

# On a finite-size neuronal population equation

Eva Löcherbach\*      Valentin Schmutz†      Tilo Schwalger‡

## Abstract

Population equations for infinitely large networks of spiking neurons have a long tradition in theoretical neuroscience. In this work, we analyze a recent generalization of these equations to populations of finite size, which takes the form of a nonlinear stochastic integral equation. We prove that, in the case of leaky integrate-and-fire (LIF) neurons with escape noise and granting a simplification, the equation is well-posed and stable in the sense of Brémaud-Massoulié.

The proof combines methods from Markov processes and nonlinear Hawkes processes.

*Keywords* : Stability, finite-size fluctuations, nonlinear Hawkes processes, piecewise-deterministic Markov processes, Meyn-Tweedie theory, spiking neuron.

*Mathematical Subject Classification* : 60G55 (primary) 60H20, 60K35, 92B20 (secondary)

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Neuronal population equations . . . . .	2
1.2	The finite-size integral equation . . . . .	4
1.2.1	Relationship with nonlinear Hawkes processes . . . . .	5
1.2.2	A heuristic interpretation of the correction term . . . . .	5
1.3	The finite-size population equation in the case of LIF neurons with escape noise . . .	7
1.4	Assumptions and main result . . . . .	7
1.5	Plan of the paper . . . . .	8
<b>2</b>	<b>Well-posedness</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Stability</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1	Coupling . . . . .	10
3.2	Existence of the stationary process . . . . .	13
<b>4</b>	<b>Link to the original finite-size population equation</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Multi-population model</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Appendix</b>	<b>20</b>

---

\*Statistique, Analyse et Modélisation Multidisciplinaire, Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, 75013 Paris, France

†Brain Mind Institute, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

‡Institut für Mathematik, Technische Universität Berlin, 10623 Berlin, Germany

# 1 Introduction

The dynamics of large population of neurons can be summarized by population equations (see [17, Part. III] for an overview). Some of these population equations have been shown to be the exact mean-field limits of large networks of spiking neurons [10, 13, 5]. Examples of such population equations are the time-elapsd neuron network model [22] and the voltage-structured model of [10, 13]. Both examples can be seen as special cases of the integral equation [15, 16, 25] which offers a general formalism for population equations with neuronal refractoriness [25].

One of the limitations of the aforementioned models is that they represent populations of infinite size and therefore neglect finite-size fluctuations. The extension of these models to account for finite-size fluctuations has important practical implication for the coarse-graining of biologically realistic networks but rigorous extensions are subject to an accuracy/usability trade-off. If neuronal refractoriness is neglected, the population equation reduces to that of [11, 12] and finite-size noise can be added, by the linear-noise approximation [18], or granting some Markov embedding, by the diffusion approximation [12], whose numerical implementation is relatively simple [6]. On the other hand, if one does not neglect refractoriness, central limit theorem-based arguments lead to formal SPDEs [7], which are computationally expensive to simulate.

In [26], a heuristic extension of the integral equation with finite-size fluctuations is derived. It can be easily simulated and takes into account the effects of neuronal refractoriness. While this extension is not exact, its numerical implementation gives a good approximation to the dynamics of finite-size networks of spiking neurons. The aim of this work is to give a rigorous foundation to the model of [26] and prove its stability.

Below, we briefly give a review of some standard population equations. We then present the finite-size model of [26] with a simplification. Finally, we show that the simplified model, in the case of leaky integrate-and-fire (LIF) neurons with escape noise [16, 14], can be written as a SPDE driven by Poisson noise, which will be the main object of study in this work.

## 1.1 Neuronal population equations

To give a mathematical introduction to the integral equation formalism, it is useful to consider the special case of LIF neurons with escape noise [16, 14], which is also the main case we will treat in this work. Let us consider a network of  $N$  identical neurons that are all-to-all connected with uniform connection strength  $J/N$  for  $J \in \mathbb{R}$ . Each neuron  $i$  has a voltage variable  $U^{i,N}$  which evolves according to the system of SDEs: For all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ,

$$dU_t^{i,N} = \frac{\mu_t - U_t^{i,N}}{\tau_m} dt - U_t^{i,N} dZ_t^{i,N} + \frac{J}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N dZ_t^{j,N}, \quad (1a)$$

$$Z_t^{i,N} = \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{1}_{z \leq f(U_{s^-}^{i,N})} \pi^i(ds, dz). \quad (1b)$$

Here,  $Z_t^{i,N}$  is the spike counting process of the neuron  $i$  and has intensity  $f(U_{t^-}^{i,N})$ ,  $t^-$  denoting the left limit. Furthermore,  $\mu_t$  comprises the resting potential and the (possibly time-dependent) external drive,  $\tau_m$  is the membrane time constant,  $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is the intensity function and  $\{\pi^i\}_{i=1, \dots, N}$  is a collection of independent Poisson random measures on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$  with Lebesgue intensity measure.

Equation (1) is called a *microscopic model* because the neuronal dynamics is modelled with single-cell resolution (Fig. 1a, top). A drastic reduction of the complexity of the model can be

achieved by coarse-graining over the population of neurons. To this end, we consider the *empirical population activity*

$$A_{t,\mathfrak{h}}^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{Z_{t+\mathfrak{h}}^{i,N} - Z_t^{i,N}}{\mathfrak{h}}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathfrak{h} > 0$  is a small time interval determining the temporal resolution (Fig. 1a, bottom). Neuronal population equations are models of such coarse-grained quantities that describe the neuronal dynamics at the scale of whole populations. If the population is of finite size ( $N < \infty$ ), the dynamics is called a *mesoscopic model*, while the dynamics for an infinitely large population ( $N \rightarrow \infty$ ) is referred to as a *macroscopic model*. In [10, 13], the authors proved that in the macroscopic limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , if the initial conditions  $\{U_0^i\}_{i=1,\dots,N}$  are *i.i.d.* with law  $\nu_0$ , the empirical measure of the system (1) is characterized by the voltage-structured PDE:

For all  $u \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $t > 0$ ,

$$\partial_t \rho(u, t) + \partial_u \left( \left( \frac{\mu_t - u}{\tau_m} + J \rho_t[f] \right) \rho(u, t) \right) = -f(u) \rho(u, t), \quad (3a)$$

$$\rho(0^+, t) - \rho(0^-, t) = \frac{\rho_t[f]}{\mu_t/\tau_m + J \rho_t[f]}, \quad (3b)$$

$$\rho_0 = \nu_0, \quad (3c)$$

where  $\rho_t := \rho(\cdot, t)$  and  $\rho_t[f] := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(u) \rho(du, t)$ . The latter can be interpreted as the population activity

$$\lim_{\mathfrak{h} \downarrow 0} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} A_{t,\mathfrak{h}}^N = A(t) := \rho_t[f]. \quad (4)$$

We now transform Eq. (3) into an integral equation. For all continuous functions  $a : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define the time-dependent vector field  $b^a(t, u) := (\mu_t - u)/\tau_m + Ja(t)$  and write, for all  $0 \leq s \leq t$ ,  $\Phi_{s,t}^a(u)$  the associated flow.

We can now define, for all  $0 \leq s \leq t$ ,

$$\lambda^a(t|s) := f(\Phi_{s,t}^a(0)) \quad \text{and} \quad S^a(t|s) := \exp \left( - \int_s^t \lambda^a(r|s) dr \right). \quad (5)$$

The function  $\lambda^a(t|s)$ , called hazard rate, gives the intensity at time  $t$  (i.e. the instantaneous probability of emitting a spike) as a function of the time of the last spike  $s$  and the past population activity  $(a(r))_{s \leq r \leq t}$ . Similarly, the function  $S^a(t|s)$ , called the survival, gives the probability of not emitting a spike in the time interval  $[s, t]$ , given that the last spike was emitted at time  $s$ . By the method of characteristics, we get that the population activity  $A(t)$  solves the integral equation

$$A(t) = H^A(t) + \int_0^t \lambda^A(t|s) S^A(t|s) A(s) ds, \quad (6)$$

where

$$H^A(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(\Phi_{0,t}^A(u)) \exp \left( - \int_0^t f(\Phi_{0,r}^A(u)) dr \right) \nu_0(du), \quad (7)$$

has to be seen as the initial condition. Eq. (6) is the integral equation of [27, 15, 16], see also [8]. Note that traditionally, the integral equation has no explicit initial condition and therefore requires a normalizing condition [17, Sec. 14.1].

In the case of LIF neurons with escape noise, the voltage-structured equation (3) is equivalent to the integral equation (6) if  $\lambda^A(t|s)$  is defined by Eq. (5). However, we could have chosen a different definition for the hazard rate  $\lambda^A(t|s)$ ; the integral equation is therefore more general than Eq. (3). In fact, Eq. (6) can be seen as a renewal equation that holds for any population of neurons modeled as time-inhomogeneous renewal processes [23]. For example, the Fokker-Planck equation for neural networks with diffusive noise (see [17, Ch. 13]) or the time-elapsd neuron network model [22] can also be written as an integral equation with a suitable choice of the hazard rate.

## 1.2 The finite-size integral equation

In [26], the authors derive a generalization of the integral equation (6) which takes into account finite-size noise. For clarity, we will present the equation of [26] in the case of LIF neurons with escape noise. Before presenting the model, we need to extend the definitions Eq. (5). For all non-decreasing functions  $z : \mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto z_t$  with bounded variation on finite time intervals, we write, for all  $0 \leq s \leq t$ ,

$$\Phi_{s,t}^z(u) := ue^{-\frac{t-s}{\tau_m}} + \int_s^t e^{-\frac{t-\tau}{\tau_m}} \frac{\mu_\tau}{\tau_m} d\tau + J \int_s^t e^{-\frac{t-\tau}{\tau_m}} dz_\tau, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (8)$$

We can now extend the definitions Eqs. (5) and (7), replacing  $\Phi^A$  by Eq. (8). Furthermore, we define

$$\tilde{H}^z(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(-\int_0^t f(\Phi_{0,r}^z(u)) dr\right) \nu_0(du). \quad (9)$$

For a finite number of neurons  $N$ , the finite-size integral equation of [26] can be written:

For all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$Z_t = \frac{1}{N} \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{1}_{z \leq N\bar{A}_{s-}} \pi(ds, dz), \quad (10a)$$

$$\bar{A}_t = \left[ H^Z(t) + \int_0^t \lambda^Z(t|s) S^Z(t|s) dZ_s + \Lambda_t^Z \left( 1 - \tilde{H}^Z(t) - \int_0^t S^Z(t|s) dZ_s \right) \right]_+, \quad (10b)$$

where  $\pi$  is a Poisson random measure on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$  with Lebesgue intensity measure and  $[\cdot]_+ = \max(0, \cdot)$ . Equation (10) defines a jump process  $Z_t$  where jumps of size  $1/N$  occur with intensity  $N\bar{A}_{t-}$ . The finite-size analog of the population activity  $A(t)$  for infinitely large populations (Eq. (6)) is the distributional derivative of  $Z_t$ ,

$$\dot{Z}_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \delta(t - t_k),$$

where  $t_k$  are the jump times of  $Z_t$  and  $\delta(\cdot)$  denotes the Dirac delta distribution<sup>†</sup>. We call  $\dot{Z}_t$  the population spike train (sum of  $\delta$ -pulses at spike times  $t_k$ ) associated with the point process induced by the stochastic intensity  $N\bar{A}_{t-}$ . Note that the biologically relevant quantity is the empirical population activity at a finite time resolution,  $\hat{A}_{t,\mathfrak{h}}^N := \mathfrak{h}^{-1} \int_t^{t+\mathfrak{h}^+} \dot{Z}_s ds = [Z(t+\mathfrak{h}) - Z(t)]/\mathfrak{h}$ , for some small time interval  $\mathfrak{h} > 0$ . Furthermore, we will often call the finite-size population model, Eq. (10), *mesoscopic model* because the variables  $\bar{A}_t$  and  $Z_t$  describe the neuronal activity of the population as a whole driven by the single Poisson noise  $\pi(dt, [0, N\bar{A}_{t-}])$ . A time discretization of

<sup>†</sup>Formally,  $\dot{Z}_t dt := dZ_t$ , where  $dZ$  is the Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure associated with the counting measure  $Z$ .

the mesoscopic model permits a highly efficient simulation of the neuronal dynamics directly on the population level, without the need to simulate individual neurons. Importantly, even though the mesoscopic model is an approximation, it accurately captures the statistics of the population activity  $A_{t,h}^N$  of the original microscopic model. In particular, the fluctuation statistics of the population activities  $A_{t,h}^N$  and  $\hat{A}_{t,h}^N$ , as expressed by their power spectral density, are well matched (Fig. 1b, also see [26] for further examples). In this work, we focus our mathematical analysis on the case where the modulating factor  $\Lambda_t^Z$  is fixed ( $\Lambda_t^Z \equiv \Lambda > 0$ ). This is a simplified version of the original model of [26] where  $\Lambda_t^Z$  has an explicit expression in terms of the past  $Z$ , which we present in Sec. 4.

One important question which was left open in [26] was why is the ‘correction term’  $\Lambda_t^Z(1 - \dots)$  in Eq. (10b) sufficient to make Eq. (10) ‘stable’? Numerical simulations show that the naive finite-size model obtained by putting  $\Lambda = 0$  not only diverges from the original microscopic model but  $\bar{A}_t$  typically takes non-physiological values before converging to 0 (Fig. 1c–f). The goal of this work is to understand why the condition  $\Lambda_t^Z \equiv \Lambda > 0$  is sufficient to make Eq. (10) ‘stable’, in a sense defined below.

### 1.2.1 Relationship with nonlinear Hawkes processes

If  $J = 0$  (neurons do not interact),  $\mu_t \equiv \mu$  (the external drive is constant) and  $\Lambda_t^Z \equiv \Lambda$ , Eq. (10) reduces to a nonlinear Hawkes process:

For all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$Z_t = \frac{1}{N} \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{1}_{z \leq N \bar{A}_{s-}} \pi(ds, dz), \quad (11a)$$

$$\bar{A}_t = \left[ \Lambda + H^0(t) - \Lambda \tilde{H}^0(t) + \int_0^t \underbrace{(\lambda^0(t|s) - \Lambda) S^0(t|s)}_{=: h^\Lambda(t-s)} dZ_s \right]_+, \quad (11b)$$

where  $h^\Lambda : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the self-interaction kernel. It is easy to verify that  $\int_0^\infty h^\Lambda(t) dt = 1$  if  $\Lambda = 0$  and  $\int_0^\infty h^\Lambda(t) dt < 1$  if  $\Lambda > 0$ . If  $\Lambda = 0$ , Eq. (11) is a critical Hawkes process and has a nontrivial stationary solution only if  $h^0$  is heavy-tailed [4] (which is not the case for the neuron models considered here). On the other hand, if  $\Lambda > 0$ , Eq. (11) is a stable nonlinear Hawkes process with a unique stationary solution (Theorem 1 in [3] and see also [9]). Hence, in the time-homogeneous ( $\mu_t \equiv \mu$ ) and non-interacting case ( $J = 0$ ),  $\Lambda_t \equiv \Lambda > 0$  is a sufficient condition for the stability of Eq. (11), in the sense of [3].

In this work, we generalize this stability result to the interacting case ( $J \neq 0$ ). To this end, we use a Markov embedding of Eq. (10), which allows us to use Meyn-Tweedie theory [20] in addition to arguments inspired by the stability theory of nonlinear Hawkes processes [3].

### 1.2.2 A heuristic interpretation of the correction term

If we assume that the mesoscopic model, Eq. (10), is ‘stable’ and that we can formally take an initial condition at time  $-\infty$ , in analogy to the normalizing condition for the deterministic integral equation [17, Sec. 14.1], we would expect the neuronal ‘mass’

$$M_t := \int_{-\infty}^t S^Z(t|s) dZ_s \quad (12)$$

to stay close to 1. This feature is supported by simulations of the mesoscopic model showing that  $M_t$  fluctuates around unity (Fig. 1d,f). Indeed, the number of neurons in the system (1) being




Figure 1: Mesoscopic population dynamics. (a) Top: Spike-raster plot of a microscopic model of  $N = 200$  uncoupled LIF neurons with escape noise, Eq. (1) with  $J = 0$ . Neurons were initialized in a synchronized state, i.e. all neurons spiked at time  $t = 0$ . Bottom: Empirical population activity measured with temporal bin size  $\mathfrak{h} = 0.001$ s. (b) Comparison of the power spectral densities (defined as in [26]) of the empirical population activities  $A_{t,\mathfrak{h}}(t)$  of the microscopic model (black line, exact theory [17]) and  $\hat{A}_{t,\mathfrak{h}}(t)$  of the mesoscopic model (blue line, simulation). (c,d)  $\bar{A}_t$  (10b) and mass  $M_t$  (12) for simulations – approximating the microscopic model in (a) – of the mesoscopic model (blue line) and the ‘naive’ mesoscopic model with  $\Lambda_t \equiv 0$  (orange line). (e,f) Same as (c,d) but for a longer simulation time. Parameters:  $\tau_m = 0.02$  s,  $\mu = 20$  mV,  $f(u) = ce^{(u-\vartheta)/\Delta_u}$ ,  $c = 10$  Hz,  $\vartheta = 10$  mV,  $\Delta_u = 1$  mV.

obviously constant, the finite-size population model Eq. (10) should reflect this mass conservation principle.

If, in addition, we assume that  $\bar{A}_t$  is always strictly positive, i.e. Eq. (10b) can always be written

$$\bar{A}_t = \int_{-\infty}^t \lambda^Z(t|s) S^Z(t|s) dZ_s + \Lambda_t^Z (1 - M_t),$$

then, by formal differentiation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} dM_t &= dZ_t - \left( \int_{-\infty}^t \lambda^Z(t|s) S^Z(t|s) dZ_s \right) dt = \Lambda_t^Z (1 - M_t) dt + dZ_t - \bar{A}_t dt \\ &= \Lambda_t^Z (1 - M_t) dt + d\tilde{Z}_t, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $\tilde{Z}_t := Z_t - \bar{A}_t$  is the compensated jump process. Then, if the jumps of  $\tilde{Z}_t$  are small and frequent enough and if the increments of  $\tilde{Z}_t$  are ‘independent’ enough, by analogy with the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, the mass  $M_t$  should fluctuate around 1, if  $\Lambda_t^Z$  is always positive, consistent with simulations of the model (Fig. 1d,f). However, in a naive finite-size population model, corresponding to setting  $\Lambda_t = 0$ , the “restoring force” towards  $M_t = 1$  in Eq. (13) would be absent. In this case, we empirically observed that during a long simulation time (100 s) most stochastic realizations reached the “absorbing boundary” at  $M = 0$ , where it stayed (Fig. 1f). Note that  $M_t = 0$  is a solution to the mesoscopic dynamics with  $\Lambda_t \equiv 0$ .

### 1.3 The finite-size population equation in the case of LIF neurons with escape noise

As the voltage-structured equation (3) can be transformed into an integral equation, assuming  $\Lambda_t \equiv \Lambda$ , we can transform the stochastic integral equation (10) back into a voltage-structured SPDE. Denoting  $\mathcal{M}_+$  the space of nonnegative finite measures on  $\mathbb{R}$ , for all  $\mathcal{M}_+$ -valued random variables  $\hat{\nu}_0$ , the SPDE writes:

For all  $t > 0$  and  $u \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\partial_t \rho(u, t) - \partial_u \left( \left( \frac{u - \mu_t}{\tau_m} + J \dot{Z}_t \right) \rho(u, t) \right) = -f(u) \rho(u, t), \quad (14a)$$

$$\rho(0^+, t) - \rho(0^-, t) = \dot{Z}_t, \quad (14b)$$

$$Z_t = \frac{1}{N} \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{1}_{z \leq N \bar{A}_s} \pi(ds, dz) \quad \text{with } \bar{A}_t := [\rho_t[f] + \Lambda(1 - \|\rho_t\|)]_+, \quad (14c)$$

$$\rho_0 = \hat{\nu}_0, \quad (14d)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the total variation norm, that is, the total mass of the measure. Eq. (14) is the Markov embedding of the jump process Eq. (10) (with  $\Lambda_t^Z \equiv \Lambda$ ). We say that  $Z$  is the jump process associated with the solution  $\rho$ . In Sec. 2, we show that Eq. (14) is well-posed as a measure-valued piecewise deterministic Markov process.

### 1.4 Assumptions and main result

The main result of this work concerns the stability of Eq. (14). We use a notion of stability that is close to that of Brémaud and Massoulié [3] for nonlinear Hawkes processes.

We say that a process  $Z$  is *stationary* if, for all  $\tau > 0$ , the time-shifted process  $(Z_{t+\tau} - Z_\tau)_{t \geq 0}$  has the same law as  $(Z_t - Z_0)_{t \geq 0}$ . Then, we say that a solution  $\bar{\rho}$  to Eq. (14) with the  $\mathcal{M}_+$ -valued random initial condition  $\bar{\nu}_0$  is stationary if the associated jump process  $\bar{Z}$  is stationary.

**Definition** (Stability in variation). *The voltage-structured SPDE (14) is stable in variation if there exists a stationary process  $\{\bar{\rho}, \bar{\nu}_0\}$  solving Eq. (14) such that for all  $\mathcal{M}_+$ -valued random initial conditions  $\hat{\nu}_0$ , there exists a coupling of  $\bar{\rho}$  and  $\rho$  (the solution for initial condition  $\hat{\nu}_0$ ) such that the associated jump processes  $\bar{Z}$  and  $Z$  couple a.s., i.e.*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \{(\bar{Z}_s)_{s \geq t} \neq (Z_s)_{s \geq t}\} \right) = 0.$$

Here, by *coupling* of  $\bar{\rho}$  and  $\rho$ , we mean a joint construction of  $\bar{\rho}$  and  $\rho$ , the solution for initial condition  $\hat{\nu}_0$ , on the same probability space, using the same underlying Poisson random measure.

In modeling terms, the stability in variation implies that for any (random) initial condition  $\hat{\nu}_0$ , the population spike train  $\dot{Z}_t$  relaxes to a unique stationary process in finite time.

To prove that Eq. (14) is stable in variation, we need

**Assumption 1.**  $\mu_t \equiv \mu \in \mathbb{R}$ .

This just means that the external drive is time-homogeneous and it is a natural assumption to make if we want to show relaxation to a stationary process.

The other important assumption concerns the intensity function  $f$ :

**Assumption 2.**  $f$  is bounded, i.e.  $\|f\|_\infty < \infty$ , and  $\inf_{u \in \mathbb{R}} f(u) =: \min(f) > 0$ .

A simple example of function satisfying the assumption is the sigmoid. Note that these bounds do not allow taking exponential function  $f$  nor having an absolute refractory period (short interval of time following a spike during which an neuron cannot spike). Nevertheless, since  $\|f\|_\infty$  can be arbitrarily large and  $\min(f)$  can be arbitrarily small, these bounds do not affect biological realism.

Finally, to prove that the stationary process exists, we need:

**Assumption 3.**  $f$  is differentiable and  $f'$  is bounded. Furthermore, there exists a positive constant  $C$  such that  $|uf'(u)| \leq C$  for all  $u$ .

This is a purely technical assumption and is rather innocent since  $f$  is anyway bounded.

We can now state our main result:

**Theorem 1.** *Grant Assumptions 1–3. The voltage-structured SPDE (14) is stable in variation.*

The proof is divided into two parts. In the first part, using Meyn-Tweedie theory [20], we show that the solutions of Eq. (14) satisfy a certain recurrence property which then allows us to prove that the associated jump processes couple, using methods from [3] for nonlinear Hawkes processes. In the second part, we prove the existence of a non-trivial stationary process solving Eq. (14).

As mentioned previously, in the original population equation [26],  $\Lambda_t^Z$  has an explicit expression in terms of the past  $Z$  (see Sec. 4). Importantly, the simplified model with fixed  $\Lambda$  Eq. (14) has a qualitatively similar behavior (from the stability point of view) as the original model. The proof of Theorem 1 therefore provides some understanding of the role of the ‘correction term’  $\Lambda_t^Z(1 - \dots)$  in the original model (Fig. 1c–f).

## 1.5 Plan of the paper

First, in Section 2, we prove the well-posedness of the SPDE (14). The proof of Theorem 1 is then presented in Section 3.

In Section 4, we link the simplified model studied in this work with the original model of [26], written in a compact form. Finally, in Section 5, we recall how the finite-size population equation can be used to model multiple interacting populations.



## 2 Well-posedness

Although the SPDE (14) might look somewhat formal, it can be rigorously formulated in terms of a Piecewise Deterministic Markov Process (PDMP) taking values in the space  $\mathcal{M}_+$  of all positive measures on  $\mathbb{R}$ . We endow  $\mathcal{M}_+$  with the topology of weak convergence, which makes  $\mathcal{M}_+$  Polish.

Since Assumptions 1 and 2 are always imposed in the sequel, we will omit their mention.

For all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+$ , let us write  $(\mathcal{S}(t)\nu)_{t \geq 0} := (\varrho(\cdot, t))_{t \geq 0}$  the solution to the transport equation

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \varrho(u, t) - \partial_u \left( \left( \frac{u - \mu}{\tau_m} \right) \varrho(u, t) \right) &= -f(u) \varrho(u, t), \quad \forall (u, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \varrho_0 &= \nu. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

$(\mathcal{S}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  can be therefore seen as a sub-stochastic  $\mathcal{C}_0$ -semigroup of bounded linear operators on  $\mathcal{M}_+$ . Moreover, we introduce, for any  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and any  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+$ , the shifted measure

$$\Delta_a \nu : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \ni B \mapsto \nu((B - a)).$$

In the following, we assume that  $f$  is bounded (Assumption 2). Putting  $\rho_0 = \nu_0$ , we can construct a path-wise solution to Eq. (14) following the procedure:

1. We start from an initial value  $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{M}_+$  at time  $t = 0$ .
2. We consider the counting process

$$Z_t^* = \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{1}_{z \leq N[(\mathcal{S}(s)\rho_0)[f] + \Lambda(1 - \|\mathcal{S}(s)\rho_0\|)]} \pi(ds, dz),$$

together with its first jump time  $\tau^1 := \inf\{t \geq 0 : Z_t^* = 1\}$ .

3. We put  $\rho_t := \mathcal{S}(t)\rho_0$  for all  $t < \tau^1$ .
4. At time  $\tau^1$ , we update

$$\rho_{\tau^1} := \Delta_{\frac{J}{N}} \left( \mathcal{S}(\tau^1)\rho_0 \right) + \frac{1}{N} \delta_0 \quad (16)$$

and we return to step 1. replacing  $\rho_0$  by  $\rho_{\tau^1}$  and time 0 by  $\tau^1$ .

On a restricted set of test functions, we can explicitly write the generator  $\mathcal{L}$  of the PDMP described above: for all  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^1(\mathbb{R})$  (bounded and continuously differentiable functions), for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+$  and using the abuse of notation  $\varphi(\nu) := \nu[\varphi]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\varphi(\nu) &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{u - \mu}{\tau_m} \varphi'(u) \nu(du) - \nu[\varphi f] \\ &\quad + N[\nu[f] + \Lambda(1 - \|\nu\|)]_+ \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi \left( u + \frac{J}{N} \right) \nu(du) + \frac{1}{N} \varphi(0) - \nu[\varphi] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

For all  $K > 0$ , let us define the exit time

$$T^K := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|\rho_t\| > K\} \quad (18)$$

and the explosion time of the process  $\zeta := \lim_{K \rightarrow +\infty} T^K$ . Assuming that  $f$  is bounded, the procedure described above is well-defined up to time  $\zeta$ .

**Remark 1.** The  $T^K$  are well-defined stopping times since the sets  $\{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+ : \|\nu\| > K\}$  are the pre-image of  $]K, +\infty[$  by the linear form  $\mathbf{1} : \mathcal{M}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+, \nu \mapsto \nu[\mathbf{1}]$  and we have endowed  $\mathcal{M}_+$  with the topology of weak convergence. For a general treatment of the measurability of hitting times, see [1] and in particular Theorem 2.4 of that article.

To show that Eq. (14) is well-defined on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , we need to prove that the PDMP defined above is *non-explosive* in the sense of [20], i.e.  $\zeta = +\infty$  a. s. We follow the standard ‘drift condition’-based approach of [20]. Writing  $V(\nu) := \|\nu\| = \nu[\mathbf{1}], \forall \nu \in \mathcal{M}_+$ , we have

**Lemma 1** (Foster-Lyapunov inequality). *There exist  $K^* > 0, d \geq 0$  and  $c > 0$  such that*

$$\forall \nu \in \mathcal{M}_+, \quad \mathcal{L}V(\nu) \leq d\mathbb{1}_{\|\nu\| \leq K^*} - c(1 + V)(\nu). \quad (19)$$

*Proof.* Using Eq. (17) and  $V(\nu) = \nu[\mathbf{1}]$ , we have  $\mathcal{L}V(\nu) = -\nu[f] + \left[ \nu[f] + \Lambda(1 - \|\nu\|) \right]_+$ .

Two cases arise: either  $\left[ \nu[f] + \Lambda(1 - \|\nu\|) \right]_+ > 0$ , in which case  $\mathcal{L}V(\nu) = \Lambda(1 - \|\nu\|) = \Lambda - \Lambda V(\nu)$ , or  $\left[ \nu[f] + \Lambda(1 - \|\nu\|) \right]_+ = 0$ , in which case  $\mathcal{L}V(\nu) = -\nu[f] \leq -\min(f)V(\nu)$ .

Whence,  $\mathcal{L}V(\nu) \leq \Lambda - (\min(f) \wedge \Lambda)V(\nu)$ . We can adapt the constants to obtain Eq. (19).  $\square$

Arguing as in Theorem 2.1 of [20], Lemma 1 guarantees that the PDMP is non-explosive. Hence, we have proved the well-posedness of Eq. (14):

**Proposition 1** (Well-posedness). *For all  $\nu_0 \in \mathcal{M}_+$ , there exists a  $\mathcal{M}_+$ -valued path-wise unique solution to Eq. (14) on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ .*

## 3 Stability

### 3.1 Coupling

More than non-explosion, the ‘drift condition’-based method of [20, 21] allows us to show that the PDMP (14) satisfies a certain ‘recurrence’ property.

For all  $K > 0$ , let us write the hitting time  $t_K := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|\rho_t\| \leq K\}$  and denote by  $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_0}[t_K]$  the expected hitting time of the PDMP (14) starting in state  $\nu_0 \in \mathcal{M}_+$  at time 0.

**Lemma 2.** *Take the constant  $K^*$  of Lemma 1. For all  $\nu_0 \in \mathcal{M}_+$  such that  $\|\nu_0\| > K^*$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_0}[t_{K^*}] < +\infty$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is standard but we reproduce it here to highlight the fact that it holds even if the space in which in process evolves is not locally compact.

We use  $V$  and the constants of Lemma 1. For any  $t > 0$  and any  $M > K^*$ , by Dynkin’s formula (see [20]),

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_0}[V(\rho_{t \wedge T^M})] = V(\nu_0) + \mathbb{E}_{\nu_0} \int_0^{t \wedge T^M} \mathcal{L}V(\rho_s) ds \leq V(\nu_0) + dt,$$

where  $T^M$  is the exit time defined in Eq. (18) and where  $d$  is given in Eq. (19).

Since  $V(\rho_{t \wedge T^M}) \geq M\mathbb{1}_{T^M \leq t}$ , this implies

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu_0}(T^M \leq t) \leq \frac{V(\nu_0) + dt}{M}.$$

Taking  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , by monotone convergence,  $\mathbb{P}_{\nu_0}(\zeta \leq t) = 0$ , which implies non-explosion.

We now make another use of Dynkin's formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\nu_0}[V(\rho_{t \wedge t_{K^*} \wedge T^M})] &= V(\nu_0) + \mathbb{E}_{\nu_0} \int_0^{t \wedge t_{K^*} \wedge T^M} \mathcal{L}V(\rho_s) ds \\ &\leq V(\nu_0) - c \mathbb{E}_{\nu_0} \int_0^{t \wedge t_{K^*} \wedge T^M} (1 + V)(\rho_s) ds.\end{aligned}$$

Whence,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_0} \int_0^{t \wedge t_{K^*} \wedge T^M} (1 + V)(\rho_s) ds \leq \frac{V(\nu_0) - \mathbb{E}_{\nu_0}[V(\rho_{t \wedge t_{K^*} \wedge T^M})]}{c} \leq \frac{V(\nu_0) - K^*}{c}.$$

Taking  $t, M \rightarrow \infty$ , we get, by monotone convergence

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_0} \int_0^{t_{K^*}} (1 + V)(\rho_s) ds \leq \frac{V(\nu_0) - K^*}{c}.$$

The fact that  $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_0}[t_{K^*}] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\nu_0} \int_0^{t_{K^*}} (1 + V)(\rho_s) ds$  concludes the proof.  $\square$

The definition of stability we use involves the notion of coupling of two processes (see Sec. 1.4). For  $\nu_0$  and  $\tilde{\nu}_0 \in \mathcal{M}_+$ , a natural way to couple two processes  $\rho$  and  $\tilde{\rho}$  following Eq. (14) with initial condition  $\nu_0$  and  $\tilde{\nu}_0$  respectively is to construct them with the same Poisson random measure  $\pi$ . With this coupling, the associated jump processes  $Z$  and  $\tilde{Z}_t$  follow, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$Z_t := \frac{1}{N} \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{1}_{z \leq N[\rho_s[f] + \Lambda(1 - \|\rho_s\|)]_+} \pi(ds, dz), \quad \tilde{Z}_t := \frac{1}{N} \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{1}_{z \leq N[\tilde{\rho}_s[f] + \Lambda(1 - \|\tilde{\rho}_s\|)]_+} \pi(ds, dz).$$

For all  $t \geq 0$ , we can now introduce the event

$$E_t := \{Z_{t+s} - Z_t = \tilde{Z}_{t+s} - \tilde{Z}_t \text{ for all } s \geq 0\}$$

on which both counting processes couple after time  $t$ . With  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  denoting the natural filtration of the coupled process, we have a lower bound on  $\mathbb{P}(E_t | \mathcal{F}_t)$ :

**Lemma 3.** *For any  $K > 0$ , there exists a constant  $\varepsilon \in ]0, 1[$  such that for all  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(E_t | \mathcal{F}_t) \geq \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\|\rho_t\| + \|\tilde{\rho}_t\| \leq K}. \quad (20)$$

*Proof.* We use the shorthand  $\bar{A}[\nu] := [\nu[f] + \Lambda(1 - \|\nu\|)]_+$ ,  $\forall \nu \in \mathcal{M}_+$ . Fix any  $t \geq 0$  such that  $\|\rho_t\| + \|\tilde{\rho}_t\| \leq K$ . Write  $\tau_t^1 := \inf\{s > t : (Z_s - Z_t) + (\tilde{Z}_s - \tilde{Z}_t) \geq 1/N\}$  the next jump after time  $t$ . Noticing that for all  $t \leq s < \tau_t^1$ ,  $\bar{A}[\rho_s] \vee \bar{A}[\tilde{\rho}_s] \leq \|f\|_\infty K + \Lambda$ , we clearly have that  $t < \tau_t^1$ , that is, there is no accumulation of jumps in finite time.

In what follows, we evaluate the difference  $\bar{A}[\rho_s] - \bar{A}[\tilde{\rho}_s]$ , for  $t \leq s$ .

We start by considering the difference  $\rho_s[f] - \tilde{\rho}_s[f]$ , for all  $t \leq s < \tau_t^1$ . It is clear that, for all  $t \leq s < \tau_t^1$ ,

$$\rho_s[f] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_t(du) f(\Phi_{t,s}^0(u)) \exp\left(-\int_t^s f(\Phi_{t,r}^0(u)) dr\right) \leq K \|f\|_\infty e^{-(s-t) \min(f)},$$

where  $\Phi^0$  is the flow of the transport equation (15) and where for the inequality, we used the bounds of  $f$  given by Assumption 2. Consequently, for all  $t \leq s < \tau_t^1$ ,  $|\rho_s[f] - \tilde{\rho}_s[f]| \leq 2K \|f\|_\infty e^{-(s-t) \min(f)}$ . Similarly,  $|\|\rho_s\| - \|\tilde{\rho}_s\|| \leq 2K e^{-(s-t) \min(f)}$ .

At the jump time  $\tau_t^1$ , two cases arise:

- $\tau_t^1$  is an asynchronous jump, that is, only one of the two processes, say  $Z$ , jumps, in which case  $\rho$  is shifted to the right by  $J/N$ , and a Dirac mass  $\frac{1}{N}\delta_0$  is added (see Eq. (16)). Then, for all  $s \in [\tau_t^1, \tau_t^2[$ , where  $\tau_t^2 := \inf\{s > \tau_t^1 : (Z_s - Z_{\tau_t^1}) + (\tilde{Z}_s - \tilde{Z}_{\tau_t^1}) \geq 1/N\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s[f] &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_{\tau_t^1-}(du) f(\Phi_{\tau_t^1, s}^0(u + J/N)) \exp\left(-\int_{\tau_t^1}^s f(\Phi_{\tau_t^1, r}^0(u + J/N)) dr\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} f(\Phi_{\tau_t^1, s}^0(0)) \exp\left(-\int_{\tau_t^1}^s f(\Phi_{\tau_t^1, r}^0(0)) dr\right), \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\tilde{\rho}_s[f] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\rho}_{\tau_t^1-}(du) f(\Phi_{\tau_t^1, s}^0(u)) \exp\left(-\int_{\tau_t^1}^s f(\Phi_{\tau_t^1, r}^0(u)) dr\right).$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} |\rho_s[f] - \tilde{\rho}_s[f]| &\leq \|f\|_{\infty} e^{-\min(f)(s-\tau_t^1)} (\|\rho_{\tau_t^1-}\| + \|\tilde{\rho}_{\tau_t^1-}\|) + \frac{\|f\|_{\infty}}{N} e^{-\min(f)(s-\tau_t^1)} \\ &\leq 2K\|f\|_{\infty} e^{-\min(f)(s-\tau_t^1)} e^{-\min(f)(\tau_t^1-t)} + \frac{\|f\|_{\infty}}{N} e^{-\min(f)(s-\tau_t^1)} \\ &= 2K\|f\|_{\infty} e^{-\min(f)(s-t)} + \frac{\|f\|_{\infty}}{N} e^{-\min(f)(s-\tau_t^1)}. \end{aligned}$$

- $\tau_t^1$  is a synchronous jump, in which case we obtain similarly that for all  $s \in [\tau_t^1, \tau_t^2[$ ,

$$|\rho_s[f] - \tilde{\rho}_s[f]| \leq 2K\|f\|_{\infty} e^{-\min(f)(s-t)}.$$

Similar estimates hold for  $|\|\rho_s\| - \|\tilde{\rho}_s\||$ .

Working iteratively with respect to the successive jump times  $\tau_t^n, n \geq 2$ , we deduce that for an appropriate constant  $C > 0$ , for all  $t \leq s$ ,

$$|\bar{A}[\rho_s] - \bar{A}[\tilde{\rho}_s]| \leq C e^{-\min(f)(s-t)} (\|\rho_t\| + \|\tilde{\rho}_t\|) + C \int_{]t, s]} e^{-\min(f)(s-r)} d|Z_r - \tilde{Z}_r|, \quad (21)$$

where  $(|Z_s - \tilde{Z}_s|)_{s \geq t}$  is the process counting the asynchronous jumps of  $Z$  and  $\tilde{Z}$ . Notice that  $(|Z_s - \tilde{Z}_s|)_{s \geq t}$  has stochastic intensity  $(N|\bar{A}[\rho_s] - \bar{A}[\tilde{\rho}_s]|)_{s \geq t}$ . In particular, the above upper bound implies that on  $[t, \infty[$ ,  $(N|Z_s - \tilde{Z}_s|)_{s \geq t}$  is stochastically upper bounded by a linear Hawkes process with self-interaction kernel  $h(s) = C e^{-\min(f)s}$  and with time inhomogeneous basic rate  $s \mapsto N C e^{-\min(f)(s-t)} (\|\rho_t\| + \|\tilde{\rho}_t\|)$ .

Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 2 of [3, p. 1581] (see also their Lemma 1), we obtain the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(E_t | \mathcal{F}_t) &= \mathbb{P}\left(|Z - \tilde{Z}|([t, \infty[) = 0 | \mathcal{F}_t\right) \geq \exp\left(-\int_t^{\infty} N C e^{-\min(f)(s-t)} (\|\rho_t\| + \|\tilde{\rho}_t\|) ds\right) \\ &= \exp\left(-N C / \min(f) [\|\rho_t\| + \|\tilde{\rho}_t\|]\right). \end{aligned}$$

Putting  $\varepsilon := \exp(-2NCK / \min(f))$  concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\rho$  and  $\tilde{\rho}$  be the coupled processes defined above for initial condition  $\nu_0$  and  $\tilde{\nu}_0 \in \mathcal{M}_+$ . The associated counting processes  $Z$  and  $\tilde{Z}$  couple a.s. in finite time, i.e.*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \left\{ (Z_s)_{s \geq t} \neq (\tilde{Z}_s)_{s \geq t} \right\} \right) = 0.$$

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the Lemma 5 of [3]. Defining  $E_\infty := \cup_{t=0}^\infty E_t$ ,  $(\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{E_\infty} | \mathcal{F}_t])_{t \geq 0}$  is a uniformly integrable martingale and we have  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{E_\infty} | \mathcal{F}_t] \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{E_\infty}$  a.s.

However, for all  $K > 0$ , we have, by Lemma 3,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{E_\infty} | \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{P}(E_\infty | \mathcal{F}_t) \geq \mathbb{P}(E_t | \mathcal{F}_t) \geq \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\|\rho_t\| + \|\tilde{\rho}_t\| \leq K\}}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

We can easily adapt the proofs of Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 to discrete times  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and show that there exists  $K^* > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\|\rho_n\| + \|\tilde{\rho}_n\| \leq K^*\}) = 1$ . Hence,  $\mathbb{1}_{E_\infty} \geq \varepsilon$  a.s., which in turn implies that  $\mathbb{P}(E_\infty) = 1$ . Since the event  $E_\infty$  is the complement of the event  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \left\{ (Z_s)_{s \geq t} \neq (\tilde{Z}_s)_{s \geq t} \right\}$ , this concludes the proof.  $\square$

### 3.2 Existence of the stationary process

We construct a stationary process  $Z$  following the lines of [3]. The main idea is to show that a construction on the whole line  $\mathbb{R}$ , that is, starting from  $t = -\infty$  is feasible. If it is so, then intuitively the constructed process is automatically stationary. More precisely, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.** *In addition to the usual assumptions, grant Assumption 3. Then there exists a unique stationary process  $Z$  solving Eq. (14).*

*Proof.* We only need to show that a stationary process  $Z$  exists - uniqueness follows then from the coupling property stated in Lemma 2 above.

We construct a sequence  $Z^{[n]}$  of jump processes in the following way. For any fixed  $n \geq 1$ , let  $(\rho^{[n]}, \tilde{Z}^{[n]})$  be the solution of Eq. (14) defined on  $[-n, \infty[$ , starting at time  $-n$  from the initial condition  $\rho_{-n}^{[n]} = \frac{1}{N} \delta_0$ , with

$$\tilde{Z}_t^{[n]} = \frac{1}{N} \int_{[-n, t] \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{1}_{z \leq N \bar{A}_s^{[n]}} \pi(ds, dz), \quad \text{with } \bar{A}_t^{[n]} := \left[ \rho_t^{[n]}[f] + \Lambda(1 - \|\rho_t^{[n]}\|) \right]_+, \quad \forall t \geq -n,$$

and  $\tilde{Z}_t^{[n]} \equiv 0$  for all  $t \leq -n$ .

In order to obtain a standardized sequence of processes, we put

$$Z_t^{[n]} := \tilde{Z}_t^{[n]} - \tilde{Z}_0^{[n]}.$$

In this way, for all  $n$ ,  $Z^{[n]}$  is an element of the Skorokhod space  $D(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  with  $Z_0^{[n]} = 0$ . We shall also consider the associated sequence of processes

$$X_s^{[n]} := \rho_s^{[n]}[f] - \Lambda \|\rho_s^{[n]}\|,$$

such that the stochastic intensity of  $NZ_s^{[n]}$  is  $\lambda^{[n]}(s) := N[X_s^{[n]} + \Lambda]_+$ .

**Step 1.** We first show that the family  $(Z^{[n]}, X^{[n]})_{n \geq 1}$  is tight in the Skorokhod space  $D(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^2)$ . To do so, we use the criterion of Aldous, see Theorem VI.4.5 of [19]. It is sufficient to prove that

(a) for all  $T > 0$ , all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{\sigma \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(\tau, \tau') \in P_{\sigma, T}} \mathbb{P}(|Z_{\tau'}^{[n]} - Z_{\tau}^{[n]}| + |X_{\tau'}^{[n]} - X_{\tau}^{[n]}| > \varepsilon) = 0,$$

where  $P_{\sigma, T}$  is the set of all pairs of stopping times  $(\tau, \tau')$  such that  $-T \leq \tau \leq \tau' \leq \tau + \sigma \leq T$  a.s.,

(b) for all  $T > 0$ ,  $\lim_{K \uparrow \infty} \sup_n \mathbb{P}(\sup_{-T \leq s \leq T} (|Z_s^{[n]}| + X_s^{[n]}) \geq K) = 0$ .

To check (a), observe that,

$$\mathbb{E}[|Z_{\tau'}^{[n]} - Z_{\tau}^{[n]}|] \leq \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \int_{\tau}^{\tau + \sigma} \lambda^{[n]}(s) ds \leq \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{2T\sigma} \sqrt{\sup_{-T \leq s \leq T} \mathbb{E}[(\lambda^{[n]}(s))^2]}.$$

Note that  $(\lambda^{[n]}(s))^2 \leq C \|\rho_s^{[n]}\|^2 + C'$ , for some constants  $C, C'$  independent of  $n$ . By similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 1, we have that  $W(\nu) := \|\nu\|^2$  satisfies

$$\forall \nu \in \mathcal{M}_+, \quad \mathcal{L}W(\nu) \leq \alpha - \beta W(\nu), \quad (22)$$

for suitable constants  $\alpha, \beta > 0^\dagger$ . Then, it is straightforward to show that (22) implies

$$\sup_n \sup_{-T \leq s \leq T} \mathbb{E}[W(\rho_s^{[n]})] < \infty,$$

implying (a) for the sequence of processes  $Z^{[n]}$ .

We now turn to the study of the sequence of processes  $X^{[n]}$ . We show how to control  $\rho^{[n]}[f]$ ; the control of  $\|\rho^{[n]}\|$  is obtained similarly by taking  $f \equiv 1$ . We fix stopping times  $\tau < \tau'$  and consider the increment  $\rho_{\tau'}^{[n]}[f] - \rho_{\tau}^{[n]}[f]$  on the event  $Z_{\tau'}^{[n]} - Z_{\tau}^{[n]} = 0$ . On this event,

$$\rho_{\tau'}^{[n]}[f] - \rho_{\tau}^{[n]}[f] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_{\tau}^{[n]}(du) \left( f(\Phi_{\tau, \tau'}^0(u)) \exp\left(-\int_{\tau}^{\tau'} f(\Phi_{\tau, s}^0(u)) ds\right) - f(u) \right).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| f(\Phi_{\tau, \tau'}^0(u)) \exp\left(-\int_{\tau}^{\tau'} f(\Phi_{\tau, s}^0(u)) ds\right) - f(u) \right| \\ & \leq |f(\Phi_{\tau, \tau'}^0(u)) - f(u)| + \|f\|_{\infty} \left| \exp\left(-\int_{\tau}^{\tau'} f(\Phi_{\tau, s}^0(u)) ds\right) - 1 \right| \\ & \leq |f(\Phi_{\tau, \tau'}^0(u)) - f(u)| + \|f\|_{\infty} (1 - e^{-\sigma \|f\|_{\infty}}). \end{aligned}$$

Using that  $|\Phi_{\tau, \tau'}^0(u) - u| \leq (1 - e^{-\sigma/\tau_m})|u - \mu|$ , Taylor's formula implies

$$|f(\Phi_{\tau, \tau'}^0(u)) - f(u)| \leq |f'(\xi)|(1 - e^{-\sigma/\tau_m})|u - \mu|,$$

where  $\xi \in [u, \Phi_{\tau, \tau'}^0(u)] \cup [\Phi_{\tau, \tau'}^0(u), u]$ .

---

<sup>†</sup>See Appendix A

We first produce an upper bound in the case where  $u \geq \mu$  and  $\mu \geq 0$ . Since  $|f'(u)| \leq C/u$  by Assumption 3 and since  $\xi \geq \Phi_{\tau, \tau'}^0(u)$ , we have

$$|f(\Phi_{\tau, \tau'}^0(u)) - f(u)| \leq C(1 - e^{-\sigma/\tau_m})C_\sigma, \quad (23)$$

where

$$C_\sigma := \sup_{u \geq \mu} \frac{1}{ue^{-\sigma/\tau_m} + \mu(1 - e^{-\sigma/\tau_m})} (u - \mu).$$

Moreover, it is clear that, for any  $\sigma_0 > 0$ ,  $\sup_{\sigma \leq \sigma_0} C_\sigma < \infty$ .

If  $\mu \leq 0$  and  $\mu < u \leq 0$ , we use that  $f'(\xi)$  is bounded on  $[\mu, 0]$  to obtain Eq. (23). The case  $u < \mu$  is treated analogously.

As a consequence, we get the global upper bound (on the event  $Z_{\tau'}^{[n]} - Z_\tau^{[n]} = 0$ ):

$$\left| \rho_{\tau'}^{[n]}[f] - \rho_\tau^{[n]}[f] \right| \leq C(1 - e^{-\kappa\sigma}) \|\rho_\tau^{[n]}\|, \quad \text{with } \kappa := \|f\|_\infty \vee 1/\tau_m.$$

We conclude the control of  $\rho^{[n]}[f]$ , on the event  $Z_{\tau'}^{[n]} - Z_\tau^{[n]} = 0$ , using the Foster-Lyapunov inequality (Lemma 1):

$$\mathbb{E} \|\rho_\tau^{[n]}\| \leq \mathbb{E} \|\rho_0^{[n]}\| + dT, \quad \text{with } d \text{ from Eq. (19),}$$

and the fact that  $\sup_n \mathbb{E} \|\rho_0^{[n]}\| < \infty$ .

To deal with the event  $Z_{\tau'}^{[n]} - Z_\tau^{[n]} > 0$ , observe that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \rho_{\tau'}^{[n]}[f] - \rho_\tau^{[n]}[f] \right| \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{\tau'}^{[n]} - Z_\tau^{[n]} > 0\}} \right] \leq \|f\|_\infty \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \|\rho_{\tau'}^{[n]}\| + \|\rho_\tau^{[n]}\| \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{\tau'}^{[n]} - Z_\tau^{[n]} > 0\}} \right].$$

Moreover, for any stopping time  $\tau$  taking values in between  $-T$  and  $T$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\rho_\tau^{[n]}\| \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{\tau'}^{[n]} - Z_\tau^{[n]} > 0\}} \right] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \|\rho_\tau^{[n]}\|^2} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Z_{\tau'}^{[n]} - Z_\tau^{[n]} > 0)}.$$

Using similar arguments as above, but now with the Lyapunov function  $W(\nu) = \|\nu\|^2$ , we obtain

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E} \|\rho_\tau^{[n]}\|^2 < \infty.$$

Finally, using the already established control over  $Z^{[n]}$ , we get that

$$\limsup_{\sigma \downarrow 0} \sup_n \mathbb{P}(Z_{\tau'}^{[n]} - Z_\tau^{[n]} > 0) = 0,$$

which concludes the proof of (a).

(b) Let us first observe that  $\sup_{-T \leq s \leq T} |Z_s^{[n]}| \leq Z_T^{[n]} - Z_{-T}^{[n]}$ , and

$$\sup_{-T \leq s \leq T} |X_s^{[n]}| \leq C \sup_{-T \leq s \leq T} \|\rho_s^{[n]}\| \leq C \left( \|\rho_{-T}^{[n]}\| + Z_T^{[n]} - Z_{-T}^{[n]} \right).$$

We can then conclude using the moment estimates established above.

**Step 2.** By tightness we can extract a subsequence  $n_k$  such that  $(Z^{[n_k]}, X^{[n_k]})$  converges, in  $D(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^2)$ , to a limit process that we shall denote  $(Z, X)$ . We now show that  $Z$  is necessarily stationary. For that sake, take a test function  $\varphi : D(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  which is continuous (with respect

to the Skorokhod topology), bounded, and which does only depend on  $Z \in D(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  within a finite time interval  $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ . We have to show that for every  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(Z)] = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\theta_t Z)],$$

where  $\theta_t Z$  is the shifted counting process defined by  $(\theta_t Z)_s = Z_{t+s} - Z_t$ , for all  $s \geq 0$ .

By weak convergence, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\theta_t Z)] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\varphi(Z^{[n_k]})] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\theta_t Z^{[n_k]})].$$

Now we use the coupling property proven in Theorem 2 above. For any fixed  $k$  and  $t$  we realize  $Z^{[n_k]}$  and  $\theta_t Z^{[n_k]}$  according to the construction used in the proof of Theorem 2.

This means the following. Let  $\pi(dt, dz)$  be a Poisson random measure on  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$  which has intensity  $dt dz$  on  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ . We construct  $Z^{[n_k]}$  using the atoms of  $\pi$  within  $[-n_k, \infty[\times\mathbb{R}_+$ , starting from  $\frac{1}{N}\delta_0$  at time  $-n_k$ . Then we choose, independently of  $\pi$ , a random measure  $\tilde{\rho}_{-n_k} \sim \mathcal{L}(\rho_{-n_k+t}^{[n_k]})$ . Note that this law does not depend on  $n_k$ ; it only depends on  $t$ . Finally, we realize the process  $\theta_t Z^{[n_k]}$  letting it start at time  $-n_k$  from the initial condition  $\tilde{\rho}_{-n_k}$  and using the same underlying Poisson random measure  $\pi$ . Let  $T_{coup}^{n_k}$  be the finite coupling time of the two processes. Notice that once again,  $\mathcal{L}(T_{coup}^{n_k})$  does not depend on  $n_k$ .

Using this coupling, we obtain

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\varphi(Z^{[n_k]})] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\theta_t Z^{[n_k]})] \right| \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty \mathbb{P}(T_{coup}^{n_k} \geq n_k + a) = \|\varphi\|_\infty \mathbb{P}(T_{coup} > n_k + a) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $n_k \rightarrow \infty$ , implying that  $\mathbb{E}[\varphi(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\theta_t Z)] = 0$ . Since the test functions  $\phi$  form a separating-class (see Theorem 1.2 in [2, p. 8]), we have that  $Z$  and  $\theta_t Z$  have the same law, whence stationarity.

**Step 3.** Now, we verify that that the process  $Z$ , where  $Z$  is taken from the stationary limit process  $(Z, X)$  constructed above, is a jump process where jumps of size  $1/N$  occur with intensity  $\lambda_t := N[X_{t-} + \Lambda]_+$ .

To ease the notation, in what follows, we rename the subsequence  $n_k$  by  $n$ . Using the Skorokhod representation theorem, we may assume that the above weak convergence is almost sure, for a particular realization of the couples  $(Z^{[n]}, X^{[n]})$ . Hence, we know that almost surely,  $(Z^{[n]}, X^{[n]}) \rightarrow (Z, X)$  and  $\lambda^{[n]} \rightarrow \lambda$ . Moreover, let  $\bar{Z}$  be the process having intensity  $\lambda$  for the same underlying Poisson random measure as (the realization of)  $Z$ . Then, by Fatou's lemma, for any  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}|Z_t - \bar{Z}_t| \leq \liminf_n \mathbb{E}|Z_t^{[n]} - \bar{Z}_t| \leq \frac{1}{N} \liminf_n \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\lambda^{[n]}(s) - \lambda(s)| ds = 0,$$

where we used the uniform integrability of the  $\lambda^{[n]}$ , namely that  $\sup_n \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \mathbb{E}[\lambda_s^{[n]}] < \infty$ . The same argument shows that  $\mathbb{E}|Z_t - \bar{Z}_t| = 0$  for all  $t \leq 0$ . Hence  $Z = \bar{Z}$  almost surely, implying that  $Z$  has the limit intensity  $\lambda$ .

**Step 4.** Finally, we show that the limit process  $Z$  has the right dynamic, i.e. its intensity  $\lambda_t$  is equal to  $\bar{\lambda}_t$  given by

$$\bar{\lambda}_t := N \left[ \sum_{k: T_k < t} \frac{1}{N} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k}^t f(\Phi_{T_k, s}^Z(0)) ds \right) (f(\Phi_{T_k, t}^Z(0)) - \Lambda) + \Lambda \right]_+, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (24)$$

where  $T_k$  denote the jump times of  $Z$  and  $\Phi^Z$  is given in (8).

The goal of this step is to show that  $\lambda \equiv \bar{\lambda}$ . Fix some time  $t \geq 0$  and a truncation level  $K > 1$ . Since almost surely,  $Z$  does not jump at time  $t$  nor at time  $-K$  for all  $K \geq 1$ , Proposition



VI.2.2.1 of [19] implies that  $Z_t^{[n]} - Z_{-K}^{[n]} \rightarrow Z_t - Z_{-K}$ . Therefore, we may choose  $n_K$  be such that  $Z_t^{[n]} - Z_{-K}^{[n]} = Z_t - Z_{-K}$  for all  $n \geq n_K$ . By the continuity properties of the Skorokhod topology, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have that  $T_k^{[n]} \rightarrow T_k$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , for all  $Z_{-K} \leq k \leq Z_t$  (Proposition VI.2.2.1 of [19]). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k: -K \leq T_k^{[n]} < t} \frac{1}{N} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k^{[n]}}^t f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]},s}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) ds \right) \left( f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]},t}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) - \Lambda \right) \rightarrow \\ \sum_{k: -K \leq T_k < t} \frac{1}{N} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k}^t f \left( \Phi_{T_k,s}^Z(0) \right) ds \right) \left( f \left( \Phi_{T_k,t}^Z(0) \right) - \Lambda \right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the expression on the lhs corresponds to the terms contributing to  $X_{t^-}^{[n]}$ , issued by jumps happening after time  $-K$ . Since we know that  $X_t^{[n]}$  converges to  $X_t$  for almost all  $t$ , this implies that for all  $K$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} X_{t^-} = \sum_{k: -K \leq T_k < t} \frac{1}{N} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k}^t f \left( \Phi_{T_k,s}^Z(0) \right) ds \right) \left( f \left( \Phi_{T_k,t}^Z(0) \right) - \Lambda \right) \\ + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k: T_k^{[n]} < -K} \frac{1}{N} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k^{[n]}}^t f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]},s}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) ds \right) \left( f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]},t}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) - \Lambda \right), \end{aligned}$$

where this last limit is necessarily finite. Letting  $K \rightarrow \infty$  we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} X_{t^-} = \sum_{k: T_k < t} \frac{1}{N} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k}^t f \left( \Phi_{T_k,s}^Z(0) \right) ds \right) \left( f \left( \Phi_{T_k,t}^Z(0) \right) - \Lambda \right) \\ + \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k: T_k^{[n]} < -K} \frac{1}{N} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k^{[n]}}^t f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]},s}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) ds \right) \left( f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]},t}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) - \Lambda \right), \end{aligned}$$

Next, we shall prove that

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k: T_k^{[n]} < -K} \frac{1}{N} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k^{[n]}}^t f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]},s}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) ds \right) f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]},t}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) = 0 \quad a.s., \quad (25)$$

a similar argument proving that

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k: T_k^{[n]} < -K} \frac{1}{N} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k^{[n]}}^t f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]},s}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) ds \right) \Lambda = 0 \quad a.s.,$$

to obtain that indeed,  $\lambda_t = N[X_{t^-} + \Lambda]_+ = \bar{\lambda}_t$ .

Let us now prove (25). Using Fatou's lemma, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k: T_k^{[n]} < -K} \frac{1}{N} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k^{[n]}}^t f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]},s}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) ds \right) f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]},t}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) \\ \leq \liminf_{K \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sum_{k: T_k^{[n]} < -K} \frac{1}{N} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k^{[n]}}^t f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]},s}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) ds \right) f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]},t}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right). \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

Using the same arguments as those leading to Eq. (21), we have

$$\sum_{k: T_k^{[n]} < -K} \frac{1}{N} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k^{[n]}}^t f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]}, s}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) ds \right) f \left( \Phi_{T_k^{[n]}, t}^{Z^{[n]}}(0) \right) \leq \|f\|_\infty \|\rho_{-K}^{[n]}\| e^{-\min(f)(t+K)}.$$

Therefore, the rhs of (26) is upper bounded by

$$\|f\|_\infty \liminf_{K \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(\|\rho_{-K}^{[n]}\|) e^{-\min(f)(t+K)} = 0,$$

since  $\sup_n \sup_K \mathbb{E}(\|\rho_{-K}^{[n]}\|) < \infty$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3, there exists a unique stationary process  $\{\rho, \hat{\nu}_0\}$  solving Eq. (14).*

*Proof.* Taking the process  $Z \in D(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  constructed in Theorem 3 and using the same notations as in Eq. (24), the stationary process  $\{\bar{\rho}, \bar{\nu}_0\}$  corresponding to  $Z$  is simply

$$\bar{\nu}_0 = \sum_{T_k \leq 0} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k}^0 f(\Phi_{T_k, s}^Z(0)) ds \right) \frac{1}{N} \delta_{\Phi_{T_k, 0}^Z(0)},$$

and for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\bar{\rho}_t = \sum_{T_k \leq t} \exp \left( - \int_{T_k}^t f(\Phi_{T_k, s}^Z(0)) ds \right) \frac{1}{N} \delta_{\Phi_{T_k, t}^Z(0)}.$$

$\square$

## 4 Link to the original finite-size population equation

In this section, we explicit the link between the stochastic integral equation (10) and the original model of [26], in the case of Generalized integrate-and-fire neurons (without adaptation).

Following the integral equation convention [15, 16] and as in [26], we formally put the initial condition at time  $-\infty$  and Eq. (10) becomes

For all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$dZ_t = \frac{1}{N} \pi(dt, [0, N\bar{A}_t]), \tag{27a}$$

$$\bar{A}_t = \left[ \int_{-\infty}^t \lambda^Z(t|s) S^Z(t|s) dZ_s + \Lambda_t^Z \left( 1 - \int_{-\infty}^t S^Z(t|s) dZ_s \right) \right]_+, \tag{27b}$$

where  $\pi$  is a random Poisson measure on  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$  and the time-dependent modulating factor  $\Lambda_t^Z$  is given by<sup>†</sup>

$$\Lambda_t^Z = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^t \lambda^Z(t|s) \{1 - S^Z(t|s)\} S^Z(t|s) dZ_s}{\int_{-\infty}^t \{1 - S^Z(t|s)\} S^Z(t|s) dZ_s}. \tag{27c}$$

---

<sup>†</sup>In the original formulation of the model (see Eqs. (11) and (12) in [26]), the expression for the time-dependent modulating factor  $\Lambda_t^Z$  involved a ‘variance function’  $v$ . Integrating Eq. (12) in [26] gives  $v(t|s) = \{1 - S^Z(t|s)\} S^Z(t|s) \dot{Z}_s$ . As a consequence, Eq. (11) in [26] can be written as Eq. (27c), eliminating  $v$ .

The only difference between the neuron model in Eq. (1) and the Generalized integrate-and-fire model considered in [26] is the addition of a synaptic filtering kernel  $\epsilon$  and an absolute refractory period  $\Delta \geq 0$ . Accordingly, Eq. (1a) is replaced by

$$dU_t^{i,N} = \left[ \frac{\mu_t - U_t^{i,N}}{\tau_m} dt - U_t^{i,N} dZ_t^{i,N} + \frac{J}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{-\infty}^t \epsilon(t-s) dZ_s^{j,N} \right] \mathbb{1}_{T_t^{i,N} > \Delta},$$

where  $T_t^{i,N}$  is an additional ‘‘age’’-variable defined by the stochastic dynamics  $dT_t^{i,N} = dt - T_t^{i,N} dZ_t^{i,N}$ , which clocks the time elapsed since the last spike of neuron  $i$ . Then, the definitions for the hazard rate  $\lambda$  and the survival  $S$  can be easily adapted replacing  $\Phi$  in Eq. (8) by

$$\Phi_{s,t}^z(u) := ue^{-\frac{t-s}{\tau_m}} + \int_s^t e^{-\frac{t-r}{\tau_m}} \left( \frac{\mu_r}{\tau_m} + J \int_{-\infty}^r \epsilon(r-s') dz_{s'} \right) dr, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{R},$$

and replacing  $\lambda$  in Eq. (5) by  $\lambda^z(t|s) = f(\Phi_{s+\Delta,t}^z(0)) \mathbb{1}_{t \geq s+\Delta}$ .

In practice, we can deal with the ill-defined initial condition at time  $-\infty$  by assuming that  $Z_t = 0$  for all  $t < 0$  and  $Z_0 = 1$  (all neurons spike at time 0). Consistently, we also put  $\Lambda_0^Z = 0$ . Then, the model Eq. (27) can be written

For all  $t > 0$ ,

$$Z_t = 1 + \frac{1}{N} \int_{(0,t] \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{1}_{z \leq N \bar{A}_{s-}} \pi(ds, dz), \quad (28a)$$

$$\bar{A}_t = \left[ \int_{0^-}^t \lambda^Z(t|s) S^Z(t|s) dZ_s + \Lambda_t^Z \left( 1 - \int_{0^-}^t S^Z(t|s) dZ_s \right) \right]_+, \quad (28b)$$

$$\Lambda_t^Z = \frac{\int_{0^-}^t \lambda^Z(t|s) \{1 - S^Z(t|s)\} S^Z(t|s) dZ_s}{\int_{0^-}^t \{1 - S^Z(t|s)\} S^Z(t|s) dZ_s}, \quad (28c)$$

with the initial condition  $Z_0 = 1$  and  $\Lambda_0^Z = 0$ . Assuming that the original model Eq. (27) has the same stability property as the simpler model Eq. (14), this practical choice of initial condition is acceptable as it will be ‘forgotten’ after some time.

## 5 Multi-population model

As explained in [26], it is straightforward to generalize Eq. (28) to multiple interacting populations. Importantly, the multi-population model allows to coarse-grain microscopic models of large biological networks of neurons, like a cortical column [26].

To ease the notation, here, we drop all the superscript  $Z$ . Let us consider a system of  $K$  interacting (homogeneous) populations, each consisting of  $N^1, \dots, N^K$  neurons, with  $\{N^k, \tau_m^k, f^k, \epsilon^k, (\mu_t^k)_{t \geq 0}\}_{k=1, \dots, K}$  and average connectivity matrix  $\mathbf{J}$ , where  $\mathbf{J}_{kl}$  is the average connection strength from population  $l$  to population  $k$ . The multi-population version of Eq. (28) is

For all  $k = 1, \dots, K$  and  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_t^k &= 1 + \frac{1}{N} \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{1}_{z \leq N \bar{A}_{s^-}^k} \pi^k(ds, dz), \\ \bar{A}_t^k &= \left[ \int_{0^-}^t \lambda^k(t|s) S^k(t|s) dZ_s^k + \Lambda_t^k \left( 1 - \int_{0^-}^t S^k(t|s) dZ_s^k \right) \right]_+, \\ \Lambda_t^k &= \frac{\int_{0^-}^t \lambda^k(t|s) \{1 - S^k(t|s)\} S^k(t|s) dZ_s^k}{\int_{0^-}^t \{1 - S^k(t|s)\} S^k(t|s) dZ_s^k}, \end{aligned}$$

with the initial condition  $Z_0^1 = \dots = Z_0^K = 1$  and  $\Lambda_0^1 = \dots = \Lambda_0^K = 0$ , where  $\{\pi^k\}_{k=1, \dots, K}$  are independent Poisson random measures on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$  with Lebesgue intensity measure and

$$S^k(t|s) = \exp \left( - \int_s^t \lambda^k(r|s) dr \right), \quad (29)$$

$$\lambda^k(t|s) = f^k(u^k(t|s)) \mathbb{1}_{t \geq s + \Delta^k},$$

$$u^k(t|s) = \mathbb{1}_{t \geq s + \Delta^k} \int_{s + \Delta^k}^t e^{-\frac{t-r}{\tau_m^k}} \left( \frac{\mu_r^k}{\tau_m^k} + \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbf{J}_{kl} \int_s^r \epsilon^k(r-s') dZ_{s'}^l \right) dr. \quad (30)$$

For simplicity, we have presented here a version of the multi-population model without spike-frequency adaptation nor short-term synaptic plasticity but these features can be included [26, 24].

## A Appendix

### Proof of Eq. (22)

Using Eq. (17), we have  $\mathcal{L}W(\nu) = -2\|\nu\| \nu[f] + \left[ \nu[f] + \Lambda(1 - \|\nu\|) \right]_+ \left( 2\|\nu\| + \frac{1}{N} \right)$ . Whenever  $\left[ \nu[f] + \Lambda(1 - \|\nu\|) \right]_+ > 0$ , this yields, for a suitable constant  $C$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}W(\nu) \leq -2W(\nu) + C(\|\nu\| + 1),$$

which implies the claim. The easier case  $\left[ \nu[f] + \Lambda(1 - \|\nu\|) \right]_+ = 0$  follows simply from the fact that  $\nu[f] \geq \min(f)\|\nu\|$ .

## Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant no. 200020\_184615).

## References

- [1] Richard Bass et al. The measurability of hitting times. *Electronic communications in Probability*, 15:99–105, 2010.
- [2] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. John Wiley & Sons, 1999.

- [3] P. Brémaud and L. Massoulié. Stability of nonlinear Hawkes processes. *Ann. Probab.*, pages 1563–1588, 1996.
- [4] Pierre Brémaud and Laurent Massoulié. Hawkes branching point processes without ancestors. *Journal of applied probability*, pages 122–135, 2001.
- [5] Julien Chevallier. Mean-field limit of generalized Hawkes processes. *Stoch. Process. Their Appl.*, 127(12):3870–3912, 2017.
- [6] Julien Chevallier, Anna Melnykova, and Irene Tubikanec. Theoretical analysis and simulation methods for Hawkes processes and their diffusion approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.10710*, 2020.
- [7] Julien Chevallier and Guilherme Ost. Fluctuations for mean-field interacting age-dependent Hawkes processes. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 22, 2017.
- [8] Quentin Cormier, Etienne Tanré, and Romain Veltz. Long time behavior of a mean-field model of interacting neurons. *Stoch. Process. Their Appl.*, 130(5):2553–2595, 2020.
- [9] Manon Costa, Carl Graham, Laurence Marsalle, and Viet Chi Tran. Renewal in Hawkes processes with self-excitation and inhibition. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 52(3):879–915, 2020.
- [10] Anna De Masi, Antonio Galves, Eva Löcherbach, and Errico Presutti. Hydrodynamic limit for interacting neurons. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 158(4):866–902, 2015.
- [11] Sylvain Delattre, Nicolas Fournier, Marc Hoffmann, et al. Hawkes processes on large networks. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 26(1):216–261, 2016.
- [12] Susanne Ditlevsen and Eva Löcherbach. Multi-class oscillating systems of interacting neurons. *Stoch. Process. Their Appl.*, 127(6):1840–1869, 2017.
- [13] Nicolas Fournier and Eva Löcherbach. On a toy model of interacting neurons. In *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, volume 52, pages 1844–1876. Institut Henri Poincaré, 2016.
- [14] A. Galves and E. Löcherbach. Modeling networks of spiking neurons as interacting processes with memory of variable length. *J. Soc. Fr. Stat.*, 157:17, 2016.
- [15] W. Gerstner. Time structure of the activity in neural network models. *Phys. Rev. E*, 51:738, 1995.
- [16] W. Gerstner. Population dynamics of spiking neurons: Fast transients, asynchronous states, and locking. *Neural Comput.*, 12:43, 2000.
- [17] W. Gerstner, W. M. Kistler, R. Naud, and L. Paninski. *Neuronal Dynamics: From Single Neurons to Networks and Models of Cognition*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [18] Sophie Heesen and Wilhelm Stannat. Fluctuation limits for mean-field interacting nonlinear Hawkes processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 2021.
- [19] Jean Jacod and Albert N Shiryaev. *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg New York, second edition, 2003.

- [20] Sean P Meyn and Richard L Tweedie. Stability of Markovian processes iii: Foster-Lyapunov criteria for continuous-time processes. *Advances in Applied Probability*, pages 518–548, 1993.
- [21] Sean P Meyn and Richard L Tweedie. *Markov chains and stochastic stability*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [22] K. Pakdaman, B. Perthame, and D. Salort. Dynamics of a structured neuron population. *Nonlinearity*, 23(1):55–75, 2009.
- [23] B. Pietras, N. Gallice, and T. Schwalger. Low-dimensional firing-rate dynamics for populations of renewal-type spiking neurons. *Phys. Rev. E*, 102:022407, 2020.
- [24] V Schmutz, W. Gerstner, and T. Schwalger. Mesoscopic population equations for spiking neural networks with synaptic short-term plasticity. *J. Math. Neurosci.*, 10(5), 2020.
- [25] T. Schwalger and A. V. Chizhov. Mind the last spike – firing rate models for mesoscopic populations of spiking neurons. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.*, 58:155–166, 2019.
- [26] T. Schwalger, M. Deger, and W. Gerstner. Towards a theory of cortical columns: From spiking neurons to interacting neural populations of finite size. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 13(4):e1005507, 2017.
- [27] H. R. Wilson and J. D. Cowan. Excitatory and inhibitory interactions in localized populations of model neurons. *Biophys. J.*, 12(1):1, 1972.