

Wandering chimeras in adaptive network of pulse-coupled oscillators

Dmitry Kasatkin, Vladimir Klinshov and Vladimir Nekorkin
*Institute of Applied Physics of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
 46 Ul'yanov Street, 603950, Nizhny Novgorod, Russia*

In a network of pulse oscillators with adaptive coupling, we discover a novel dynamical regime which we call a “wandering chimera”. Similarly as in conventional chimera states, the network splits into two domains, the coherent and the incoherent ones. The drastic difference is that the composition of the domains is volatile, i.e. the oscillators demonstrate spontaneous switching between the domains. We explore the basic features of the wandering chimeras, such as the mean and the variance of the core size, and the oscillators lifetime within the core. We also study the scaling behavior of the system and show that the observed regime is not a finite size effect but clearly seen even in large networks.

Networks of interacting nodes are omnipresent in nature and technology [1]. In recent decades, a specific type of collective behavior called “chimera states” is intensively explored in networks of coupled oscillators. Chimera states manifest themselves as spontaneous symmetry breaking in systems of identical and symmetrically coupled oscillators which split into phase-coherent and incoherent parts. First observed by Kuramoto and Battogtokh [2] and later named “chimeras” by Abrams and Strogatz [3], this type of partial synchronization later attracted much attention of specialists in dynamical networks. Chimera states were discovered and studied for networks of various configurations, and experimental observations were provided as well (see the reviews [4, 5] and references therein).

The analytical study of the chimera states was carried out in the continuum limit, see for example [6–8]. However, for the finite network size the rigorous analysis remain elusive, and the results rely on the intensive numerical studies. It has been shown that finite-size effects have a pronounced influence on the chimera states. In particular, the life-time of chimeras quickly decreases as the number of oscillators in the network becomes smaller [9]. Another characteristic feature is the Brownian-like motion of the chimera position, i.e. location of the coherent domain in the network [10]. The associated diffusion coefficient quickly decreases as the network size grows which allows to associate the motion to finite-size effects.

In the present Letter, we demonstrate a new type of chimera-like behavior which we call a “wandering chimera”. Similarly with conventional chimeras, in this state the network splits into the coherent and the incoherent domains. However, the drastic difference is the volatile composition of the domains. As the time passes, each oscillator demonstrates spontaneous transitions between the domains, so that none of them remains in the same domain forever. From the collective dynamics viewpoint, the synchronized core “wanders” across the network. Importantly, the core “wandering” is not just a finite size effect observed for small number of interacting units, but rather a key characteristic of the network dynamics observed even for large networks.

Our model is a network of phase oscillators with pulse




Figure 1. The dynamics of the two arbitrary chosen oscillators of network (1-2). (a) The phase lag between the oscillators. (b) The transient synchrony degree. The network size $N = 200$, the parameters $\varepsilon = 0.01$, $\alpha = 1.4$ and $\beta = 4.94$.

coupling, whereas the coupling weights are not constant but rather evolve according to a certain plasticity rule. The major motivation to our study comes from populations of neurons where the interaction between the cells is mediated by pulses. In neural networks, the strength of the synapses may change with time due to various plasticity mechanisms. Recent studies have demonstrated the importance of the timing of individual spikes in synaptic plasticity [11–13]. In order to account for such spike-timing-dependent plasticity (STDP) in our model the dynamics of the coupling weights is phase-dependent. Our network of N identical oscillators is given by the system

$$\frac{d\varphi_j}{dt} = \omega + \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \kappa_{jk} \Gamma(\varphi_j) \sum_{t_k} \delta(t - t_k), \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{d\kappa_{jk}}{dt} = \varepsilon \left(-\kappa_{jk} + \Pi(\varphi_j) \sum_{t_k} \delta(t - t_k) \right). \quad (2)$$

Here, φ_j is the j -th oscillator’s phase, κ_{jk} is the strength of the connection from k -th to j -th oscillator [14], $\Gamma(\varphi)$ is the phase response curve, ε is a (small) parameter controlling the adaptation rate, while function $\Pi(\varphi)$ defines the plasticity rule. In the absence of




Figure 2. The network states at subsequent time moments. (a) The transient synchrony degree (upper panel) and the phase distributions (bottom panel) of the oscillators for $t = t_0 = 500000$ after the indexes renumbering (see the explanations in the main text). In the upper panel, red (blue) corresponds to strong (weak) synchrony degree. (b) Coupling matrix κ_{jk} at the same moment $t = t_0$, see the legend below the image. (c) Same as in (a) for $t = t_1 = 650000$. (d) Same as in (a) for $t = t_2 = 850000$. The network size $N = 200$, the parameters same as in Fig. 1.

coupling, each oscillator has the same native frequency $\omega = 1$, and its phase grows uniformly. When the phase reaches unity, it resets to zero, and the oscillator emits a pulse. The coupling between the oscillators is described by the double sum in (1). The first sum runs over all the peer oscillators k which project on the given oscillator j , while the second sum runs over all the moments t_k when the k -th oscillator produces pulses. Each pulse is instantly received by the j -th oscillator and causes the latter's momentary phase shift $\Delta\varphi_j = \kappa_{jk}\Gamma(\varphi_j)$. We consider the phase response curve of the second type $\Gamma(\varphi) = -\sin(\varphi + \alpha)$, where α is the coupling phase lag.

In the absence of pulses, the coupling coefficients κ_{jk} relax to zero with the rate defined by ε . Each pulse

produced by oscillator k leads to momentary change of its connections to all other oscillators. The plasticity rule is given by the function $\Pi(\varphi) = \sin(\varphi + \beta)$, where β allows to control various modalities. For example, $\beta = \pi$ gives rise to an STDP-like plasticity rule, while $\beta = 3\pi/2$ qualitatively represents the Hebbian learning rule [15, 16].

For the rest of the paper, we use the parameter values $\varepsilon = 0.01$, $\alpha = 1.4$ and $\beta = 4.94$ by default. We observed the dynamics of the network starting from randomly distributed phases φ_j and coupling coefficients κ_{jk} . Our attention was drawn by a novel peculiar regime which to the best of our knowledge has not been reported before. We first noticed this regime when observed the temporal dynamics of phase lags between different oscillators. For certain parameters, these lags demonstrated intermittent behavior: the two oscillators alternated between the periods of phase locking and incoherence. Interestingly enough, the same type of behavior was observed for any arbitrarily chosen pair of oscillators, as illustrated in Fig. 1a.

In order to gain sight of a broader picture on the whole network scale we calculated the transient synchrony degree between the oscillators defined as follows:

$$R_{jk}(t) = \frac{1}{\Delta} \left| \int_t^{t+\Delta} e^{i[\varphi_j(t) - \varphi_k(t)]} dt \right|.$$

Here, t is the current time, and Δ is a (large) time window during which the synchrony is estimated. In Fig. 1b we show the evolution of the transient synchrony degree between the two oscillators whose dynamics is depicted in Fig. 1a. It is close to one in the episodes when the phases of the two oscillators are locked, and smaller than one when they drift apart. Here and further we use the time interval $\Delta = 3000$, but the results do not significantly change for other values of Δ in a wide range.

We analyzed the synchrony degree of all the oscillator pairs across the network depending on time. The results are presented in Fig. 2a,c,d along with the snapshots of the oscillator phases. The major finding is that after the transient the oscillators split into two groups. The first group demonstrates strong synchronization within the group which is manifested by synchrony degree close to one. The oscillators of the second group are incoherent to those from the first group and also to each other. In order to demonstrate this splitting we renumbered the oscillators according to their synchrony degree at the particular time moment $t = t_0 = 500000$ after a long transient. Then, the coherent domain consists of the oscillators with indexes from 1 to M , and the incoherent one of the oscillators with indexes from $M + 1$ to N , where $M = 157$ is the size of the coherent domain at t_0 . The state of the network with renumbered indexes is illustrated in Fig. 2a. One sees that the coherent group consists of two anti-phase clusters, while the incoherent group has a broad distribution of phases.

The described distribution of phases is supported by the sufficient structure of the coupling matrix depicted




Figure 3. The evolution of the coherent and the incoherent domains of the wandering chimera. Red (blue) corresponds to the coherent (incoherent) domain. The network size $N = 200$, the parameters same as in Fig. 1.

in Fig. 2b. The oscillators within each synchronous cluster has strong positive connections, while the two clusters are strongly negatively connected to each other. These strong and structured connections are the reason for the synchrony within the coherent domain. At the same time, the connections within the incoherent domain and between the domains do not show any structure, they may be either negative or positive as well as strong or weak. This diversity defines the lack of synchrony within the incoherent domain. Note that the structure of the coupling matrix is not prescribed but rather emerged from the random initial conditions due to the network adaptivity.

The splitting of the oscillators into the two domains, the coherent and the incoherent ones, strongly resembles a chimera state. However, there is a drastic difference between the classic chimeras and the regime that we observe. In order to trace it we fix the oscillator indexes and observe the long-term evolution of the network. Then we notice that the composition of the coherent and the incoherent domains is volatile, meaning that each particular oscillator may spontaneously switch from one domain to another. In order to demonstrate this volatility we illustrate the network states in subsequent moments of time. In Fig. 2c, the coherent and the incoherent domains are still present at $t = t_1 = 650000$, but the oscillators which constitute them are not longer ordered but rather mixed across the network. This mixing goes even further in Fig. 2d for $t = t_2 = 850000$.

To better picture the process of mixing of the coherent and the incoherent domains we illustrate their temporal dynamics in Fig. 3. Here, at each time moment we calculate the transient synchrony degrees and determine the attribute u_j of each oscillator according to their values. The oscillator is attributed belonging to the coherent domain ($u_j = 1$) if it is strongly synchronized with some others, and to the incoherent one ($u_j = 0$) if it has no synchrony with any others. Then we plot the attribute of the oscillators u_j versus time, red (blue) corresponding to the coherent (incoherent) domains with $u_j = 1$ ($u_j = 0$). We start with the oscillators renumbered as described earlier, so that the domains are ordered. One sees that as the time passes the oscillators sporadically switch their domains. From the network viewpoint, this corresponds




Figure 4. (a) Dynamics of the chimera core size versus time for $N = 200$. (b) Distribution of the core size along the time for $N = 200$. Black solid line corresponds to the binomial distribution. (c) The mean and the variance of the core size versus the network size. The parameters same as in Fig. 1.

to the volatility of the domains composition. The coherent domain, which is also called the chimera’s “core”, does not stay in the same position but rather moves spontaneously, or “wanders” across the network. This feature led us to adopt the name “wandering chimera” to the observed regime.

Further we investigate basic features of the wandering chimeras and demonstrate that it is not only a finite-size effect, but a keynote feature of the network dynamics which preserves even for large number of nodes. First, we notice that not only the composition, but also the size of the wandering chimera’s core M changes with time. The dynamics of the core size is illustrated in Fig. 4a, it demonstrate quite pronounced fluctuations around the mean. These fluctuations are due to the fact that the switching of one oscillator does not necessarily imply its immediate swapping with another one. Moreover, the transitions of the oscillators between the domains are positively correlated meaning that they tend to switch their domain in groups. In order to prove this we plot the distribution of the chimera core size M observed in a long time interval in Fig. 4b. If the oscillators switches are statistically independent, the distribution of the core size must be binomial with $M \sim B(N, p)$, where p is the fraction of the oscillators belonging to the core. However, the obtained distribution is poorly approximated by the binomial since it is much wider and has much heavier tails suggesting concurrent transitions of large groups of oscillators.

In order to study the scaling of the wandering chimeras we plot the mean and the variance of the core size M versus the network size N in Fig. 4c. The mean core size $\langle M \rangle$ grows linearly with the network size suggesting the constant ratio between the coherent and the incoherent domains. The fraction of the oscillators in the core may be estimated as $p = \langle M \rangle / N \approx 0.72$. The variance $\sigma_M =$




Figure 5. (a) Autocorrelation function of the chimera core versus time for $N = 200$. The horizontal dashed line corresponds to $A = p^2$ (see the main text for the explanation). (b) Distribution of the nodes lifetimes in the core for $N = 200$. (c) The mean lifetime versus the network size. The parameters same as in Fig. 1.

$\sqrt{\langle M^2 \rangle - \langle M \rangle^2}$ grows sub-linearly, however, it is much larger than predicted by the binomial distribution. The wide distribution of the core size corroborates that the core wandering manifests itself on the macroscopic level, not only as a finite-size effect.

The previous findings suggest that the transitions of the oscillators between the domains can barely be approximated as independent. However, each oscillator changes its domain in a quasi-random manner which results in the wandering of the chimera's core across the network. In order to estimate the wandering rate we calculated the autocorrelation function of the core composition defined as

$$A(\tau) = \frac{1}{\langle M \rangle} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \sum_{j=1}^N u_j(t) u_j(t + \tau) dt.$$

Here, the sum under the integral is nothing else but the number of the oscillators shared by the core at time moments t and $t + \tau$, and $A(\tau)$ is the mean fraction of the oscillators which stay in the core (or return back to it) in time τ . The autocorrelation function $A(\tau)$ is plotted in Fig. 5a. It equals one at $\tau = 0$ and falls at $\tau \sim 50000$ reaching an almost constant value close to p^2 which corresponds to the fraction of units shared between two randomly selected sets of size $\langle M \rangle$. This means that the network memory about the core composition fades completely in $\tau = 50000$, and the core dissolves across the network in this time.

Another way to estimate the rate of the core wandering is to compute the lifetimes of the oscillators in the core. The distribution of the oscillators lifetimes is shown in Fig. 5b, it is a broad uni-modal distribution with the

average of about 50000 which roughly corresponds to the result from Fig. 5a. The scaling behavior of the mean lifetime is illustrated in Fig. 5c. Although the lifetime grows with the network size, this growth is relatively slow and tends to saturate, in sharp contrast with the lifetime of classic chimeras which was shown to increase exponentially [9]. Thus, the finite speed wandering preserves even for large networks.

To conclude, we have studied a new type of chimera-like behavior observed in networks of oscillators with adaptive coupling. Similarly with classical chimeras, the oscillators split into two domains, the coherent and the incoherent ones. However, the drastic distinction is that the composition of the coherent and incoherent domains changes with time. The oscillators spontaneously switch their domain which results in wandering of the chimera's core across the network. This wandering process is characterized by fading memory, meaning that the network forgets the composition of the core in a finite time. The lifetime of the core is independent of the network size suggesting that wandering is not a finite size effect but rather an intrinsic feature of the network collective dynamics.

The motion of the chimera's core was reported in a number of previous works. In [10] it was shown that Brownian-like motion is intrinsic for chimeras as a consequence of finite network size. For large networks the effective diffusion coefficient quickly drops. In [17] the so-called resurgence of chimera states was reported which manifests itself as spontaneous emergence of chimeras at random positions where they exist for some time and later disappear. Transient chimeras in modular networks were observed in [18] where the synchrony in different modules was rising and falling in irregular manner. In [19] heteroclinic switching between chimeras was demonstrated which is equivalent to the periodical traveling of the chimera across the network. Another typical type of chimera motion is a constant-speed drift which may be induced by such factors as sign-alternating coupling function [20], coupling asymmetry [21], nonlinear coupling [22, 23] or coupling delay [24]. This drift may be used in control schemes for stabilization of the chimera's position [25–27]. The drastic difference of our model is that the core motion is quasi-random from one hand, but from the other hand it does not vanish as the network size grows. Therefore we consider wandering chimeras reported herein as a novel dynamical regime observed for the first time.

Our system may also demonstrate other collective behaviors depending on the parameters α and β . In particular, we observed conventional chimera states and the emergence of multilayered structures similar to those described earlier for continuous coupling [28]. However, we believe that the pulse nature of coupling together with its adaptivity was crucial for the emergence of wandering chimeras. Provided that the major motivation for the model comes from neuroscience, it would be intriguing to search for similar dynamical regimes in more biologically

plausible setups and explore their possible role in neural computations.

The authors are grateful to Dr. Anna Zakharova and Dr. Christian Bick for many helpful discussions. The

work was supported by the Russian Science Foundation (Project No. 16-42-01043 for the Institute of Applied Physics).

-
- [1] S. Boccaletti, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Chavez and D.U. Hwang, *Phys. Rep.* **424**, 175 (2006).
- [2] Y. Kuramoto and D. Battogtokh, *Nonlinear Phenom. Complex Syst.* **5**, 380 (2002).
- [3] D.M. Abrams and S.H. Strogatz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 174102 (2004).
- [4] M.J. Panaggio and D.M. Abrams. *Nonlinearity* **28**, R67 (2015).
- [5] O.E. Omelchenko, *Nonlinearity* **31**, R121 (2018).
- [6] D.M. Abrams, R. Mirollo, S.H. Strogatz and D.A. Wiley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 084103 (2008).
- [7] M. Wolfrum, O.E. Omelchenko, S. Yanchuk and Y. Maistrenko, *Chaos* **21**, 013112 (2011).
- [8] O.E. Omelchenko, *Nonlinearity* **26**, 2469 (2013).
- [9] M. Wolfrum and O.E. Omelchenko, *Phys. Rev. E* **84**, 015201 (2011).
- [10] O.E. Omelchenko, M. Wolfrum and Y.L. Maistrenko, *Phys. Rev. E* **81**, 065201 (2010).
- [11] W. Gerstner, R. Kempter, J.L. van Hemmen and H. Wagner, *Nature* **383**, 76 (1996).
- [12] A. Morrison, M. Diesmann and W. Gerstner, *Biol. Cybern.* **98**, 459 (2008).
- [13] M. Gilson, A.n. Burkitt AN, J.L. van Hemmen, *Front Comput Neurosci* **4**, 23 (2010).
- [14] Note that the matrix κ_{jk} encodes both the weights and topology of the connections: even if we start from all-to-all coupling, in principle some connections may weaken with time and extinct due to the plasticity.
- [15] T. Aoki and T. Aoyagi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 034101 (2009).
- [16] T. Aoki and T. Aoyagi, *Phys. Rev. E* **84**, 066109 (2011).
- [17] D.P. Rosin, D. Rontani, N. Haynes, E. Schöll and D.J. Gauthier, *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 030902(R) (2014).
- [18] M. Shanahan, *Chaos*, **20**, 013108 (2010).
- [19] C. Bick, *Phys. Rev. E* **97**, 050201(R) (2018).
- [20] J. Xie, E. Knobloch and H.-C. Kao, *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 022919 (2014).
- [21] C. Bick, V. Dzubak, V. Maistrenko, Yu.L. Maistrenko, E.A. Martens and M. Timme M (private communication)
- [22] B.K. Bera, D. Ghosh, and T. Banerjee, *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 012215 (2016).
- [23] A. Mishra, S. Saha, D. Ghosh, G.V. Osipov and S.K. Dana, *S. K. Opera Med. Physiol.* **3**, 14 (2017).
- [24] J. Sawicki, I. Omelchenko, A. Zakharova, and E. Schöll, *Euro. Phys. J. Special Topics* **226**, 1883 (2017).
- [25] C. Bick and E.A. Martens. *New J. Phys.* **17**, 033030 (2015).
- [26] I. Omelchenko, O.E. Omel'chenko, A. Zakharova, M. Wolfrum, and E. Schöll, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 114101 (2016).
- [27] I. Omelchenko, O.E. Omel'chenko, A. Zakharova, and E. Schöll, *Phys. Rev. E* **97**, 012216 (2018).
- [28] D.V. Kasatkin, S. Yanchuk, E. Schöll and V.I. Nekorkin, *Phys. Rev. E* **96** 062211 (2017).