

Ultradiscrete Bifurcations for One Dimensional Dynamical Systems

Shousuke Ohmori^{*)} and Yoshihiro Yamazaki

Department of Physics, Waseda University, Shinjuku, Tokyo 169-8555, Japan

**corresponding author: 42261timemachine@ruri.waseda.jp*

Abstract

Bifurcations of one dimensional dynamical systems are discussed based on some ultradiscrete equations. The ultradiscrete equations are derived from normal forms of one-dimensional nonlinear differential equations, each of which has saddle-node, transcritical, or supercritical pitchfork bifurcations. An additional bifurcation, which is similar to flip bifurcation, is found in ultradiscrete equations for supercritical pitchfork bifurcation. Dynamical properties of these ultradiscrete bifurcations can be characterized with graphical analysis. As an example of application of our treatment, we focus on an ultradiscrete equation of FitzHugh-Nagumo model, and discuss its dynamical properties.

1 Introduction

Ultradiscretization is a limiting procedure converting a difference equation into other type of difference equation subject to max-plus algebra[1]. In this procedure, first, a positive variable u_n of a difference equation is transformed into U_n by $u_n = \exp(U_n/\varepsilon)$, where ε is a positive parameter. After the transformation, the formulae

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log(e^{A/\varepsilon} + e^{B/\varepsilon} + \dots) = \max(A, B, \dots), \\ \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log(e^{A/\varepsilon} \cdot e^{B/\varepsilon} \cdot \dots) = A + B + \dots, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

are adopted. Then, we obtain a new difference equation called an ultradiscrete equation of U_n .

This limiting procedure brings piecewise linearization of the original equation, and an obtained

ultradiscrete equation can be associated with a cellular automaton. Ultradiscretization has been successfully applied to integrable systems[2]. Actually, some cellular automata have been derived from soliton equations such as KdV equation through ultradiscretization[1, 3, 4, 5]. Lately, ultradiscretization has been applied to non-integrable non-equilibrium dissipative systems such as reaction diffusion systems, which are also expressed by non-linear differential equations[6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12].

For discretization of non-linear differential equations, Murata proposed the tropical discretization[7].

Now we consider the equation of u :

$$\frac{du}{dt} = f(u) - g(u). \quad (2)$$

Here, $u = u(t) > 0$ and $f(u), g(u) \geq 0$. The tropical discretization leads eq.(2) to the discrete equation

$$u_{n+1} = u_n \frac{u_n + \Delta t f(u_n)}{u_n + \Delta t g(u_n)}, \quad (3)$$

where Δt is the discretized time interval. n shows the number of iteration steps and is non-negative integer; $u_n = u(n\Delta t)$. In order to obtain an ultradiscrete equation for eq.(2), the variable transformations are adopted to eq.(3): $\Delta t = e^{T/\varepsilon}$, $u_n = e^{U_n/\varepsilon}$, $f(u_n) = e^{F(U_n)/\varepsilon}$, and $g(u_n) = e^{G(U_n)/\varepsilon}$. After these transformation, we obtain the following ultradiscrete equation by eq.(1):

$$U_{n+1} = U_n + \max\{U_n, T + F(U_n)\} - \max\{U_n, T + G(U_n)\}. \quad (4)$$

So far, relationship between solutions of original non-linear differential equations and those of their ultradiscrete equations has also been discussed for non-integrable dissipative systems [7, 8, 9, 12]. Meanwhile, these differential equations have been widely studied from the view point of dynamical systems[13, 14, 15, 16]. For instance, stability of fixed points and bifurcation

phenomena have been treated. And frameworks for their treatments have been established. We feel that application of ultradiscretization to the nonlinear dynamical systems is important but seems to be insufficient now.

In this paper, we discuss dynamical properties of some ultradiscrete equations for the nonlinear dynamical systems. Especially, we focus on normal forms of saddle node, transcritical, and supercritical pitchfork bifurcations [14, 15]. In the next section, ultradiscrete equations of these normal forms are derived. It is noted that ultradiscrete bifurcations, namely bifurcations of ultradiscrete equations, are characterized by the piecewise linearity with max-plus algebra[17]. To elucidate essence of the ultradiscrete bifurcations, we introduce some simple max-plus discrete equations in Section 3. These equations have the same piecewise linearity as the ultradiscrete equations. By introducing the simple max-plus discrete equations, it is easy to sketch the piecewise linear graphs and easy to grasp dynamical properties of the bifurcations; this approach is known as a graphical analysis[18]. Discussion and conclusion are given in Sections 4 and 5, respectively.

2 Ultradiscretization of one dimensional normal forms

The one-dimensional normal forms of the saddle-node, transcritical, and supercritical pitchfork bifurcations are generally given as the following nonlinear equations, respectively [14, 15];

$$\text{(saddle-node)} \quad \frac{du}{dt} = r + u^2, \quad (5)$$

$$\text{(transcritical)} \quad \frac{du}{dt} = ru - u^2, \quad (6)$$

$$\text{(supercritical pitchfork)} \quad \frac{du}{dt} = ru - u^3, \quad (7)$$

where r is a bifurcation parameter. The bifurcation points of these three normal forms are $r = 0$.

In this section, we first derive ultradiscrete equations from equations for these bifurcations.

Then, we show the bifurcation properties of the obtained ultradiscrete equations.

2.1 Saddle-node bifurcation

Now we focus on eq.(5), the normal form of saddle-node bifurcation. In eq.(5), there is no fixed point for $r > 0$. For $r < 0$, the two fixed points exist; one of them is positive and another one is negative. Note that, in general, existence of negative values makes it difficult to apply ultradiscretization. To avoid this difficulty for eq.(5), we consider the following equation instead of eq.(5).

$$\frac{du}{dt} = c + u(u - 2). \quad (8)$$

c is the bifurcation parameter, and the saddle-node bifurcation occurs at $c = 1$. If $c < 1$, eq.(8) has the two fixed points u_- and u_+ , where $u_{\pm} = 1 \pm \sqrt{1 - c}$. Note that $u = u_-$ and $u = u_+$ are stable and unstable, respectively. If $c = 1$, $u = 1$ is half-stable. If $c > 1$, there is no fixed point.

By using the tropical discretization, the discrete equation of eq.(8) is obtained as

$$u_{n+1} = \frac{u_n + \Delta t[(u_n)^2 + c]}{1 + 2\Delta t}. \quad (9)$$

It is confirmed that eq.(9) shows the saddle-node bifurcation by changing the parameter c and that the bifurcation point $c = 1$ of eq.(9) is the same as that of eq.(8). After the variable transformations

$$\Delta t = e^{T/\varepsilon}, \quad u_n = e^{U_n/\varepsilon}, \quad c = e^{C/\varepsilon}, \quad (10)$$

and ultradiscretization by eq.(1), we obtain the ultradiscrete equation

$$U_{n+1} = \max\{U_n, T + \max(2U_n, C)\} - \max\{0, T\}. \quad (11)$$

Assuming $T \geq \max\{0, -C/2\}$, the following ultradiscrete equation can be derived from eq.(11):

$$U_{n+1} = \max(2U_n, C). \quad (12)$$

(For derivation of eq.(12), see Appendix A.1.) Dynamical properties of U_n in eq.(12) are summarized as **2.1(i)** \sim **2.1(iii)** depending on the value of C (see Appendix B.1 for details).

2.1(i) When $C > 0$, $U_{n+1} > U_n$ for any n ; there is no fixed point.

2.1(ii) When $C = 0$, $U_n = 0$ is a fixed point. If $U_n < 0$, $U_{n+1} = 0$. If $U_n > 0$, $U_{n+1} > U_n$.

Hence, $U_n = 0$ is half-stable.

2.1(iii) We set $C < 0$. $U_n = C$ and $U_n = 0$ are fixed points.

(a) If $U_n < C$ or $C < U_n \leq C/2$, $U_{n+1} = C$.

(b) If $C/2 < U_n < 0$, $C < U_{n+1} < U_n$.

(c) If $U_n > 0$, $U_{n+1} > U_n$.

Hence, $U_n = C$ is stable and $U_n = 0$ is unstable.

From these dynamical properties of U_n , the ultradiscrete bifurcation point $C = 0$ corresponds to the bifurcation point $c = 1$ for eq.(8), and **2.1(i)**, **(ii)**, and **(iii)** correspond to the cases of $c > 1$, $c = 1$, and $c < 1$ in eq.(8), respectively. Thus, the ultradiscrete equation (12) reproduces a similar saddle-node bifurcation to the original normal form.

2.2 Transcritical bifurcation

Next we focus on eq. (6), the normal form for the transcritical bifurcation. To apply ultradiscretization, we consider

$$\frac{du}{dt} = (u - 1)(c - u). \quad (13)$$

In eq.(13), c is the bifurcation parameter and the transcritical bifurcation occurs at $c = 1$. By the tropical discretization for eq.(13), we obtain

$$u_{n+1} = u_n \frac{u_n + \Delta t(1 + c)u_n}{u_n + \Delta t[(u_n)^2 + c]}. \quad (14)$$

Then ultradiscretization of eq.(14) produces

$$U_{n+1} = U_n + \max\{U_n, T + U_n + \max(0, C)\} - \max\{U_n, T + \max(2U_n, C)\}, \quad (15)$$

where we set the variable transformations

$$\Delta t = e^{T/\varepsilon}, \quad u_n = e^{U_n/\varepsilon}, \quad c = e^{C/\varepsilon}. \quad (16)$$

Now we assume $T \geq -C/2$. Then, eq.(15) can be simplified as follows.

$$U_{n+1} = 2U_n + \max(0, C) - \max(2U_n, C). \quad (17)$$

(For derivation of eq.(17), see Appendix A.2.) Dynamical properties of U_n given by eq.(17) are summarized as **2.2(i)** \sim **(iii)** (see Appendix B.2 for further explanation).

2.2(i) When $C > 0$, $U_n = 0$ and $U_n = C$ are fixed points.

- (a) If $U_n < 0$, $U_{n+1} < U_n$.
- (b) If $0 < U_n < \frac{C}{2}$, $U_{n+1} > U_n$.
- (c) If $U_n > C$ or $\frac{C}{2} \leq U_n < C$, $U_{n+1} = C$.

Hence, $U_n = 0$ is unstable and $U_n = C$ is stable.

2.2(ii) When $C = 0$, $U_n = 0$ is a fixed point.

- (a) If $U_n > 0$, $U_{n+1} = 0$.
- (b) If $U_n < 0$, $U_{n+1} < U_n$.

Then, $U_n = 0$ is the half-stable point.

2.2(iii) When $C < 0$, $U_n = 0$ and $U_n = C$ are fixed points. As in the case of **2.2(i)**,

- (a) If $U_n < C$, $U_{n+1} < U_n$.
- (b) If $C < U_n < \frac{C}{2}$, $U_{n+1} > U_n$.
- (c) If $U_n > 0$ or $\frac{C}{2} \leq U_n < 0$, $U_{n+1} = 0$.

Hence, $U_n = 0$ is stable and $U_n = C$ is unstable.

These dynamical properties are similar to those of the transcritical bifurcation by eq.(13). Actually, the ultradiscrete bifurcation point $C = 0$ corresponds to the bifurcation point $c = 1$ for

eq.(13), and **2.2(i)**, **(ii)**, and **(iii)** correspond to the cases of $c > 1$, $c = 1$, and $c < 1$ in eq.(13), respectively.

2.3 Supercritical pitchfork bifurcation

For ultradiscretization, let us consider the following equation instead of eq.(7),

$$\frac{dv}{dt} = r(v + v^2) - v^3. \quad (18)$$

After the variable transformations $v = u - 1$ and $r = 3(c - 1)$ to eq.(18), we obtain

$$\frac{du}{dt} = 3cu(u - 1) - u^3 + 1, \quad (19)$$

where c is positive. c is the bifurcation parameter and supercritical pitchfork bifurcation occurs at $c = 1$. The discrete equation of eq.(19) by the tropical discretization is

$$u_{n+1} = \frac{u_n + \Delta t[3c(u_n)^2 + 1]}{1 + \Delta t[(u_n)^2 + 3c]}. \quad (20)$$

Setting the variable transformations

$$\Delta t = e^{T/\varepsilon}, \quad u_n = e^{U_n/\varepsilon}, \quad c = e^{C/\varepsilon}, \quad (21)$$

we obtain the ultradiscrete equation

$$U_{n+1} = \max\{U_n, T + \max(2U_n + C, 0)\} - \max\{0, T + \max(2U_n, C)\}. \quad (22)$$

Assuming $T \geq \max(-C, 0)$, the following ultradiscrete equation is obtained from eq.(22).

$$U_{n+1} = \max(2U_n + C, 0) - \max(2U_n, C). \quad (23)$$

(For derivation of eq.(23), see Appendix A.3.) C -dependence of dynamical properties of eq.(23)

are summarized as follows (see Appendix B.3 for details);

2.3(i) When $C > 0$, the following three values of U_n are fixed points: $U_n = -C$, 0 , and C .

(a) If $U_n < -C$ or $-C < U_n \leq -\frac{C}{2}$, $U_{n+1} = -C$.

(b) If $-\frac{C}{2} < U_n < 0$, $U_{n+1} < U_n$.

(c) If $0 < U_n < \frac{C}{2}$, $U_{n+1} > U_n$.

(d) If $U_n > C$ or $\frac{C}{2} \leq U_n < C$, $U_{n+1} = C$.

From (a) \sim (d), $U_n = -C$ and C are stable, and $U_n = 0$ is unstable.

2.3(ii) When $C = 0$, $U_n = 0$ is the only one fixed point. If $U_n \neq 0$, $U_{n+1} = 0$. Hence, $U_n = 0$ is stable.

2.3(iii) When $C < 0$, $U_n = 0$ is the only one fixed point.

(a) If $U_n \leq \frac{C}{2}$, $U_{n+1} = -C$.

(b) If $\frac{C}{2} < U_n < 0$, $U_{n+1} > -U_n$.

(c) If $0 < U_n < -\frac{C}{2}$, $U_{n+1} < -U_n$.

(d) If $U_n \geq -\frac{C}{2}$, $U_{n+1} = C$.

Therefore, $U_n = 0$ is unstable.

Focusing on **2.3(i)** and **2.3(ii)**, it seems that eq.(23) exhibits a bifurcation similar to the supercritical pitchfork bifurcation. However, eq.(19) does not possess a dynamical property like **2.3(iii)**; the dynamical transition between **2.3(ii)** and **2.3(iii)** is rather similar to the flip bifurcation[20].

3 Graphical analysis

In the previous section, we have shown the bifurcation properties of the ultradiscrete equations (12),(17), and (23) with the bifurcation parameter C . In this section, we propose some general max-plus discrete equations, which exhibit the same properties of the ultradiscrete equations. Especially, by using a graphical analysis, their dynamical properties can be visualized. The graphical analysis is well known as a method to intuitively understand one dimensional discrete iterated dynamics[18, 19, 20]. In general, time evolution of U_n can be described as $U_{n+1} =$

$f(U_n, U_{n-1}, \dots; C)$. Here we consider the case where U_{n+1} is determined only by U_n : $U_{n+1} = f(U_n; C)$.

3.1 Saddle-node bifurcation

First let us consider the following max-plus equation with the bifurcation parameter C :

$$U_{n+1} = \max(PU_n, C). \quad (24)$$

Here, we set $P > 1$. Figure 1 shows the graphs of eq.(24) for (a) $C > 0$, (b) $C = 0$, and (c) $C < 0$.

For (a) $C > 0$, the graph of eq.(24) does not touch the diagonal $U_{n+1} = U_n$. Then, eq.(24) has no fixed point. If $U_n < C/P$, $U_{n+1} = C$ and U_{n+2} increases along $U_{n+2} = PU_{n+1} > U_{n+1}$. For

(b) $C = 0$, eq.(24) touches the diagonal at the origin of the graph. Then, $U_n = 0$ is the only

fixed point and it is half-stable. For (c) $C < 0$, the graph intersects the diagonal at the two

points $U_n = 0$ and $U_n = C$, which are the unstable and stable fixed points, respectively. In fact,

when $U_n \leq C/P$, $U_{n+1} = C$. When $C/P < U_n < 0$, U_n tends to C/P first along $U_{n+1} = PU_n$,

and after that U_n finally arrives at C . If $U_n > 0$, U_n goes to positive infinity along $U_{n+1} = PU_n$.

Then this bifurcation is saddle-node. The bifurcation diagram is shown in Fig.2. In the diagram,

the solid arrows show the transition of U_n to the stable point just at the next step. The dotted

arrows represent the transition satisfying $U_{n+1} = PU_n$. We note that eq.(12) is the special case

of eq.(24) with $P = 2$. Then, Fig.1 (a), (b), and (c) correspond to graphical descriptions of

2.1(i), **(ii)**, and **(iii)** in Sec. 2.1.

3.2 Transcritical bifurcation

Next we focus on the following max-plus equation with the bifurcation parameter C :

$$U_{n+1} = PU_n + \max(0, C) - \max(PU_n, C), \quad (25)$$

where $P > 1$. The graphs of eq.(25) with three different cases of C are shown in Fig.3. For

(a) $C > 0$, the graph intersects the diagonal at the two points $U_n = 0$ and $U_n = C$, which are




Figure 1: The graphs of eq.(24). (a) $C > 0$, (b) $C = 0$, and (c) $C < 0$.




Figure 2: The bifurcation diagram for the ultradiscrete saddle-node bifurcation generated from eq.(24).

unstable and stable fixed points, respectively. Actually if $U_n < 0$, $U_{n+1} = PU_n < U_n$ goes to negative infinity. If $0 < U_n \leq C/P$, there is the iteration step m , at which $U_m \geq C/P$ and $U_{m+1} = C$. If $U_n > C/P$, $U_{n+1} = C$. For (b) $C = 0$, there exists only one half-stable fixed point $U_n = 0$; if $U_n > 0$, $U_{n+1} = 0$ and if $U_n < 0$, $U_{n+1} = PU_n (< U_n)$. For (c) $C < 0$, the graph of eq.(25) intersects the diagonal at the two points $U_n = 0$ (stable) and $U_n = C$ (unstable). Figure 4 shows the bifurcation diagram; the bifurcation occurs at $C = 0$.




Figure 3: The graphs of eq.(25) where (a) $C > 0$, (b) $C = 0$, and (c) $C < 0$.

In the case of ultradiscrete transcritical bifurcation shown by eq.(17), the same piecewise




Figure 4: The bifurcation diagram of eq.(25).

linear graph as the case of eq.(25) can be drawn by putting $P = 2$. In fact, Fig.3 (a), (b), and (c) become graphical representations of **2.2(i)**, **(ii)**, and **(iii)** in Sec. 2.2, respectively.

3.3 Supercritical pitchfork bifurcation

Here we consider the following max-plus equation:

$$U_{n+1} = \max\{PU_n + C, 0\} - \max\{PU_n, C\}, \quad (26)$$

where $P > 1$. If we set $P = 2$, eq.(26) is the same as eq.(23). Figure 5 (a), (b), and (c) show the graphs of eq.(26) for $C > 0$, $C = 0$, and $C < 0$, respectively. Note that U_{n+1} of eq.(26) is an odd function of U_n as shown in Fig.5. For (a) $C > 0$, the graph of eq.(26) intersects the diagonal




Figure 5: The graphs of eq.(26). (a) $C > 0$, (b) $C = 0$, and (c) $C < 0$.

at the three fixed points $U_n = 0, \pm C$. If $U_n \geq C/P$ ($U_n \leq -C/P$), $U_{n+1} = +C$ ($U_{n+1} = -C$). If $-C/P < U_n < 0$, there exists a certain m at which $U_m \leq -C/P$ and $U_{m+1} = -C$. In the same way, $0 < U_n < C/P$ finally goes to C . Therefore, $U_n = \pm C$ are stable and $U_n = 0$ is unstable. As C decreases, the two stable fixed points $U_n = \pm C$ merge when $C = 0$ as shown in

Fig.5(b). Then, $U_n = 0$ is only the stable fixed point for $C = 0$; $U_1 = 0$ for any initial U_0 . We note that the dynamical properties of the cases (a) and (b) in Fig.5 correspond to **2.3(i)** and **(ii)**, respectively.

3.4 Flip bifurcation

For Fig.5(c) where $C < 0$ in eq.(26), $U_n = 0$ becomes the unstable fixed point and there is a cycle $\mathcal{C} = \{+C, -C\}$ with period 2, which is the attractor of U_n . The properties of \mathcal{C} are shown as follows. (i) \mathcal{C} surrounds the unstable fixed point: $U_n = 0$. (ii) Whenever $|U_0| > C$, $U_n \in \mathcal{C}$ for any $n \geq 1$. (iii) If U_0 satisfies $0 < |U_0| < C$, U_n leaves from 0 oscillating around 0 and reaches the point U_m such that $C/P \leq |U_m|$. After that, $U_n \in \mathcal{C}$ for $n > m$. Therefore, any U_n starting from $U_0 \neq 0$ is finally absorbed by the cycle \mathcal{C} . The dynamical property shown in Fig.5(c) corresponds to **2.3(iii)**.

4 Discussion

Regarding the derivation of eq.(23) from eq.(19), the dynamical property **2.3(iii)** of eq.(23) for $C < 0$ is not consistent with eq.(19) for $c < 1$. The dynamical inconsistency for $c < 1$ can be resolved as follows. For $c < 1$, setting $\eta = 1 - c (> 0)$, eq.(19) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{du}{dt} &= 3(1 - \eta)u(u - 1) - u^3 + 1 \\ &= -(u - 1)^3 - 3\eta u(u - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Then, we obtain the following discrete equation of eq.(27) by the tropical discretization.

$$u_{n+1} = \frac{u_n + \Delta t \{3u_n^2 + 3\eta u_n + 1\}}{1 + \Delta t \{(u_n)^2 + 3\eta u_n + 3\}}. \quad (28)$$

Applying the transformations

$$\Delta t = e^{T/\varepsilon}, \quad u_n = e^{U_n/\varepsilon}, \quad \eta = e^{E/\varepsilon}, \quad (29)$$

and assuming $T \geq 0$, the following ultradiscrete equations for $C < 0$ can be obtained from eq.(28).

$$U_{n+1} = \max\{2U_n, E + U_n, 0\} - \max\{2U_n, E + U_n, 0\} = 0. \quad (30)$$

Thus, for retaining the dynamical properties of the original equation for supercritical bifurcation, we should consider eq.(23) for $C \geq 0$ and eq.(30) for $C < 0$. It is important to properly select a form for the discretized equation of the original normal forms for retaining their original dynamical properties.

For ultradiscretization of supercritical bifurcation, now we start from eq.(7) as an another case instead of eq.(18). Applying the variable transformation $u \rightarrow u - 1$ and setting $r = c - 1$ to eq.(7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{du}{dt} &= (c-1)(u-1) - (u-1)^3 \\ &= \begin{cases} -(u-1)(u-\alpha)(u-\gamma) & \text{for } c \geq 1, \\ -(u-1)^3 - \eta(u-1) & \text{for } c < 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where $\alpha = 1 - \sqrt{c-1}$, $\gamma = 1 + \sqrt{c-1}$, and $\eta = 1 - c$. Now we assume $\alpha > 0$. Then, the discrete equation of eq.(31) by the tropical discretization becomes

$$u_{n+1} = \frac{u_n + \Delta t\{(1 + \alpha + \gamma)u_n^2 + \alpha\gamma\}}{1 + \Delta t\{(u_n)^2 + \alpha + \gamma + \alpha\gamma\}} \quad \text{for } c \geq 1, \quad (32)$$

$$u_{n+1} = \frac{u_n + \Delta t\{3u_n^2 + 1 + \eta\}}{1 + \Delta t\{(u_n)^2 + 3 + \eta\}} \quad \text{for } c < 1. \quad (33)$$

Setting

$$\begin{cases} \Delta t = e^{T/\varepsilon}, & u_n = e^{U_n/\varepsilon}, & c = e^{C/\varepsilon}, \\ \alpha = e^{A/\varepsilon}, & \gamma = e^{\Gamma/\varepsilon}, & \eta = e^{E/\varepsilon}, \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

and assuming $T \geq \max\{0, -(A + \Gamma)\}$, the following ultradiscrete equations are obtained from eq.(32) and eq.(33).

$$U_{n+1} = \max\{2U_n + \Gamma, A + \Gamma\} - \max\{2U_n, \Gamma\}, \quad \text{for } C \geq 0, \quad (35)$$

$$U_{n+1} = 0, \quad \text{for } C < 0. \quad (36)$$

(For derivation of eq.(35) and eq.(36), see Appendix C.) Note that A and Γ depend on C due to c dependence of α and γ . Furthermore when $C = 0$, it is necessary that eq.(35) is equal to eq.(36), namely $A = \Gamma = 0$. Then if we set $A = -C$ and $\Gamma = C$, eq.(35) coincides with eq.(23). In the present case, eq.(35) is considered when $C \geq 0$, then we do not have to take the flip bifurcation shown in **2.3(iii)** into account. If eq.(35) and eq.(36) are put in the following single equation,

$$U_{n+1} = \max\{2U_n + \max(C, 0), 0\} - \max\{2U_n, C, 0\}, \quad (37)$$

C -dependence of dynamical properties of eq.(37) is shown in Fig.6 as a bifurcation diagram. Note that eq.(37) holds for both cases which start from eq.(7) and eq.(18). The dynamical property of eq.(37) is consistent with that of the original normal forms for supercritical pitchfork bifurcation. Furthermore for $C \geq 0$, eq.(35) is the same form as the ultradiscrete Allen-Cahn equation[7] without diffusion effect.




Figure 6: The bifurcation diagram of eq.(37). The solid arrows show the transition of U_n to the stable point just at the next step. The dotted arrows represent the transition satisfying $U_{n+1} = 2U_n$.

Here, we focus on the ultradiscrete equation of FitzHugh-Nagumo model, which is given as the following reaction-diffusion system[21];

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{du}{dt} &= u(1-u)(u-a) - v + i, \\ \frac{dv}{dt} &= \kappa u - \lambda v \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where a, i, κ , and λ are positive and we set $0 < a < 1$. The ultradiscrete equation of FitzHugh-

Nagumo model has been proposed by Sasaki et.al[22] as the following one-dimensional ultradiscrete equation

$$U_{n+1} = \max\{2U_n, I\} - \max\{2U_n, B\}. \quad (39)$$

By their numerical calculation, it was found that eq.(39) has some characteristic solutions by changing the parameters I and B ($B > 0$). For instance, a cyclic solution was found for $I > 3B/2$. In the graphical analysis, the dynamics of eq.(39) for $B > 0$ can be visualized as shown in Fig. 7 (a)-(d). Figure 7 (a) shows the case of $I > 3B/2$. We can find the cyclic solution




Figure 7: The graphs of eq.(39) with $B > 0$. (a) $I > 3B/2$, (b) $B < I \leq 3B/2$, (c) $I = B$, and (d) $I < B$.

\mathcal{C}' surrounding the unstable fixed point $U_n = I/3$ which satisfies the properties of **3.4** stated above. Then, \mathcal{C}' is composed of the two points; $\mathcal{C}' = \{0, I - B\}$ for $I \geq 2B$, $\mathcal{C}' = \{2B - I, I - B\}$ for $I < 2B$. Note that it is easily confirmed that eq.(39) with $I = 3B(> 3B/2)$ is the same as eq.(26) with $C = -B$ by the variable transformation $U_n \rightarrow U_n + B$. Note that if $U_0 \geq I/2$, it is verified that $U_n = 0$ when n is odd and $U_n = I - B$ when n is even.

For $B < I \leq 3B/2$, Fig. 7 (b) shows that $U_n = I - B$ is the only fixed point and it is stable.

According to the graphical analysis, when $U_0 \leq B/2$, $U_1 = I - B$. On the other hand, when $U_0 > B/2$, $U_1 < I - B$, and $U_2 = I - B$. Note that this time evolution is similar to that of excitability. In Figs. 7 (c) and (d), all of the initial values finally go to the unique stable fixed point. For $I = B$, Fig. 7 (c) is the same as Fig. 5 (b). For $I < B$, it is confirmed that any U_0 finally arrives at the stable point $U_n = I - B$ according to eq.(39); Fig. 7 (d) shows the case of $I < 0$. The graphical analysis can also be applied to eq.(39) for $B < 0$ as shown in Fig. 8 (a)-(d). In Fig.8 (a), $U_n = I - B$ and $U_n = 0$ are stable and half-stable, respectively. In Fig.8




Figure 8: The graphs of eq.(39) with $B \leq 0$. (a) $I < B = 0$, (b) $I < B < 0$, (c) $B < 0 < I$, and (d) $B < I \leq 0$.

(b), $U_n = I - B, U_n = 0$ are stable and $U_n = B$ is unstable. In Fig.8 (c), $U_n = I/3$ is the unstable fixed point, and a cyclic solution is obtained. In Fig.8 (d), $U_n = 0$ is stable in which the system produces the excitability like behavior when $I/2 \lesssim 0$.

Here, we comment the above cyclic solution of the ultradiscrete equation (39). It is noted that eq. (39) is composed of one-variable discrete dynamics for U_n , although the original FitzHugh-Nagumo model (38) shows the two-variable dynamics for u and v . This reduction of the variables

occurs in the derivation of eq. (39) from eq. (38) through tropical discretization in which the variable v in the first differential equation of eq.(38) is discretized by v_{n+1} instead of v_n [22]. Since a one-dimensional differential equation can not have periodic solutions and the limit cycle solution of (38) occurs due to the two-dimensional dynamics, the above periodic solution \mathcal{C}' of eq. (39) for $I > 3B/2$ is not associated with the limit cyclic solution of the original FitzHugh-Nagumo model, but just caused by the discretization of eq.(38). Actually eq.(39) can be also derived from the one dimensional differential equation of u , $\frac{du}{dt} = u(1-u)(u-a) - \frac{\kappa}{\lambda}u + i$, which is obtained from eq.(38) by setting $\frac{dv}{dt} = 0$. Note that this periodicity is similar to the well-known relation between logistic map and logistic differential equation; the former has the periodic solution whereas the latter has no periodic solution.

Several developments of the current study are expected as the next steps. (i) The cases in higher dimensions, such as stability and bifurcations of simultaneous ultradiscrete equations[11, 12]. (ii) Other topics for the one-dimensional discrete dynamical systems such as chaos[23]. (iii) Application to ultradiscrete equations with spatial variables.

5 Conclusion

Ultradiscrete equations are derived from the normal forms of saddle node, transcritical, and supercritical pitchfork bifurcations. These derived equations exhibit ultradiscrete bifurcations, namely the similar bifurcation properties to the original normal forms. From supercritical bifurcation, we encounter another ultradiscrete bifurcation, similar to the flip bifurcation, where there is a stable cycle around a unstable fixed point. With the aid of graphical analysis, these ultradiscrete bifurcations can be characterized with the much simpler max-plus equations. As an example of application of graphical analysis, we can grasp essential dynamical features of the ultradiscrete equation for FitzHugh-Nagumo model, which was previously proposed in [22].

A Derivation of the ultradiscrete equations

A.1 Saddle-node bifurcation: eq.(11) \rightarrow eq.(12)

When we set $T \geq \max\{0, -C/2\}$,

$$T + \max(2U_n, C) - U_n = T + C/2 + \max(U_n - C/2, -U_n + C/2) \geq 0$$

since $T + C/2 \geq 0$ and $\max(U_n - C/2, -U_n + C/2) = |U_n - C/2| \geq 0$. Hence, $\max\{U_n, T + \max(2U_n, C)\} = T + \max(2U_n, C)$, and eq.(12) is obtained from eq.(11).

A.2 Transcritical bifurcation : eq.(15) \rightarrow eq.(17)

When we set $T \geq -C/2$,

$$T + U_n + \max(0, C) - U_n = T + C/2 + \max(-C/2, C/2) \geq 0$$

since $T + C/2 \geq 0$ and $\max(-C/2, C/2) = |C/2| \geq 0$. Moreover,

$$T + \max(2U_n, C) - U_n = T + C/2 + \max(U_n - C/2, -U_n + C/2) \geq 0$$

since $T + C/2 \geq 0$ and $\max(U_n - C/2, -U_n + C/2) = |U_n - C/2| \geq 0$. Thus, eq.(17) is derived from eq.(15) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} U_{n+1} &= U_n + \max\{U_n, T + U_n + \max(0, C)\} - \max\{U_n, T + \max(2U_n, C)\} \\ &= U_n + T + U_n + \max(0, C) - \{T + \max(2U_n, C)\} \\ &= 2U_n + \max(0, C) - \max(2U_n, C) \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

A.3 Supercritical pitchfork bifurcation : eq.(22) \rightarrow eq.(23)

When we set $T \geq \max\{-C/2, -C\}$,

$$T + \max(2U_n + C, 0) - U_n = T + C/2 + \max(U_n + C/2, -U_n - C/2) \geq 0$$

since $T + C/2 \geq 0$ and $\max(U_n + C/2, -U_n - C/2) = |U_n + C/2| \geq 0$. Moreover, $T + \max(2U_n, C) = T + C + \max(2U_n - C, 0) \geq 0$ from $T + C \geq 0$. Thus, eq.(22)

$$U_{n+1} = \max\{U_n, T + \max(2U_n + C, 0)\} - \max\{0, T + \max(2U_n, C)\}$$

becomes

$$U_{n+1} = T + \max(2U_n + C, 0) - \{T + \max(2U_n, C)\}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and, eq.(23) is obtained from eq.(A.2).

B Supplementarys for dynamical properties of the ultradiscrete bifurcations

For simplicity, we set $n = 0$ without loss of generality.

B.1 Saddle node bifurcation (sec.2.1)

2.1(i) For $C > 0$, there is no fixed point. Actually if $U_0 \leq 0, U_1 = \max(2U_0, C) \geq C > 0 \geq U_0$.

If $U_0 > 0, U_1 = \max(2U_0, C) \geq 2U_0 > U_0$.

2.1(ii) For $C = 0$, eq.(12) becomes $U_1 = \max(2U_0, 0)$. Then, $U_0 = 0$ is a fixed point. If

$U_0 < 0, U_1 = \max(2U_0, 0) = 0$. If $U_0 > 0, U_1 = \max(2U_0, 0) = 2U_0 > U_0$. Hence, 0 is

half-stable.

2.1(iii) For $C < 0$, $U_0 = C$ and $U_0 = 0$ are fixed points. If $U_0 \leq C/2, U_1 = C$. If $C/2 < U_0 <$

$0, U_1 = 2U_0 < U_0$. If $0 < U_0, U_1 = 2U_0 > U_0$. Hence, $U_0 = C$ and $U_0 = 0$ are stable and

unstable, respectively.

B.2 Transcritical bifurcation (sec.2.2)

2.2(i) For $C > 0$, eq.(17) becomes $U_1 = 2U_0 + C - \max(2U_0, C)$. Then, $U_0 = 0$ and $U_0 = C$ are

fixed points. If $U_0 < 0, U_1 = 2U_0 + C - C = 2U_0 < U_0$. If $0 < U_0 < C/2, U_1 = 2U_0 > U_0$.

If $C/2 \leq U_0 < C$, $U_1 = 2U_0 + C - 2U_0 = C$. If $C < U_0$, $U_1 = C$. Hence, C and 0 are stable and unstable, respectively.

2.2(ii) For $C = 0$, it follows from eq.(17) that $U_1 = 2U_0 - 2\max(U_0, 0)$. Then, $U_0 = 0$ is the only one fixed point. If $U_0 < 0$, $U_1 = 2U_0 < U_0$. If $U_0 > 0$, $U_1 = 0$. Hence, 0 is half-stable.

2.2(iii) For $C < 0$, eq.(17) becomes $U_1 = 2U_0 - \max(2U_0, C)$. Then, $U_0 = 0$ and $U_0 = C$ are fixed points. If $U_0 < C$, $U_1 = 2U_0 - C < U_0$. If $C < U_0 < C/2$, $U_1 = 2U_0 - C > U_0$. If $U_0 \geq C/2$, $U_1 = 0$. Hence, $U_0 = 0$ and $U_0 = C$ are stable and unstable, respectively.

B.3 Supercritical pitchfork bifurcation (sec.2.3)

2.3(i) For $C > 0$, the stability of eq.(23) have already been studied[12]. If $U_0 \leq -C/2$, $U_1 = -C$. If $C/2 \leq U_0$, $U_1 = C$. If $-C/2 < U_0 < 0$, $U_1 = 2U_0 < U_0$ and there is a finite time $m(> 0)$ at which $U_m \leq -C/2$ and $U_{m+1} = 0$. Similarly if $0 < U_0 < C/2$, there is a finite time $m(> 0)$ at which $C/2 \leq U_m$ and $U_{m+1} = C$. In conclusion, $C, -C$ are stable fixed points, 0 is a unstable fixed point.

2.3(ii) For $C = 0$, it follows from eq.(23) that $U_1 = 0$ for any U_0 . 0 is a stable fixed point.

2.3(iii) Set $C < 0$. If $U_0 \leq C/2$, $U_1 = \max(2U_0 + C, 0) - C = \max(2U_0, -C) = -C$. If $C/2 < U_0 < 0$, $U_1 = \max(2U_0 + C, 0) - 2U_0 = \max(C, -2U_0) = -2U_0 > -U_0$. If $0 < U_0 < -C/2$, $U_1 = -\max(2U_0, C) = -2U_0 < -U_0$. If $-C/2 \leq U_0$, $U_1 = 2U_0 + C - 2U_0 = C$. 0 is a unstable fixed point.

C Supercritical pitchfork bifurcation : eqs.(32) and (33) \rightarrow eqs.(35) and (36)

From eqs. (32) and (33) with eq. (34), the following ultradiscrete equations are obtained through the ultradiscretization shown by eq.(1):

$$U_{n+1} = \max\{U_n, T + \max(2U_n + \Gamma, A + \Gamma)\} - \max\{0, T + \max(2U_n, \Gamma)\}, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

$$U_{n+1} = \max\{U_n, T + \max(2U_n, 0, E)\} - \max\{0, T + \max(2U_n, 0, E)\}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

When we set $T \geq \max\{0, -A/2\} - \Gamma$ for eq.(C.1),

$$T + \max(2U_n + \Gamma, A + \Gamma) - U_n = T + \Gamma + A/2 + \max(U_n - A/2, -U_n + A/2) \geq 0$$

since $T + \Gamma + A/2 \geq 0$ and $\max(U_n - A/2, -U_n + A/2) \geq 0$. Hence, $\max\{U_n, T + \max(2U_n + \Gamma, A + \Gamma)\} = T + \max(2U_n + \Gamma, A + \Gamma)$. Moreover, $\max\{0, T + \max(2U_n, \Gamma)\} = T + \max(2U_n, \Gamma)$ since $T + \max(2U_n, \Gamma) \geq T + \Gamma \geq 0$. Therefore, eq.(35) is derived from eq.(C.1).

When we set $T \geq -\max(0, E/2)$ for eq.(C.2),

$$T + \max(2U_n, 0, E) - U_n = T + \max(0, E/2) + \max\{U_n - \max(0, E/2), -U_n + \max(0, E/2)\} \geq 0$$

since $T + \max(0, E/2) \geq 0$ and $\max\{U_n - \max(0, E/2), -U_n + \max(0, E/2)\} \geq 0$. Hence, $\max\{U_n, T + \max(2U_n, 0, E)\} = T + \max(2U_n, 0, E)$. Moreover, $\max\{0, T + \max(2U_n, 0, E)\} = T + \max(2U_n, 0, E)$ from $T + \max(2U_n, 0, E) \geq T + \max(0, E) \geq T + \max(0, E/2) \geq 0$. Thus, eq.(36) is derived from eq.(C.2).

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to Prof. D. Takahashi, Prof. T. Yamamoto, and Prof. Emeritus A. Kitada at Waseda university for useful suggestions and encouragements. Also, we greatly appreciate the valuable comments from an reviewer.

Data Availability

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

References

- [1] T. Tokihiro, D. Takahashi, J. Matsukidaira, and J. Satsuma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3247 (1996).
- [2] B. Grammaticos, Y. Ohta, A. Ramani, D. Takahashi, and K. M. Tamizhmani, Phys. Lett. A **226**, 53 (1997).
- [3] D. Takahashi and J. Satsuma, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **59** 3514 (1990).
- [4] J. Matsukibara, J. Satsuma, D. Takahashi, T. Tokihiro, and M. Torii, Phys. Lett. A **225** 287 (1997).
- [5] A. Nagai, D. Takahashi, and T. Tokihiro, Phys. Lett. A **255** 265 (1999).
- [6] T. Nagatani, Phys. Rev. E **58** 700 (1998).
- [7] M. Murata, J. Differ. Equations Appl. **19** 1008 (2013).
- [8] S. Ohmori and Y. Yamazaki, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. 08A01 (2014).
- [9] K. Matsuya and M. Murata, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. B **20** 173 (2015).
- [10] M. Murata, J. Phys. A Math, Theor. **48** 255202 (2015).
- [11] S. Gibo and H. Ito, J. Theor. Biol. **378** 89 (2015).
- [12] S. Ohmori and Y. Yamazaki, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **85** 045001 (2016).
- [13] G. Nicolis and I. Prigogine, *Self-organization in nonequilibrium systems* (Wiley, New York, 1977).

- [14] J. Guckenheimer and P. Holmes, *Nonlinear Oscillations, Dynamical Systems, and Bifurcations of Vector Fields* (Springer, New York, 1983).
- [15] Steven. H. Strogatz, *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos* (Westview Press, U.S. 1994).
- [16] G. Nicolis, *Introduction to Nonlinear Science* (Cambridge Univ. Press 1995).
- [17] F. Baccelli, G. Cohen, G. J. Olsder, and J. P. Quadrat, *Synchronization and Linearization* (Wiley, New York, 1992).
- [18] R. Devaney, *An Introduction to Chaotic Dynamical Systems, 2ed edition* (Addison-Wesley 1989).
- [19] C. Robinson, *Dynamical systems -Stability, Symbolic Dynamics, and Chaos-, 2ed edition* (CRC Press, Florida 1999).
- [20] Yuri A. Kuznetsov, *Elements of Applied Bifurcation Theory* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 2010).
- [21] C. Rocsoreanu, A. Georgescu, and N. Giurgiteanu, *The FitzHugh-Nagumo Model* (Springer Science+Business Media, Dordrecht, 2000).
- [22] M. Sasaki, S. Nishioka, F. Hongo, and M. Murata, Reports of RIAM Symposium, No.29AO-S7, 81 (2018).
- [23] W. Melo and R. G. Riezman, *One-Dimensional Dynamics* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 2012).