

# Infinitesimal phase response functions can be misleading

Christoph Börgers

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Mathematics, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02421, USA*

---

## Abstract

Phase response functions are the central tool in the mathematical analysis of pulse-coupled oscillators. When an oscillator receives a brief input pulse, the phase response function specifies how its phase shifts as a function of the phase at which the input is received. When the pulse is weak, it is customary to linearize around zero pulse strength. The result is called the *infinitesimal* phase response function. These ideas have been used extensively in theoretical biology, and also in some areas of engineering. I give examples showing that the infinitesimal phase response function may predict that two oscillators, as they exchange pulses back and fourth, will converge to synchrony, yet this is false when the exact phase response function is used, for all positive interaction strengths. For short, the analogue of the Hartman-Grobman theorem that one might expect to hold at first sight is invalid. I give a condition under which the prediction derived using the infinitesimal phase response function does hold for the exact phase response function when interactions are sufficiently weak but positive. However, I argue that this condition may often fail to hold.

*Keywords:* phase oscillator, phase response function, infinitesimal phase response function, pulse-coupled oscillators, synchrony, Hartman-Grobman theorem

---

## 1. Phase oscillators, phase response functions, and synchrony

In this paper, I present a greatly expanded discussion of a calculation from [1], concerning pulse-coupled phase oscillators. Although I have in mind periodically firing neurons, or perhaps populations of neurons that periodically fire spike volleys, the mathematics may be applicable in other contexts as well. In this section, I review some background.

### 1.1. Phase oscillators

Stable oscillators are usually described mathematically as points moving along an attracting limit cycle in a phase space. For simplicity, we will say that the *oscillator* (rather than the point in phase space) moves along the limit cycle.

A *phase oscillator* is one that never leaves the limit cycle, not even in response to inputs. Further, the dynamics are assumed to be *autonomous*, meaning that in the absence of inputs, the velocity of motion only depends on position in phase space. Therefore at any time, even when there have been *past* inputs, the remaining time to cycle completion in the absence of *future* inputs lies between 0 and  $T$ , where  $T$  is the period of the oscillator in the absence of *any* inputs. “Cycle completion” must, of course, be defined in an arbitrary way. We think of neurons firing periodic trains of action potentials, or networks of neurons firing periodic spike volleys, and mean firing by “cycle completion”.

We define the *phase* of a phase oscillator to be

$$\varphi = \frac{T - r}{T}$$

where  $r$  is the remaining time to cycle completion in the absence of future inputs. We have

$$\varphi \in [0, 1]$$

always, and the state of the oscillator is completely characterized by  $\varphi$ .

The phase description is a common idealization in the study of coupled oscillators. It is an approximation to reality, always somewhat inaccurate, and often inappropriate. For example, an input to a neuron can delay the next firing by far more than  $T$  [2, Figure 1], and it can even halt firing altogether [3]. Such examples do involve leaving the limit cycle, and are outside the scope of this article.

The main example in this paper is the Ermentrout-Kopell theta neuron model [4], which explicitly incorporates the assumption that the oscillator never leaves its limit cycle in response to external inputs; in fact, the model describes the motion of a point on the unit circle.

To view an oscillator as a *phase oscillator* is a more plausible approximation when inputs to the oscillator are weaker or the limit cycle underlying the oscillation is more strongly attracting. Nonetheless the phase description is commonly used not only for *infinitesimally* weak inputs, but also for

inputs of positive strength. In neuroscience, inputs of positive (sometimes considerable) strength are certainly of interest, especially if we think of an oscillator as representing a network of neurons.

### 1.2. Phase response functions

We assume inputs to the oscillators to be *instantaneous pulses*. This, too, is a simplification, and it is commonly denoted with the phrase *pulse-coupling*. The simplification is valid perhaps for instance as an idealization of fast AMPA-receptor-mediated excitatory synaptic pulses, but not valid in many other contexts.

When an oscillator at phase  $\varphi$  receives an input pulse of strength  $\epsilon$ , we assume that its phase changes instantaneously as a result:

$$\varphi \mapsto \varphi + g(\varphi, \epsilon).$$

The function  $g$  is called the *phase response function*. Phase response functions have been measured experimentally in many studies in the neuroscience literature; see for instance [2].

We will not yet be specific about what we mean by the “strength” of the input pulse. The parameter  $\epsilon$  is assumed to be  $\geq 0$ , with

$$g(\varphi, 0) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in [0, 1]. \quad (1)$$

Since phase, by our definition, always lies between 0 and 1, we must have

$$-\varphi \leq g(\varphi, \epsilon) \leq 1 - \varphi \quad \text{for } \varphi \in [0, 1], \epsilon \in [0, \infty). \quad (2)$$

We further assume that receipt of an input cannot *instantly* set a neuron to phase 0 or phase 1:

$$-\varphi < g(\varphi, \epsilon) < 1 - \varphi \quad \text{for } \varphi \in (0, 1), \epsilon \in [0, \infty). \quad (3)$$

“Phase 0” and “phase 1” denote the same thing — the time of firing. Nonetheless we think of  $g(0, \epsilon)$  and  $g(1, \epsilon)$  as two different quantities:  $g(0, \epsilon)$  is the phase shift that an input immediately *following* firing will cause, and  $g(1, \epsilon)$  is the phase shift that an input immediately *preceding* firing will cause. However, we will now argue that in the neuroscience context,  $g(0, \epsilon)$  and  $g(1, \epsilon)$  should in fact be the same, and both should be zero.

The assumption

$$g(0, \epsilon) = 0 \quad (4)$$

is justified by analogy with a neuron, which has a refractory period immediately following firing, during which it is input-insensitive. On the other hand, since input has little effect once the spike-generating currents have been activated, it is also reasonable to assume

$$g(1, \epsilon) = 0. \tag{5}$$

Finally, we assume that  $g$  is smooth:

$$g \in C^1([0, 1] \times [0, \infty)). \tag{6}$$

We have defined phase as a number in  $[0, 1]$ . It is mathematically tempting to view it instead as a point on the unit circle  $S^1$ , identifying  $\varphi$  with the complex number  $e^{2\pi i\varphi}$ . In that case, the mapping

$$\varphi \mapsto \varphi + g(\varphi, \epsilon)$$

(for fixed  $\epsilon$ ) becomes the mapping

$$S^1 \rightarrow S^1$$

described by

$$e^{2\pi i\varphi} \mapsto e^{2\pi i\varphi} e^{2\pi i g(\varphi, \epsilon)}.$$

Assumptions (2)–(6) make this mapping continuous. However, continuity of the mapping  $S^1 \rightarrow S^1$  is a weaker condition than (2)–(6); it would only require that the periodic extension of  $g(\varphi, \epsilon)$  (fixed  $\epsilon \geq 0$ ) from  $[0, 1]$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  be continuous up to jumps of integer magnitude. Our more specific assumptions about  $g$  are motivated by neuroscience, as I have explained.

### *1.3. Two interacting pulse-coupled phase oscillators*

Consider two identical phase oscillators  $A$  and  $B$  with period  $T$ . When  $A$  reaches phase 1 (fires), it sends a pulse to  $B$ , which causes the phase  $\varphi_B$  of  $B$  to shift from  $\varphi_B$  to  $\varphi_B + g(\varphi_B, \epsilon)$ . Similarly, when  $B$  reaches phase 1 (fires), it sends a pulse to  $A$ , causing the shift  $\varphi_A \mapsto \varphi_A + g(\varphi_A, \epsilon)$ .

We can now ask questions about the dynamics of  $A$  and  $B$ . For instance we can ask whether synchrony is attracting, that is, whether the two oscillators will synchronize their firing if started out sufficiently close in phase to each other.

Consider a time when  $\varphi_A = 0$  and  $\varphi_B \in (0, 1)$ . So  $A$  has just fired. We assume that it has had its effect on  $B$  already. After time  $(1 - \varphi_B)T$  elapses,  $B$  fires. At that time,  $A$  is at phase  $1 - \varphi_B$  and is advanced to phase  $1 - \varphi_B + g(1 - \varphi_B, \epsilon)$ . Now the roles reverse:  $B$  is at phase 0 and  $A$  is at a phase  $1 - \varphi_B + g(1 - \varphi_B, \epsilon) \in (0, 1)$ . After  $A$  fires next and has its effect on  $B$ ,  $B$  will be at phase  $F(\varphi_B, \epsilon)$  with

$$F(\varphi, \epsilon) = \varphi - g(1 - \varphi, \epsilon) + g(\varphi - g(1 - \varphi, \epsilon), \epsilon). \quad (7)$$

We call  $F$  the *strobe map* — it is as though a strobe light were turned on each time  $A$  completes a cycle, to check where  $B$  is. This idea for analyzing synchronization was suggested by Peskin in [5]. I first saw the word “strobe” for it in [6].

Since  $F(\varphi, \epsilon)$  is a phase, we must always have  $0 \leq F(\varphi, \epsilon) \leq 1$ . Indeed this follows easily from (2). The two oscillators implement fixed point iteration for the function  $F(\cdot, \epsilon)$ :

$$\varphi_{k+1} = F(\varphi_k, \epsilon), \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \quad (8)$$

where  $\varphi_k$  is the phase of  $B$  after  $A$  has completed its  $k$ -th cycle and has had its effect on  $B$ . Therefore the analysis of synchronization now simply becomes an analysis of a fixed point iteration. Our assumptions imply that  $\varphi = 0$  and  $\varphi = 1$  are fixed points:

$$F(0, \epsilon) = 0, \quad F(1, \epsilon) = 1.$$

Synchrony is attracting if 0 and 1 are attracting fixed points.

In the standard analysis of fixed point iteration, derivatives at fixed points plays a central role. As should be expected, the derivatives of  $F(\cdot, \epsilon)$  at  $\varphi = 0$  and  $\varphi = 1$  are the same. A straightforward calculation shows the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *Assume (1)–(7). Then*

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \varphi}(0, \epsilon) = \frac{\partial F}{\partial \varphi}(1, \epsilon) = \left(1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(0, \epsilon)\right) \left(1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(1, \epsilon)\right). \quad (9)$$

The idea of the strobe map is usually attributed to Winfree [7], although Peskin’s 1975 course notes [5], where the same idea appeared in a special context, precede [7]. Peskin’s result was later generalized by Mirollo and

Strogatz in [8]. The literature on phase response functions and their use for the analysis of networks of oscillators has since become vast. For a review of phase response functions in neuroscience, see [9]. Phase response functions have also been used in engineering; see for instance [10, 11, 12].

#### 1.4. Infinitesimal phase response function

The linearization of  $g$  around  $\epsilon = 0$ ,

$$\tilde{g}(\varphi, \epsilon) = \frac{\partial g}{\partial \epsilon}(\varphi, 0)\epsilon, \quad (10)$$

is commonly called the *infinitesimal phase response function*.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $g \in C^2([0, 1] \times [0, \infty))$  satisfy assumptions (1)–(5). Then for sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ , (1)–(6) hold with  $g$  replaced by  $\tilde{g}$ .*

**Proof.** Because of the factor of  $\epsilon$  in (10),  $\tilde{g}(\varphi, 0) = 0$  for all  $\varphi \in [0, 1]$ . Because  $g \equiv 0$  for  $\varphi = 0$ , also  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial \epsilon} \equiv 0$  for  $\varphi = 0$ , and the analogous holds for  $\varphi = 1$ . Therefore  $\tilde{g}(0, \epsilon) = \tilde{g}(1, \epsilon) = 0$  for all  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . Since  $g \in C^2([0, 1] \times [0, \infty))$ ,  $\tilde{g} \in C^1([0, 1] \times [0, \infty))$ . Finally, these properties imply that (2) and (3) with  $g$  replaced by  $\tilde{g}$  hold for sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ .  $\square$

The infinitesimal phase response function  $\tilde{g}$  gives rise to the strobe map

$$\tilde{F}(\varphi, \epsilon) = \varphi - \tilde{g}(1 - \varphi, \epsilon) + \tilde{g}(\varphi - \tilde{g}(1 - \varphi, \epsilon), \epsilon).$$

## 2. Conditions for synchrony to be attracting

Throughout this section we consider two identical phase oscillators  $A$  and  $B$ , interacting via a phase response function  $g \in C^2([0, 1] \times [0, \infty))$  that satisfies (1)–(5). We assume that  $F$  is the strobe map defined by (7). We take  $\tilde{g}$  to be the associated infinitesimal phase response function; it is a phase response function for sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$  by Lemma 2. The phrase “for sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ ” will appear often in the subsequent discussion; we will abbreviate it by “for small  $\epsilon$ ” from here on.

2.1. Strongly and weakly attracting synchrony

**Definition 1.** We say that synchrony is  $g$ -attracting if 0 and 1 are locally attracting fixed points of  $F(\cdot, \epsilon)$ . We define  $g$ -repelling analogously.

The standard theory of fixed point iteration, together with eq. (9), shows:

**Lemma 3.** Synchrony is  $g$ -attracting if

$$\left| \left( 1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(0, \epsilon) \right) \left( 1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(1, \epsilon) \right) \right| < 1, \quad (11)$$

and it is  $g$ -repelling if

$$\left| \left( 1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(0, \epsilon) \right) \left( 1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(1, \epsilon) \right) \right| > 1. \quad (12)$$

It should be noted though that (11) and (12) are *sufficient* conditions for synchrony to be  $g$ -attracting and  $g$ -repelling, respectively, not *necessary* ones.

**Definition 2.** We say that synchrony is strongly  $g$ -attracting if (11) holds. We say that synchrony is weakly  $g$ -attracting if it is  $g$ -attracting but not strongly  $g$ -attracting. The terms strongly  $g$ -repelling and weakly  $g$ -repelling are defined analogously.

To say that synchrony is strongly  $g$ -attracting is to say that the *linearized* analysis of the fixed point iteration shows that 0 and 1 are attracting fixed points of  $F$ . To avoid confusion, we stress that this refers to linearization of  $F$  around  $\varphi = 0$  and  $\varphi = 1$ ;  $\epsilon > 0$  is fixed here. By contrast,  $\tilde{g}$  is obtained by linearizing  $g$  around  $\epsilon = 0$ .

When synchrony is strongly  $g$ -attracting, two oscillators  $A$  and  $B$  interacting through the phase response function  $g$  converge to synchrony exponentially fast when started out sufficiently close to synchrony.

Since  $\tilde{g}$  is, for small  $\epsilon$ , a phase response function, we can also talk about synchrony being  $\tilde{g}$ -attracting, strongly  $\tilde{g}$ -attracting, and so on.

**Lemma 4.** Synchrony is strongly  $\tilde{g}$ -attracting for small  $\epsilon$  if and only if one of the following two conditions holds.

$$\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(0, 0) + \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(1, 0) < 0, \quad (13)$$

or

$$\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(0, 0) = -\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(1, 0) \neq 0. \quad (14)$$

Synchrony is strongly  $\tilde{g}$ -repelling for small  $\epsilon$  if and only if

$$\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(0, 0) + \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(1, 0) > 0, \quad (15)$$

**Proof.** By definition, synchrony is strongly  $\tilde{g}$ -attracting if and only if

$$\left| \left( 1 + \frac{\partial \tilde{g}}{\partial \varphi}(0, \epsilon) \right) \left( 1 + \frac{\partial \tilde{g}}{\partial \varphi}(1, \epsilon) \right) \right| < 1.$$

By definition of  $\tilde{g}$ , this means

$$\left| \left( 1 + \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(0, 0)\epsilon \right) \left( 1 + \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(1, 0)\epsilon \right) \right| < 1,$$

that is,

$$\left| 1 + \left( \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(0, 0) + \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(1, 0) \right) \epsilon + \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(0, 0) \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(1, 0) \epsilon^2 \right| < 1.$$

This clearly holds for sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$  if and only if either (13) or (14) holds.

Similarly, synchrony is strongly  $\tilde{g}$ -repelling if and only if

$$\left| 1 + \left( \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(0, 0) + \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(1, 0) \right) \epsilon + \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(0, 0) \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(1, 0) \epsilon^2 \right| > 1.$$

This holds for sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$  if and only if (15) holds.  $\square$

## 2.2. Why weakly attracting synchrony may not be unusual

If inputs arriving around the time of firing have very little effect — as is typical for a neuron — then it seems not unreasonable that (4) and (5) could be strengthened like this:

$$g(0, \epsilon) = \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(0, \epsilon) = 0, \quad (16)$$

and

$$g(1, \epsilon) = \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(1, \epsilon) = 0. \quad (17)$$

For example (16) clearly holds if there is an *absolute* refractory period, a brief time following firing during which the neuron is *entirely* input-insensitive. Both (16) and (17) hold for an Ermentrout-Kopell theta neuron responding to instantaneous charge injections; see Section 4. Note that (16) and (17) imply that neither (11) nor (12) hold.

### 2.3. Very strongly $\tilde{g}$ -attracting synchrony

**Definition 3.** We say that synchrony is very strongly  $\tilde{g}$ -attracting for small  $\epsilon$  if (13) holds.

We don't define *very strongly  $\tilde{g}$ -repelling*, nor do we define *very strongly  $g$ -attracting* or *very strongly  $g$ -repelling*.

## 3. Results

**Theorem 1.** *It is possible for synchrony to be weakly  $\tilde{g}$ -attracting for small  $\epsilon$ , yet not  $g$ -attracting for any  $\epsilon$ . Two identical Ermentrout-Kopell theta neurons interacting via instantaneous charge injection provide an example. (See Section 4 for details.)*

Theorem 2 strengthens Theorem 1.

**Theorem 2.** *It is possible for synchrony to be weakly, or even strongly  $\tilde{g}$ -attracting, yet strongly  $g$ -repelling for all  $\epsilon$ .*

Theorem 3 provides conditions under which the infinitesimal phase response function does make the correct prediction.

**Theorem 3.** *(a) If synchrony is very strongly  $\tilde{g}$ -attracting for small  $\epsilon$ , it is strongly  $g$ -attracting for small  $\epsilon$ . (b) If synchrony is strongly  $\tilde{g}$ -repelling for small  $\epsilon$ , it is strongly  $g$ -repelling for small  $\epsilon$ .*

## 4. Proof of Theorem 1

### 4.1. The theta neuron

Ermentrout and Kopell [4] proposed to model a neuron as a point moving along the unit circle, with its position  $(\cos \theta(t), \sin \theta(t))$  governed by

$$\frac{d\theta}{dt} = 1 - \cos \theta + I(1 + \cos \theta). \quad (18)$$

The right-hand side of (18) is positive for all  $\theta$  if  $I > 0$ , which we will assume here. The period, that is, the time it takes for  $\theta$  to increase by  $2\pi$  and therefore for the moving point to move once around the unit circle, is then

$$T = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{dt}{d\theta} d\theta = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{1}{1 - \cos \theta + I(1 + \cos \theta)} d\theta = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{I}}. \quad (19)$$

See [13], [14], or [1] for discussions of what (18) has to do with a neuron, and also for an explanation why

$$v = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \tan \frac{\theta}{2} \quad (20)$$

should be considered the analogue of the “membrane potential” (interior voltage) of the neuron — notwithstanding the fact that it becomes infinite when  $\theta$  is an odd multiple of  $\pi$ . We say that the theta neuron “fires” when  $\theta$  reaches an odd multiple of  $\pi$ .

### 4.2. Instantaneous charge injections

An instantaneous injection of a positive amount of charge into a neuron would make the membrane potential jump. We will therefore assume that the response of a theta neuron to a brief input pulse is the jump

$$v \mapsto v + \Delta v. \quad (21)$$

We’ll assume  $\Delta v > 0$  here (*positive* charge is injected, the input is *excitatory*). Using eq. (20), eq. (21) translates into

$$\theta \mapsto 2 \arctan \left( \tan \frac{\theta}{2} + 2\Delta v \right). \quad (22)$$

### 4.3. The phase response function

Equation (22) does not yet describe the *phase* response, since  $\theta$  is not the same as the phase  $\varphi$ . The relation between  $\theta$  and  $\varphi$  is

$$\varphi = \frac{1 - \int_{\theta}^{\pi} \frac{1}{1 - \cos s + I(1 + \cos s)} ds}{T} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan \left( \frac{\tan \frac{\theta}{2}}{\sqrt{I}} \right). \quad (23)$$

We use (23) to express the right-hand side of (22) in terms of  $\varphi$ , and conclude that (22) translates into

$$\varphi \mapsto \varphi + \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan \left( \tan \left( \left( \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \right) \pi \right) + \frac{2\Delta v}{\sqrt{I}} \right) - \left( \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \right).$$

To simplify the notation, we write

$$\epsilon = \frac{2\Delta v}{\sqrt{I}}.$$

So

$$g(\varphi, \epsilon) = \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan \left( \tan \left( \left( \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \right) \pi \right) + \epsilon \right) - \left( \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \right). \quad (24)$$

A straightforward computation verifies (16) and (17) now.

### 4.4. Synchrony is neutrally $g$ -stable for all $\epsilon \geq 0$

We insert (24) into (7) and find a surprise:

$$F(\varphi, \epsilon) = \varphi \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in [0, 1], \quad \epsilon \geq 0. \quad (25)$$

The exchange of one pulse from  $B$  to  $A$  and one from  $A$  to  $B$  brings the phase difference between the two theta neurons back to where it started. Any initial phase difference persists. This is true for all  $\epsilon > 0$ .

### 4.5. Synchrony is weakly $\tilde{g}$ -attracting for small $\epsilon$

We now replace (24) by its local linear approximation near  $\epsilon = 0$ :

$$\tilde{g}(\varphi, \epsilon) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{1 + \tan^2 \left( \left( \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \right) \pi \right)} \epsilon. \quad (26)$$

For sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ , for example for  $\epsilon \leq 1$ ,  $\tilde{g} < 1 - \varphi$  for  $\varphi \in (0, 1)$ , so  $\tilde{g}$  is indeed a valid phase response function. We insert (26) into (7) to find the strob map

$$\tilde{F}(\varphi, \epsilon) = \varphi + \frac{\epsilon}{2\pi} \cos(2\pi\varphi) - \frac{\epsilon}{2\pi} \cos(2\pi\varphi + \epsilon \cos(2\pi\varphi) - \epsilon). \quad (27)$$

Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be fixed. A straightforward calculation shows that in the limit as  $\varphi \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\tilde{F}(\varphi, \epsilon) = \varphi - 2\epsilon^2\pi^2\varphi^3 + O(\varphi^4) < \varphi. \quad (28)$$

This implies that for sufficiently small  $\varphi$ ,  $\tilde{F}(\varphi, \epsilon) < \varphi$ . Therefore the sequence  $\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots$  generated by fixed point iteration is decreasing if  $\varphi_0$  is close enough to 0, and since it is bounded below by 0 it must converge. The limit must be a fixed point of  $\tilde{F}(\cdot, \epsilon)$ , and for sufficiently small  $\varphi_0 > 0$ , that fixed point must be 0. So  $\varphi = 0$  is an attracting fixed point.

Arguments like those given in the preceding paragraph show that  $\varphi = 1$  is an attracting fixed point as well. We conclude that synchrony is  $\tilde{g}$ -attracting. It is *weakly*  $\tilde{g}$ -attracting because  $\frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \varphi}(0, \epsilon) = \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \varphi}(1, \epsilon) = 1$ . On the other hand, when the phase response function is  $g$ , synchrony is just *neutrally* stable, not attracting.

This proves Theorem 1.

## 5. Proof of Theorem 2

### 5.1. Example 1: Weakly $\tilde{g}$ -attracting, yet strongly $g$ -repelling

This example is a modification of the phase response function of the theta neuron:

$$g(\varphi, \epsilon) = \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan \left( \tan \left( \left( \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \right) \pi \right) + \epsilon \right) - \left( \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \right) + \varphi(1 - \varphi)^2 \epsilon^2. \quad (29)$$

Compare this with eq. (24): It is the phase response function for the theta neuron, plus  $\varphi(1 - \varphi)^2 \epsilon^2$ . Unfortunately I am not aware of any neuroscience motivation for this formula. I added the term  $\varphi(1 - \varphi)^2 \epsilon^2$  simply to construct an interesting mathematical example.

Using that (16) and (17) hold for the phase response function of the theta neuron, we have

$$\left(1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(0, \epsilon)\right) \left(1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(1, \epsilon)\right) = 1 + \epsilon^2 > 1.$$

So synchrony is strongly  $g$ -repelling for all  $\epsilon > 0$ . However, the *infinitesimal* phase response function, namely the linearization around  $\epsilon = 0$ , is the same as for the theta neuron — we just added a term of size  $O(\epsilon^2)$ . Synchrony is weakly  $\tilde{g}$ -attracting for small  $\epsilon$ , but strongly  $g$ -repelling for all  $\epsilon > 0$ .

### 5.2. Example 2: Strongly $\tilde{g}$ -attracting yet strongly $g$ -repelling

Let

$$g(\varphi, \epsilon) = \varphi(1 - \varphi)\epsilon - 2\varphi(\varphi - 1)^2(2\varphi - 1)\epsilon^2. \quad (30)$$

Here

$$\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(0, 0) = -\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(1, 0) = 1.$$

Therefore synchrony is strongly  $\tilde{g}$ -attracting for small  $\epsilon$  by Lemma 4. However,

$$\left(1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(0, \epsilon)\right) \left(1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(1, \epsilon)\right) = (1 + \epsilon + 2\epsilon^2)(1 - \epsilon) = 1 + \epsilon^2 - 2\epsilon^3 > 1$$

for small  $\epsilon$ , so synchrony is strongly  $g$ -repelling for small  $\epsilon$ .

This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.

## 6. Proof of Theorem 3

Now suppose that synchrony is *very* strongly  $\tilde{g}$ -attracting. Recall that by definition, this means that (13) holds. Then, expanding around  $\epsilon = 0$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(0, \epsilon)\right) \left(1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varphi}(1, \epsilon)\right) \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(0, 0)\epsilon + o(\epsilon)\right) \left(1 + \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(1, 0)\epsilon + o(\epsilon)\right) \\ &= 1 + \left(\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(0, 0) + \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial \varphi \partial \epsilon}(1, 0)\right)\epsilon + o(\epsilon) < 1 \end{aligned}$$

for small  $\epsilon$ . This proves part (a) of Theorem 3. Part (b) is proved analogously.

## 7. Summary and a concluding comment

### 7.1. Summary

The infinitesimal phase response function first approximates the behavior of  $g$  near  $\epsilon = 0$ , then analyzes synchrony by studying the behavior near  $\varphi = 0$  and  $\varphi = 1$ . What one really wants to know is the behavior near  $\varphi = 0$  and  $\varphi = 1$  for fixed small  $\epsilon > 0$ . There is no reason why these should be the same, and the examples given here show that they aren't always the same.

### 7.2. Comparison with the Hartman-Grobman theorem

The Hartman-Grobman theorem states that if linearization near an equilibrium of a dynamical system yields a definite prediction about the dynamics near the equilibrium, that prediction holds (qualitatively) for the non-linear problem. See [15] for a particularly nice version of the theorem. The examples I have given here show that if linearization around  $\epsilon = 0$  yields a definite prediction about whether synchrony is attracting, that prediction may still be false for the non-linear problem, for arbitrarily small but possible interaction strengths. The analogue of the Hartman-Grobman theorem that one might expect at first sight does not hold here.

Theorem 2 shows that even if linearization of  $g$  around  $\epsilon = 0$ , then linearization of  $F$  around  $\varphi = 0$  and  $\varphi = 1$ , yields a definite prediction for small  $\epsilon > 0$ , that prediction may still be false. In other words, the analogue of the Hartman-Grobman theorem that one might expect at *second* sight is also false.

Theorem 3 gives a condition under which the prediction of the analysis based on  $\tilde{F}$  *does* hold for  $F$ , but Section 2.2 explains why situations in which that condition is satisfied may not be typical.

**Acknowledgments.** I thank an anonymous reviewer for an exceptionally thorough and thoughtful report, which led to very substantial clarifications, improvements, and extensions. I also thank Nancy Kopell, whose comments and questions resulted in Theorems 2 and 3.

## References

- [1] C. Börgers, An Introduction to Modeling Neuronal Dynamics, Texts in Applied Mathematics 66, Springer, 2017.

- [2] E. Phoka, H. Cuntz, A. Roth, and M. Häusser, A new approach for determining phase response curves reveals that Purkinje cells can act as perfect integrators, *PLOS Comp. Biol.* 6 (2010) e1000768.
- [3] C. Börgers, M. Krupa, and S. Gielen, The response of a population of classical Hodgkin-Huxley neurons to an inhibitory input pulse, *J. Comp. Neurosci.* 28 (2010) 509–526.
- [4] G. B. Ermentrout, N. Kopell, Parabolic bursting in an excitable system coupled with a slow oscillation, *SIAM J. Appl. Math* 46 (1986) 233–253.
- [5] C. S. Peskin, *Mathematical Aspects of Heart Physiology*, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, New York, 1975.
- [6] S. H. Strogatz, *Sync*, Hachette Books, 2003.
- [7] A. T. Winfree, *The Geometry of Biological Time*, Springer-Verlag, 1980.
- [8] R. E. Mirollo, S. H. Strogatz, Synchronization of pulse-coupled biological oscillators, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 50 (1990) 1645–1662.
- [9] R. M. Smeal, G. B. Ermentrout, J. A. White, Phase-response curves and synchronized neural networks, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* 365 (2010) 2407–2422.
- [10] Y. Kato, N. Yamamoto, H. Nakao, Semiclassical phase reduction theory for quantum synchronization, *Phs. Rev. Research* 1, 033012 (2019).
- [11] I. A. Loe, H. Nakao, Y. Jimbo, K. Kotani, Phase-reduction for synchronization of oscillating flow by perturbation on surrounding structure, *J. Fluid Mech.* 911 (R2) (<https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2020.1110b>) (2021).
- [12] Y. Wang, F. Núñez, F. J. Doyle, Increasing sync rate of pulse-coupled oscillators via phase response function design: Theory and application to wireless networks, *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.* 21 (4) (2013) 1455–1462.
- [13] B. B. Ermentrout, Type I membranes, phase resetting curves, and synchrony, *Neural Compl* 8 (1996) 979–1001.
- [14] C. Börgers, N. Kopell, Effects of noisy drive on rhythms in networks of excitatory and inhibitory neurons, *Neural Comp.* 17 (3) (2005) 557–608.

- [15] M. Guysinsky, B. Hasselblatt, V. Rayskin, Differentiability of the Hartman-Grobman linearization, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 9 (4) (2003) 979–984.