

# Inductively coupled Josephson junctions: a platform for rich neuromorphic dynamics

G. Baxevanis

*School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 54124 Thessaloniki, Greece*

J. Hizanidis\*

*Institute of Electronic Structure and Laser, Foundation for Research and Technology-Hellas, 70013 Heraklion, Greece and  
Institute of Nanoscience and Nanotechnology, National Center for Scientific Research, “Demokritos”, 15341 Athens, Greece*

(Dated: January 8, 2025)

Josephson junctions (JJs) are by nature neuromorphic hardware devices capable of mimicking excitability and spiking dynamics. When coupled together or combined with other superconducting elements, they can emulate additional behaviors found in biological neurons. From a technological point of view, JJ-based neuromorphic systems are particularly appealing since they present THz-speed processing and they operate with near-zero power dissipation. In this work we study a system of inductively coupled JJs and focus on the nonlinear dynamical aspects of its neurocomputational properties. In particular, we report on spiking behavior, synchronization, first spike latency effects, and multistability. Special emphasis is placed on the bursting dynamics this system is capable of reproducing, and a new underlying mechanism is proposed beyond the approach followed in prior works.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Since their discovery in the early 1960s [1–3], Josephson junctions (JJs) remain at the forefront of advancing technology in superconducting electronics, sensing, high frequency devices, and quantum science. An important JJ-based device is the Superconducting Quantum Interference Device (SQUID), a highly sensitive magnetometer that uses JJs to measure extremely small magnetic fields [4, 5]. Josephson junctions are also incorporated in Rapid Single-Flux Quantum (RSFQ) technology, as elements of ultrafast and low-power digital circuits [6], and in superconducting metamaterials with unique tunable electromagnetic properties [7]. In addition, Josephson junctions are employed in quantum computing since they constitute the key component of superconducting quantum bits (qubits) [8]. Another fascinating application involves the exploration of JJs for the design of superconducting neuromorphic computing systems [9].

Neuromorphic computing with Josephson junctions presents many advantages. First of all, JJs are by nature neuromorphic hardware devices capable of mimicking excitability and spiking behavior [10], as demonstrated by the fundamental dynamical model for the device, namely the Resistively and Capacitively Shunted Junction (RCSJ) model [11]. When combined in circuits, Josephson junctions are capable of emulating additional properties of biological neurons. Moreover, superconductor-based neuromorphic systems are particularly appealing since they present THz-speed processing which far surpasses CMOS-based neuromorphic chips [12]. Furthermore, they operate with near-zero power dissipation even when cryogenic cooling is taken into account and have excellent scaling properties. Finally, superconducting neuromorphic systems combine

classical analog dynamics with quantum effects for versatile computation.

The number of neuromorphic device implementations using superconducting elements shows a significant increase over the last few years. These involve circuit simulations, theoretical modeling, and experimental efforts. Several works employ coupled Josephson junctions for the emulation of single neurons, transmission lines, and synapses [13–18]. Other setups use circuitry components based on superconducting quantum-phase slip junctions [19, 20], SQUIDs combined with JJs [16, 21, 22], superconducting nanowires [23–25], or incorporate superconducting electronics with integrated photonics creating hybrid hardware platforms [26, 27]. A recent review can be found in [9].

As already stressed, the single Josephson junction is capable of mimicking the behavior of a biological neuron insofar as it exhibits excitability and spiking [10]. When coupled together, JJs can reproduce even more characteristic neurophysiological properties, namely action potentials, refractory periods, and firing thresholds [13]. Nonlinearity is a key feature of JJs and biological neurons which are inherently nonlinear dynamical systems due to their ability to process, integrate, and transmit signals in complex, time-dependent ways [28, 29]. Information processing in the brain depends not only on the electrophysiological properties of neurons but also on their dynamical properties. This fact has inspired nonlinear dynamics based computing, which exploits the rich behavior of nonlinear dynamical systems for computation purposes [30, 31].

In this spirit, there have been a few studies on superconducting neurons where the focus is placed on the nonlinear dynamical aspect of neurocomputation. More specifically, Ref. [32] numerically confirms the spiking and bursting behavior in the Resistive Capacitive inductive Shunted Josephson junction (RCLSJ) model and the underlying mechanism is explained through a qualitative

\* Correspondence email address: hizanidis@physics.uoc.gr

bifurcation analysis. Bursting dynamics has also been reported for resistively coupled Josephson junctions [33] as well as globally coupled mixed populations of oscillatory and excitable JJs [34]. The distinct form of the action potential is remarkably reproduced by a system of inductively coupled JJs [13], a detailed bifurcation analysis confirms neural excitability type I and II, while chaos and noise-induced bursting are also observed [35].

In the present work, we address another configuration of inductively coupled JJs which was first introduced in the context of superconducting interferometers [36], but no association was made with the neuromorphic properties of this device. Through an in-depth dynamical analysis we will explore the system's rich neuron-like behavior and we will also attempt to elucidate the mechanisms behind certain dynamics which have been overlooked in prior studies.

The paper is organized as follows: in Sec. II we derive the coupled Josephson junction model (which from now on will be referred to as JJ neuron) and make a brief comparison to previous relevant models. In Sec. III a linear stability analysis is undertaken and the bifurcations involving fixed points are discussed. Section IV deals with the global dynamics and the associated neuro-computational properties of the JJ neuron, namely spiking behavior (Sec. IV A), first spike latency (Sec. IV B), and bursting (Sec. IV C). We summarize our results and propose topics for further studies in Sec. V.

## II. THE MODEL

The circuit corresponding to the model under study involves two Josephson junctions in a loop, driven by a dc current source  $i_s$ , as shown in the schematic figure of Fig. 1(a), where JJs are marked with the symbol "×". The JJs are inductively coupled with the total inductance of the circuit divided into two portions, namely  $2\alpha L$  on the right and  $2(1-\alpha)L$  on the left, where  $\alpha$  is an asymmetry parameter in the sense that  $\alpha \neq 0.5$  ensures that the currents carried by the two junctions differ. The labels "1" and "2" mark the left and right junction, respectively.

The Josephson junctions are nonlinear superconducting elements made of two superconductors that are weakly coupled through a non-superconducting gap, such as an insulator. Each superconductor may be characterized by a single macroscopic wavefunction with a corresponding phase. When the current applied to the JJ is less than a critical threshold  $I_c$  no voltage will develop across the junction; that is, the junction acts as if it had zero resistance. However, the JJ is characterized by a constant phase difference  $\phi$  that satisfies the Josephson current-phase relation according to which the current is equal to  $I_c \sin \phi$ . When the threshold is exceeded, a voltage develops across the junction that obeys the Josephson voltage-phase relation  $V = (\hbar/2e)d\phi/dt = (\Phi_0/2\pi)d\phi/dt$  where  $\Phi_0$  is the flux quantum,  $t$  denotes the time,  $e$  is

the electron charge and  $\hbar$  is the Planck's constant.




Figure 1: (a) Schematic diagram of the circuit for the inductively coupled JJ model. (b) RCSJ equivalent circuit of the single Josephson junction.

Within the framework of the Resistively and Capacitively Shunted Junction (RCSJ) model [3], the JJ is treated as a parallel circuit consisting of an ideal Josephson element, a resistor, and a capacitor, driven by a constant current source  $i$ , schematically shown in Fig. 1(b). The current flowing through the junction is the sum of the supercurrent through an ideal JJ, the displacement current through the capacitor  $C$  and a resistive current through the resistor  $R$ :

$$\frac{\hbar C}{2e} \frac{d^2 \phi}{dt^2} + \frac{\hbar}{2eR} \frac{d\phi}{dt} + I_c \sin \phi = i. \quad (1)$$

The mechanical analog of the RCSJ model is the damped pendulum driven by a constant torque. When  $i$  exceeds a critical value, a magnetic flux pulse [6] is created in analogy to the whirling solution in the pendulum [37]. This magnetic flux pulse forms the basis for the neuron-like oscillatory dynamics exhibited by JJ neuron model, which will be studied in the following sections.

Using the following normalizations:  $\tau^2 = t^2/(LC)$ ,  $\gamma = LI_c/\Phi_0$ ,  $\beta = R^{-1}\sqrt{L/C}$ ,  $I_s = i_s/I_c$ , and applying Kirchoff's laws for the circuit of the system under study [Fig. 1(a)], we obtain the dimensionless equations for the JJ neuron model:

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\phi}_1 + \beta \dot{\phi}_1 + 2\pi\gamma \sin \phi_1 &= -\frac{1}{2}(\phi_1 - \phi_2) + 2\pi\alpha\gamma I_s, \\ \ddot{\phi}_2 + \beta \dot{\phi}_2 + 2\pi\gamma \sin \phi_2 &= \frac{1}{2}(\phi_1 - \phi_2) + 2\pi(1-\alpha)\gamma I_s, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the dot notation refers to differentiation with respect to  $\tau$ .

In this work the focus will be on the analogies of this model to the biological neuron, i. e. we will cover all the neuronal properties that this model is capable of emulating. The main variable whose dynamics we will study is the voltage  $V_{1,2} = \dot{\phi}_{1,2}$  that corresponds to the membrane potential of the biological neuron, and the control parameters will be  $I_s$  and  $\alpha$  that define the postsynaptic current received by the neuron. Note that in previous works on inductively-coupled JJs in a different circuit [13, 35] the action potential was reproduced by a different quantity, namely the sum of the two phases  $\phi_1 + \phi_2$ , while the voltages across the two junctions corresponded to the ionic

currents flowing in real neurons,  $Na^+$  and  $K^+$ , respectively. That is, each model, depending on the coupling, is capable of emulating neuron-like behaviors through different variables.

As far as dimensionless parameters are concerned, the values we have used stem from physically meaningful ones provided by the rapid single-flux quantum (RFSQ) circuitry [6, 14]. Typical values for the critical current are  $I_{cr} \in [10 - 100 \mu A]$ , for the inductance  $L \in [1 - 100 pH]$ , the input current  $i_s$  takes values close to  $I_{cr}$ , and the junction size, which determines its capacitor  $C$  and resistance  $R$  is in the range of  $0.7 - 5 \mu m$ . Based on these values, we obtain the dimensionless parameters  $\beta = 4.5$ ,  $\Gamma = 10$ , and  $\alpha = 0.6$  that were also also in [36]. Similarly, the bias current is kept within a plausible range  $(0, 2]$ .

It is important to note here that the choice of  $\Gamma = 10$  ensures large inductances, thus yielding the system a slow-fast dynamical model, which is crucial for the bursting behavior that we will address in Sec. IV C. In the following section, we derive expressions for the fixed points of the system and perform a linear stability analysis.

### III. LINEAR STABILITY ANALYSIS

Although fixed points in terms of neuronal dynamics correspond to resting states and as such are not particularly interesting from a neurcomputation point of view, we will see that they play an important role for the more complicated, global dynamics presented further in the manuscript. By setting  $V_1 = \dot{\phi}_1$  and  $V_2 = \dot{\phi}_2$ , the system of Eqs. 2 is transformed to the following set of equations:

$$\dot{\phi}_1 = V_1, \quad (4)$$

$$\dot{V}_1 = -\beta V_1 - 2\pi\gamma \sin \phi_1 - \frac{1}{2}(\phi_1 - \phi_2) + 2\pi\alpha\gamma I_s, \quad (5)$$

$$\dot{\phi}_2 = V_2, \quad (6)$$

$$\dot{V}_2 = -\beta V_2 - 2\pi\gamma \sin \phi_2 + \frac{1}{2}(\phi_1 - \phi_2) + 2\pi(1 - \alpha)\gamma I_s. \quad (7)$$

In this way, the evolution of the system can be visualized as a trajectory in the phase plane  $(\phi_1, V_1, \phi_2, V_2)$ . Then, the equilibria  $(\phi_1^*, 0, \phi_2^*, 0)$  of the system are provided by solving the following equations:

$$\phi_1^* = \phi_2^* + 4\pi\gamma \sin \phi_2^* - 4\pi(1 - \alpha)\gamma I_s, \quad (8)$$

$$\phi_2^* = \phi_1^* + 4\pi\gamma \sin \phi_1^* - 4\pi\alpha\gamma I_s. \quad (9)$$

The next step is to calculate the stability of the equilibria. The Jacobian of the fixed points reads:

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -2\pi\gamma \cos \phi_1^* - 1/2 & -\beta & 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1/2 & 0 & -2\pi\gamma \cos \phi_2^* - 1/2 & -\beta \end{bmatrix}, \quad (10)$$




Figure 2:  $V_1$  (black) and  $V_2$  (red) nullclines for (a)  $I_s = 2.0$  and (b)  $I_s = 1.3$ .




Figure 3: Zoom-in of nullclines for (a)  $I_s = 1.9999$ , (b)  $I_s = 1.999$ , (c)  $I_s = 1.99$ , (d)  $I_s = 1.92$ , and (e)  $I_s = 1.9$ . Full circles denote stable nodes, open circles are saddle points, full squares are stable foci, and open squares are saddle-foci.

while the characteristic equation is given by:

$$\lambda^4 + 2\beta\lambda^3 + \lambda^2 [\beta^2 + 1 + 2\gamma\pi(\cos \phi_1^* + \cos \phi_2^*)] + \lambda\beta [1 + 2\gamma\pi(\cos \phi_1^* + \cos \phi_2^*)] + \gamma\pi[\cos \phi_1^* + \cos \phi_2^* + 4\gamma\pi \cos \phi_1^* \cos \phi_2^*] = 0, \quad (11)$$

with roots that provide the eigenvalues of the fixed points:

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{2}(-\sqrt{-A+C} - \beta), \quad (12)$$

$$\lambda_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{-A+C} - \beta), \quad (13)$$

$$\lambda_3 = -\frac{1}{2}(-\sqrt{A+C} - \beta), \quad (14)$$

$$\lambda_4 = \frac{1}{2}(-\sqrt{A+C} - \beta), \quad (15)$$

where

$$A = 2\sqrt{4\gamma^2\pi^2(\cos\phi_1^* - \cos\phi_2^*)^2 + 1}. \quad (16)$$

$$C = \beta^2 - 4\gamma\pi(\cos\phi_1^* + \cos\phi_2^*) - 2. \quad (17)$$

The fixed points can be found geometrically in the  $(\phi_1, \phi_2)$  plane, as intersections of the  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  nullclines given by Eqs. 8–9. Plugging 9 into 8 we obtain the expression  $\sin\phi_1 + \sin\phi_2 = I_s$ , which automatically imposes a maximum value  $I_s = 2$  above which no fixed points are to be found. This is visible in Fig. 2(a) where the two nullclines are plotted in the  $(\phi_1, \phi_2)$  projection, and for this specific value of  $I_s$  are tangent to each other. As  $I_s$  decreases (and for all other parameters fixed) the  $V_1$  nullcline moves upward, while the  $V_2$  nullcline moves to the right, resulting in an ever increasing number of intersections, and thus, fixed points.




Figure 4: Saddle-node (blue solid line) and saddle-saddle (red dashed line) bifurcation lines occurring in the  $(\alpha, I_s)$  parameter plane, in the vicinity of  $I_s = 2$ .

A typical case is shown for  $I_s = 1.3$  in Fig. 2(b). Note that the nullclines consist of infinitely many parabolic-shaped “slices” which are equivalent to each other since they merely are shifted by  $\pm 2\pi$  in both directions. Therefore, one can just focus on one of those “slices”, for instance the ones closer to the zero horizontal axis. The maximum number of intersections (and thus fixed points) is achieved for  $I_s = 0$ , where the overlap of the nullclines is maximum. As  $I_s$  increases, the number of fixed points obeys the formula  $N_{\mathbf{FP}} = 160 - 80I_s$ , when  $I_s$  is varied by a step  $\Delta I_s = 0.025$ . For intermediate values of  $I_s$  the formula does not apply per se, however the general rule is that the number of fixed points is always an even number which decreases by 2 as  $I_s = 2$  is approached, where finally  $N_{\mathbf{FP}} = 0$ . This happens due to the saddle-node and saddle-saddle bifurcations that take place in turns, and will be discussed next.

Our analysis will start at the vicinity of  $I_s = 2$  and progress downward. Figure 3 shows the generation of fixed points in the interval  $I_s \in [1.9, 2)$ . At  $I_s = 1.9999$  (Fig. 3(a)) we have two fixed points: one stable node denoted by a full circle and one saddle point denoted by an open circle, which are born through a saddle-node (SN) bifurcation. At  $I_s = 1.999$  the number of fixed




Figure 5: Eigenvalues of the fixed points for  $I_s$  values marked in Fig. 4. (a) Corresponds to point A where we have one stable node and one saddle point, (b) corresponds to B, where we have 4 fixed points (1 stable node and 3 saddle points), and (c) corresponds to point C, where we have 1 stable focus, 1 saddle-focus, and 2 saddle points.  $\alpha = 0.6$ .

points increases by 2, as explained above, namely by 2 saddle points (Fig. 3(b)), this time via a saddle-saddle (SS) bifurcation. At  $I_s = 1.99$  the number of fixed points is the same, however their quality has changed: the stable node has become a stable focus, while one saddle point has turned into a saddle-focus, see Fig. 3(c).

The SN and SS bifurcations have been confirmed and followed in the  $(\alpha, I_s)$  parameter space, shown in Fig. 4,

via a powerful software tool that executes a root-finding algorithm for the continuation of solutions and bifurcations [38]. Labels A-C denote the position in the parameter space of the fixed points of Figs. 3(a-c). The corresponding eigenvalues of these fixed points are shown in Fig. 5: The stable node of Fig. 3(a) has four real negative eigenvalues shown in Fig. 5(a) (left), while the saddle-point has three real negative eigenvalues one positive, shown in Fig. 5(a) (right). Similarly, the eigenvalues of the four fixed points of Figs. 3(b) and (c) are shown in Figs. 5 (b) and (c), respectively. For uniformity, the symbols of the eigenvalues follow those of their corresponding fixed points.

At  $I_s = 1.92$  [Fig. 3(d)] the number of fixed points again increases by 2, namely by a pair of a stable-focus and saddle-focus, due to a SN bifurcation. Finally, at  $I_s = 1.9$  we have yet again an increase by 2 of the number of fixed points, this time by a pair of saddle-point and saddle-focus Fig. 3(e), through a SS bifurcation. This scenario is repeated with SN and SS bifurcations occurring in turns, increasing thus, the number of fixed points until  $I_s = 0$  is reached, where the maximum number of equilibria is achieved.




Figure 6: Number of stable fixed points shown with different colors, for  $\alpha \in [0.55, 0.65]$  and  $I_s \in [1.33, 2]$ . Black solid lines mark the saddle-node bifurcation. Other parameter values:  $b = 4.5$  and  $\gamma = 10$ . Vertical dashed line marks the value  $\alpha = 0.6$ .

Figure 6 shows the number of stable fixed points and the underlying saddle-node bifurcation lines through which they lose their stability, as parameters  $\alpha$  and  $I_s$  are varied. The borders between different colors mark the annihilation/generation of fixed points. For lower values of  $I_s$  there are many fixed points while when  $I_s > 2$  there are none. In the following, we will see how the nullclines and the associated fixed points affect the global dynamics and the associated neurocomputation properties of the system.

#### IV. MULTISTABLE GLOBAL DYNAMICS

Apart from the fixed points that we analyzed above, the system exhibits additional coexisting solutions that present very interesting neuron-like properties that we will look into in this section. For an overview of the full palette of dynamical behavior, we generate the orbit diagram in terms of the local minima and maxima (extrema) of the variable  $V_1$  in dependence on the control parameter  $I_s$ , shown in Fig. 7.




Figure 7: Local minima and maxima (extrema) of  $V_1$  in dependence of parameter  $I_s$ . I: the only attractor is a fixed point (neuron resting region), II: coexistence of spiking and resting (bistable region), III: coexistence of bursting, spiking, and resting (multistable region), and IV: the only attractor is a limit cycle. “SPD” marks the subcritical period doubling bifurcation while “SN” the saddle-node bifurcation. Other parameters are  $\alpha = 0.6$ ,  $b = 4.5$ , and  $\gamma = 10$ .

We distinguish four different dynamical regions as  $I_s$  is varied: In region I the only attractor is a fixed point and therefore the JJ neuron is resting. Region II is bistable as there is coexistence of a limit cycle and a fixed point, thus the JJ neuron is capable of both spiking and resting. The limit cycle is born at  $I_s = 1.3527$  via a subcritical period-doubling (SPD) bifurcation which will be discussed later. In-between the two bistable regimes there exists a multistable one, region III, where in addition to spiking and resting, the system also exhibits bursting dynamics. The multiple points extending over a long range of positive  $V_1$  values for a specific  $I_s$  correspond to the multiple peaks found within each burst. Finally in region IV the only attractor is a limit cycle, since the fixed point disappears via a saddle-node (SN) bifurcation. In what follows, we will undertake an in-depth study of the spiking and bursting dynamical properties of our system and see how they relate to neurocomputation.

### A. Spiking and synchronization

Spiking dynamics is observed in the regions II of Fig. 7 in which there is coexistence with the resting state. As analyzed in Sec. III and visualized in Fig. 6, the number of fixed point attractors decreases as  $I_s$  approaches the critical value  $I_s^{\text{crit}} = 2$ . Naturally, this has an effect on the basin of attraction of the spiking solution which expands as  $I_s^{\text{crit}}$  is approached and shrinks in the opposite direction, in the left region II of Fig. 7. The latter yields it harder to identify the corresponding limit cycle for lower values of  $I_s$ , because the phase space contains many equilibria that attract the trajectory of the system, and the spiking solution is less likely to be approached.




Figure 8: (a) A stable periodic orbit (solid line,  $I_s = 1.355$ ) coalesces with an unstable orbit with double its period and loses its stability (dashed line,  $I_s = 1.345$ ). Subcritical period doubling (SPD) bifurcation and line and saddle-node (SN) bifurcation line in the  $(\alpha, I_s)$  parameter plane. Other parameters are  $\alpha = 0.6$ ,  $b = 4.5$ , and  $\Gamma = 10$ .

The spiking behavior arises via a subcritical period doubling bifurcation: Viewed from the opposite direction (for decreasing  $I_s$ ) a stable limit cycle collides with an unstable limit cycle with double its period and loses its stability. Both stable (solid line) and unstable (dashed line) limit cycles are shown in the phase portrait of Fig. 8(a) in the  $(V_1, V_2)$  plane for  $I_s = 1.355$  and  $I_s = 1.345$ , respectively. At the critical point  $I_s^{\text{SPD}} = 1.3527$  the leading Floquet multiplier crosses the unit circle at the value  $-1$  which is a signature of the period-doubling bifurcation and has been confirmed with the bifurcation analysis and continuation software [38]. The SPD line has also been followed in the  $(\alpha, I_s)$  parameter space, shown in Fig. 8(b) in orange color. In addition we have plotted in blue color the saddle-node bifurcation lines (SN), which have been discussed in detail in Sec. III.

Within the spiking region we also address the issue of synchronization between the two Josephson junction neurons. In order to quantify this we calculate the phase difference  $\Delta\phi = |\phi_1 - \phi_2|$  of the two JJs as a function of the control parameter  $I_s$ . This is plotted in Fig. 9 where we observe that the level of synchronization oscillates periodically between the in-phase and anti-phase state. At the upper limit this is ongoing for  $I_s > 2.6$  (not included

in the figure), while at the lower limit it is terminated as the limit cycle vanishes in the aforementioned subcritical period-doubling bifurcation. The in-phase and anti-phase solutions where  $\Delta\phi = 1$  and  $0$ , respectively, are shown in the insets (a) and (b) of Fig. 9, in terms of the voltage variables. In-between these two states the trajectory as depicted in the  $(V_1, V_2)$  plane in Fig. 9(c) gradually develops from a cycle into a straight line.




Figure 9: Phase difference  $\Delta\phi = |\phi_1 - \phi_2|$  of two JJs over  $I_s$  for the spiking solution. (a) In-phase solution for  $I_s = 1.75$ , (b) anti-phase solution for  $I_s = 2.0$ , (c) Phase portrait for  $I_s = 1.85$  (blue),  $I_s = 1.8$  (orange), and  $I_s = 1.76$  (green). Other parameters are  $\alpha = 0.6$ ,  $b = 4.5$ , and  $\Gamma = 10$ .

Similar behavior has been observed in a different superconducting circuit of coupled JJs where a Josephson transmission line acts as the axon and the synapse is modeled by a SQUID. There, it was reported that the neurons are either desynchronized or synchronized in an in-phase or antiphase state, and that the tuning of the SQUID is capable of switching the system back and forth in a phase-flip bifurcation [14].

In terms of neurocomputation, synchronization plays a critical role in several cognitive functions by enabling efficient communication and coordination but may also reflect pathological brain states [39]. In addition, synchronization is closely linked to plasticity, i. e. the ability of neurons to adapt and learn by altering the strength of their connections in response to stimuli, and more specifically to Hebbian plasticity according to which “neurons that fire together, wire together” [28].

### B. First-spike latency

Another interesting behavior that we observe, which is related to the spiking dynamics and its interaction with the fixed points of the system, is the so-called “first spike latency” (FSL) property. The FSL effect is related to the existence of a significant delay in the production of the first spike [40]. In our system this effect is related to the “bottleneck” below and above  $I_s^{\text{crit}}$  and in order for FSL to be observed the system must be prepared in close proximity to the SN bifurcation.

Figure 10(a) shows the first-spike latency (FSL) effect






Figure 10: (a) Time-series of the  $V_2$  variable showing spike latency. (b) Spike latency time over  $I_s - I_s^{\text{SN}}$ , where  $I_s^{\text{crit}} = 2$ . The inset shows the scaling law  $1/T_{\text{FSL}} \sim O(\sqrt{I_s - I_s^{\text{crit}}})$  (black circles) and the corresponding linear fit (blue line) with a slope value of 0.52. Other parameters are  $\alpha = 0.6$ ,  $b = 4.5$ , and  $\Gamma = 10$ .

[10] in terms of the voltage variable  $V_2$ , while Fig. 10(b) shows the dependence of the first-spike latency on the distance from the critical current  $I_s^{\text{crit}} = 2$ . Interestingly, the inverse of FTL as a function of  $I_s - I_s^{\text{crit}}$  obeys a square root law, which is verified by the near 0.5 slope of the graph shown in the inset.

The FSL behavior is closely related to neural encoding, i. e. the process by which external environmental stimuli are mapped to neuronal electrical activity. Stimulus information is encoded in spikes, in both the firing rate and the spike timing [41]. In the first concept, the variable of interest is the amount of action potentials fired, while the second concentrates on the exact time at which spikes take place.

Concerning spike timing, a significant measure seems to be the time that ensues from stimulus arrival to first spike generation. This is often referred to as latency or first-spike or first-spike latency [42]. First-spike latency seems to be crucial in information integration and relay in biological neurons, especially at the population level in the case of sensory and retinal neurons [43, 44]. Exploiting first-spike latency to convey information, leads to a different type of information encoding known as time-to-first-spike coding (TTFS) [45]. Biological neural systems exploit TTFS, providing them with the significant advantage of a faster and more robust route for information transfer, compared to the firing rate.

In the realm of artificial intelligence, efforts are being made to develop neuromorphic hardware and algorithms that will enable spiking neural networks (SNNs) to perform comparably to classical artificial neural net-

works (ANNs), with substantially lower energy consumption [46]. In [47] the authors leverage TTFS coding to achieve equivalent performance to artificial neural networks (ANNs) on standard benchmarks with fewer than 0.3 spikes per neuron. To do so they overcome the challenges of vanishing or exploding gradients, unstable training dynamics and hardware related fine-tuning constraints, proposing low-latency neuromorphic hardware implementations of deep SNNs with performance on par with ANNs.

### C. Bursting

The last region of Fig. 7 we will examine in this subsection is region III, where spiking and resting coexist with bursting dynamics. In biological neurons, bursting is a rhythmic pattern of spikes, characterized by periods of rapid firing (bursts) interspersed with quiescent intervals. Bursting has been found in recordings of real neurons [29] and is considered to be linked to a distinct mode of neuronal signaling [48]. Moreover, bursting has profound implications for neurocomputation: Its multiscale dynamics, robustness, and efficiency make it essential for tasks involving temporal pattern recognition, learning, and synchronization [49].

Dynamically speaking, bursting originates, in general, from a fast motion controlled by a slow motion in a slow-fast dynamical system. This is in line with what actually happens in biological neurons, where fast spiking of  $Na^+$  and  $K^+$  ions are controlled by a slow process like  $Ca^{++}$  gated  $K^+$  ion movement. In autonomous bursting, that is for constant stimulus, there should be an additional variable with a slower timescale than those participating in the spiking, which is responsible for turning off and on the generation of the action potentials [29].

Bursting behavior in coupled Josephson junctions was first reported in [36], however the focus was not on dynamics, let alone neurocomputation, but rather on the properties of the system as a superconducting interferometer. The mechanism behind both autonomous and non-autonomous bursting has been qualitatively described for the single RCLSJ model in [32, 50]. The approach is based on the well-known bifurcation scenario of the RCSJ model [37], where spiking is achieved above a critical current threshold via a SNIC bifurcation for higher damping, while for lower damping there exists a bistable regime where resting and spiking coexist. In this case, spiking is achieved via a homoclinic bifurcation, while the resting dynamics vanishes through a fold (saddle-node) bifurcation at the critical current threshold. Before we turn to how bursting occurs in our system, we briefly summarize the corresponding bifurcation mechanisms for the single RCLSJ model which follow the classification done in [10].

Similarly to the RCSJ model, the autonomous RCLSJ system has two fixed points, one saddle point and one stable node, that participate in the aforementioned bifurcation scenario, triggered by the inductive current. For




Figure 11:  $V_1$  (black) and  $V_2$  (red) nullclines (Eqs. 8 and 9, respectively) and trajectory in the  $(\phi_1, \phi_2)$  plane (blue) for (a)  $I_s = 1.651$  and (b)  $I_s = 1.652$ , and their corresponding close-ups in (c) and (d). Panels (e) and (f) show the system variable time-series for the first (black line) and second (red line) Josephson junction, for  $I_s = 1.651$  and  $I_s = 1.652$ , respectively. Other parameters are  $\alpha = 0.6$ ,  $b = 4.5$ , and  $\gamma = 10$ .

high inductance, the inductive current is slow enough in comparison to the fast junction voltage. When the inductive current starts growing, the junction voltage starts spiking via a SNIC bifurcation. During the decaying process of the inductive current, the junction voltage also starts decaying in a spiral motion into the saddle-point-turned-saddle-focus via a homoclinic bifurcation. Therefore, the bursting in this case is of SNIC/homoclinic type.

In the non-autonomous RCLSJ model, there are two mechanisms that generate bursting, depending on the choice of damping: When the damping parameter is chosen in the SNIC region, below the critical current threshold, a slow periodic current pushes the dynamics in and out of the spiking regime via a SNIC bifurcation, generating bursting behavior of SNIC/SNIC type, also known as circle/circle or parabolic type. Alternatively, if the system is prepared in the bistable region, the external driving will periodically force it into the spiking regime via a fold bifurcation and bring it back to the resting state via a homoclinic bifurcation. In this case the bursting is of fold/homoclinic type.

The fold/homoclinic bursting mechanism has also been attributed to the model under study here [50], but merely as an assumption, since no formal study has been conducted to confirm it. In the following analysis, we present a different description for the creation of bursting in our system. Besides, this model involves two coupled junctions, i. e. it is a higher dimensional system than the single RCLSJ model and, as such, it is expected to exhibit more complex dynamics.

As shown in Fig. 7 the bursting dynamics coexists with spiking and resting behavior (region III). The onset of bursting is observed around  $I_s = 1.652$  where the system is indeed bistable as required for fold/homoclinic bursting to occur. This bistability is also illustrated in the corresponding basins of attraction in the  $(\phi_1, \phi_2)$  plane shown in Fig. 12(a), where light green areas indicate the initial conditions leading to spiking and blue areas those that lead to resting behavior. However, contrary to the single RCLSJ, here we have multiple pairs of stable-foci/saddle-foci and saddle/saddle-foci which do not have to undergo a fold bifurcation in order for bursting to occur, as in the



case of the RCLSJ model. Neither do we observe a homoclinic transition back into the resting state.

Once bursting occurs, the basins of attraction change dramatically. This is illustrated in Fig. 12(b), where the initial conditions leading to bursting are shown in pink. In both of the basins of attraction of Fig. 12 we have included the nullclines and the stable foci which are denoted by full rectangles. These are important in order for us to understand how bursting occurs, as explained next.




Figure 12: Basins of attraction in the  $(\phi_1, \phi_2)$  plane for (a)  $I_s = 1.651$  and (b)  $I_s = 1.652$ . Initial conditions  $V_1 = V_2 = 0$  have been used for the other two variables. Light green, blue, and pink areas mark spiking, resting, and bursting dynamics, respectively. White lines correspond to the nullclines, while full rectangles to the stable foci. Other parameters are  $\alpha = 0.6$ ,  $b = 4.5$ , and  $\Gamma = 10$ .

Just below bursting occurs, for  $I_s = 1.651$  [Fig. 11(a)], the trajectory is as follows: The system moves “along” the  $V_2$  nullcline (red nullcline, where  $\dot{V}_2 = 0$ ) up to its last intersection with the  $V_1$  nullcline (black nullcline, where  $\dot{V}_1 = 0$ ) and then moves “along” the latter until it is finally attracted to the uppermost stable focus of

this “slice”. This is better visualized in Fig. 11(c), where a blow-up of the trajectory is shown, as it terminates in the stable focus in a spiral motion. The corresponding time-series for all variables are shown in Fig. 11(e). We see that while the system “climbs” the  $V_2(V_1)$  nullcline, the slow phase variable  $\phi_1(\phi_2)$  starts growing and at the same time the voltage variable  $V_1(V_2)$  starts spiking. When  $\phi_1(\phi_2)$  stops growing,  $V_1(V_2)$  starts decaying into the stable focus and the system reaches the resting state.

As soon as bursting takes over, at  $I_s = 1.652$  [Fig. 11(b)], the first part of the trajectory is similar. The main difference here is that as the system finishes “climbing” the  $V_1$  nullcline, it is not attracted by the uppermost stable focus, but rather, spends some time in the vicinity of the saddle-point and then manages to escape to the next  $V_2$  nullcline [see Fig. 11(d)] and so on, resulting thus in a constant alternation between spiking and resting, which makes for bursting behavior [Fig. 11(f)]. Within the spiking phase, the system is attracted/repelled by the corresponding stable foci/saddle foci along the nullclines. It has no relation to the coexisting spiking state that is born via a SPD bifurcation, discussed in subsection IV A. This is also a major difference compared to the fold/homoclinic mechanism for bursting observed in the single driven RCLSJ model. Therefore, we believe that the bursting mechanism in the model under study is related to the interaction between the moving nullclines and the multiple fixed points and the way the system navigates through an everchanging phase space.




Figure 13: Three-dimensional phase space showing the coexisting trajectories for  $I_s = 1.652$ . Blue, light green, and pink color corresponds to resting, spiking, and bursting, respectively. The star marks the vicinity of the coordinates of the initial conditions used, and open circles denote the saddle-points. Other parameters are  $\alpha = 0.6$ ,  $b = 4.5$ , and  $\gamma = 10$ .

A typical instance of the phase space in the multistable region is finally shown in the three-dimensional projection of Fig. 13. For clarity, we have used the same code as in Fig. 11, i. e. the resting trajectory is blue, the spiking

one is light green, and the bursting one is in pink color. All three trajectories start in close proximity (marked by the star). The blue trajectory is quickly attracted to the stable focus, while the light green one ends up in the limit cycle. The pink trajectory oscillates between spiking and resting, the latter of which happens in the vicinity of the saddle points that are also included in the plot.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, inductively-coupled Josephson junctions serve as an excellent platform for reproducing key neurophysiological behaviors. This and the fact that they are capable of operating in great speeds with near zero power dissipation yield them very promising candidates for neuromorphic computing.

In this study we addressed a system first introduced in the context of superconducting interferometers and undertook an in-depth analysis of its neurocomputational properties. The model presents multistability where the local dynamics of fixed points (neuron resting state) interacts with oscillatory motion (neuron spiking and bursting). Via bifurcation analysis we study the complex “landscape” involving fixed points and identify the mechanism behind the emergence of spiking. In addition,

we report on in-phase and anti-phase spiking synchronization and the interchange between them, as well as first spike latency effects. Particular emphasis has been placed on the study of the bursting dynamics exhibited by the system. Unlike previous studies claiming that bursting is generated in the same way as in the single resistive–capacitive–inductive shunted Josephson junction model, in this work we present a different, more elaborate scenario that takes into account the everchanging phase space of the system.

All of the identified dynamics have their biological counterparts and may have implications in a wide range of neurophysiological behaviors: Bursting is closely related to temporal pattern recognition and learning, synchronization is linked to Hebbian plasticity, and first spike latency plays a crucial role in neural encoding. Further studies could utilize the system for another advancing neuromorphic technology, namely physical reservoir computing, in which the complex dynamics of physical systems is exploited as information-processing devices [51, 52]. From a merely dynamical point of view, another interesting direction that requires a dedicated mathematical study would be to explore the potential implications of Shilnikov theory [53] involving saddle-foci and homoclinic orbits on our system.

- 
- [1] Brian David Josephson. Possible new effects in superconductive tunnelling. *Physics letters*, 1(7):251–253, 1962.
  - [2] Theodore Van Duzer and Charles William Turner. Principles of superconductive devices and circuits. 1981.
  - [3] Konstantin K. Likharev. *Dynamics of Josephson Junctions and Circuits*. Gordon and Breach, 1986.
  - [4] Terry P Orlando, Kevin A Delin, and Christopher J Lobb. Foundations of applied superconductivity, 1991.
  - [5] Johanne Hizanidis, Nikos Lazarides, and GP Tsironis. Flux bias-controlled chaos and extreme multistability in squid oscillators. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 28(6), 2018.
  - [6] Konstantin K Likharev and Vasilii K Semenov. Rsfq logic/memory family: A new josephson-junction technology for sub-terahertz-clock-frequency digital systems. *IEEE Transactions on Applied Superconductivity*, 1(1):3–28, 1991.
  - [7] Jingnan Cai, Robin Cantor, Johanne Hizanidis, Nikos Lazarides, and Steven M Anlage. Effects of strong capacitive coupling between meta-atoms in rf squid metamaterials. *Superconductor Science and Technology*, 2024.
  - [8] K Osbourne and JM Martinis. Superconducting qubits and the physics of josephson junctions. In *Les Houches conference proceedings*, 2003.
  - [9] Michael Schneider, Emily Toomey, Graham Rowlands, Jeff Shainline, Paul Tschirhart, and Ken Segall. Supermind: a survey of the potential of superconducting electronics for neuromorphic computing. *Superconductor Science and Technology*, 35(5):053001, 2022.
  - [10] Eugene M Izhikevich. Neural excitability, spiking and bursting. *International journal of bifurcation and chaos*, 10(06):1171–1266, 2000.
  - [11] WC Stewart. Current-voltage characteristics of josephson junctions. *Applied physics letters*, 12(8):277–280, 1968.
  - [12] Valerio Milo, Gerardo Malavena, Christian Monzio Compagnoni, and Daniele Ielmini. Memristive and cmos devices for neuromorphic computing. *Materials*, 13(1):166, 2020.
  - [13] Patrick Crotty, Dan Schult, and Ken Segall. Josephson junction simulation of neurons. *Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics*, 82(1):011914, 2010.
  - [14] Ken Segall, Matthew LeGro, Steven Kaplan, Oleksiy Svitelskiy, Shreeya Khadka, Patrick Crotty, and Daniel Schult. Synchronization dynamics on the picosecond time scale in coupled josephson junction neurons. *Physical Review E*, 95(3):032220, 2017.
  - [15] Kenneth Segall, Siyang Guo, Patrick Crotty, Dan Schult, and Max Miller. Phase-flip bifurcation in a coupled josephson junction neuron system. *Physica B: Condensed Matter*, 455:71–75, 2014.
  - [16] Michael L Schneider and K Segall. Fan-out and fan-in properties of superconducting neuromorphic circuits. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 128(21), 2020.
  - [17] Michael L Schneider, Christine A Donnelly, Ian W Haygood, Alex Wynn, Stephen E Russek, MA Castellanos-Beltran, Paul D Dresselhaus, Peter F Hopkins, Matthew R Pufall, and William H Rippard. Synaptic weighting in single flux quantum neuromorphic computing. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1):934, 2020.
  - [18] Andrey E Schegolev, Nikolay V Klenov, Georgy I Gubochkin, Mikhail Yu Kupriyanov, and Igor I Soloviev.

- Bio-inspired design of superconducting spiking neuron and synapse. *Nanomaterials*, 13(14):2101, 2023.
- [19] Ran Cheng, Uday S Goteti, and Michael C Hamilton. Spiking neuron circuits using superconducting quantum phase-slip junctions. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 124(15), 2018.
- [20] Ran Cheng, Uday S Goteti, and Michael C Hamilton. High-speed and low-power superconducting neuromorphic circuits based on quantum phase-slip junctions. *IEEE Transactions on Applied Superconductivity*, 31(5):1–8, 2021.
- [21] Yoshinao Mizugaki, Koji Nakajima, Yasuji Sawada, and Tsutomu Yamashita. Implementation of new superconducting neural circuits using coupled squids. *IEEE transactions on applied superconductivity*, 4(1):1–8, 1994.
- [22] Timur Karimov, Valerii Ostrovskii, Vyacheslav Rybin, Olga Druzhina, Georgii Kolev, and Denis Butusov. Magnetic flux sensor based on spiking neurons with josephson junctions. *Sensors*, 24(7), 2024.
- [23] Emily Toomey, Ken Segall, and Karl K Berggren. Design of a power efficient artificial neuron using superconducting nanowires. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 13:933, 2019.
- [24] Andres E Lombo, Jesus E Lares, Matteo Castellani, Chi-Ning Chou, Nancy Lynch, and Karl K Berggren. A superconducting nanowire-based architecture for neuromorphic computing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.08928*, 2021.
- [25] Olga V Skryabina, Andrey E Schegolev, Nikolay V Klenov, Sergey V Bakurskiy, Andrey G Shishkin, Stepan V Sotnichuk, Kirill S Napolskii, Ivan A Nazhestkin, Igor I Soloviev, Mikhail Yu Kupriyanov, et al. Superconducting bio-inspired au-nanowire-based neurons. *Nanomaterials*, 12(10):1671, 2022.
- [26] Jeffrey M Shainline, Sonia M Buckley, Richard P Mirin, and Sae Woo Nam. Superconducting optoelectronic circuits for neuromorphic computing. *Physical Review Applied*, 7(3):034013, 2017.
- [27] Bryce A Primavera and Jeffrey M Shainline. Considerations for neuromorphic supercomputing in semiconducting and superconducting optoelectronic hardware. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 15:732368, 2021.
- [28] Peter Dayan and Laurence F Abbott. *Theoretical neuroscience: computational and mathematical modeling of neural systems*. MIT press, 2005.
- [29] Eugene M Izhikevich. *Dynamical systems in neuroscience*. MIT press, 2007.
- [30] Frank C Hoppensteadt and Eugene M Izhikevich. Oscillatory neurocomputers with dynamic connectivity. *Physical Review Letters*, 82(14):2983, 1999.
- [31] Behnam Kia, John F. Lindner, and William L. Ditto. Nonlinear dynamics as an engine of computation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 375, 2017.
- [32] Syamal Kumar Dana, Dipendra Chandra Sengupta, and C-K Hu. Spiking and bursting in josephson junction. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, 53(10):1031–1034, 2006.
- [33] Thotretthem Hongray, Janaki Balakrishnan, and Syamal K Dana. Bursting behaviour in coupled josephson junctions. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 25(12), 2015.
- [34] Chittaranjan Hens, Pinaki Pal, and Syamal K Dana. Bursting dynamics in a population of oscillatory and excitable josephson junctions. *Physical Review E*, 92(2):022915, 2015.
- [35] Dimitrios Chalkiadakis and Johanne Hizanidis. Dynamical properties of neuromorphic josephson junctions. *Physical Review E*, 106(4):044206, 2022.
- [36] James A Blackburn and HJT Smith. Dynamics of double-josephson-junction interferometers. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 49(4):2452–2455, 1978.
- [37] Steven H Strogatz. *Nonlinear dynamics and chaos with student solutions manual: With applications to physics, biology, chemistry, and engineering*. CRC press, 2018.
- [38] Koen Engelborghs, Tatyana Luzyanina, and Dirk Roose. Numerical bifurcation analysis of delay differential equations using dde-biftool. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, 28(1):1–21, 2002.
- [39] Pascal Fries. A mechanism for cognitive dynamics: neuronal communication through neuronal coherence. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 9(10):474–480, 2005.
- [40] Eugene M Izhikevich. Which model to use for cortical spiking neurons? *IEEE transactions on neural networks*, 15(5):1063–1070, 2004.
- [41] Gabriel Kreiman. Neural coding: computational and biophysical perspectives. *Physics of Life Reviews*, 1(2):71–102, 2004.
- [42] Wainrib Gilles, Thieullen Michele, and Pakdaman Khashayar. Intrinsic variability of latency to first-spike. *Biological cybernetics*, 103:43–56, 2010.
- [43] Roland S Johansson and Ingvars Birznieks. First spikes in ensembles of human tactile afferents code complex spatial fingertip events. *Nature neuroscience*, 7(2):170–177, 2004.
- [44] Tim Gollisch and Markus Meister. Rapid neural coding in the retina with relative spike latencies. *science*, 319(5866):1108–1111, 2008.
- [45] Lina Bonilla, Jacques Gautrais, Simon Thorpe, and Timothée Masquelier. Analyzing time-to-first-spike coding schemes: A theoretical approach. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 16:971937, 2022.
- [46] Nitin Rathi, Indranil Chakraborty, Adarsh Kosta, Abhronil Sengupta, Aayush Ankit, Priyadarshini Panda, and Kaushik Roy. Exploring neuromorphic computing based on spiking neural networks: Algorithms to hardware. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–49, 2023.
- [47] Ana Stanojevic, Stanisław Woźniak, Guillaume Bellec, Giovanni Cherubini, Angeliki Pantazi, and Wulfram Gerstner. High-performance deep spiking neural networks with 0.3 spikes per neuron. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):6793, 2024.
- [48] Rüdiger Krahe and Fabrizio Gabbiani. Burst firing in sensory systems. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 5(1):13–23, 2004.
- [49] Xiao-Jing Wang. Neurophysiological and computational principles of cortical rhythms in cognition. *Physiological reviews*, 90(3):1195–1268, 2010.
- [50] Arindam Mishra, Subrata Ghosh, Syamal Kumar Dana, Tomasz Kapitaniak, and Chittaranjan Hens. Neuron-like spiking and bursting in josephson junctions: a review. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 31(5), 2021.
- [51] Gouhei Tanaka, Toshiyuki Yamane, Jean Benoit Héroux, Ryosho Nakane, Naoki Kanazawa, Seiji Takeda, Hidetoshi Numata, Daiju Nakano, and Akira Hirose. Recent advances in physical reservoir computing: A review. *Neural Networks*, 115:100–123, 2019.
- [52] André Röhm, Lina Jaurigue, and Kathy Lüdge. Reser-

voir computing using laser networks. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Quantum Electronics*, 26(1):1–8, 2020.

[53] The existence of a denumerable set of periodic motions in

four-dimensional space in an extended neighborhood of a saddle-focus. *Soviet mathematics - Doklady.*, 8, 1967.