

Synchronization of Extended Systems From Internal Coherence

Gregory S. Duane

National Center for Atmospheric Research,

P.O. Box 3000, Boulder, CO 80307

Abstract

A condition for the synchronizability of a pair of PDE systems, coupled through a finite set of variables, is commonly the existence of internal synchronization or internal coherence in each system separately. The condition was previously illustrated in a forced-dissipative system, and is here extended to Hamiltonian systems, using an example from particle physics. Full synchronization is precluded by Liouville's theorem. A form of synchronization weaker than "measure synchronization" is manifest as the positional coincidence of coherent oscillations ("breathers" or "oscillons") in a pair of coupled scalar field models in an expanding universe with a nonlinear potential, and does not occur with a variant of the model that does not exhibit oscillons.

PACS numbers: 05.45.Xt,05.45.Jn,11.27.+d

Keywords: chaos synchronization, coherent structures, measure synchronization, oscillons, scale interactions

The phenomenon of synchronized chaos, initially explored in low-order ODE systems [1, 2, 3], has been extended to PDEs that describe a variety of systems of physical interest [4]. Chaos synchronization extends the paradigm of synchronization of regular oscillators that is ubiquitous in Nature [5]. One seeks an understanding of the internal properties of a chaotic physical system that will allow a pair of such systems, loosely coupled, to synchronize, despite sensitive dependence on initial conditions. Spatially extended systems offer richer possibilities for relationships that fall short of full synchronization than do ODE systems. In geophysical example previously studied [6], it was seen that slaving of small scales, a relationship that defines an *inertial manifold*, was crucial to synchronizability. Here, it is suggested that more general inter-scale relationships, as may give rise to coherent structures within each system separately, are required for the synchronizability of the pair. The connection is illustrated in a particle physics context - a toy model of a scalar field in the expanding early universe [7], a Hamiltonian system without an attractor. Weak scale relationships allow oscillons (breathers) to persist, and give rise to a new form of synchronization defined by the coincidence in position of oscillons in two coupled scalar field models. Conversely, where the dynamics do not admit such coherent structures, vestiges of synchronization are lost.

In the non-Hamiltonian meteorological example described in [6], which we first review, two geophysical fluid systems, representing planetary-scale wind patterns, are coupled only through their medium-scale Fourier components. Each system is given by a potential vorticity equation

$$\frac{Dq_i}{Dt} \equiv \frac{\partial q_i}{\partial t} + J(\psi_i, q_i) = F_i + D_i \quad (1)$$

where the streamfunction ψ is the fundamental dynamical variable, the Jacobian $J(\psi, \cdot) = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} \frac{\partial \cdot}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} \frac{\partial \cdot}{\partial x}$ gives the advective contribution to the Lagrangian derivative D/Dt , there are two horizontal layers $i=1, 2$, and the potential vorticity q , which generalizes angular momentum, is a derived variable defined in terms of ψ in [6]. Potential vorticity is conserved on a moving parcel, except for forcing F_i and dissipation D_i .

Two models of the form (1), $Dq^A/Dt = F^A + D^A$ and $Dq^B/Dt = F^B + D^B$ were coupled diffusively through one of the forcing terms:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\vec{k}}^A &= \mu_{\vec{k}}^c [q_{\vec{k}}^B - q_{\vec{k}}^A] + \mu_{\vec{k}}^{\text{ext}} [q_{\vec{k}}^* - q_{\vec{k}}^A] \\ F_{\vec{k}}^B &= \mu_{\vec{k}}^c [q_{\vec{k}}^A - q_{\vec{k}}^B] + \mu_{\vec{k}}^{\text{ext}} [q_{\vec{k}}^* - q_{\vec{k}}^B] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the flow has been decomposed spectrally and the subscript \vec{k} on each quantity indicates

the wave number \vec{k} spectral component (suppressing the index i). A background flow q^* forces each system separately. The set of coefficients μ_k^c was chosen to couple the two channels only in some medium range of wavenumbers. Band-limited coupling defined by μ_k^c replaces the coupling of two PDE systems at a discrete set of points as in [4].

The two systems synchronize over time in Fig. 1, where the contours of ψ are streamlines that define the flow. The synchronization is manifest as the coincidence of structures of meteorological significance (“blocking patterns” that interrupt the flow) in both space and time. That coincidence is robust against significant differences in the two systems [6].

The large scales need not be coupled because of well known dynamical relations between scales (“inverse cascade”) in 2D turbulence [9]. But the stronger result [6] that synchronization occurs without coupling of the smallest scales is explained simply: The smallest-scale components are thought not to be independent dynamical variables but are functions of the medium and large-scale components, defining a dynamically invariant *inertial manifold*. Where the set of variables that are coupled is smaller than a minimal independent set, synchronization does not occur. Partial synchronization of forced-dissipative systems will usually be easy to arrange, as previously found by Kocarev et al. [4], since *approximate inertial manifolds* (AIM’s) exist for almost all parabolic PDEs [10].

In Hamiltonian systems, the subject of the current work, inertial manifolds cannot exist, since the stability of such a manifold would imply a collapse of phase space volumes for trajectories that start off the manifold, contradicting Liouville’s Theorem. A simple example is the Klein-Gordon equation in an expanding background geometry, in one space and one time dimension, with cyclic boundary conditions, with a nonlinear potential of a type that gives rise to oscillons, possibly representing the first coherent structures in the universe. The field satisfies

$$\frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial t^2} + H \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} - e^{-2Ht} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} + V'(\phi) = 0 \quad (3)$$

where H is a Hubble constant, the potential V is given by $V(\phi) = (1/2)\phi^2 - (1/4)\phi^4 + (1/6)\phi^6$ for units in which the scalar field mass $m = 1$, and the prime denotes the derivative with respect to ϕ . The equation (3) is derived by replacing derivatives in the standard Klein-Gordon equation by covariant derivatives for a Robertson-Walker metric describing expansion with Hubble constant H [11], giving a term in $\partial\phi/\partial t$ which formally resembles friction but which in fact preserves the Hamiltonian structure. Indeed, the system (3) is

derivable from a time-dependent Hamiltonian density

$$\mathcal{H} = (1/2)e^{-Ht}[(\phi_x)^2 + \pi^2] + e^{Ht}V(\phi) \quad (4)$$

where $\pi \equiv e^{Ht}\dot{\phi}$ is the canonical momentum that is conjugate to ϕ . Liouville's theorem applies even with the time dependence, so that neither an inertial manifold, in the strict sense, nor an AIM with a usefully small approximation bound can exist.

Oscillating coherent structures appear as regions of high energy density at final time, in the numerical integration shown in Fig. 2a, after initializing with thermal noise as in [7].

Consider two systems (3) coupled diffusively, through some Fourier components of the field only, according to

$$\frac{\partial^2 \phi^{A,B}}{\partial t^2} + H \frac{\partial \phi^{A,B}}{\partial t} - e^{-2Ht} \frac{\partial^2 \phi^{A,B}}{\partial x^2} + V'(\phi^{A,B}) - F^{A,B} = 0 \quad (5)$$

$$F_k^A = c_k \left(\frac{\partial \phi_k^B}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial \phi_k^A}{\partial t} \right) \quad F_k^B = c_k \left(\frac{\partial \phi_k^A}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial \phi_k^B}{\partial t} \right) \quad (6)$$

with the coupling coefficients $c_k = 0$ vanishing above a threshold value $|k| > k_0$ and set to a large value for $|k| \leq k_0$, so that corresponding large scale components in the two systems are effectively clamped. For coupling of the lowest wavenumber modes, up to wavelengths of about twice the final oscillon width, oscillons in the two systems were found to occur at mostly the same locations, though their amplitudes differed, as shown in Fig. 3a. In contrast, if the two systems were left completely uncoupled, but shared initial conditions over a range of scales, and only the smallest scales, well below the oscillon widths, were initialized differently, then oscillons formed at locations that were uncorrelated (Fig. 3b). Apparently, there is a ‘‘butterfly effect’’, as in meteorology, through which the small scales have a large impact on the positions of formation of coherent structures.[12] But the dynamical evolution of these structures then partially slaves a portion of the small-scale sector (as with shock waves) and proceeds independently of the remaining portion.

With severely attenuated initial noise (Fig. 4a), oscillon synchronization occurs with an even narrower range of coupled wavenumbers. The large-scale components (top 32 modes) of the same oscillons are shown in the bottom portion of Fig. 4b. For four of the five oscillons shown, the oscillon positions are coincident with the local maxima of the truncated field. For the remaining one (the leftmost), the oscillon is displaced from the local maximum of the truncated field, but is still coincident with the corresponding oscillon in the other

system (Fig.4a). The small-scale Fourier components, in both situations, are slaved to the large-scale components insofar as they determine oscillon position.

Coincidence of oscillon positions suggests *measure synchronization*, the weak form of synchronized chaos in which the trajectories of two coupled systems become the same when the systems are coupled, without a requirement that the states of the systems are the same at a given instant of time[13, 14]. Measure synchronization is characteristic of jointly Hamiltonian coupled systems. Here, the coupled oscillon systems do not quite attain measure synchronization, since the corresponding oscillons differ in amplitude, and the configuration (5) which can be written:

$$\dot{\phi}_k^{A,B} = e^{-Ht} \pi_k = \partial \mathcal{H}^{A,B} / \partial \pi_k^{A,B} \quad (7)$$

$$\dot{\pi}_k^{A,B} = -\partial \mathcal{H}^{A,B} / \partial \phi_k^{A,B} + c_k (\pi_k^{B,A} - \pi_k^{A,B}) \quad (8)$$

is not derivable from a joint Hamiltonian. (It would be Hamiltonian if the second term in (8) were to be replaced by $c_k(\phi_k^{B,A} - \phi_k^{A,B})$.) But even without the joint Hamiltonian structure, complete synchronization is not likely achievable by coupling a finite number of modes, if the remaining infinite number are not slaved.

In a comparable system without oscillons, there are no vestiges of synchronization. Correlations between corresponding modes in the coupled systems are displayed in Table Ia for the oscillon system, and in Table Ib for an alternate pair of systems with potential $V = V_{\text{alt}}(\phi) = (1/2)\phi^2 + (1/4)\phi^4 + (1/6)\phi^6$ in (3), for which no oscillons form, as seen in Fig. 2b. (Oscillons occur in one case and not the other because the $-\phi^4$ term in the first case gives a flatter potential, so that larger amplitude oscillations have lower frequencies and decouple from the faster, smaller travelling wave solutions that would otherwise cause them to dissipate.) While there are small but significant correlations between some of the uncoupled modes in Table Ia, corresponding to the small partially-slaved portion of the small-scale sector, no significant correlations appear between corresponding small-scale components that are not coupled in Table Ib. The correlations in the case with oscillons are expected to extend to much shorter wavelengths in longer simulations that approach the oscillon lifetimes, as the oscillons decrease in width (in comoving coordinates) and background fluctuations decrease in amplitude [7].

The synchronization results for oscillons suggest a unifying principle governing synchronization in both Hamiltonian and forced-dissipative systems: Two complex systems of either

type can be made to synchronize, with a restricted set of coupled variables, if and only if each system exhibits synchronization internally. Sufficiency of the condition follows from transitivity if the internal synchronization is exact: Any external coupling that does not destroy the internal relationships and causes some pairs of variables in the two systems to agree will also cause all variables that internally synchronize with the coupled variables to agree with their counterparts in the other system. In the cases considered here, the condition also appears necessary. Localized coherent structures like oscillons, as well as long-range connections such as the Atlantic-Pacific “teleconnection” described previously [6, 9], can be regarded as approximate forms of internal synchronization. Where a master set of variables, in Fourier space, synchronizes with the entire remaining infinite set, an inertial manifold exists. Local coherence has been described as synchronization of a more limited type in PDEs [15] and in lattices of coupled maps [16].

The internal synchronization condition also provides guidance as to the choice of coupled variables. If the extended systems are “truth” and a “computer model” to which truth is coupled in one direction only, via observations, as in meteorology [17], then a set of variables should be observed that is synchronized with a maximal set of other variables internally.

An internal coherence criterion applies to ODE systems, consistently with Pecora and Carroll’s criterion of negative “conditional Lyapunov exponents” in the Lorenz system [1]. Lorenz X can be said to approximately synchronize with Lorenz Y, along the near-planar Lorenz attractor, in agreement with the well known fact that sufficiently strong coupling of either X or Y in one system to the corresponding variable of a second Lorenz system will synchronize the two systems. Coupling of the Z variables, that do not correlate internally with either X or Y, will not do so. But the internal coherence criterion is much more useful for PDEs that describe spatially extended systems, both because such systems are less tractable analytically - a full set of conditional Lyapunov exponents is hard to compute - and because the coherent structures are more meaningful physically.

For Hamiltonian systems coherent structures seem to bear strongly on synchronizability and on the form of synchronization. The ubiquity of coherent structures in solutions to nonlinear PDE’s is the basis on which potentially broad relevance is claimed for the current work. Solitons, for instance, in a pair of PDE systems that exhibit them, might also be made to coincide in position, and to move in synchrony, if only a restricted set of corresponding Fourier components of the two fields are coupled. The question is whether the internal

dynamics that allow the structures to exist in each system would cause the needed parts of the uncoupled components to follow. The phenomenon, if it exists, might be used for secure communications in the same manner as the systems considered in [4].

The present generalization differs from measure synchronization [13] in several notable respects: First, in an ergodic system with trajectories that define a uniform measure, such as the system with modified potential V_{alt} that exhibits no oscillon behavior, measure synchronization is trivial. Second, as already pointed out, positional coincidence of coherent structures that differ in amplitude or detailed shape is more general than measure synchronization. Third, there is no requirement that the *combined* system be Hamiltonian to exhibit the weak form of synchronization described here. The impossibility of strict synchronization follows not from the joint Hamiltonian structure, but from the impossibility of slaving or approximately slaving all uncoupled variables in each system separately.

The new types of synchronization appear to be equivalent, in their details, to detailed inter-scale relationships, within each system internally, that in the present case allow oscillons to persist and to stably maintain their positions. The partial agreement of small scales between the two synchronized systems, sufficient to force coincidence in oscillon position, when large scales are clamped, indeed defines a partial slaving that counters the butterfly effect. For consistency with Liouville's Theorem, there must be a compensating expansion of the remaining part of the uncoupled modes in phase space, as entropy is cast off to scales that are yet smaller. Details of the partial slaving remain to be worked out. The existence and the form of synchronization may provide diagnostics for the slaving relationships.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported in part by NSF Grant 0327929. The author thanks Joe Tribbia, Roger Temam, Noah Graham, and Jeff Weiss for useful discussions, and especially thanks Alan Guth for also conducting some of the numerical experiments.

[1] L.M. Pecora and T.L. Carroll, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 821 (1990).

[2] V.S. Afraimovich, N.N. Verichev, and M.I. Rabinovich, Inv. VUZ Radiofiz. RPQAEC **29**, 795 (1986).

[3] H. Fujisaka and T. Yamada, Prog. Theor. Phys. **69**, 32 (1983).

[4] L. Kocarev, Z. Tasev, and U. Parlitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 51 (1997).

- [5] S. Strogatz, *Sync: The Emerging Science of Spontaneous Order*, Theia, New York (2003).
- [6] G.S. Duane and J.J. Tribbia, *J. Atmos. Sci.* **61**, 2149 (2004).
- [7] E. Farhi, N. Graham, A.H. Guth, N. Iqbal, R.R. Rosales, and N. Stamatopoulos, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 085019 (2008).
- [8] L.M. Pecora, T.L. Carroll, G.A. Johnson, and D.J. Mar, *Chaos* **7**, 520 (1997).
- [9] G.S. Duane and J.J. Tribbia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 4298 (2001).
- [10] R. Temam, *Infinite Dimensional Dynamical Systems in Mechanics and Physics*, Springer-Verlag, New-York, Applied Mathematical Sciences Series **68**, (1988).
- [11] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of the General Theory of Relativity*, Wiley, New York (1972).
- [12] The butterfly effect here differs essentially from bubble nucleation as in Coleman, S., *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 2929 (1977). The oscillons do not grow from a seed, but shrink, in the coordinate system of (3). Initial and final oscillon widths are both much larger than the “seed” scale.
- [13] A. Hampton and D.H. Zanette, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 2179 (1999).
- [14] Measure synchronization was first reported as “non-isochronic” synchronization in Ref. [2].
- [15] J.K. Hale, *J. Dynamics and Diff. Eq.* **9**, 1 (1997).
- [16] K. Kaneko (Ed.), *Theory and Applications of Coupled Map Lattices*, Wiley, New York (1993).
- [17] G.S. Duane, J.J. Tribbia, and J.B. Weiss, *Nonlin. Processes in Geophys.* **13**, 601 (2006); G.S. Duane and J.J. Tribbia, Ch. 17 in *Nonlinear Dynamics in the Geosciences*, ed. A. Tsonis, Springer (2007).

TABLE I: Correlations between coefficients of corresponding Fourier components of the independent dynamical variables in the A and B subsystems of the coupled scalar field system (5) (a) and for the same system with the potential V_{alt} (b). The Fourier coefficients, indexed by n , are partitioned into coupled modes with wavenumber $k = [(n + 1)/2]$, $0 \leq n < 128$ (in cycles/domain-length), and several ranges of uncoupled modes. Error bars for the first range of uncoupled modes are at 2σ , where σ was computed as the standard error of the mean based on a further partitioning into odd and even n . Uncoupled modes correlate significantly only with a nonlinear potential that supports oscillons.

	a) correlations with		b) correlations with	
	$V = \phi^2/2 - \phi^4/4 + \phi^6/6$		$V_{\text{alt}} = \phi^2/2 + \phi^4/4 + \phi^6/6$	
	ϕ	$\partial\phi/\partial t$	ϕ	$\partial\phi/\partial t$
coupled modes: $0 \leq n < 128$	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
uncoupled modes: $128 \leq n < 256$	0.31 ± 0.04	0.18 ± 0.18	-0.06 ± 0.04	0.17 ± 0.18
uncoupled modes: $256 \leq n < 384$	0.08	0.00	0.06	-0.14
uncoupled modes: $384 \leq n < 512$	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.00
all uncoupled modes: $128 \leq n < 16258$	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.01

FIG. 1: Streamfunction ψ (in units of $1.48 \times 10^9 m^2 s^{-1}$, averaged over layers $i = 1, 2$) describing the flow at initial (a,b) and final (c,d) times, in a parallel channel model with coupling of medium scale modes for which $|k_x| > k_{x0} = 3$ or $|k_y| > k_{y0} = 2$, and $|k| \leq 15$, for the indicated numbers n of time steps in a numerical integration. Parameters are as in [6]. Synchronization occurs by the last time shown (c,d), despite differing initial conditions. The “blocking patterns” in the boxed areas coincide [9].

FIG. 2: Energy density $\rho = (1/2)e^{-Ht}(\phi_x)^2 + (1/2)e^{Ht}(\phi_t)^2 + e^{Ht}V(\phi)$ vs. position x for a numerical simulation of (3), suggesting localized oscillons (a), and a simulation of the same equation, but with a different potential $V(\phi) = (1/2)\phi^2 + (1/4)\phi^4 + (1/6)\phi^6$, for which oscillons do not occur, shown for comparison (b).

FIG. 3: a) The local energy density ρ vs. x for two simulations of the oscillon system (3), coupled according to (5) and (6), with coupling coefficient $c_k = 2$ for $k \leq 64$ and $c_k = 0$ otherwise, at final time. (ρ for the second system (dashed line) is also shown reflected across the x -axis for ease in comparison.) The coincidence of oscillon positions is apparent.; b) Local energy density ρ vs. x at final time for two simulations of the oscillon system, plotted as in a), but with common initialization of all modes with $k < 0.8 \times 2^{14}$, and no subsequent coupling between the two systems. Oscillon positions appear uncorrelated.

FIG. 4: a) The local energy density ρ vs. x for two simulations of the oscillon system (3), coupled according to (5) and (6), with coupling coefficient $c_k = 2$ for $k \leq 32$ and $c_k = 0$ otherwise, at final time, displayed as in Fig. 3. The initial noise level was severely attenuated as compared to the thermal initialization used in the simulation in Fig. 3: the amplitude of the n^{th} Fourier component at initial time was multiplied by $(1/n)^{0.35}$. b) Local energy density ρ vs. x at final time for one of the two simulations shown in panel a), with the part of ρ corresponding to $k \leq 32$ shown reflected in the negative- y portion of the panel.






FIG. 1:



a)



b)

FIG. 2:




FIG. 3:




FIG. 4: