator networks are found. Our theory is applicable to a wide variety of oscillator networks undergoing frequency synchronization. Any network structure can systematically be treated. A few examples are given to illustrate our theory.

PACS numbers: 05.45.Xt, 82.40.Bj, 64.60.aq

An assembly of coupled limit-cycle oscillators often behaves like a single large oscillator. This general scenario recurs in a wide variety of rhythmic phenomena in living organisms, ranging from circadian oscillations, cardiac rhythms to pathological phenomena such as epilepsy and Parkinsonian disease [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Recent experiments using electrochemical oscillators simulate such naturally arising populations of oscillators in an idealized form [6].

Many previous studies have been devoted to answering how and under what conditions oscillators mutually synchronize. In comparison, little attention has been paid to investigating the dynamical response of an oscillator network to external stimuli. Such an inquiry would shed light on mechanisms underlying biological functions (such as the phase response curves of circadian rhythms [7]), external control, and inter-network synchronization of oscillator networks [8]. Establishing a description of the collective dynamics on the basis of “microscopic” knowledge, i.e., the nature of the constituent oscillators and their mutual coupling, presents a challenging task from a theoretical point of view. In particular, it would be ideal if the collective dynamics could be described in terms of a single, suitably defined collective phase Θ in a closed form. A quantity of central importance will then be *the phase sensitivity* of a population as a whole to external weak stimuli [14]. This function has already been derived [9] for a system consisting of a large assembly of identical phase oscillators with global coupling, with each oscillator being driven independently by random time-dependent noise.

In this Letter, we argue that there is yet another general situation for which a similar phase description can be formulated. In contrast to Ref. 9, we consider noise-free but nonidentical oscillators undergoing full frequency synchronization (in which all the oscillators have exactly the same frequency due to coupling). A similar situation

has also been studied by Ko and Ermentrout for two symmetrically coupled and globally coupled oscillators very recently [10]. A distinct advantage of our present approach is that it may deal with any system size, any connectivity, any heterogeneous coupling, and nonuniform external forcing. Moreover, the theory is extended to include multiple populations simply by reinterpreting the external stimuli applied to a given population as the coupling forces originating from the other populations, which enables us to predict the synchronization behavior between oscillator networks. General formulae for the collective phase sensitivity and the effective phase coupling between the oscillator networks are found.

Consider a network of N coupled limit-cycle oscillators under external forcing. The forcing is generally nonuniform, i.e., individual oscillators receive different inputs. As is well known [2], if the heterogeneity of oscillators, the coupling between oscillators, and external forcing are weak, the system is describable by the phase equation

$$\dot{\phi}_i = \omega_i + \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_{ij}(\phi_i - \phi_j) + \epsilon Z(\phi_i) \xi_i(t). \quad (1)$$

Here ϕ_i is the phase of the i th oscillator ($i = 1, \dots, N$), ω_i its natural frequency, and Γ_{ij} the coupling force from the j th oscillator to the i th oscillator. The terms $\xi_i(t)$ and $Z(\phi_i)$ respectively represent the time-dependent external force and the phase sensitivity of the oscillator i to external perturbation [15]. Parameter ϵ is the characteristic intensity of the external forcing.

Our aim is to establish the collective phase description for Eq. (1), i.e. to derive the dynamical equation for a suitably defined macroscopic variable that describes the response to external forcing. This is generally formulated under two basic assumptions. (i) In the absence of external forcing a stable periodic solution corresponding to a fully frequency-synchronized state exists, and thus, the

oscillator network behaves as a single large limit-cycle oscillator. (ii) The external force is even weaker than the coupling force, i.e. $\epsilon \ll 1$, so that the synchronized state is almost unaltered under external forcing. Under these assumptions, the phase reduction method [2] applicable to a weakly perturbed oscillator can be applied (once again) to the oscillator network by interpreting the unperturbed system as a single limit-cycle oscillator.

For convenience, we begin by rewriting Eq. (1) in terms of the N -dimensional state vector $\mathbf{X} = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_N)$ as

$$\dot{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{X}) + \epsilon \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{X}, t), \quad (2)$$

where $F_i(\mathbf{X}) = \omega_i + \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_{ij}(\phi_i - \phi_j)$ and $p_i(\mathbf{X}, t) = Z(\phi_i)\xi_i(t)$. A frequency synchronized state (or, more exactly, a phase locked state) for $\epsilon = 0$ is found as a solution of $F_i(\mathbf{X}) = \Omega$ for all i . This ‘‘limit-cycle’’ solution is denoted by

$$\mathbf{X}_0(\Theta) = (\Theta + \phi_1^0, \Theta + \phi_2^0, \dots, \Theta + \phi_N^0), \quad \Theta = \Omega t, \quad (3)$$

where ϕ_i^0 is constant. We then extend the definition of Θ outside the limit-cycle orbit as a scalar field $\Theta(\mathbf{X})$. The identity $\dot{\Theta} = (d\Theta/d\mathbf{X}) \cdot (d\mathbf{X}/dt)$ implies

$$\dot{\Theta} = \frac{d\Theta}{d\mathbf{X}} \cdot \{\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{X}) + \epsilon \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{X}, t)\}. \quad (4)$$

As is usually done in the phase reduction process, we now adopt the definition of $\Theta(\mathbf{X})$ such that in the absence of the forcing, $\dot{\Theta} = \Omega$ is identically satisfied, i.e., $(d\Theta/d\mathbf{X}) \cdot \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{X}) = \Omega$. We call $\Theta(\mathbf{X})$ *the collective phase* [16]. Due to the assumption of weak forcing, $(d\Theta/d\mathbf{X}) \cdot \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{X}, t)$ may be evaluated at $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_0(\Theta)$. Then, to the lowest order in ϵ Eq. (4) becomes

$$\dot{\Theta} = \Omega + \epsilon \frac{d\Theta}{d\mathbf{X}_0} \cdot \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{X}_0, t). \quad (5)$$

Let the linearized equation of (2) with $\epsilon = 0$ be $\dot{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{Y}$, where \mathbf{Y} is the deviation defined by $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0$. Due to the symmetry of $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{X})$, the Jacobian \mathbf{L} is a constant matrix, one eigenvalue of which equals zero with the corresponding eigenvector given by $\mathbf{U} = d\mathbf{X}_0(\Theta)/d\Theta = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$. We define row vector \mathbf{U}^* as the left zero-eigenvector of \mathbf{L} , i.e., $\mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{L} = 0$, with the normalization condition $\mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{U} = 1$, or, $\sum_{i=1}^N U_i^* = 1$. It can then be argued that $d\Theta/d\mathbf{X}_0$ becomes identical to \mathbf{U}^* [2]. Thus, Eq. (5) takes the form

$$\dot{\Theta} = \Omega + \epsilon \boldsymbol{\zeta}(\Theta) \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}(t), \quad (6)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_N)$ and $\boldsymbol{\zeta}(\Theta)$, which is interpreted as *the collective phase sensitivity*, is a vector with components

$$\zeta_i(\Theta) = U_i^* Z(\Theta + \phi_i^0). \quad (7)$$

Equations (6) and (7) have clarified the response of the collective mode of the synchronized network. There, the forcing to the oscillator i has turned out to be weighted by U_i^* . We thus call \mathbf{U}^* *the weight vector* henceforth.

In what follows, we often consider uniform external forcing, $\xi_i(t) = \xi(t)$ for all i . In such a case, Eq. (6) is further reduced to $\dot{\Theta} = \Omega + \epsilon \zeta(\Theta)\xi(t)$, where $\zeta(\Theta)$ is the collective phase sensitivity defined for uniform forcing, $\zeta(\Theta) = \sum_{i=1}^N U_i^* Z(\Theta + \phi_i^0)$. Generally speaking, $\zeta(\Theta)$ deviates from $Z(\phi)$ more significantly as the phases of the constituent oscillators are more widely distributed.

An analytic formula of weight vector \mathbf{U}^* is given as follows. The elements of L are given by

$$L_{ij} = \delta_{ij} \sum_{k \neq i}^N \Gamma'_{ik}(\phi_i^0 - \phi_k^0) - (1 - \delta_{ij}) \Gamma'_{ij}(\phi_i^0 - \phi_j^0). \quad (8)$$

Note that the relation $L\mathbf{U} = \sum_{j=1}^N L_{ij} = 0$ holds. We define the (i, i) -cofactor of L as $M_i = \det L(i, i)$, which is the determinant of the submatrix $L(i, i)$, that is L with the i -th row and column removed. One can prove that, for any L with $\sum_{j=1}^N L_{ij} = 0$, the row vector (M_1, M_2, \dots, M_N) is a left zero-eigenvector of L , i.e., $\sum_{j=1}^N M_j L_{ji} = 0$ [11]. Using the normalization condition, we obtain the algebraic expression of \mathbf{U}^* as

$$\mathbf{U}^* = (M_1, M_2, \dots, M_N)/M, \quad (9)$$

where $M = \sum_{i=1}^N M_i$. This expression is valid for any network structure. Note that, for networks with both bidirectional connection patterns and symmetric coupling functions, L is symmetric and U_i^* is trivially $1/N$ for all i , which is the case even for networks with strongly heterogeneous connectivity including scale-free networks. In many cases, however, L is asymmetric and \mathbf{U}^* is heterogeneous.

Next, we formulate the collective phase description of multiple networks of phase oscillators. We are concerned with the case in which external forcing is absent, while $\epsilon \xi_i(t)$ in the last term in Eq. (1) is interpreted as representing the coupling force coming from oscillators of other networks. For clarity, we consider a simple system in which two identical networks composed of N oscillators, called group A and group B, are uniformly coupled (the extension to a more general case, e.g., weakly heterogeneous multiple groups, is straightforward). The dynamical equations of the system are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\phi}_i^A &= \omega_i + \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_{ij}(\phi_i^A - \phi_j^A) + \epsilon Z(\phi_i^A) \xi(\{\phi_k^B\}), \\ \dot{\phi}_i^B &= \omega_i + \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_{ij}(\phi_i^B - \phi_j^B) + \epsilon Z(\phi_i^B) \xi(\{\phi_k^A\}), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where ϕ_i^X is the phase of the oscillator i in group X ($X=A, B$), and $\xi(\{\phi_k^X\})$ denotes a function of $\phi_1^X, \phi_2^X, \dots, \phi_N^X$,

which represents the uniform coupling force coming from group X. Denoting the collective phases of the respective groups by Θ_A and Θ_B , we obtain the resulting phase equation in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\Theta}_A &= \Omega + \epsilon \zeta(\Theta_A) \xi(\{\Theta_B + \phi_k^0\}), \\ \dot{\Theta}_B &= \Omega + \epsilon \zeta(\Theta_B) \xi(\{\Theta_A + \phi_k^0\}).\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

Noting that the dominant time-dependence of $\Theta_{A,B}$ is Ωt , we may obtain the effective coupling $\gamma(\Theta_A - \Theta_B)$ between the groups by time-averaging of Eq. (11) over the common period $2\pi/\Omega$. Putting $\Theta_{A,B} = \Omega t + \theta_{A,B}$, we perform the averaging as

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(\Theta_A - \Theta_B) &= \gamma(\theta_A - \theta_B) = \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d(\Omega t) \zeta(\Omega t + \theta_A) \xi(\{\Omega t + \theta_B + \phi_k^0\}),\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

where γ rather than Γ has been used to indicate that this coupling function acts between the groups. In this way, we succeeded in deriving the collective phase equation in the simple form

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\Theta}_A &= \Omega + \epsilon \gamma(\Theta_A - \Theta_B), \\ \dot{\Theta}_B &= \Omega + \epsilon \gamma(\Theta_B - \Theta_A).\end{aligned}\quad (13)$$

We give two examples to illustrate our theory.

Example I: the dependence of weight vector \mathbf{U}^ on the connectivity.* We consider a network of identical oscillators with homogeneous coupling, i.e., $\omega_i = \omega$ and $\Gamma_{ij}(\Delta\phi) = A_{ij}\Gamma(\Delta\phi)$ undergoing perfect phase synchrony. Here, A is the adjacency matrix describing the connectivity, which is generally asymmetric and weighted. In such a system, the weight vector depends solely on the network architecture. By rescaling t and ϵ , we put $\Gamma'(0) = -1$ without loss of generality. In perfect phase synchrony, i.e., $\phi_i^0 = \phi^0$ for all i , L is a Laplacian matrix generalized for asymmetric and weighted networks, given by $L_{ij} = -A_{ij}$ for $i \neq j$ and $L_{ii} = \sum_{j \neq i}^N A_{ij}$. We consider two small networks in which the weight vector \mathbf{U}^* is easily calculated via the algebraic expression, Eq. (9). Figure 1(a) is a weighted network, where the weight vector is found to be a simple reflection of the connection weights. Figure 1(b) is a non-weighted network but its adjacency matrix is asymmetric. It is worth noticing that oscillator 2 is more influential than oscillator 3, although they have locally the same topological properties: one inward and two outward connections. In general, the weight vector depends on the global topology.

Example II: collective phase sensitivity and group synchronization in limit-cycle oscillators. We illustrate that the collective phase sensitivity of a group of coupled oscillators varies with intra-group coupling strength. We then consider two groups of coupled oscillators with an additional inter-group coupling of fixed strength, and show




FIG. 1: Examples of weight vector \mathbf{U}^* . Using Eq. (9), we find (a) $U_1^* : U_2^* = 1 : \kappa$ and (b) $U_1^* : U_2^* : U_3^* : U_4^* = 2 : 4 : 3 : 1$.

that a nontrivial qualitative change in the synchronization behavior between the groups occurs when the individual collective phase sensitivities changes as a result of modifications to the intra-group coupling strength.

As schematically illustrated in Fig. 2(a), we consider the system in which a pair of identical groups A and B, each of which consists of two coupled limit-cycle oscillators, are mutually coupled. We use the Hindmarsh-Rose model as the limit-cycle oscillator, a model originally proposed as a neural model. The system reads

$$\dot{x}_i = 3x_i^2 - x_i^3 + y_i - \mu_i + \sum_{j=1}^4 D_{ij}x_j, \quad \dot{y}_i = 1 - 5x_i^2 - y_i. \quad (14)$$

Here, the coupling matrix D is given as $D_{12,21,34,43} = K$, $D_{11,22,33,44} = -K$, $D_{13,23,31,41} = \epsilon$ with K and ϵ being the coupling intensities for intra- and inter-groups, respectively. We assume $1 \gg K \gg \epsilon = 1.0 \times 10^{-5}$. We set $\mu_1 = \mu_3 = -3.000$ and $\mu_2 = \mu_4 = -3.001$, corresponding to $\omega_{1,3} \simeq 1.80476$, $\omega_{2,4} \simeq 1.80443$, and thus $\Delta\omega \simeq 3.3 \times 10^{-4}$. The wave form $x(\phi)$ and the phase sensitivity $Z(\phi)$ of an isolated oscillator obtained numerically are shown in Figs. 2(b) and 2(c), respectively.

The corresponding phase model is given by Eq. (10), where $\Gamma_{ij}(\Delta\phi) = K\Gamma(\Delta\phi)$, $\xi(\{\phi_k^A\}) = x(\phi_1)$, and $\xi(\{\phi_k^B\}) = x(\phi_3)$. From the phase reduction theory, the coupling function is calculated as $\Gamma(\phi_1 - \phi_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d(\omega t) Z(\phi_1 + \omega t) \{x(\phi_2 + \omega t) - x(\phi_1 + \omega t)\}$. For convenience, we display $\Gamma_a(\Delta\phi) \equiv \Gamma(\Delta\phi) - \Gamma(-\Delta\phi)$ in Fig. 2(d). The phase difference $\Delta\phi^0$ between the oscillators 1 and 2 of a synchronized state is found as a stable solution of $\phi_1 = \phi_2$ (where $\epsilon = 0$ is assumed), and thus, a solution of $\Gamma_a(\Delta\phi^0) = \Delta\omega/K$. The predicted phase difference is plotted in Fig. 2(e) as a curve. It agrees well with numerical data obtained through direct numerical integration of Eq. (14). Using $Z(\phi)$, $\Delta\phi^0$, $\Gamma(\Delta\phi)$, and its derivative $\Gamma'(\Delta\phi)$ obtained numerically, we can calculate U_1^* , U_2^* , and $\zeta(\Theta)$. The results are shown in Fig. 2(f) and its caption. For large K (compared to $\Delta\omega$), $\zeta(\Theta)$ is indistinguishable from $Z(\phi)$. As K decreases, $\Delta\phi^0$ becomes larger, resulting in considerable variation in $\zeta(\Theta)$.

Given $\zeta(\Theta)$, the synchronization behavior between groups is now predicted. The collective coupling function $\gamma(\Delta\Theta)$ is calculated from Eq. (12) where $\xi(\phi) = x(\phi)$ in the system under consideration. For convenience, we display the antisymmetric part of $\gamma(\Delta\Theta)$ in Fig. 2(g). Putting $\dot{\Theta}_A = \dot{\Theta}_B$, we find the stable phase locking so-




FIG. 2: (color online) Results for a network of limit-cycle oscillators. (a) Network structure under consideration. (b) Waveform $x(\phi)$ and (c) phase sensitivity $Z(\phi)$ of an individual oscillator. (d) Antisymmetric part of the coupling function, $\Gamma_a(\Delta\phi)$. (e) Phase difference $\Delta\phi^0$ between oscillators in each group. (f) Collective phase sensitivity $\zeta(\Theta)$ defined for uniform forcing. For $K = 0.007, 0.002, 0.0015$, (U_1^*, U_2^*) is respectively about $(1.35, -0.35)$, $(2.87, -1.87)$ and $(2.89, -1.89)$. (g) Antisymmetric part of the collective coupling function, $\gamma_a(\Delta\Theta)$. (h) Phase difference $\Delta\Theta$ between the groups.

lution between groups, $\Delta\Theta \equiv \Theta_A - \Theta_B$. Predicted $\Delta\Theta$ is exhibited by the curve in Fig. 2(h), implying that the in-phase solution becomes unstable at around $K = 0.006$ (via a pitch-fork bifurcation) and the out-of-phase solution appears below. Phase difference $\Delta\Theta$ (or equivalently, $\phi_1 - \phi_3$) obtained from direct numerical integration of Eq. (14) is plotted in Fig. 2(h), which convinces us of the precision of the phase description.

In summary, we have formulated the response of the collective phase to weak external forcing given to constituent oscillators and the phase description for interacting oscillator networks. The present theory is valid for a wide class of weakly coupled oscillator networks undergoing full frequency synchronization, and thus, a

broad applicability would be expected.

* corresponding author: kori.hiroshi@ocha.ac.jp

- [1] A. T. Winfree, *The Geometry of Biological Time* (Springer, New York, 1980).
- [2] Y. Kuramoto, *Chemical Oscillations, Waves, and Turbulence* (Springer, New York, 1984).
- [3] P. A. Tass, *Phase Resetting in Medicine and Biology* (Springer, Berlin, 1999).
- [4] A. Pikovsky, M. Rosenblum, and J. Kurths, *Synchronization* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001).
- [5] S. M. Reppert and D. R. Weaver, *Nature* **418**, 935 (2002).
- [6] I. Z. Kiss, Y. M. Zhai, and J. L. Hudson, *Science* **296**, 5573 (2002); I. Z. Kiss, C. G. Rusin, H. Kori, and J. L. Hudson, *Science* **316**, 1886 (2007); H. Kori, C. G. Rusin, I. Z. Kiss, and J. L. Hudson, *Chaos* **18**, 026111 (2008).
- [7] C. H. Johnson, *Chronobiology international* **16**, 711 (1999).
- [8] K. Okuda and Y. Kuramoto, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **86**, 1159 (1991); E. Montbrio, J. Kurths, and B. Blasius, *Phys. Rev. E* **70**, 056125 (2004); I. Z. Kiss, M. Quigg, S.-H. C. Chun, H. Kori, and J. L. Hudson, *Biophysical Journal* **94**, 1121 (2008); J. H. Sheeba, A. Stefanovska, and P. V. E. McClintock, *Biophysical Journal* **95**, 2722 (2008); E. Ott and T. M. Antonsen, *Chaos* **18**, 037113 (2008); E. Barreto, B. Hunt, E. Ott, and P. So, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 036107 (2008).
- [9] Y. Kawamura, H. Nakao, K. Arai, H. Kori, and Y. Kuramoto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 024101 (2008).
- [10] T.-W. Ko and G. B. Ermentrout, arXiv/0809.3371.
- [11] N. Biggs, *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society* **29**, 641 (1997).
- [12] A. T. Winfree, *J. Theor. Biol.* **16**, 15 (1967).
- [13] E. M. Izhikevich, *Dynamical Systems in Neuroscience* (MIT Press, Cambridge, 2007).
- [14] The phase sensitivity is the function of the phase of an oscillator describing the phase shifts (compared to unperturbed one) normalized by the intensity of weak pulsative perturbation given to the oscillator [1, 2, 12]. It is also sometimes called the infinitesimal phase response curve [13].
- [15] When the forcing is given by a vector $\xi_i(t)$ in the original dynamical system model before reduction, the corresponding forcing term in the phase-reduced equation is generally given, unlike Eq.(1), by a scalar product between this forcing vector and the phase sensitivity vector $\mathbf{Z}(\phi_i)$ of the i th oscillator [2]. Here, $\mathbf{Z}(\phi_i)$ is the left eigenvector with the zero eigenvalue defined for the linearized system of the i th oscillator about its limit-cycle orbit. However, to avoid unnecessary complications, we have used a simpler form of the forcing term in Eq. (1) assuming that the original forcing vector has only one nonvanishing component ξ_i .
- [16] In our particular system, Θ can be explicitly given for $\mathbf{X} \simeq \mathbf{X}_0$ as $\Theta = \mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{X} + \Theta_0$ with some constant Θ_0 , because $\dot{\Theta} = \mathbf{U}^* \dot{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{X}_0) + \mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{L} \mathbf{Y} = \sum_{i=1}^N U_i^* \Omega = \Omega$. Correspondingly, one may immediately obtain Eq. (6) by applying \mathbf{U}^* to the lowest order description of Eq. (2), $\dot{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{X}_0) + \mathbf{L} \mathbf{Y} + \epsilon \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{X}_0, t)$, as well as by following the normal phase reduction process.